

PSCI-4200. Political Psychology

Previously PSCI-436

BELOW IS A PREVIOUS SYLLABUS TO GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT THE COURSE LOOKS LIKE. THIS IS **NOT** GOING TO BE THE EXACT SYALLBUS, BUT THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE COURSE, TOPICS COVERED, AND THE TYPES ASSIGNMENTS WILL BE SIMILAR.

Course Description

How do campaign advertisements influence voters' perceptions and behavior? What roles do emotions play in politics? Do we all harbor some measure of racism, sexism, or homophobia, and what role do these stereotypes play in political behavior? How and why do ideologies form, and how does partisanship influence the way that voters understand the political world? How do people perceive threat, and what are the psychological consequences of terrorism?

These questions, and many others, are the province of *political psychology*, an interdisciplinary field that uses methods and theories from psychology as tools to examine the world of politics. In this course, we will explore the role of human thought, emotion, and behavior in politics and examine the psychological origins of citizens' political beliefs and actions from a variety of perspectives. Most of the readings emphasize politics in the United States, though the field itself speaks to every aspect of political science.

The course has three learning objectives:

Become (the beginning of) a political psychology expert

Students will become familiar with basic theories, concepts, and controversies in political psychology by reading, discussing, and writing about a selection of contemporary works in the field. Students will come to appreciate how much we can learn by looking at politics through a psychological lens.

Understand and critically assess research

Reading assignments include journal articles and book chapters, many of which propose novel theories and make use of original data. Through these readings, students will gain a better understanding of how to read contemporary political science research and evaluate the theory, empirical results, and substantive implications of academic work. Moreover, because much of this work is quantitative, students will gain experience understanding and critically assessing research design and quantitative analyses.

Be a cautious consumer of news and better be able to understand and critique politics

A lot of what newspapers write about directly or indirectly relates to political psychology. For example, articles dealing with campaigns, terrorism, and many hot-button policies can be better understood with a political psychology background. Additionally, journalists and politicians alike are quick to make causal statements, even in the absence of evidence suggesting a causal relationship. The readings and discussions from this class will allow students to be better consumers of news and better able to evaluate claims laid out in the media on a host of topics.

Effectively communicate

Students will constantly be working on their communication skills, both written and oral. In post-college life students need to be able to consume and digest large amounts of information and be able to discuss the main ideas competently, present information to others in a clear and direct manner, and write effectively. One goal for this class, therefore, is to hone these important skills that will follow students long after the semester ends.

Text

There are no required books for purchase. Assigned readings are available on the course Canvas site under Files/Readings/Appropriate class and topic.

Students may want to consider printing out the readings each week (more on that below).

Requirements

This class is an upper division course, intended for juniors, seniors, and graduate students. The expectations and assignments will reflect the advanced-nature of this course.

First, all students are expected to attend classes and participate in class discussions. **Readings should be completed in advance of class meetings.** It will be useful if everyone brings the week's readings to class with them. **Class participation points are not freebies—they are earned.** I record "points" after each class. A student who attends but doesn't speak can expect to receive a C- in participation for the day.

Note: Graduate students should pick 1-2 "additional readings" per week to supplement the assigned reading based on their interests.

Second, students are required take surveys. These surveys will be made available on Canvas starting at 3:00 on Thursdays (right after class). I will also send an e-mail to the class with the link after class. These surveys relate to topics that we will discuss the following Thursday in class. I will analyze and present the results from the class surveys alongside results from published research.

The surveys will vary in length but will typically be quite short (usually 5 minutes, 10 at the most). Students will have approximately two days to complete the surveys. There is a code at the end of each survey. Be sure to keep this code! Students will submit this code to the Canvas site in order to receive credit.

Third, students are required to submit 3-5 questions or comments related to the readings **for each week that they do not write a short-answer response paper** (described below). These questions / comments can be (but are not limited to):

- Something about the reading a student found particularly interesting or something you disagreed with
- Something from the reading that a student did not understand (this can be either substantive or methodological)
- A thought about how two (or more) readings relate to each other. Do the main points corroborate or contradict each other?
- Did a reading make you reconsider a pre-existing view that a student had on a particular subject?
- Another comment or idea that a student would want discussed in class.

These discussion questions will not receive a letter grade, but rather will be based on a check / check minus / no credit system. These should be easy points for everyone who does the reading. I will give check minuses if the questions are too superficial, it seems like the reading was not done carefully, or it is clear that you only did some of the readings. **If you don't hear from me, that means your discussion questions are fine. I will send you a message if you're not getting full credit on your discussion questions.**

Helpful suggestion for shy students / students who do not like speaking in front of groups: Come to class with your discussion questions / comments handy. This will remove some of the stress of coming up with something to say on the spot.

Fourth, undergraduate students will write four (graded) short-answer response papers over the course of the semester. The questions corresponding to each week's reading are available below in the week-by-week schedule. The papers should be 3-4 pages, double-spaced. Undergraduates who rather not answer the specific prompt for a given week can write a response paper using the general prompt for the graduate students (but should still be 3-4 pages).

These are not reaction papers or stream-of-consciousness responses. These are like any other paper assignment, only shorter. That means the papers should make an argument, be well organized, be written clearly, and be proofread. The questions vary, and therefore how students go about answering the questions will also vary. But something that all good response papers will have in common is that they will take a position, use evidence from the readings to justify the main argument, consider alternative viewpoints or explanations, and go beyond regurgitating what the authors wrote to also include critical and/or creative thoughts about the week's topic. Also, be sure to answer the question!

Graduate students will write eight response papers over the course of the semester. The papers should be 3ish double-spaced pages in length. The papers should engage at least several of the week's readings by doing one or more of the following:

- Juxtaposing and commenting on alternative explanations for or approaches to a substantive topic;
- Criticizing the methodologies used and proposing other strategies of research;
- Criticizing the conceptualization and/or measurement of a particular construct;
- Analyzing the implications of a set of findings;
- Suggesting new questions or hypotheses for research; and/or

- Identifying similarities to or contrasts with the arguments or research in previous readings.

Reiterating expectations regarding discussion questions and short-answer responses:

Students will submit something every Wednesday at 11:59pm. Weeks when the students do not write a short-answer response, they are responsible for submitting discussion questions. Discussion questions are not required on weeks when students submit a short-answer response.

Fifth, the final project for this class will be an empirical research design paper. In it, students will lay out a tractable research question. Students are not required to answer the question, but it needs to be answerable. The question will ask how some independent variable(s) affects a dependent variable. The paper also needs to specify a political psychology theory that connects the independent and dependent variables together and lay out testable hypotheses that stem from the theory. Finally, the paper must discuss the kinds of evidence that a scholar would collect to answer the question. Think of the paper this way: the end result should look like the first 50% of academic papers assigned during the term: stating a question, outlining a theory, and stating how data will support the theory, without generating the evidence to test it. The research proposal should be about 15 pages in length for undergraduate students.

Graduate students will turn in a similar research proposal that is 15-20 pages that goes into greater detail about the data. This may mean identifying publicly available data that could be used to answer the question, including identifying the key independent and dependent variables in the data. This may mean creating an experimental stimulus from scratch. Or this may mean something else depending on the research question. Graduate students will also include a pre-analysis plan as part of the proposal, describing in detail the empirical analyses that would be done to test the hypotheses laid out.

The final papers will be due at the assigned final exam time (selected by the registrar).

Grading breakdown

Participation: 30%

2% taking surveys; 4% attendance; 4% discussion questions

20% class participation

Undergraduate short response papers: 40% (4 graded response papers, 10% each)

Graduate short response papers: 40% (8 graded response papers, 5% each)

Final research proposal: 30%

All assignments must be completed and submitted via Canvas and will go through the TurnItIn plagiarism software. Failure to complete any assignment may result in a failing grade for the class even if the student can pass the class with a 0 on the assignment.

Any grade appeals must be done in writing within two weeks of the assignment being handed back. In the appeal, the student must respond to the instructor's comments and justify why additional points are appropriate

Due dates, late policies, and conflicts

Class surveys are due by 11:59pm on the Saturday following a class. The surveys will become available at 3:00pm on Thursday (directly after class) and must be completed by Saturday night. At the end of each survey students will receive a randomly generated number. Be sure to keep this code! To get credit for taking the surveys you must:

- Log onto Canvas
- Find the appropriate assignment
 - The first assignment is called: “01 – are we rational?”
- Click “submit the assignment”
- There is a text editor to submit your assignment. In that space, paste the code from the end of the survey
- Click “submit the assignment”

There is no partial credit for late surveys.

Short-answer response papers are due by **11:59pm on Wednesday night** of a given class week. Response papers should be submitted via Canvas (Assignments/Short-answer response/Correct topic). If the response paper is submitted between 12:00am and 12:00pm, then that paper will be docked one-third of a letter grade (so an A paper becomes an A-, an A- becomes a B+, etc). No response papers will be accepted after the official start of class (12:00pm).

A note about the response papers: 1) Students must take responsibility for submitting the correct number of response papers. The instructor will not follow up with students to make sure they are on track to submit enough response papers. 2) There are no extensions granted on short-answer responses. Students only have to complete four over the course of the semester. Plan accordingly. 3) Please see the note above that failure to complete any assignment may result in a failing grade in the class.

Discussion questions are due by **11:59pm on Wednesday night** of a given class week. Discussion questions should be submitted via Canvas (Assignments/Discussion questions/Correct topic). If the discussion questions are submitted 12:00am and 12:00pm, the discussion questions will automatically receive a check minus if the questions deserve a check, and no credit if the questions deserve a check minus. No discussion questions will be accepted after the official start of class (12:00pm).

A final note about discussion questions: These questions are separate from your attendance. Students who are absent from class are not automatically excused from doing the reading and submitting discussion questions.

Final research papers are due on **Wednesday, December 22nd by 2pm**. They must be submitted via Canvas and will go through the TurnItIn plagiarism software. If the paper is late, then that paper will be docked one-third of a letter grade (so an A paper becomes an A-, an A- becomes a B+, etc) per day beginning at 2:01pm each day.

All the assignment dates are above, so students should let the instructor know within the first two weeks of class about excused absences, such as Penn sporting events and religious holidays, that conflict with the deadlines.

Statement of academic integrity

Students are bound to uphold the Code of Academic Integrity. The code prohibits activities that “have the effect of intention of interfering with education, pursuit of knowledge, or fair evaluation of a student’s performance.” Students are responsible for fully adhering to the code; the details can be found online at <http://www.upenn.edu/academicintegrity/>. Please note that ignorance of these guidelines is no excuse for failure to comply with them.

Note that all work is submitted through Canvas, and I use turnitin.com to check for plagiarism on all assignments.

Penalties for academic dishonesty are up to the professor, which (in my case), definitely means receiving a 0 on the assignment in question and may include failing the course. If you have questions about what constitutes plagiarism, feel free to speak with me or someone in the library.

Classroom Culture

Many topics discussed in a political psychology course have the possibility to be sensitive. A diverse class allows for stimulating conversation and debate, but all topics must be discussed in a respectful and constructive manner.

Soliciting feedback

Email should be used to ask short and straightforward questions. Office hours are meant to ask substantive questions, follow up on discussion from class / a comment on a response paper, or to ask for feedback on an idea for a response or final paper topic. I will do my best to find time to meet with students who cannot come to my office hours. But I do not write long and detailed substantive e-mails.

Communication

We all need to be flexible this semester! To that end, all students are required to have an email account that they check regularly. Not checking your email will not be an excuse for not knowing that the schedule changed. Additionally, everyone should check their e-mail in the hour before each class (lecture and recitation) just to confirm there has not be an unexpected shift to virtual.

COVID protocols and policies

Everyone must wear an appropriately fitting mask (relatively tight, covering nose and mouth) during lecture and recitation. This rule will remain in place even if Penn and/or Philadelphia eases up on the restriction. Extra masks will be available in both lecture and recitation. There is no eating allowed in lecture or recitation. Students who fail to comply with these rules will be asked to leave the classroom (regardless of Penn’s official policy) and will be reported to the office of student conduct (so long as the mask restriction is in place at the university).

Attendance and active participation will make or break whether this course (or any discussion-based course) is successful. As such, attendance is required for all healthy individuals. That said, please do not come to class if you are feeling sick and (obviously) you will not come to class if you test positive for COVID-19. Please utilize [Couse Absence Reports](#) to let me know if you won’t be in class. In order to provide flexibility to students who cannot attend class, everyone has one “free” class absence whereby the participation grade does not factor in their final grade. If

a student will be missing two or more classes for health-related reasons, then we discuss alternative ways to ensure that the student earns participation points for the missing class(es). This can include writing an additional response paper (if missing one additional class) or doing some sort of additional project (such as a podcast) if the student will be missing multiple classes. In short, I'm willing to be flexible but it will come with additional work.¹

Campus resources

- [The Tutoring Center](#)
- [Marks Family Writing Center](#)
- [CAPS \(Counseling and psychological services\)](#)
- [Wellness at Penn](#)
- [Penn Violence Prevention](#)
- [Office of Student Disabilities Services](#)

Schedule

September 2: Introductions; how to read an academic article; some basic background stuff

September 9: Are we rational?

Short-answer response: Do you see normative (rational choice / economic) and descriptive (behavioral decision theory) analyses as inherently opposed to one another, or can you conceive of ways in which they might be integrated? Be sure to take a position and back up your claim with evidence.

Required reading

Quattrone, George A. and Amos Tversky. 1988. "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analysis of Political Choice." *American Political Science Review* 82(3): 719-36.

Chong, Dennis. "Degrees of Rationality in Politics." In David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Chapter 4). Only up until section titled "Measuring Performance."

Kahneman, D. (2003). "A Perspective on Judgment and Choice: Mapping Bounded Rationality." *American Psychologist* 58: 697-720.

Harmon Courage, Katherine. 2020. "[How We Make Decisions During a Pandemic.](#)" *Knowable Magazines*. May 26.

Green, Amelia Hoover. 2013. "How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps."

¹ I created this policy under the working assumption that students who test positive for COVID will have a relatively mild case on account of being young, vaccinated, and (hopefully) healthy. This means that I expect quarantined students to be able to stay on top of the readings, submit discussion questions, and write response papers. If your illness precludes you from staying up on your work, we will need to find a way for you to make up the work once you are healthy.

Additional reading (not required)

Arceneaux, Kevin, and Ryan J. Vander Wielen. 2013. "The Effects of Need for Cognition and Need for Affect on Partisan Evaluations." *Political Psychology* 34(1): 23-42.

Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eckles, David L., Cindy D. Kam, Cherie D. Maestas, and Brian F. Schaffner. 2014. "Risk Attitudes and Incumbency Advantage." *Political Behavior* 36(4): 731-749.

Kam, Cindy D. 2012. "Risk Attitudes and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(4): 817-836.

Kam, Cindy D. and Elizabeth N. Simas. 2010. "Risk Orientations and Policy Frames." *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 381-396.

Mutz, Diana C., and Eunji Kim. 2020. The Progress and Pitfalls of Using Survey Experiments in Political Science. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.

Broockman, David, Josh Kalla, and Jasjeet Sekhon. 2017. "The Design of Field Experiments with Survey Outcomes: A Framework for Selecting More Efficient, Robust, and Ethical Designs." *Political Analysis*

September 16 (Yom Kippur)

September 23: The formation of the political self

Short-answer response: Drawing on the personality and socialization research, do the theories and subsequent predictions apply to your own political outlook or not? Be sure to describe which theories and predictions you think accurately reflect your political attitudes and behaviors. If the theories and predictions do not apply to you, what parts of the theories do you think are flawed or should be updated?

Required reading

Genetics: Alford, John R., Carolyn L. Funk, and John R. Hibbing. 2005. "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?" *American Political Science Review* 99(2): 153-167.

Personality: Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. 2011. "The Big Five Personality Traits in the Political Arena." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 265-287.

Personality: Bakker, Bert N., Yphtach Lelkes, and Ariel Malka. Forthcoming. "Rethinking the Link Between Self-Reported Personality Traits and Political Preferences." *American Political Science Review*.

Political Socialization: Erickson, 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.

Political Socialization: Cox, Amanda. The Upshot. "How Birth Year Influences Political Views." *New York Times*. (July 7, 2014).

Additional readings

Fazekas, Zoltan, and Levente Littvay. 2015. "The Importance of Context in the Genetic Transmission of US Party Identification." *Political Psychology* 36(4): 361-77.

Fowler, James H., Christopher T. Dawes, and Jaime Settle. 2009. "The Heritability of Partisan Attachment" *Political Research Quarterly* 62(3): 601-13.

Funk, Carolyn L. 2013. Genetic Foundations of Political Behavior. In L. Huddy, D.O. Sears, and J.S. Levy, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. 2012. "Disagreement and the Avoidance of Political Discussion: Aggregate Relationships and Differences across Personality Traits." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(4): 849-74.

Hatemi, Peter K., John R. Alford, John R. Hibbing, Nicholas G. Martin, and Lindon J. Eaves. 2009. "Is there a "party" in your genes?." *Political Research Quarterly* 62(3): 584-600.

Hatemi, Peter K., 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." *The Journal of Politics* 71(3): 1141-56.

Jennings, M. Kent. 1987. "Residues of a Movement: The Aging of the American Protest Generation." *American Political Science Review* 81(2): 367-382.

Margolis, Michele. 2018. "How Politics Affects Religion: Partisanship, Socialization, and Religiosity in America." 2018. *The Journal of Politics*. 80(1): 30-43.

Sears, David O. 1983. "The Persistence of Early Political Predispositions" *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* 4: 79-110.

Sears, David O., and Nicholas A. Valentino. 1997. "Politics Matters: Political Events as Catalysts for Preadult Socialization." *American Political Science Review* 91(1): 45-65.

Sherkat, Darren. "Counterculture or continuity? Competing influences on baby boomers' religious orientations and participation." *Social Forces* 76(3): 1087-1114.

Valentino, Nicholas A., and David O. Sears. 1998. "Event-Driven Political Communication and the Preadult Socialization of Partisanship." *Political Behavior* 20(2): 127-54.

Bos, Angela, Kill Greenlee, Mirya R. Holman, Zoe Oxley, and J. Celeste Lay. Forthcoming. "This One's for the Boys: How Gendered Political Socialization Limits Girls' Political Ambition and Interest" *American Political Science Review*.

September 30: Authoritarianism, social pressure, and obedience

Short-answer response: How, if at all, do theories related to authoritarianism, obedience, and social pressure inform our understanding of the current American political landscape?²

Zimbardo, Phillip. G. Haney, W.C. Banks, and D. Jaffe. 1974. "The Mind is a Formidable Jailer: A Pirandellian Prison." *New York Times Magazine*, Section 6, 36.

Le Texier, Thibault. 2019. "Debunking the Stanford Prison Experiment." *American Psychologist*.

MacWilliams, Matthew C. 2016. "Who Decides when the Party Doesn't? Authoritarian Voters and the Rise of Donald Trump." *PS* (October): 716-21.

Hartman, Todd K. 2021. "The Authoritarian Dynamic During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Nationalism and Anti-Immigrant Sentiment." *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 12(7): 1274-1285.

Milgram, Stanley. 1971. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper Perennial. Chapters 1-4.

Asch, Solomon E. 1955. "Opinions and Social Pressure." *Scientific American* 193(5): 31-35.

Additional readings:

Malka, Ariel, Yphtach Lelkes, and Bert Bakker. 2020. "Openness to Authoritarian Governance within Western Democracies: The Roles of Cultural Conservatism and the Protection-Based Attitude Configuration." *Perspectives on Politics*.

Hetherington, Marc J. and Elizabeth Suhay. 2011. "Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans' Support for the War on Terror." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 546-60.

Velez, Yamil R. and Howard Lavine. 2017. "Racial Diversity and the Dynamics of Authoritarianism." *Journal of Politics* 79(2): 519-33.

White, Ismail K., Chryl Laird, and Troy Allen. 2014. "Selling Out? The Politics of Navigating Conflicts Between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." *American Political Science Review*. 108(4): 783-800.

White, Ismail K. and Chryl Laird. 2020. *Steadfast Democrats: How Social Forces Shape Black Political Behavior*. Princeton University Press.

Hetherington, Marc J. and Efrén O. Pérez. 2013. "Authoritarianism in Black and White: Testing the Cross-Racial Validity of the Child Rearing Scale" *Political Analysis* 22: 398-412.

Panagopoulos, Costas and Sander van der Linden. 2016. "Conformity to Implicit Social Pressure: The Role of Political Identity." *Social Influence* 11(3): 177-184.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 33-48.

October 7: Political knowledge and heuristics

² I am flexible on how one defines "American political landscape", but be sure to define it!

Short-answer response: What would happen if Americans were fully informed? Would our politics look different?

Kuklinski, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2000. "Reconsidering the Rational Public: Cognition, Heuristics, and Mass Opinion." In Arthur Lupia, Matthew D. McCubbins, and Samuel L. Popkin (eds.), *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hochschild, Jennifer L. and Katherine Levine Einstein. 2015. "Do Facts Matter? Information and Misinformation in American Politics." *Political Science Quarterly* 130(4): 585-624.

Ahler, Douglas J., and Gaurav Sood. 2018. "The Parties in Our Heads: Misperceptions about Party Composition and Their Consequences." *The Journal of Politics* 80 (3): 964-981.

Hopkins, Daniel J., John Sides, and Jack Citrin. 2018. "The Muted Consequences of Correct Information on Immigration." *Journal of Politics*. 81(1): 315-320.

Additional reading

Bullock, John G. and Kelly Radar. 2021. "Response Options and the Measurement of Political Knowledge." *British Journal of Political Science*.

Munger, Kevin, Patrick J. Egan, Jonathan Nagler, Jonathan Ronen, and Joshua Tucker. 2020. "Political Knowledge and Misinformation in the Era of Social Media: Evidence from the 2015 UK Election." *British Journal of Political Science*

Bakker, B., Lelkes, Y, Malka, A. (2020). Understanding Partisan Cue Receptivity: Tests of Predictions from the Bounded Rationality and Expressive Utility Perspectives. *Journal of Politics*.

Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(4): 951-971.

Dancey, Logan and Geoffrey Sheagley. 2013. "Heuristics Behaving Badly: Party Cues and Voter Knowledge." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(2): 312-325.

Bernhard, Rachel and Sean Freeder. 2020. "The More You Know: Voter Heuristics and the Information Search." *Political Behavior* 42: 603-623.

Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Popkin, Samuel L. 1991. *The Reasoning Voter: Communication and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88(1): 63-76.

Luskin, Robert C. and John G. Bullock. 2011. "Don't Know" Means "Don't Know": DK Responses and the Public's Level of Political Knowledge." *Journal of Politics* 73(2): 547-557.

Thomas J. Leeper. forthcoming. "The Role of Media Choice and Media Effects in Political Knowledge Gaps" *Political Communication*.

Bullock, John G., Alan S. Gerber, Seth J. Hill, and Gregory A. Huber. 2015. "Partisan Bias in Factual Beliefs about Politics." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10: 519-578.

Fowler, Anthony and Michele Margolis. 2014. "The Political Consequences of Uninformed Voters." *Electoral Studies*. 34: 100-110.

October 14 (Fall break)

October 21: Information processing

Short-answer response: Using different theories from the readings, explain why there are people who believe that the COVID-19 pandemic is a hoax. From a psychological standpoint, what, if anything, would make a "COVID denier" believe that COVID-19 is real.

Lodge, Milton, and Charles Taber. 2000. "Three Steps toward a Theory of Motivated Political Reasoning." In Lupia, McCubbins, and Popkin (eds.), *Elements of Reason*.

Festinger, Leon and James M. Carlsmith. 1959. "Cognitive Consequences of Forced Compliance." *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 58(2): 203-210.

Aronson, Elliot and Carol Tavris. 2020. "The Role of Cognitive Dissonance in the Pandemic." *The Atlantic*.

Kahan, Dan M., Ellen Peters, Erica Cantrell Dawson, and Paul Slovic. 2017. "Motivated Numeracy and Enlightened Self-Government." *Behavioural Public Policy* 1(1): 54-86.

Bisgaard, Martin. 2015. "Bias Will Find a Way: Economic Perceptions, Attributions of Blame, and Partisan-Motivated Reasoning during Crisis." *Journal of Politics* 77(3): 849-860.

Additional reading

Redlawsk, David P., Andrew J.W. Civettini, and Karen M. Emmerson. 2010. "The Affective Tipping Point: Do Motivated Researchers Ever 'Get It'?" *Political Psychology* 31(4): 563-593.

Arceneaux, Kevin, and Ryan J. Vander Wielen. 2017. *Taming Intuition: How Reflection Minimizes Partisan Reasoning and Promotes Democratic Accountability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Redlawsk, David P. 2002. "Hot Cognition or Cool Consideration? Testing the Effects of Motivated Reasoning on Political Decision Making." *The Journal of Politics* 64(4): 1021-44.

Slothuus, Rune, and Claes H. De Vreese. 2010. "Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue Framing Effects." *The Journal of Politics* 72(3): 630-45.

Leeper, Thomas J., and Rune Slothuus. 2014. "Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion formation." *Political Psychology* 35: 129-56.

Porumbescu, Gregory, Donald Moynihan, Jason Anastasopoulos, and Asmus Leth Olsen. "Motivated Reasoning and Blame: Responses to Performance Framing and Outgroup Triggers During COVID-19." Working paper available [here](#).

Brenes Peralta, C., Wojcieszak, M., Lelkes, Y. (2021). Can I Stick to My Guns? Motivated Reasoning and Biased Processing of Balanced Political Information. *Communication and Society*.

October 28: Ideology and Public Opinion

Short-answer response: Evaluate the following statement: “Americans are not ideological.” Be sure to justify your position and to consider alternative positions.

Kinder, Donald R. and Nathan P. Kalmoe. 2017. “Converse’s Claim” (Chapter 1: 11-21), “The Great Debate” (Chapter 2: 22-46), and “Meaning and Measurement of Ideological Identification” (Chapter 3: 47-60). In *Neither Liberal Nor Conservative. Ideological Innocence in the American Public*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson. “The Meaning of Ideology in America” (Chapter 1: 1-13), “Operational Ideology: Preferences Data” (part of Chapter 2: 14-17), “The Operational-Symbolic Disconnect” (Chapter 5: 90-112)”, and “Ideology and American Political Outcomes” (part of Chapter 8: 175-184).” In *Ideology in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barber, Michael. And Jeremy C. Pope. 2019. “Does Party Trump Ideology? Disentangling Party and Ideology in America.” *American Political Science Review*. 113(1): 38-54.

Mason, Lilliana. 2018. “Ideologues without Issues: The Polarizing Consequences of Ideological Identities” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82(S1): 280-301.

Additional reading

Conover, Pamela Johnson and Stanley Feldman. 1981. “The Origins and Meaning of Liberal / Conservative Self-Identifications.” *American Journal of Political Science* 25(4): 617-45.

Converse, Phillip. 1964. “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.” In *Ideology and Discontent*, edited by David E. Apter, 206-61. New York: Free Press.

John, John T. 2006. “The End of the End of Ideology.” *American Psychologist* 61(7): 651-670.

Levendusky, Matthew. 2009. *The Partisan Sort. How Liberals Became Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jefferson, Hakeem. “The Curious Case of Black Conservatives: Construct Validity and the 7-Point Liberal-Conservative Scale.” SSRN version available [here](#).

Lee, Hye-Yon, and Diana C. Mutz. 2018. Changing Attitudes toward Same-Sex Marriage: A Three-Wave Panel Study. *Political Behavior* 41:701–722.

Kalla, Joshua L. and David E. Broockman. 2020. Reducing Exclusionary Attitudes through Interpersonal Conversation: Evidence from three field experiments. *American Political Science Review*, 114(2): 410-425.

Lelkes, Y. (2020). Policy over party: Comparing the effects of candidate ideology and party on affective polarization. *Political Science Research and Methods*.

Graham, Matthew H. and Alexander Coppock. 2021. “Asking About Attitude Change.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 85(1): 28–53.

November 4: The Importance of Groups—how should we think about groups and why do they matter?

Short-answer response: Thinking about the question through the lens of groups, how did Americans become so bitterly divided about wearing masks and mask mandates?³

Huddy, Leonie. 2013. "Group Identity and Political Cohesion." In David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Chapter 15: 511-58).

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

Nicholson, Stephen. 2012. Polarizing Cues. *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1): 52-66.

Hobolt, Sara B., Thomas J. Leeper, and James Tilley. 2020. "Divided by the Vote: Affective Polarization in the Brexit Referendum." *British Journal of Political Science*.

Additional readings:

Tajfel, Henri, John C. Turner, William G. Austin, and Stephen Worchel. (1979). "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict." *Organizational identity: A Reader* (pp. 56-65).

Tavits, Margit, and Efren O. Perez. 2019. "Language Influences Mass Opinion Toward Gender and LGBT Equality." *PNAS*.

Kinder, Donald R. and Cindy D. Kam. 2009. *Us Against Them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Klar, Samara. 2013. "The Influence of Competing Identity Primes on Political Preferences." *Journal of Politics* 75(4): 1108-24.

Mansfield, Edward. and Diana C. Mutz. 2013. "US vs. Them: Mass Attitudes toward Offshore Outsourcing," *World Politics* 65 (04): 571-608.

Arceneaux, Kevin. 2017. "Anxiety Reduces Empathy Toward Outgroup Members But Not Ingroup Members" *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 4(1): 68-80.

Klar, Samara. 2018. "When Common Identities Decrease Trust: An Experimental Study of Partisan Women." *American Journal of Political Science*. 62(3): 610-622.

Mutz, Diana C. and Eunji Kim. 2017. How In-group Favoritism Affects Trade Preferences. *International Organization* 71 (4): 827-850.

Kam, Cindy D. and Allison M N Archer. 2021. "Mobilizing and Demobilizing: Modern Sexism and Turnout in the #MeToo Era." *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 85(1): 172-182.

November 11: The Importance of Groups—race and ethnicity in the U.S.

³ I recognize that there are individual-level attributes (such as authoritarianism) that corresponds with beliefs regarding mask wearing and mask mandates. This response should focus on group-level explanations.

Short-answer response: America's demographic makeup has been changing rapidly. See [here](#) for a summary of key changes between the 2010 and 2010 census and [here](#) for population projections going out into the future. Drawing on the readings from this week, generate some theoretically grounded expectations (hypotheses) about how different racial and ethnic groups in the United States may respond.

Required reading

Perez, Efrén O. 2015. "Xenophobic Rhetoric and Its Political Effects on Immigrants and Their Co-Ethnics." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(3): 549-564..

White, Ismail K., Chyrl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen. 2014. "Selling Out? The Politics of Navigating Conflicts between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." *American Political Science Review* 108(4): 783–800.

Tesler, Michael and David O. Sears. 2010. *Obama's Race. The 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America*. Chapters 1, 2, 3 (pp: 1-74).

Jardina, Ashley. 2019. *White Identity Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2 (pp. 21-49).

Additional readings:

Jardina, Ashley and LaFleur Stephens-Dougan. 2021. "The Electoral Consequences of Anti-Muslim Prejudice." *Electoral Studies*

Anoll, Allison P. 2018. "What Makes a Good Neighbor? Race, Place, and Norms of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*.

Sears, David O., Colette van Laar, Mary Carrillo, and Rick Kosterman. 1997. "Is it Really Racism? The Origins of White Americans' Opposition to Race-Targeted Policies." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(1): 16-53.

Goldman, Seth K. and Diana C. Mutz. 2014. *The Obama Effect: How the 2008 Campaign Changed White Racial Attitudes*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.

Hopkins, Daniel J., Cheryl Kaiser, Efrén Pérez, Sara Hagá, Corin Ramos, and Michael Zárate. Forthcoming. "Does Perceiving Discrimination Influence Partisanship among U.S. Immigrant Minorities? Evidence from Five Experiments" *Journal of Experimental Political Science*

Jardina, Ashley. 2020. "In-group Love and Out-Group Hate: White Racial Attitudes in Contemporary U.S. Elections." *Political Behavior*.

Goldman, Seth and Daniel J. Hopkins. Forthcoming. When Can Exemplars Shape White Racial Attitudes? Evidence from the 2012 U.S. Presidential Campaign. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*.

Hainmueller, Jens and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2015. "The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(3): 529-48.

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 40-60.

Stephens-Dougan, LaFleur. 2016. "Priming Racial Resentment without Stereotypic Cues." *Journal of Politics*. 78(3): 687-704.

Hopkins, Daniel J. and Samantha Washington. 2020. "The Rise of Trump, the Fall of Prejudice? Tracking White Americans' Racial Attitudes 2008-2018 via a Panel Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 84(1): 119-140.

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2015. "The Upside of Accents: Language, Skin Ton, and Attitudes toward Immigration." *British Journal of Political Science* 45(3): 531-557.

Yadon, Nicole and Mara Ostfeld. 2020. "Shades of Privilege: The Relationship Between Skin Color and Political Attitudes Among White Americans." *Political Behavior*, 42(4), 1369-1392.

Ashley Jardina, Nathan P. Kalmoe, & Kimberly Gross. 2020. "Disavowing white identity: How social disgust can change social identities." *Political Psychology*.

Perez, Efren O. and Margit Tavits. 2018. "Language Heightens the Political Science of Ethnic Divisions." *Journal of Experimental Political Science*

November 18: The Importance of Groups—polarization and social sorting (April 2)

Short-answer response: How should scholars evaluate the statement: "America is deeply polarized."? In answering this question, be sure to think about how scholars *should* define and measure polarization (be sure to justify that position).

Levendusky, Matthew. 2009. "The Transformation of the American Electorate" (Chapter 1: 1-11), "Why Voters Sort" (Chapter 2: 12-20), "Have Voters Sorted" (Chapter 3: 38-52), and "How Voters Sort" (Chapter 6: 109-119). In *The Partisan Sort. How Liberals Became Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mason, Lilliana. 2013. "The Rise of Uncivil Agreement: Issue Versus Behavioral Polarization in the American Electorate." *American Behavioral Scientist* 57(1): 140-159.

Dias, Nicholas, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2021. "The Nature of Affective Polarization: Disentangling Policy Disagreement from Partisan Identity." *American Journal of Political Science*

Klar, Samara, Yanna Krupnikov, and John B. Ryan. 2018. "Affective Polarization or Partisan Disdain?: Untangling a Dislike for the Opposing Party from a Dislike of Partisanship." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82(2): 379-90.

Additional readings:

Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams and Jeremy C. Pope. 2010. *Culture War? The Myth of Polarized America*.

Mason, Lilliana. 2015. "'I Disrespectfully Agree': The Differential Effects of Partisan Sorting on Social and Issue Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(2): 128-45.

Westwood, S., Petersen, E., & Lelkes, Y. (2019). Are there Still Limits on Partisan Prejudice?. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83(3), 584-597.

Abramowitz, Alan and Kyle Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *Journal of Politics* 70(2): 542-55.

Mason, Lilliana. 2018. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(3): 405-31.

Druckman, Jamie. and Matthew S. Levendusky. (2019). "What Do We Measure When We Measure Affective Polarization?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 83(1): 114-132.

Druckman, James N., S.R. Gubitz, Matthew S. Levendusky, and Ashley M. Lloyd. 2019. "How Incivility (De)Polarizes the Electorate." *Journal of Politics* 81(1): 583-92.

Levendusky, Matthew S. (2018). Americans, Not Partisans: Can Priming American National Identity Reduce Affective Polarization? *Journal of Politics* 80(1): 59-70.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Sean J. Westwood. "Fear and Loathing Across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(3): 690-707.

Druckman, James N., Samara Klar, Yanna Krupnikov, Matthew Levendusky, and John Barry Ryan. 2021. "(Mis)Estimating Affective Polarization." *Journal of Politics*.

November 23 (Tuesday meeting for Thursday class): I've got a feeling – Emotions TBD, but class will most likely be virtual.

Short-answer response: Having read about knowledge, information processing, polarization and group attachment, and now emotions – what is the best campaign to encourage vaccination? While you should justify why the proposed campaign is the best you can come up with, also be sure to note whether (and why) you think it will be effective in an absolute sense.

Banks, Antoine J., and Nicholas A. Valentino. 2012. Emotional Substrates of White Racial Attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science* 56: 286-297.

Gadarian, Shana Kushner and Bethany Albertson. 2014. "Anxiety, Immigration, and the Search for Information." *Political Psychology* 35(2): 133-64.

Pfattheicher, Stefan, Laila Nockur, Robert Bohm, Claudia Sassenrath, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2020. "The Emotional Path to Action: Empathy Promotes Physical Distancing and Wearing of Face Masks During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Psychological Science*. 31(11): 1363-1373.

Additional readings:

McClendon, Gwyneth H. 2018. *Envy in Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Phoenix, Davin. 2019. *The Anger Gap: How Race Shapes Emotion in Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Banks, Antoine J. 2014. "The Public's Anger: White Racial Attitudes and Opinions Toward Health Care Reform" *Political Behavior*, 36: 493-514.

Banks, Antoine J. and Melissa A. Bell. 2013. "Racialized Campaign Ads: The Emotional Content in Implicit Racial Appeals Primes White Racial Attitudes" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77: 549-560.

Banks, Antoine J. 2016 "Are Group Cues Necessary?: How Anger Makes Ethnocentrism Among Whites a Stronger Predictor of Racial and Immigration Policy Opinions" *Political Behavior*, 38: 635-657

Banks, Antoine J. and Heather K. Hicks. 2016. "Fear and Implicit Racism: Whites' Support for Voter ID laws" *Political Psychology* 37(5): 641-658.

Banks, Antoine J., Ismail K. White and Brian D. McKenzie. 2019. "Black Politics: How Anger Influences the Political Actions Blacks Pursue to Reduce Racial Inequality" *Political Behavior* 41:917-943

Webster, Steven. 2020. *American Rage: How Anger Shapes Our Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 388-405.

Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, and Erin Cassese. 2007. "On the Distinct Political Effects of Anxiety and Anger." In W. Russel Neuman, George E. Marcus, Ann Crigler, and Michael Mackuen, eds, *The Affect Effect: Dynamics of Emotion in Political Thinking and Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Conover, Pamela J., and Stanley Feldman. 1986. "Emotional Reactions to the Economy: I'm Mad as Hell and I'm Not Going to Take It Anymore." *American Journal of Political Science* 30(1): 50-78.

Marcus, George E., and Michael B. MacKuen. "Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 672-85.

Lene, Aaroe, Michael Bang Peterson, and Kevin Arceneaux. 2017. "The Behavioral Immune System Shapes Political Intuitions: Why and How Individual Differences in Disgust Sensitivity Underlie Opposition to Immigration." 111(2): 277-94.

Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2005. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis." *Political Psychology* 26(3): 455-482.

Valentino, Nick, Vince Hutchings, Antoine Banks, and Anne K. Davis. 2008. "Is a Worried Citizen a Good Citizen? Emotions, Political Information Seeking, and Learning via the Internet. *Political Psychology*. 29(2): 247-73.

Valentino, Nicholas A. et al. 2011. "Election Night's Alright for Fighting: The Role of Emotions in Political Participation." *Journal of Politics* 73(1): 156-170.

Dietrich, Bryce J, Ryan D. Enos, and Maya Sen. 2019. "Emotional Arousal Predicts Voting on the US Supreme Court." *Political Analysis* 27(2): 237-243.

Kam, Cindy D. and Beth A. Estes. 2016. "Disgust Sensitivity and Public Demand for Protection." *Journal of Politics* 78(2): 481-496.

December 2: The importance of the media

Short-answer response: Each reading from this week offers a different theory or explanation of how media influence (or does not influence) opinions and behaviors. Which explanations, in any, do you think do the best job explaining the media's role in the 2020 elections? Are there any explanations that are not particularly relevant to the most recent election?

Required reading

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982, "Experimental Demonstrations of the "Not-So-Minimal" Consequences of Television News Programs." *American Political Science Review* 76(4): 848-58.

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(3): 567-583.

Mutz, Diana C. 2007. "Effect of "In-Your-Face" Television Discourse on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 101(4).

Iyengar, Shanto and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use" *Journal of Communication* 59: 19–39.

Allcott, Hunt and Matthew Gentzkow. 2017. "Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31(2): 211-36.

Additional readings:

Kim, Eunji. (Forthcoming). "Entertaining Beliefs in Economic Mobility." *American Journal of Political Science*

Levendusky, Matthew (Forthcoming). "How Does Local TV News Change Viewers' Attitudes? The Case of Sinclair Broadcasting." *Political Communication*.

Tobias Konitzer, Jennifer Allen, Stephanie Eckman, Baird Howland, Markus Mobius, David Rothschild, Duncan J Watts. 2021. Comparing Estimates of News Consumption from Survey and Passively Collected Behavioral Data, *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

Munger, Kevin, Mario Luca, Jonathan Nagler, and Joshua Tucker. 2020. "The (Null) Effects of Clickbait Headlines on Polarization, Trust, and Learning." *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 84(1): 49-73.

Munger, Kevin, Patrick J. Egan, Jonathan Nagler, Jonathan Ronen, and Joshua Tucker. 2020. "Political Knowledge and Misinformation in the Era of Social Media: Evidence from the 2015 UK Election." *British Journal of Political Science*

Kim, Eunji, Michael E. Shepherd, and Joshua D. Clinton. 2020. "The Effect of Big-City News on Rural America During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *PNAS* 117:(36).

Druckman, James N. 2001. "On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame?" *Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1041-66.

Settle, Jaime. 2018. *Frenemies: How Social Media Polarizes America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Arceneaux, Kevin and Martin Johnson. 2013. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levendusky, Matthew. *How Partisan Media Polarize America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mutz, Diana C. 2015. *In-Your-Face Politics. The Consequences of Uncivil Media*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zaller, John. 2001. "Monica Lewinsky and the Mainsprings of American Politics" in *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*. W. Lance Bennett and Robert M. Entman (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prior, Markus. 2005. "News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 577-592.

Iyengar, Shanto. 2016. "News and Public Opinion." In *Media Politics: A Citizen's Guide* (Chapter 8: pp. 230-269). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Mutz, Diana C. and Lilach Nir. 2010. "Not Necessarily the News: Does Fictional Television Influence Real-World Policy Preferences?" *Mass Communication and Society* 13(2): 196-217.

Druckman, James N., S.R. Gubitz, Matthew S. Levendusky, and Ashley M. Lloyd. 2019. "How Incivility (De)Polarizes the Electorate." *Journal of Politics* 81(1): 583-92.

Druckman, Jamie, Matthew S. Levendusky, & Audrey McLain. (2018). No Need to Watch: How the Effects of Partisan Media Can Spread via Inter-Personal Discussions. *American Journal of Political Science*. 62(1): 99-112.

December 9: TBD, class choice

Short-answer response: After digesting this week's readings, what sorts of political psychology questions associated to the topic are still left unanswered? Come up with three research questions related to this week's topic (although it can incorporate theories from previous weeks). Remember, research questions should be direct, straightforward, and answerable. For two of the research questions, write out testable hypotheses. The hypotheses should assert a directional relationship between a dependent variable and an independent variable. And while you do not need to provide a full theoretical justification for the proposed relationship, the hypotheses should not be too far fetched. Finally, for one of the hypotheses, describe what sort of data a researcher would collect in order to test the hypothesis. What do the data need to show in order to support your hypothesis?

- More reading on a particular topic
- Psychological consequences of terrorism; violence
- Populism and nativism
- Morality
- Conspiracy theories
- Something else altogether