

Political Attitudes and Behavior PSCI 7031

University of Colorado-Boulder

Professor Vanessa A. Baird

Please come to my office hours!

Wednesdays 1:30-3:30

(also by appointment)

(also text me for quick questions! 303-859-3520)

Introduction

Political behavior is the term we give to any study what causes people – or the public – to convey attitudes and behave the way they do. It includes

- the study of what causes individuals to form attitudes and act politically (political psychology)
- aggregations of attitudes and behaviors, over time or place (public opinion)
- how linkages among ordinary people change what they think or do (social networks)
- the connection between the public and elites and public policy (representation)
- how people or the public reacts to information (political communication or media studies)

Each of the above could be the focus of a graduate course. Since the literature is too enormous to cover in its entirety, I have decided to create a course that dives deeply into the mysteries of political behavior that stem from the (often) inconsistency between what we learn from studying ordinary people and what we learn from the dynamics of the “macropolity.”

In general, my pedagogical goal is to keep the focus on the end game:

- to help you learn to design research that matters to other political scientists
- to help you pass Methods, American, or Comparative comps,
- write a great dissertation, get a great job, and get tenure
 - (or whatever you want to do with your life; feel free to make suggestions so I can help you do that!)

Skills and methods

Qualitative skills

Reconciling the work on public opinion with that of individual human psychology requires unique qualitative skills, including how to

- evaluate exogeneity (especially when time does not vary),
- design conceptually valid experimental treatments,
- use comparative methods to think conceptually across different contexts, evaluate generalizability, and
- avoid the logical fallacies associated with units (e.g., the ecological fallacy).

One practical qualitative skill that I will teach is how to write (the various kinds of) literature reviews efficiently, using what I call the skill of “loose conceptualization.” For example, a study on support for democracy in South Africa can potentially explain a mystery from a prior study on support for the rule of law in Russia, both of which could benefit from a rational choice analysis of the advent of the rule of law in 17th Century England, all of which could help you with your own study of political tolerance in the U.S. Loose conceptualization is also useful in telling your story about how your findings

enlighten other scholars about resolving answers to puzzles or creating new mysteries or controversies.

1 Quantitative skills

Though assigned readings use the most cutting-edge methodologies, I assume little quantitative knowledge. I will do my best to provide an intuitive non-mathematical and practical foundation you need to do your own quantitative analysis, including an introduction to measurement unidimensional scaling and reliability. I will begin the semester with a review the basics of multiple regression, with attention to what ordinary regression can help you understand – and where it falls short.

2 Professional development

Unlike other graduate seminars, there will be short weekly lectures on various topics related to methodology and how the weekly readings are situated in the larger landscape. Whether you get a job in the profession depends on your ability to impress a room full of diverse faculty in a job talk. You must learn how to communicate why your findings should matter to them. My hope is that this course will teach you how to do that even if you end up writing a project that is not political behavior.

3 A short note on statistical programs: Stata or R?

As a language, I can read R, but I use Stata in my own work, so I cannot be depended on to identify bugs in R syntax files. I find R to be unnecessarily buggy and irritating. For these reasons, I encourage Stata, which is very easy to learn. There are only about 10-15 commands to learn; moreover, you may have future

coauthors who use Stata. In other words, learning Stata is high reward and low cost. One downside is that Stata costs \$35 for the semester (though there are free options).

In the end, which program you use for your project is up to you. I evaluated hundreds of learning videos for both R and Stata and will make the best of those resources available.

I also spent hundreds of hours cleaning various data sources so that I can relieve you of that headache. Though I strongly recommend that you do an original analysis for your final project, you may also choose to do a research proposal.

4 Course Requirements

Participation (25%). Students are expected to do the assigned reading and take part in a high-level conversation each week. See this document for grading criteria.

Discussion questions and leading the seminar (10% - 5% each) Each student will be responsible for helping lead the discussion twice throughout the semester, including writing high-quality discussion questions due at the latest on Tuesday at 9 am to help students prepare for the following day's seminar. Unlike other obligations where due dates are targets, I will count off if the discussion questions are sent out to the class email late.

You should not miss the seminar unless absolutely necessary. I missed one seminar my entire graduate career: I was meeting with people who were inviting me to interview for a job. Even then, my professors were disgusted and called me in for a meeting and did not accept this as a valid excuse. In the case of illness, I will allow people to participate by Zoom.

Short assignments on the readings (~5%) Answer three questions:

- 1) what else could it be?
- 2) how could I conduct a study to test among alternatives?
- 3) What difference would it make to our understanding of the world if it turns out to be one instead of the others?

An A is 1 point; a B is .8 points, etc. Do as many or few as you like. Points accumulate. Due before class.

PowerPoints and paper milestones (40%). There will also be an allocation of class time for students to give very short presentations about their intended final projects. We will discuss expectations for these timed presentations in class. There will be four PowerPoint presentations. Three are five minutes and one at the end of the semester will be ten minutes. Each five-point grade will be based on both the presentation and the written product, including how well you document your data syntax file.

1. The research question and why the question matters. Situate your question in line with the literature. What is the puzzle created by previous literature? How will your answer to the question contribute to the literature? Remember that your question is preliminary and will change. Target due dates are weeks Feb 1-8.
2. The data and measures. Bonus for creative measures. Give students a full view of what is in the data; be attuned to creative uses of data to triangulate inferences in creative ways, like wringing water from a rock. The literature review along with the measures you will use will be due at this time. Your R or Stata (or any other program) documentation is due. Target due dates are weeks March 1-8. **Note that this milestone is extremely labor-intensive, so readings around this time are light.**
3. Preliminary findings. Your updated R or Stata (or any other program) documentation is due. Note: These are not PowerPoints: Give us the 60-second “elevator” talk. Target due dates are weeks April 5-12.

4. Ten-minute conference-style PowerPoint presentation during our scheduled final exam period (TBA). I think of an academic career as running your own business. Your research products are manufacturing. Conference presentations can be considered marketing and sales. You want to use presentations to inspire other political scientists to read and cite your research. These presentations are not meant to show the details of every analysis you do. Pretty graphs are a bonus.

Final course project (20% total). Students must complete a substantial research project. The default is to write an original analysis using either cleaned versions of various data sources I will provide (feel free to do the headache of cleaning another data source or write a survey vignette and collect your own data). Alternatively, students can write what will amount to a dissertation prospectus-type project, with an extended literature review and creative research design. The nonobviousness and creative potential to add to the literature will be a more exacting standard with a research design. Doing a research proposal does not exempt you from doing some preliminary data analyses of measurement and preliminary findings of the above assignments. Proposal projects are mostly meant for those preparing to write a dissertation prospectus.

- Your final product will be due 24 hours after the final exam period presentations. The beginning of the paper is like marketing and sales, but the product – for the purposes of this class – will include some attention to methodological choices, taking care to think carefully about the implications and caveats.
- As a guide, consider how the following problems affect your inferences. Be specific. What is included at the end of your paper prepares you for the Q&A portion of this talk.
 - a. Your data and the problems with generalizability.
 - b. Your measures and missing data as potential confounders.

- c. Omitted variables and how they would affect other inferences? Be specific. Are there confounders or missing mediators? What interrupts your causal and descriptive inferences? Use other literature or creative uses of data to shore up inferences.
- d. How do your findings contribute to our understanding of how democracy works, stability, economic growth, dealing with economic inequality, representation, and minority rights? Are there policy implications? What are the critiques of those inferences? Be creative and then critique your inferences.
- e. What project did you wish you could do if you had infinite resources? What difference would it make for your ability to contribute to the literature?

- Replication style Stata or R syntax and data due with the final project.

5 extra credit points for submitting your project to a journal.

5 extra credit points for turning in every paper milestone on time.

A note about me as a professor: I think very carefully about every pedagogical choice I make. I care very much about training graduate students and preparing you for your career. On the other hand, there will be times you will have to bug me to get me to answer your emails. If I do not answer your email or grade your paper within 24 hours, please for the love of all that is great about the universe, **bug me by text**. 303-859-3520.

Moreover, I am flexible. If you want to do something different for your final project, please feel free to talk to me about it. I think graduate-level coursework should subsidize your research agenda, so alternative final projects that would do this better might be acceptable, provided they are comparably effortful and that I can give you good guidance.

5 Course outline and readings¹

January 18: Introduction

Reading for our first day stands somewhat apart from the rest of the semester. They should be considered optional.

Don't think what?! Reading before the semester begins?

Instead, think: cool resources to skim for better writing and thinking for me and my future students.

Part I: Writing well

[DeScioli, Peter and Steven Pinker, "Piled Modifiers, Buried Verbs, and Other Turgid Prose in the American Political Science Review."](#)

This is an essay that teaches academic political scientists to avoid overcomplicating prose (though it is not without critiques from people Steven Pinker and Oliver Kamm call the "pedants.")

[I have some other writing advice here about words that are commonly mixed up. It is a short file with my notes from Oliver Kamm's book.](#)

[Steven Pinker. 10 'grammar rules' it's OK to break \(sometimes\). The Guardian.](#)

Part II: Thinking well: Three essays on the same topic. The easiest to digest is the last one.

The first was written by a genius and because it was written decades ago, it is sort of hard to read. The second is a tribute to a psychologist, Sandra Wood Scarr, who spent her life following Platt's advice. The third could be assigned to undergraduates and is a good introduction to the logic of how to think about the creation of hypotheses. The best

¹ I borrowed much of this from various syllabi from world renowned scholars, including from Tim Ryan, Jennifer Wolak, Anand Sokhey, Barry Burden, and Steven Webster.

compliment I have ever received on my work was: I don't believe your argument at all but I have never seen anyone try this hard to prove themselves wrong.

Part of the reason I am assigning these pieces is that I am frustrated with aspects of political science. We join camps and write a ton of articles proving that our camp is correct. We make little bitty descriptive contributions that do not get to the bones of what matters. Worse, we memorize statistical or other methodological rules that are common to our camps that work as shibboleths so that we can ascertain who the in-groups are when we review papers. This is path dependent if we continue doing what has always been done (how to contribute to itty bitty descriptive inferences? More small-minded descriptive inferences.)

One great way to modify the path is with graduate seminars.

Those articles above are one way of decolonizing this syllabus. They are telling us to think hard when we think about what questions matter. They are asking us to be creative in asking questions that matter to the stories of people who may not be who we are. Regardless of whether quantitative or qualitative, or journalistic: it matters to humanity that the ones entrusted to do so ask questions that turn the world upside down.

Side note: You think you don't belong here? (Everyone thinks that). But this is not the question. The question is: now that you are here, what (big) questions are you going to ask? And then now learn to answer them well, whatever your methods and interests.

The most important thing political scientists can do is to understand how rules affect behavior. Why? Because rules are the only thing we can change. But the big problem there is that rules are "endogenous," a fancy word for the fact that rules are caused by attitudes, behaviors, and context. So, causality is difficult to unravel. Nevertheless, we humans cannot change how we are. But we can change the rules that change how we think and behave.

Platt, John R. 1964. "Strong Inference." *Science* 146(3642): 347-53.

Years and decades can easily be wasted on the usual type of "low information" observations or experiments if one does not think carefully in advance about what the most important and conclusive experiments would be. ~ John R. Platt

The Platt piece is a well-regarded classic on the progression of science.

Bouchard, Thomas J., Jr. 2011. "Strong Inference: A Strategy for Advancing Psychological Science." In *Experience and Development*, pp. 47-68. Psychology Press.

The Bouchard piece is a review of an application that is a tribute to a brilliant psychological scientist, Sandra Wood Scarr.

Hutto, Richard L. "Distorting the process of scientific inquiry." *BioScience* 62, no. 8 (2012): 707-708.

This Hutto piece is a reiteration of the arguments of Bouchard and Platt but is suited to undergraduates. I am posting it here in case you would like to use it when you teach. really, this is the only must-read to understand the main points of strong inference.

Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson. "How to be a peer reviewer: a guide for recent and soon-to-be PhDs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46, no. 1 (2013): 120-123.

January 25 Motivated reasoning and attitude formation

Nyhan, Brendan, Ethan Porter, Jason Reifler, and Thomas J. Wood. "Taking fact-checks literally but not seriously? The effects of journalistic fact-checking on factual beliefs and candidate favorability." *Political Behavior* 42, no. 3 (2020): 939-960.

Miller, Joanne M., and Saunders, Kyle L., and Christina E. Farhart. 2016. "Conspiracy Endorsement as Motivated Reasoning: The Moderating Roles of Political Knowledge and Trust." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (4): 824-844.

Pennycook, Gordon, and David G. Rand. 2019. "Lazy, Not Biased: Susceptibility to Partisan Fake News Is Better Explained by Lack of Reasoning than by Motivated Reasoning." *Cognition* 188: 39-50.

Delton, Andrew W, Peter DeScioli, and Timothy J Ryan. 2020. "Moral Obstinacy in Political Negotiations." *Political Psychology* 41(1): 3-20.

Tappin, Ben. "Rethinking the link between cognitive sophistication and politically motivated reasoning." *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

February 1 The politics of racial attitudes

Group 1

Chudy, Jennifer. "Racial Sympathy and Its Political Consequences." *Journal of Politics*.

Frymer, Paul, and Jacob M Grumbach. 2020. "Labor Unions and White Racial Politics." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Jardina, Ashley et al. "Disavowing White Identity." *British Journal of Political Science*.

Sirin, Cigdem V, José D Villalobos, and Nicholas A Valentino. 2016. "Group Empathy Theory: The Effect of Group Empathy on US Intergroup Attitudes and Behavior in the Context of Immigration Threats." *The Journal of Politics* 78(3): 893-908.

Group 2

Agadjanian, Alexander, et al. "Disfavor or Favor? Assessing the Meaning of White Americans' Racial Attitudes." Working paper.

Itzhakov, Guy, Netta Weinstein, Nicole Legate, and Moty Amar. 2020. "Can High Quality Listening Predict Lower Speakers' Prejudiced Attitudes?" *Journal of experimental social psychology* 91: 104022.

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

Enos, 2015, "What the Demolition of Public Housing Teaches Us about the Impact of Racial Threat on Political Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science*.

February 8 Macro trends of attitudes and behaviors

Coggins, K. Elizabeth, James A. Stimson, Mary Layton Atkinson, and Frank R. Baumgartner. *Beyond the Thermostat: A Theory of Public Opinion Change*. Working paper.

Amat, Francesc, and Pablo Beramendi. "Democracy under high inequality: Capacity, spending, and participation." *The Journal of Politics* 82, no. 3 (2020): 859-878.

Gelman, Andrew. "The twentieth-century reversal: How did the Republican states switch to the Democrats and vice versa?." *Statistics and Public Policy* 1, no. 1 (2014): 1-5.

Heath, Oliver. Trends in partisanship.

PowerPoints: The research question and why the question matters

February 15 Surveys and survey experiments

We will assign readings to groups in the class to make this more manageable.

Group 1: Measurement

Flake, Jessica Kay, and Eiko I Fried. 2019. "Measurement Schmeasurement: Questionable Measurement Practices and How to Avoid Them." *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*.

Aronow, Peter M, Jonathon Baron, and Lauren Pinson. 2019. "A Note on Dropping Experimental Subjects Who Fail a Manipulation Check." *Political Analysis* 27(4): 572–589.

Flake, Jessica K, Jolynn Pek, and Eric Hehman. 2017. "Construct Validation in Social and Personality Research: Current Practice and Recommendations." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 8(4): 370–378.

Lopez, Jesse and D. Sunshine Hillygus. "Why So Serious?: Survey Trolls and Misinformation." Working paper. SSRN.

Pietryka, Matthew T., and Randall C. MacIntosh. "ANES Scales Often Do Not Measure What You Think They Measure." *The Journal of Politics* 84, no. 2 (2022): 1074-1090.

Group 2: Survey experiments

[Coppock, Alexander. "Ten Things to Know About Multiple Comparisons."](#)

Clifford et al. "Increasing Precision in Survey Experiments Without Introducing Bias." *American Political Science Review*.

Dafoe, Allan, Baobao Zhang, and Devin Caughey. 2018. "Information Equivalence in Survey Experiments." *Political Analysis* 26(4): 399–416.

Montgomery, Jacob M, Brendan Nyhan, and Michelle Torres. 2018. "How Conditioning on Posttreatment Variables Can Ruin Your Experiment and What to Do about It." *American Journal of Political Science* 62(3): 760– 75.

Spencer, Steven J., Mark P. Zanna, and Geoffrey T. Fong. "Establishing a causal chain: why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 89, no. 6 (2005): 845.

February 22 Media and communication

Bøggild, Troels, Lene Aarøe, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2020. "Citizens as Complicits: Distrust in Politicians and Biased Social Dissemination of Political Information." *American Political Science Review*: 1–17.

Groenendyk, Erik. "Of Two Minds But One Heart." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Levy, Ro'ee. 2021. "Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment." *American Economic Review*. Vol 111, March 831-70.

Ryan, Timothy J. and Yanna Krupnikov. 2021. "Split Feelings: Understanding Routes to Implicit and Explicit Attitude Change." *American Political Science Review* 115, 4, 1424–1441.

Ash, Elliott, and Michael Poyker. Conservative News Media and Criminal Justice: Evidence from Exposure to Fox News Channel. [2023 SSRN](#).

March 1 Taking the context seriously

Steinert-Threlkeld, 2017, "Spontaneous Collective Action: Peripheral Mobilization During the Arab Spring," *American Political Science Review*

Johnston, Ron, and Charles Pattie. "Local context, social networks and neighborhood effects on voter choice." *The Routledge Handbook of Elections, Voting Behavior and Public Opinion* (2017): 244-255.

Huckfeldt, Robert, Matthew T. Pietryka, and John B. Ryan. "Networks, contexts, and the process of political influence 1." In *The Routledge Handbook of Elections, Voting Behavior and Public Opinion*, pp. 267-279. Routledge, 2017.

Note: reading is light to give students a chance to work on their projects.

March 8 Class PowerPoint presentations

Reading are class project literature reviews and measurement papers.

March 15 The impact of white supremacist context and policy on attitudes

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(4): 917-43.

Michener, Jamila. *Fragmented Democracy: Medicaid, Federalism, and Unequal Politics*. Excerpts.

Walker, Hannah, Marcel Roman, and Matt Barreto. "The ripple effect: The political consequences of proximal contact with immigration enforcement." *Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics* 5, no. 3 (2020): 537-572.

Jefferson, Hakeem, et al. "Seeing Blue in Black and White: Race and Perceptions of Officer-Involved Shootings." *Perspectives on Politics*.

Wasow, Omar. 2020. "Agenda Seeding: How 1960s Black Protests Moved Elites, Public Opinion and Voting." *American Political Science Review*: 1–22.

Recommended: Gillion, Daniel Q. *Loud Minority*, Introduction, ch. 1, and ch. 5 (EPUB version linked)

March 22 Social networks

Bond, Robert M., et al. 2012. "A 61-million-person Experiment in Social Influence and Political Mobilization." *Nature* 489:295-8.

Mosleh, Mohsen. "Shared Partisanship Dramatically Increases Social Tie Formation in a Twitter Field Experiment"

Rossiter, Erin. "The Consequences of Interparty Conversation on Outparty Affect and Stereotypes." Working paper.

Larson, Jennifer M., and Janet I. Lewis. "Ethnic networks." *American Journal of Political Science* 61, no. 2 (2017): 350-364.

Earp, Brian D. et al., "How Social Relationships Shape Moral Judgment." Working paper. Everett, Jim A.C. et al., "Effectiveness of Moral Messages." Working paper.

March 29 Spring break! Yay! Take a break!

April 5 Elite attitudes and behavior

Bussell, Jennifer. 2020. "Shadowing as a Tool for Studying Political Elites." *Political Analysis* 28(4): 469–486.

Costa, Mia. 2020. "Ideology, Not Affect: What Americans Want from Political Representation." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Kertzer, Joshua D. "Rethinking Elite-Public Gap." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Lee, Nathan. "Do Policymakers Listen to Experts? Evidence from a National Survey of Local and State Policymakers." Working paper.

Sheffer, Lior et al. 2018. "Nonrepresentative Representatives: An Experimental Study of the Decision Making of Elected Politicians." *American Political Science Review* 112(2): 302–21.

April 12 Polarization and negative partisanship

Broockman, David, Joshua Kalla, and Sean Westwood. "Does affective polarization undermine democratic norms or accountability? Maybe not." *OSF Preprints*. December 22 (2020).

Engelhardt, Andrew M, and Stephen M Utych. 2018. "Grand Old (Tailgate) Party? Partisan Discrimination in Apolitical Settings." *Political Behavior*: 1–21.

Graham, Matthew H, and Milan W Svobik. 2020. "Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 114(2): 392–409.

Mutz, Diana C. 2007. "Effects of 'In-Your-Face' Television Discourse on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 101 (4): 621-635.

Recommended but not required. An example of a very short article to communicate to the scientific community something political scientists are very sure about: that politics is a religion in the U.S.

Finkel, Eli J et al. 2020. "Political Sectarianism in America." *Science* 370 (6516): 533–536.

April 19 Inequality and representation

Kasara and Suryanarayan, 2015, "When Do the Rich Vote Less Than the Poor and Why? Explaining Turnout Inequality across the World," *American Journal of Political Science*

Bartels, Larry M. 2005. Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics* 3: 15-29.

Hacker, Jacob S. and Paul Pierson. 2005. Abandoning the Middle: The Bush Tax Cuts and the Limits of Democratic Control." *Perspectives on Politics* 3: 33-53.

Soroka, Stuart N. and Christopher Wlezien. 2008. On the Limits to Inequality in Representation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41: 319-327.

Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. 2013. Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans." *Perspectives on Politics* 11: 51-73.

April 26

Group 1 Political Socialization

Prior, Markus. 2019. *Hooked: How Politics Captures People's Interest*. Ch. 1, 2, skim 3, 6, skim 9, 10.

Franklin, Mark N. Consequences of Lowering the Voting Age to 16: Lessons from Comparative Research. Working paper.

Zuckerman, Dasovic, and Fitzgerald. Chapter 5: *Bounded Partisanship in Intimate Social Units: Parents and Children from Partisan Families: The Social Logic of Bounded Partisanship in Germany and Britain*

van der Brug, Wouter and Mark N. Franklin. Generational replacement: Engine of electoral change. *The Routledge Handbook of Elections, Voting Behavior, and Public Opinion*.

Group 2: Social identity and procedural justice

Lind, E. Allan, Tom R. Tyler, and Yuen J. Huo. "Procedural context and culture: Variation in the antecedents of procedural justice judgments." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 73, no. 4 (1997): 767.

Jackson, Jonathan, Adam Fine, Ben Bradford, and Rick Trinkner. "Social Identity and Support for Defunding the Police in the Aftermath of George Floyd's Murder." (2022).

Gibson, James L., and Michael Nelson. *Black and Blue: How African Americans View the Legal System*, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 (will be scanned).

May 3 Emotions and attitude formation

Simas, Elizabeth N, Scott Clifford, and Justin H Kirkland. 2020. "How Empathic Concern Fuels Political Polarization." *American Political Science Review* 114(1): 258–69.

Young, Dannagal. 2019. *Irony and Outrage: The Polarized Landscape of Rage, Fear, and Laughter in the United States*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 4, 6, and 8.

Suhay, Elizabeth, and Cengiz Erisen. 2018. "The Role of Anger in the Biased Assimilation of Political Information." *Political Psychology* 39 (4): 793-810.

Valentino, Nicholas A., and Brader, Ted, and Groenendyk, Eric W., and Gregorowicz, Krysha, and Vincent L. Hutchings. 2011. "Election Night's Alright for Fighting: The Role of Emotions in Political Participation." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (1): 156-170