

Psychology 7897: Topical Seminar in Social Psychology
Political Psychology
Autumn 2020
Wednesday 2:00-3:50
Online via Zoom
Class #: 25639

COURSE OVERVIEW

Instructor

Russell Fazio
100c Lazenby Hall
Phone: 688-5408
E-mail: fazio.11@osu.edu
Office Hours: by appointment

Course description

This advanced seminar will focus on political psychology and, in particular, how it intersects with social psychological theories and findings. We first will consider the history of political psychology as a discipline and then turn to the determinants and correlates of political ideology. In what ways, do liberals and conservatives differ from one another? We also will examine such issues as social identities and partisanship, media effects, voting behavior, social networks, and fake news. The goal is to arrive at an understanding of the foundations, correlates, and consequences of political ideology, with the ultimate aim of inspiring new research directions.

Course learning outcomes

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

1. Delineate the relevance of basic social psychological theories and principles to research regarding political psychology
2. Describe the determinants and known correlates of political ideology
3. Describe the effects of partisanship on political attitudes and behavior
4. Generate research ideas regarding the intersection of social and political psychology

HOW THIS COURSE WORKS

Mode of delivery:

- 100% online delivery.
- All synchronous sessions will be held within the original time/day pattern of this course – W 2:00-3:50

Attendance: Because this is an online seminar, your attendance is required at each week's meeting at the regularly scheduled time.

COURSE MATERIALS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Course readings

All the readings will be made available on the course's Carmen website and are listed for each week on subsequent pages. The readings are divided into primary and secondary sets. All students should read each of the primary readings carefully. The secondary readings are optional. However, each secondary reading will be briefly summarized by an assigned student during the class discussion.

Some of the readings are reprinted in Jost, J.T. & Sidanius, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Political psychology: Key readings*. New York: Psychology Press. [This volume is referred to as J&S in the reading list.]

Another excellent edited volume is Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., & Levy, J. (2013). *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (2nd Ed.)*. Oxford University Press. [This book is available online through the library via Oxford Handbooks Online 2013.]

Course technology

TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT

For help with your password, university email, Carmen, or any other technology issues, questions, or requests, contact the Ohio State IT Service Desk. Standard support hours are available at ocio.osu.edu/help/hours, and support for urgent issues is available 24/7.

- **Self-Service and Chat support:** ocio.osu.edu/help
- **Phone:** 614-688-4357(HELP)
- **Email:** servicedesk@osu.edu
- **TDD:** 614-688-8743

TECHNOLOGY SKILLS NEEDED FOR THIS COURSE

- Basic computer and web-browsing skills
- Navigating Carmen (go.osu.edu/canvasstudent)
- CarmenZoom virtual meetings (go.osu.edu/zoom-meetings)

REQUIRED EQUIPMENT

- Computer: current Mac (MacOs) or PC (Windows 10) with high-speed internet connection
- Webcam: built-in or external webcam, fully installed and tested
- Microphone: built-in laptop or tablet mic or external microphone
- Other: a mobile device (smartphone or tablet) to use for BuckeyePass authentication

REQUIRED SOFTWARE

- Microsoft Office 365: All Ohio State students are now eligible for free Microsoft Office 365. Full instructions for downloading and installation can be found at go.osu.edu/office365help.

CARMEN ACCESS

You will need to use BuckeyePass (buckeyepass.osu.edu) multi-factor authentication to access your courses in Carmen. To ensure that you are able to connect to Carmen at all times, it is recommended that you take the following steps:

- Register multiple devices in case something happens to your primary device. Visit the BuckeyePass - Adding a Device help article for step-by-step instructions (go.osu.edu/add-device).
- Request passcodes to keep as a backup authentication option. When you see the Duo login screen on your computer, click **Enter a Passcode** and then click the **Text me new codes** button that appears. This will text you ten passcodes good for 365 days that can each be used once.
- Download the Duo Mobile application (go.osu.edu/install-duo) to all of your registered devices for the ability to generate one-time codes in the event that you lose cell, data, or Wi-Fi service

If none of these options will meet the needs of your situation, you can contact the IT Service Desk at 614-688-4357(HELP) and IT support staff will work out a solution with you.

GRADING AND FACULTY RESPONSE

How your grade is calculated

ASSIGNMENT CATEGORY	PERCENT OF GRADE
Weekly Thought Papers	20
Discussion Participation	20
Discussion Leadership	15
Secondary Reading Presentations	15
Research Proposal	30

See course schedule below for due dates.

Descriptions of major course assignments

WEEKLY THOUGHT PAPERS

Description: Each week all students other than the week's discussion leader and those presenting secondary readings (see below) will prepare a one-page thought paper in which they offer commentaries regarding the primary readings for that week. These are not to be summaries of the readings, but instead thoughts, questions, critiques, or insights inspired by the readings. In other words, the focus is on reactions to the readings, especially ones you would like to have discussed in class. At the discretion of any given week's discussion leader, the thought paper may focus on a specific "question of the day." The thought papers are to be submitted via the Carmen website's Assignment function by **9:00AM on the day of 5:00PM on the day before** the seminar meeting (Tuesday). The instructor will send a zip file of the thought papers to the week's discussion leader shortly thereafter.

Academic integrity and collaboration: You may discuss the readings with other students as much as you like. Your papers must be your own individual work, should reflect your unique thoughts, and be written in your own words.

DISCUSSION PARTICIPATION

Description: The expectation is that each and every student will be prepared to actively participate in the discussion, sharing their ideas about the readings.

DISCUSSION LEADERS

Description: Each week, one student will serve as the discussion leader. This role involves (a) familiarizing oneself with both the primary and secondary readings; (b) deciding in advance whether the topic and readings for the day would benefit from the thought papers having a specific focus, i.e., a “question of the day,” or whether the thought papers can assume their default format; (c) reading the submitted thought papers to note issues of confusion, excitement, or contention; (d) organizing these observations, as well as the secondary readings, into a series of starting points for the discussion; and (e) then leading the class discussion, introducing the presentation of each secondary reading when appropriate.

SECONDARY READING PRESENTATIONS

Description: Each secondary reading will be assigned to one student who will present the reading to the class. These presentations should be 10-15 minute summaries of the reading, as well as its relation to the primary readings. The designated student should prepare a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the reading that you can share via zoom. Alternatively, if a PowerPoint presentation does not seem appropriate for the reading, you may instead prepare a one-page handout summarizing the reading. Either the PowerPoint or the handout should be uploaded via the shared Buckeye Box link within the Carmen website by 9:00AM on the day of the seminar meeting. The link itself is available on the Carmen Announcements page.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Description: Each student should prepare a brief research proposal related to any of the seminar topics. The paper should take the form of a grant proposal in which you present a research idea whose aim is to offer an innovative contribution to the literature. The research aims, theoretical background and significance, hypotheses, research design and major aspects of the procedure should be presented. The paper should be written in APA format and should be no more than 2500 words in length (excluding only the list of references). The word count, as indicated by any standard word processor, should be listed on the title page. The papers are due on December 7.

Academic integrity and collaboration: You are encouraged to discuss your research idea with the instructor and you may discuss it with other students as much as you like. However, your paper must be your own individual work and should be written in your own words.

Late assignments

- Late submissions will not be accepted.
- Please refer to Carmen for due dates.

Instructor feedback and response time

I am providing the following list to give you an idea of my intended availability throughout the course. (Remember that you can call **614-688-HELP** at any time if you have a technical problem.)

- **Grading and feedback:** For large weekly assignments, you can generally expect feedback within **7 days**.
- **Email:** I will reply to emails within **24 hours on weekdays when class is in session at the university**.

OTHER COURSE POLICIES

Discussion and communication guidelines

The discussions are very central to a seminar of this sort. Hence, it may be useful to offer some general guidelines and expectations that should serve to maximize the effectiveness of our discussions. Above all, please remember to be respectful and thoughtful.

- The discussions are ultimately an intellectual exercise in which we *collectively evaluate* the strengths and weaknesses of the readings. The goal is to *explore* freely. Everyone should feel free to contribute ideas. Sometimes, those will generate enthusiastic responses. Surely, other times they will fall flat. That variability is not only acceptable, but also expected. Do not hesitate to throw out ideas that are not yet fully formulated. We are interested in the progress we make as group toward fully understanding the value of the readings.
- For everyone to feel the freedom necessary for effective exploratory discussion, all discourse must be *civil and respectful*. Disagreement is to be expected and indeed is encouraged, but the discussions are not debates with winners or losers. No one's ego should be boosted or diminished by the conversation. Let's maintain a supportive learning community where everyone feels safe and where people can disagree amicably. Remember that sarcasm doesn't always come across online. Please do not engage other students with negative feedback about them as a person and remember to always rely on the data and to focus on the argument being made, not the person making it. The aim is to *learn* from one another, not to show how smart one is in comparison to others. Remember to adhere to the OSU Student Code of Conduct at all times - <https://studentconduct.osu.edu/>.
- *All students* are expected to participate. No one should be dominating the discussion. *Monitor yourself*. If you find yourself talking far more than others, then you should give others a chance to speak, so that you have the opportunity to learn from others. If you find yourself not contributing, you should make every effort to do so. Feel free to verbalize whatever thoughts are occurring to you. Often the very act of articulating one's thoughts will sharpen them, and even expressions of confusion can move the discussion forward in a productive manner. No one is judging *you*. Any disagreement is about the *idea* that was offered, not you. Treat the discussion as a learning opportunity – a means of developing your skills at communicating your thoughts.

Zoom/Videoconferencing Guidelines

The class will meet through Zoom videoconferencing. Because this mode of discussion has benefits and challenges that differ from in-person class sessions, I want to share my expectations for how we will meet and communicate:

- **Technical Issues:** If you encounter a technical issue with Zoom during a session, first make sure you are using the latest version of Zoom. Next, contact the IT Service Desk at <http://go.osu.edu/it> or 614-688-4357(HELP). If issues continue, contact me after the session to learn how to make up for the missed content either via a recording or other means. I will not be able to address technical issues during a live session.
- **Preparation:** Come to the session having completed any readings or pre-work and be ready to have open, civil, and supportive discussions in video and chat spaces. I ask that you update your Zoom profile with your preferred name and add a picture with your face.
- **Participation:** At the start of our sessions, I'll share specific expectations for how to use the chat, how to interact, and how to raise questions or concerns as we go. If you are unsure about expectations or are unsure about raising a question, please follow up with me afterward to make sure your questions are answered. Plan to be present during the entire class session as much as you are able. For some activities, I may ask you to share your faces on camera so that we can see each other and connect. Please feel encouraged to use a non-distracting [virtual background](#). Many students and instructors prefer not to share their remote spaces for a variety of reasons. Mute your microphone when others are talking to minimize background noise in the meeting.
- **Recordings:** I will be recording our meetings for the benefit of students who may need to be absent. These links will only be shared with students in our class.

Academic integrity policy

See **Descriptions of major course assignments**, above, for my specific guidelines about collaboration and academic integrity in the context of this online class.

OHIO STATE'S ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Academic integrity is essential to maintaining an environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research, and other educational and scholarly activities. Thus, The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the university's *Code of Student Conduct* (studentconduct.osu.edu), and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Students must recognize that failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the university's *Code of Student Conduct* and this syllabus may constitute "Academic Misconduct."

The Ohio State University's *Code of Student Conduct* (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: "Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the university or subvert the educational process." Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the university's *Code of Student Conduct* is never considered an excuse for academic misconduct, so I recommend that you review the *Code of Student Conduct* and, specifically, the sections dealing with academic misconduct.

If I suspect that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course, I am obligated by university rules to report my suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If you have any questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, please contact me.

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct <http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/>.

Other sources of information on academic misconduct (integrity) to which you can refer include:

- Committee on Academic Misconduct web page (go.osu.edu/coam)
- Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity (go.osu.edu/ten-suggestions)
- Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity (go.osu.edu/cardinal-rules)

Copyright for instructional materials

The materials used in connection with this course may be subject to copyright protection and are **only** for the use of students officially enrolled in the course for the educational purposes associated with the course. Copyright law must be considered before copying, retaining, or disseminating materials outside of the course.

Statement on Title IX

All students and employees at Ohio State have the right to work and learn in an environment free from harassment and discrimination based on sex or gender, and the university can arrange interim measures, provide support resources, and explain investigation options, including referral to confidential resources.

If you or someone you know has been harassed or discriminated against based on your sex or gender, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking, or sexual exploitation, you may find information about your rights and options at titleix.osu.edu or by contacting the Ohio State Title IX Coordinator at titleix@osu.edu. Title IX is part of the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) at Ohio State, which responds to all bias-motivated incidents of harassment and discrimination, such as race, religion, national origin and disability. For more information on OIE, visit equity.osu.edu or email equity@osu.edu.

Commitment to a diverse and inclusive learning environment

The Ohio State University affirms the importance and value of diversity in the student body. Our programs and curricula reflect our multicultural society and global economy and seek to provide opportunities for students to learn more about persons who are different from them. We are committed to maintaining a community that recognizes and values the inherent worth and dignity of

every person; fosters sensitivity, understanding, and mutual respect among each member of our community; and encourages each individual to strive to reach his or her own potential. Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender identity or expression, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited.

Your mental health

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student's ability to participate in daily activities. No matter where you are engaged in distance learning, The Ohio State University's Student Life Counseling and Consultation Service (CCS) is here to support you. If you find yourself feeling isolated, anxious or overwhelmed, on-demand resources are available at go.osu.edu/ccsondemand. You can reach an on-call counselor when CCS is closed at 614- 292-5766, and 24-hour emergency help is also available through the 24/7 National Prevention Hotline at 1-800-273-TALK or at suicidepreventionlifeline.org. The Ohio State Wellness app is also a great resource available at go.osu.edu/wellnessapp.

Health and safety requirements

All students, faculty and staff are required to comply with and stay up to date on all university safety and health guidance (<https://safeandhealthy.osu.edu/>), which includes following university mask policies and maintaining a safe physical distance at all times. Non-compliance will be warned first and disciplinary actions will be taken for repeated offenses." (Updated: Aug. 14, 2020)

ACCESSIBILITY ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Requesting accommodations

The University strives to make all learning experiences as accessible as possible. If you anticipate or experience academic barriers based on your disability (including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions), please let me know immediately so that we can privately discuss options. To establish reasonable accommodations, I may request that you register with Student Life Disability Services. After registration, make arrangements with me as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that they may be implemented in a timely fashion. SLDS contact information: slds@osu.edu; 614-292-3307; slds.osu.edu; 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Avenue.

Accessibility of course technology

This online course requires use of CarmenCanvas (Ohio State's learning management system) and other online communication and multimedia tools. If you need additional services to use these technologies, please request accommodations with me.

- Canvas accessibility (go.osu.edu/canvas-accessibility)
- Streaming audio and video
- CarmenZoom accessibility (go.osu.edu/zoom-accessibility)
- Collaborative course tools

Course Schedule and Readings

August 26 – Introduction

September 2 – History of Political Psychology as a Discipline

Jost, J.T., & Sidanius, J. (2004). Political psychology: An introduction. In J.T. Jost, & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 1-17). New York: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

McGuire, W. J. (2004). *The Poly-Psy Relationship: Three Phases of a Long Affair*. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 22–31). Psychology Press. [Reading 1 in J&S]

Stone, S., K. Johnson, E. Beall, P. Meindl, B. Smith, and J. Graham. (2014). Political psychology. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 5, 373-385.

Sears, D. O. (1989). The ecological niche of political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 10, 501-506.

Secondary Readings

Tetlock, P.E. (1994). Political psychology or politicized psychology: Is the road to scientific hell paved with good moral intentions? *Political Psychology*, 15, 509-529.

Sears, D.O. (1994). Ideological bias in political psychology: The view from scientific hell. *Political Psychology*, 15, 547-556.

September 9 – Does Ideology Exist?

Converse, P.E. (1964/2004). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 239-264). Psychology Press. [Reading 10 in J&S]

Conover, P. & Feldman, S. (1981). The origins and meaning of liberal-conservative self-identification. *American Journal of Political Science*, 25, 617–645. [Reading 11 in J&S]

Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*, 61, 651-670.

Kalmoe, N.P. (2020). Uses and abuses of ideology in political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 41, 771-793.

Secondary Readings

Ditto, P.H., Liu, B.S., Clark, C.J., Wojcik, S.P., Chen, E.E., Grady, R.H., Celniker, J.B., & Zinger, J.F. (2019). At least bias is bipartisan: A meta-analytic comparison of partisan bias in liberals and conservatives. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14, 273-291.

Baron, J., & Jost, J.T. (2019). False equivalence: Are liberals and conservatives in the U.S. equally “biased”? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14, 292-303.

September 16 – Authoritarianism

Brown, R. (1965/2004). The authoritarian personality and the organization of attitudes. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 39–68). Psychology Press. [Reading 2 in J&S]

Altemeyer, B. (1998/2004). The other “authoritarian personality.” In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 109-140). Psychology Press. [Reading 4 in J&S]

Feldman, S. and Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 18, 741-770.

Secondary Readings

Hetherington, M. & Suhay, E. (2011). Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans’ support for the war on terror. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55, 546-560.

Womick, J., Rothmund, T., Azevedo, F., King, L.A., & Jost, J.T. (2019). Group-based dominance and authoritarian aggression predict support for Donald Trump in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 10, 643-652.

Tagar, M. R., Federico, C. M., Lyons, K. E., Ludeke, S., & Koenig, M. A. (2014). Heralding the authoritarian? Orientation toward authority in early childhood. *Psychological Science*, 25, 883-892.

September 23 – Foundations of Ideology I: Personality, Morality, and Genetics

Block, J., & Block, J. H. (2006). Nursery school personality and political orientation two decades later. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 734-749.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 1029-1046.

Hatemi, P. K., Gillespie, N. A., Eaves, L. J., Maher, B. S., Webb, B. T., Heath, A. C., ... & Montgomery, G. W. (2011). A genome-wide analysis of liberal and conservative political attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(1), 271-285.

Secondary Readings

Tetlock, P.E. (1984). Cognitive style and political belief systems in the House of Commons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 365–375. [Reading 13 in J&S]

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

Jones, K.L., Noorbaloochi, S., Jost, J.T., Bonneau, R., Nagler, J. and Tucker, J.A. (2018). Liberal and conservative values: What we can learn from congressional tweets. *Political Psychology*, 39, 423-443.

September 30 – Foundations of Ideology II: Motivated Social Cognition

Jost, J. T., Nosek, B. A., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Ideology: Its resurgence in social, personality, and political psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 3, 126-136.

Jost, J.T. (2017). Ideological asymmetries and the essence of political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 38, 167-208.

Jost, J.T., & Banaji, M.R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1–27. [Reading 17 in J&S]

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999/2004). Social dominance theory: A new synthesis. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 239-264). Psychology Press. [Reading 18 in J&S]

Secondary Readings

Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The secret lives of liberals and conservatives: Personality profiles, interaction styles, and the things they leave behind. *Political Psychology*, 29, 807–840.

Jolley, D., Douglas, K., & Sutton, R. (2018). Blaming a few bad apples to save a threatened barrel: The system-justifying function of conspiracy theories. *Political Psychology*, 39, 465-478.

Brandt, M. J. (2013). Do the disadvantaged legitimize the social system? A large-scale test of the status-legitimacy hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104, 765–785.

Malka, A., Lelkes, Y., & Soto, C. J. (2017). Are cultural and economic conservatism positively correlated? A large-scale cross-national test. *British Journal of Political Science*, 1-25.

October 7 – Motivated Reasoning

Ruisch, B. C. & Stern, C. (in press). The confident conservative: Ideological differences in judgment and decision-making confidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

Flynn, D. J., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2017). The nature and origins of misperceptions: Understanding false and unsupported beliefs about politics. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 127-150.

Tappin, B. M., Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Thinking clearly about causal inferences of politically motivated reasoning: why paradigmatic study designs often undermine causal inference. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 81-87.

Douglas, K., Sutton, R., & Cichocka, A. (2017). The psychology of conspiracy theories. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 538-542.

Secondary Readings

Redlawsk, D. P., Civettini, A. J., & Emmerson, K. M. (2010). The affective tipping point: Do motivated reasoners ever “get it”? *Political Psychology*, 31, 563-593.

Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). The ideological-conflict hypothesis: Intolerance among both liberals and conservatives. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*, 27-34.

Washburn, A. N., & Skitka, L. J. (2017). Science denial across the political divide: Liberals and conservatives are similarly motivated to deny attitude-inconsistent science. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 9*, 972-980.

October 14 – Social Identity and Partisanship

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

Abramowitz, A.I. and Webster, S.W. (2018), Negative partisanship: Why Americans dislike parties but behave like rabid partisans. *Advances in Political Psychology, 39*, 119-135.

Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). The strengthening of partisan affect. *Advances in Political Psychology, 39*, 201-218.

Mason, L. (2015). "I disrespectfully agree: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science, 59*, 128-145.

Secondary Readings

Anson, I.G. (2018). Partisanship, political knowledge, and the Dunning-Kruger effect. *Political Psychology, 39*, 1173-1192.

Mason, L. & Wronski, J. (2018). One tribe to bind them all: How our social group attachments strengthen partisanship. *Advances in Political Psychology, 39*, 257-277.

October 21 – Social Networks and Political Psycholinguistics

Sterling, J., Jost, J. T., & Bonneau, R. (in press). Political Psycholinguistics: A Comprehensive Analysis of the Language Habits of Liberal and Conservative Social Media Users. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Boutyline, A., & Willer, R. (2017). The social structure of political echo chambers: Variation in ideological homophily in online networks. *Political Psychology, 38*, 551-569.

Lake, R., & Huckfeldt, R. (1998). Social networks, social capital, and political participation. *Political Psychology, 19*, 567-584.

Secondary Readings

Huckfeldt, R., Morehouse Mendez, J., & Osborn, T. (2004). Disagreement, ambivalence, and engagement: The political consequences of heterogeneous networks. *Political Psychology, 26*, 65-96.

Ashokkumar, A., Talaifar, S., Fraser, W.T., Landabur, R., Buhrmester, M.D., Gomez, A., Paredes, B., & Swann, W.B., Jr. (in press). Censoring political opposition online: Who does it and why. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

October 28 – Disgust Sensitivity and Political Ideology

Schaller, M., & Park, J. H. (2011). The behavioral immune system (and why it matters). *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 99-103.

Inbar, Y., & Pizarro, D. A. (2016). Pathogens and Politics: Current Research and New Questions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10*, 365-374.

Tybur, J. et al. (2016). Parasite stress and pathogen avoidance relate to distinct dimensions of political ideology across 30 nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113*, 12408-12413.

Ruisch, B. C., Anderson, R. A., Inbar, Y., & Pizarro, D. A. (in press). A matter of taste: Gustatory sensitivity shapes political ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Secondary Readings

White, A. E., Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L. (2013). Beauty at the ballot box: Disease threats predict preferences for physically attractive leaders. *Psychological Science, 24*, 2429-2436.

Boggs, S. T., Ruisch, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (2020). Salient pathogen threats increase sensitivity to disgust

November 4 – More General Negativity Bias and Political Ideology

Hibbing, J. R., Smith, K. B., & Alford, J. R. (2014). Differences in negativity bias underlie variations in political ideology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 37*, 297-350. [Article ends on p. 307. Remainder is devoted to open peer commentary, which is optional reading. However, you are likely to find Hibbing et al.'s response, which is on pp. 333-341, interesting. Skimming that is recommended.]

Oxley, D. R., Smith, K. B., Alford, J. R., Hibbing, M. V., Miller, J. L., Scalora, M., Hatemi, P. K. & Hibbing, J. R. (2008) Political attitudes vary with physiological traits. *Science, 321*, 1667–70.

Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2009). Political ideology, exploration of novel stimuli, and attitude formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 995-998.

Bakker, B. N., Schumacher, G., Gothreau, C., Arceneaux, K. (2020). Conservatives and liberals have similar physiological responses to threats. *Nature Human Behaviour, 4*, 613-621.

Secondary Readings

Shook, N. J., Thomas, R., & Ford, C. G. (2019). Testing the relation between disgust and general avoidance behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 150*, Article 109457.

Fiagbenu, M. E., Proch, J., & Kessler, T. (in press). Of deadly beans and risky stocks: Political ideology and attitude formation via exploration depend on the nature of the attitude stimuli. *British Journal of Psychology*. [also see the brief exchange that follows: (a) Ruisch, B., Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (in press). Of unbiased beans and slanted stocks: Neutral stimuli reveal the fundamental relation between political ideology and exploratory behavior. *British Journal of Psychology*. (b) Fiagbenu, M., E., Proch, J. & Kessler, T. (in press), Stimulus sampling and other recommendations for assessing domain-general processes of attitude formation through exploration: Reply to Ruitsch, Shook, and Fazio (in press). *British Journal of Psychology*.]

November 11 – No Class – Veterans Day

November 18 – Media, Political Attitudes & Voting Behavior

Iyengar, S., Peters, M., & Kinder, D. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the “not-so-minimal” consequences of television news programs. *American Political Science Review*, 81, 848–858. [Reading 7 in J&S]

Gerber, Alan S. et al. (2011). How large and long-lasting are the persuasive effects of televised campaign ads? Results from a randomized field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 105, 135-150.

Lundberg, K. B., & Payne, B. K. (2014). Decisions among the undecided: Implicit attitudes predict future voting behavior of undecided voters. *PLoS One*, 9(1), e85680.

Friese, M., Smith, C. T., Koeber, M., & Bluemke, M. (2016). Implicit measures of attitudes and political voting behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10, 188-201.

Secondary Readings

Vitriol, J.A., Lavine, H. G., & Borgida, E. (in press): Meta-cognition and resistance to political persuasion: evidence from a three-wave panel study. *Social Influence*.

November 25 – No Class – Unofficial Thanksgiving

Use this week to develop your research proposal further.

December 2 – Fake News

Fazio, L. K. (2020). Repetition increases perceived truth even for known falsehoods. *Collabra: Psychology*, 6(1): 38.

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 18, 39-50.

Garrett, R. K., Long, J., & Jeong, M. (2019). From partisan media to misperception: Affective polarization as mediator. *Journal of Communication*, 69, 490-512.

Fazio, L. K. (2020). Pausing to consider why a headline is true or false can help reduce the sharing of false news. *The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*.

Secondary Readings

Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5, eaau4586.

Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J. Zhang, Y., Lu, J. G. & Rand, D. G. (2020). Fighting COVID-19 misinformation on social media: Experimental evidence for a scalable accuracy nudge intervention. *Psychological Science*, 31, 770-780.

December 7 – Research proposals due by 5:00 PM