

POS 5208 - Political Psychology

Fall 2021

Last Updated: January 06, 2022

Note: All times and dates in the syllabus or other course material correspond to Tallahassee's Eastern Time Zone

Class Time: Tuesdays, 2:30-5PM

Class Location: BEL 113

Instructor: Matthew Pietryka (you can call me *Matt*)

Pronouns: he/him

Email: mpietryka@fsu.edu (<mailto:mpietryka@fsu.edu>)

Office: BEL 561

Office Hours: I will be available Thursdays 2-3pm, but you can visit my office whenever the door is open. You may alternatively schedule a virtual meeting using this link: <https://calendly.com/pietryka/office-hours> (<https://calendly.com/pietryka/office-hours>)

Slow the spread of COVID-19

I am excited to return to the classroom, but sad that we must do so while covid-19 remains so prevalent. To protect each of you (and the broader community), I expect all students to follow the guidance laid out by the university:

1. **wear masks** in the classroom
2. **get fully vaccinated**
3. **get tested** for the virus if you have symptoms
4. **if you are sick, stay home** and away from others.

I promise to do the same.

If you miss class or a deadline, I will work with you to ensure that your grade does not suffer—as long as you receive my permission in advance. If your condition prevents you from contacting me in advance, notify me as soon as possible so we can discuss the situation.

Finally, please bear in mind that the covid-19 situation is fast moving and that university guidance on the issue may change at any time.

Course Description

This course focuses on research that explores the psychological processes of individual decision makers. This research focuses on *political* attitudes and decisions, but also includes more general research on attitude formation and information processing. The first goal of the course is to understand the distinct set of theoretic approaches and substantive foci of political psychology. We will study theoretic approaches including rational choice, personality, hot cognition, and group identity. We will see how these approaches are applied to a range of substantive topics including authoritarianism, political socialization, political ideologies, racial attitudes, and political participation.

In addition to these substantive considerations, a second goal of the course is to understand the methods that scholars use to study political psychology. While we will consider readings that trace the development of the field over time, the emphasis will be on recent quantitative work. We will try to understand how the methodologies common to political psychology inform both the questions researchers ask and the answers they receive.

The third goal of the course will be to increase students' overall level of professionalism. We will accomplish this goal, in part, by periodic discussions of a variety of relevant topics for carrying out and presenting political science research—in both written and oral form.

Course Objectives

- **identify** and **explain** the distinct theoretic approaches used in the study of political psychology
- **discuss** the range of substantive questions examined by political psychologists
- **evaluate** the research design and statistical methods used in the study of political psychology
- **practice** developing, communicating, and defending research ideas

ASSESSMENTS

Students' grades for the course are comprised of four sets of assessments, each weighted equally:

PARTICIPATION (weekly):

Each weekly meeting will be spent discussing and critically evaluating the assigned readings. Students' participation grades hinge on their contribution to each discussion. After each class, I will assign each student a participation grade using a three-point scale: Students will earn a ✓+ if they demonstrate an understanding of how these readings build upon, reinforce, or contradict material from earlier in the course; a ✓ grade if they demonstrate an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of these readings, and a ✓- if they do not participate or their participation does not demonstrate understanding of all assigned readings.

PRESENTATIONS (×2):

Over the course of the semester, each student will present two of the assigned readings to the class. Each presentation should be designed to mimic an excellent conference presentation. Additional details will be available on Canvas.

INTRODUCTION MEMOS (×3):

Over the course of the semester, each student will write three memos designed to look like the introduction to an original research manuscript. Each memo should briefly describe a research problem and propose a research design that can help address the problem. Optionally, each student may write an additional, fourth memo to replace their lowest score. Additional details will be available on Canvas.

PEER REVIEWS (×2):

Over the course of the semester, each student will write two responses to recent research. Each response should mimic the form of an anonymous peer review. Each review should be thorough, helpful, and polite. Additional details will be available on Canvas.

FINAL GRADE

The final letter grade will be assigned according to the standard table:

Cumulative Percentage	Grade
93-100%	A
90-92	A-
87-89	B+
83-86	B
80-82	B-
77-79	C+

Cumulative Percentage	Grade
73-76	C
70-72	C-
67-69	D+
63-66	D
60-62	D-
00-59	F

POLICIES

The standard university policies apply:

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE POLICY

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

Please note: Modifications to this policy have been made to accommodate the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic. For more information, see this memo that has been distributed to all faculty and instructional staff (https://www.fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/Academic%20Policies/Important%20Policies%20AY%202020-2021_revised_b.pdf) regarding the 2020-2021 academic year.

ACADEMIC HONOR POLICY

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to "...be honest and truthful and... [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (For more details see the FSU Academic Honor Policy and procedures for addressing alleged violations (<http://fda.fsu.edu/academic-resources/academic-integrity-and-grievances/academic-honor-policy>).

ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Your academic success is a top priority for Florida State University. University resources to help you succeed include tutoring centers, computer labs, counseling and health services, and services for designated groups, such as veterans and students with disabilities. The following information is not exhaustive, so please check with your advisor or the Dean of Students office to learn more.

PROCESS FOR RESOLVING ACADEMIC PROBLEMS OR GRIEVANCES

Please use this step-by-step guide to resolving academic problems (https://www.fda.fsu.edu/sites/g/files/upcbnu636/files/Media/Files/General%20Academic%20Appeals/Academic_Problem-Solving_Flowchart_Binder_Oct-2020.pdf) to begin the process of communicating with your instructor to resolve any confusion or difficulty you may be having in the course. Detailed information on FSU's grievance procedure, including special instructions for students enrolled in an FSU branch campus, is maintained on the General Bulletin's Academic Integrity & Grievances (<https://registrar.fsu.edu/bulletin/undergraduate/information/integrity/index.cfm>) webpage. Out-of-state distance learning students should review the Office of Distance Learning Complaint Resolution (<https://distance.fsu.edu/about-us/complaint-resolution>) page for additional procedures.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Florida State University (FSU) values diversity and inclusion; we are committed to a climate of mutual respect and full participation. Our goal is to create learning environments that are usable, equitable, inclusive, and welcoming. FSU is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities in a manner that is consistent with academic standards of the course while empowering the student to meet integral requirements of the course.

To receive academic accommodations, a student:

- 1. must register with and provide documentation to the Office of Accessibility Services (OAS);
- 2. must provide a letter from OAS to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type; and,
- 3. should communicate with the instructor, as needed, to discuss recommended accommodations. A request for a meeting may be initiated by the student or the instructor.

Please note that instructors are not allowed to provide classroom accommodations to a student until appropriate verification from the Office of Accessibility Services has been provided.

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request.

For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the

Office of Accessibility Services (*Tallahassee Campus*) (<https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas>) 874 Traditions Way 108 Student Services Building Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167 (850) 644-9566 (voice) (850) 644-8504 (TDD) oas@fsu.edu (<mailto:oas@fsu.edu>) <https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas> (<https://dsst.fsu.edu/oas>)

Student Disability Services (*Panama City Campus*) (<https://pc.fsu.edu/students/student-disability-services>) Office of Student Affairs 4750 Collegiate Drive 2nd Floor Barron Building (Room 215) Florida State University Panama City Panama City, FL 32405 (850) 770-2172 (office) (866) 693-7872 (toll free) Email: sds@pc.fsu.edu (<mailto:sds@pc.fsu.edu>) <https://pc.fsu.edu/students/student-disability-services> (<https://pc.fsu.edu/students/student-disability-services>)

CONFIDENTIAL CAMPUS RESOURCES

Various centers and programs are available to assist students with navigating stressors that might impact academic success. These include the following:

Victim Advocate Program (<https://dsst.fsu.edu/vap>) University Center A, Room 4100, (850) 644-7161, Available 24/7/365, Office Hours: M-F 8-5 <https://dsst.fsu.edu/vap> (<https://dsst.fsu.edu/vap>)

University Counseling Center (<https://counseling.fsu.edu/>) Askew Student Life Center, 2nd Floor, 942 Learning Way (850) 644-8255 <https://counseling.fsu.edu/> (<https://counseling.fsu.edu/>)

University Health Services (<https://uhs.fsu.edu/>) Health and Wellness Center, (850) 644-6230 <https://uhs.fsu.edu/> (<https://uhs.fsu.edu/>)

FREE TUTORING FROM FSU (*TALLAHASSEE CAMPUS*)

On-campus tutoring and writing assistance are available for many courses at Florida State University. For more information, visit the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) Tutoring Services' comprehensive list of on-campus tutoring options - see the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) Tutoring Services' website (<http://ace.fsu.edu/tutoring>) or contact tutor@fsu.edu (<mailto:tutor@fsu.edu>). High-quality tutoring is available by appointment and on a walk-in basis. These services are offered by tutors trained to encourage the highest level of individual academic success while upholding personal academic integrity.

CLASS RECORDING POLICY

In this class, consistent with state law and university policy, you may **not** make recordings of classroom activities without the permission of the instructor. This policy applies to both audio and video recordings.

SYLLABUS CHANGE POLICY

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

SCHEDULE

WEEK 1 (AUGUST 24): INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

- Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy *Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2013), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.013.0001> (<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.013.0001>).
- Leif D. Nelson, Joseph Simmons, and Uri Simonsohn “Psychology’s Renaissance,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 69, no. 1 (2018): null, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011836> (<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011836>).

WEEK 2 (AUGUST 31): RATIONALITY, SELF-INTEREST, AND ALTRUISM

- Herbert A. Simon “Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science,” *American Political Science Review* 79 (1985): 293–304.
- George A. Quattrone and Amos Tversky “Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice,” *American Political Science Review* 82 (1988): 719–36.
- Stanley Feldman and Marco R. Steenbergen “The Humanitarian Foundation of Public Support for Social Welfare,” *American Journal of Political Science* 45, no. 3 (2001): 658–77, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2669244> (<https://doi.org/10.2307/2669244>).
- Lior Sheffer et al. “Nonrepresentative Representatives: An Experimental Study of the Decision Making of Elected Politicians,” *American Political Science Review*, December 2017, 1–20, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000569> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000569>).

WEEK 3 (SEPTEMBER 07): UNCERTAINTY AND HEURISTICS

- Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman “Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases,” *Science* 185, no. 4157 (September 1974): 1124–31, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124> (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124>).
 - presented by Michael
- Arthur Lupia “Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections,” *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 1 (1994): 63–76.
 - presented by Sarah
- James H. Kuklinski and Paul J. Quirk “Reconsidering the Rational Public: Cognition, Heuristics, and Mass Opinion,” *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, 2000, 153–82.
- Patricia A. Kirkland and Alexander Coppock “Candidate Choice Without Party Labels,” *Political Behavior* 40, no. 3 (September 2018): 571–91, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9414-8> (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-017-9414-8>).

WEEK 4 (SEPTEMBER 14): IDEOLOGY AND MASS BELIEF SYSTEMS

- For this meeting, I’ll assume you are already familiar with: Philip Converse “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Politics,” *Ideology and Discontent*, 1964, 206–61. Please read that first if you do not remember it well enough to discuss it.
- Stanley Feldman “Structure and Consistency in Public Opinion: The Role of Core Beliefs and Values,” *American Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 2 (1988): 416–40, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111130> (<https://doi.org/10.2307/2111130>).
- John T. Jost et al. “Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition,” *Psychological Bulletin* 129, no. 3 (2003): 339–75.
 - presented by Sarah
- Jesse Graham, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A. Nosek “Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, no. 5 (May 2009): 1029–46, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141> (<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141>).

- Nathan P. Kalmoe “Uses and Abuses of Ideology in Political Psychology,” *Political Psychology* 41, no. 4 (2020): 771–93, <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12650> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12650>).

WEEK 5 (SEPTEMBER 21): CONSIDERED OR UNTHINKING?

- Elizabeth C. Connors “The Social Dimension of Political Values,” *Political Behavior* 42, no. 3 (September 2020): 961–82, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09530-3> (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09530-3>).
- Anthony Fowler “Partisan Intoxication or Policy Voting?” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 15, no. 2 (2020): 141–79.
 - presented by Olivia
- Lilla V. Orr and Gregory A. Huber “The Policy Basis of Measured Partisan Animosity in the United States,” *American Journal of Political Science* 64, no. 3 (2020): 569–86, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12498> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12498>).
 - presented by Marli
- Nicholas Dias and Yphtach Lelkes “The Nature of Affective Polarization: Disentangling Policy Disagreement from Partisan Identity,” *American Journal of Political Science* n/a, no. n/a (n.d.), <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12628> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12628>).

WEEK 6 (SEPTEMBER 28): HOT COGNITION: AFFECT, EMOTION, AND MOTIVATIONS

- George E. Marcus and Michael B. MacKuen “Anxiety, Enthusiasm and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns,” *American Political Science Review* 87 (1993): 672–85.
 - presented by Rob
- Andrew W. Delton, Michael Bang Petersen, and Theresa E. Robertson “Partisan Goals, Emotions, and Political Mobilization: The Role of Motivated Reasoning in Pressuring Others to Vote,” *The Journal of Politics* 80, no. 3 (July 2018): 890–902, <https://doi.org/10.1086/697124> (<https://doi.org/10.1086/697124>).
 - presented by Chris
- Robin Bayes et al. “When and How Different Motives Can Drive Motivated Political Reasoning,” *Political Psychology* 41, no. 5 (October 2020): 1031–52, <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12663> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12663>).
- Andrew T. Little “Directional Motives and Different Priors Are Observationally Equivalent,” Preprint (Open Science Framework, July 2021), <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/b8tvk> (<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/b8tvk>).

WEEK 7 (OCTOBER 05): PERSONALITY AND TRAITS

- Alan S. Gerber et al. “Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships Across Issue Domains and Political Contexts,” *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 1 (February 2010): 111–33, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000031> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000031>).
- Jeffery J. Mondak et al. “Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior,” *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 1 (February 2010): 85–110, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990359> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990359>).
 - presented by Michael
- Samuel Greene and Graeme Robertson “Agreeable Authoritarians: Personality and Politics in Contemporary Russia,” *Comparative Political Studies* 50, no. 13 (November 2017): 1802–34, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414016688005> (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414016688005>).
 - presented by Harley
- Matthew T. Pietryka and Randall C. MacIntosh “ANES Scales Often Don’t Measure What You Think They Measure,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1086/715251> (<https://doi.org/10.1086/715251>).

WEEK 8 (OCTOBER 12): AUTHORITARIANISM

- John Duckitt “Authoritarianism and Group Identification: A New View of an Old Construct,” *Political Psychology* 10, no. 1 (1989): 63–84, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3791588> (<https://doi.org/10.2307/3791588>).

- presented by Harley
- **Chapter 2** from Karen Stenner *The Authoritarian Dynamic* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Lasse Laustsen and Michael Bang Petersen “Perceived Conflict and Leader Dominance: Individual and Contextual Factors Behind Preferences for Dominant Leaders,” *Political Psychology* 38, no. 6 (December 2017): 1083–1101, <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12403> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12403>).
- Andrew M. Engelhardt, Stanley Feldman, and Marc J. Hetherington “Advancing the Measurement of Authoritarianism,” *Political Behavior*, May 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-021-09718-6> (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-021-09718-6>).

WEEK 9 (OCTOBER 19): IMPRESSIONS AND INFORMATION PROCESSING

- Reid Hastie and Bernadette Park “The Relationship Between Memory and Judgment Depends on Whether the Task Is Memory-Based or On-Line,” *Psychological Review* 93 (1986): 258–68.
- Milton Lodge, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau “The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation,” *American Political Science Review* 89 (1995): 309–27.
- Alan S. Gerber et al. “How Large and Long-Lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment,” *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 1 (February 2011): 135–50, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541000047X> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541000047X>).
- Larry M. Bartels “Remembering to Forget: A Note on the Duration of Campaign Advertising Effects,” *Political Communication* 31, no. 4 (October 2014): 532–44, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2014.956198> (<https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2014.956198>).

WEEK 10 (OCTOBER 26): IMPLICIT ATTITUDES

- A. G. Greenwald, M. R. Banaji, and B. A. Nosek “Statistically Small Effects of the Implicit Association Test Can Have Societally Large Effects.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 108, no. 4 (April 2015): 553–61, <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000016> (<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000016>).
- Frederick L. Oswald et al. “Predicting Ethnic and Racial Discrimination: A Meta-Analysis of Iat Criterion Studies,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 105, no. 2 (August 2013): 171–92, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032734> (<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032734>).
 - presented by Braeden
- Timothy J. Ryan “How Do Indifferent Voters Decide? The Political Importance of Implicit Attitudes,” *American Journal of Political Science* 61, no. 4 (October 2017): 892–907, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12307> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12307>).
- Rory Truex and Daniel Tavana “Implicit Attitudes Towards an Authoritarian Regime,” {{SSRN Scholarly Paper}} (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, January 2017).

WEEK 11 (NOVEMBER 02): PERSUASION AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

- Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman “Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects over Time,” *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 4 (2010): 663–80, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000493> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000493>).
- David E. Broockman and Daniel M. Butler “The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication,” *American Journal of Political Science* 61, no. 1 (January 2017): 208–21, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12243> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12243>).
 - presented by Marli
- Thomas Wood and Ethan Porter “The Elusive Backfire Effect: Mass Attitudes’ Steadfast Factual Adherence,” {{SSRN Scholarly Paper}} (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, December 2017).
- Timothy J. Ryan and Yanna Krupnikov “Split Feelings: Understanding Implicit and Explicit Political Persuasion,” *American Political Science Review*, n.d., 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055421000538> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055421000538>).
 - presented by Rob

WEEK 12 (NOVEMBER 09): DISCUSSION AND DELIBERATION

- Adam F. Simon and Tracy Sulkin “Discussion’s Impact on Political Allocations: An Experimental Approach,” *Political Analysis* 10, no. 4 (November 2002): 403–12, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/10.4.403> (<https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/10.4.403>).
- William Minozzi et al. “Field Experiment Evidence of Substantive, Attributional, and Behavioral Persuasion by Members of Congress in Online Town Halls,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, no. 13 (March 2015): 3937–42, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418188112> (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418188112>).
- Logan Strother et al. “College Roommates Have a Modest but Significant Influence on Each Other’s Political Ideology,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, no. 2 (January 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015514117> (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015514117>).
 - presented by Olivia
- Steven W Webster, Elizabeth C Connors, and Betsy Sinclair “The Social Consequences of Political Anger,” n.d., 33.

WEEK 13 (NOVEMBER 16): SOCIALIZATION

- M. Kent Jennings “Residues of a Movement: The Aging of the American Protest Generation,” *American Political Science Review* VOL (1987): 367–82.
- Jennifer Fitzgerald and K. Amber Curtis “Partisan Discord in the Family and Political Engagement: A Comparative Behavioral Analysis,” *The Journal of Politics* 74, no. 1 (January 2012): 129–41, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611001150> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611001150>).
- Andrew Healy and Neil Malhotra “Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” *The Journal of Politics* 75, no. 4 (2013): 1023–37, <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381613000996> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381613000996>).
- Seth K. Goldman and Daniel J. Hopkins “Past Place, Present Prejudice: The Impact of Adolescent Racial Context on White Racial Attitudes,” *The Journal of Politics* 82, no. 2 (April 2020): 529–42, <https://doi.org/10.1086/706461> (<https://doi.org/10.1086/706461>).

WEEK 14 (NOVEMBER 23): GROUP IDENTITY

- Henri Tajfel “Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination,” *Scientific American* 223, no. 5 (1970): 96–103.
 - presented by Chris
- Katherine Cramer Walsh “Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective,” *American Political Science Review* 106, no. 3 (August 2012): 517–32, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305>).
- Pazit Ben-Nun Bloom, Gizem Arikan, and Marie Courtemanche “Religious Social Identity, Religious Belief, and Anti-Immigration Sentiment,” *American Political Science Review* 109, no. 2 (May 2015): 203–21, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000143> (<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000143>).
- Patrick J. Egan “Identity as Dependent Variable: How Americans Shift Their Identities to Align with Their Politics,” *American Journal of Political Science* 64, no. 3 (2020): 699–716, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12496> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12496>).
 - presented by Braeden

WEEK 15 (NOVEMBER 30): STEREOTYPING, RESENTMENT, AND PREJUDICE

- Stanley Feldman and Leonie Huddy “Racial Resentment and White Opposition to Race-Conscious Programs: Principles or Prejudice?” *American Journal of Political Science* 49, no. 1 (January 2005): 168–83, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0092-5853.2005.00117.x> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0092-5853.2005.00117.x>).
- Ravi Bhavnani et al. “Group Segregation and Urban Violence,” *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 1 (January 2014): 226–45, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12045> (<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12045>).
- Nicholas A. Valentino, Fabian G. Neuner, and L. Matthew Vandenberg “The Changing Norms of Racial Political Rhetoric and the End of Racial Priming,” *The Journal of Politics* 80, no. 3 (July 2018): 757–71,

<https://doi.org/10.1086/694845> (<https://doi.org/10.1086/694845>).

- Kyle Peyton and Gregory A. Huber “Racial Resentment, Prejudice, and Discrimination,” *The Journal of Politics*, September 2020, 000–000, <https://doi.org/10.1086/711558> (<https://doi.org/10.1086/711558>).

Syllabus Changes

- 2021-09-01:
 - Added students’ presentation assignments
- 2021-09-13:
 - updated students’ presentation assignments