

John Bullock
Political Science
john.bullock@northwestern.edu
Office: Scott Hall 304
Spring 2018

Political Behavior

Political Science 390 (33073)
Scott Hall 212, Wednesdays, 300pm-550pm
<https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/72425>
Syllabus date: May 9, 2018 (6:08pm)

This course is about the ways in which people form and act on their political preferences. We start with utility theory and spatial models of choice. We then turn to basic empirical criticisms of this literature, many of which stem from psychological research on heuristics and cues. In the second half of the course, we turn to bread-and-butter American politics topics: partisanship, social influences on political behavior, models of election outcomes, and more.

The readings are usually short, but they take time. Some have a substantial mathematical or statistical component. Outside of class, you should try to work through these parts of the readings for yourself outside of class. In other words, I want you to wrestle with the mathematical and statistical arguments that you encounter in the readings.

Assignments and Grades

Each student must write two responses, each 2-3 pages long and accounting for 10% of the overall grade. Discussion accounts for 30% of the final grade. A final paper, no more than 15 pages long, accounts for 50% of the final grade.

Perfect attendance does not ensure that you will get a satisfactory discussion grade. If you always attend class but rarely speak, or if you speak regularly in ways that suggest that you haven't thought about the readings, you will receive a low discussion grade—perhaps an F. In the

past, most discussion grades have been in the B range, and C grades have sometimes been more common than A grades.

There is no formal penalty for missing a class. But you cannot contribute to class discussion if you do not attend, so it will be hard to get a high discussion grade if you miss more than a few classes.

DISCUSSION

Discussion will be based heavily on the readings.

You are required to lead the first part of discussion in two different classes. In each of these classes, you should come prepared to speak about the assigned reading for 15 minutes at the beginning of class. It may make sense to begin with a brief overview of the assigned reading, but as with the reading responses, the emphasis should be on critique rather than summary. (As a rule of thumb, spend no more than 90 seconds summarizing any particular reading.) The discussion grade is based on discussion throughout the semester, but I will weight these presentations heavily as I determine the discussion grade.

In some weeks, more than one student may be assigned to discuss. In those cases, each student must be prepared to talk for 15 minutes. Students should also coordinate with each other to ensure that their comments don't overlap much.

Students who are going to present in a given class must post at least one page of notes on their presentations to the "Discussions" section of the Canvas site. These notes will not be graded, but they must be posted at least 24 hours before the start of class.

READING RESPONSES

Each student must write two reading responses. These responses should be 2-3 pages long. They should critique—not summarize—at least one of the assigned readings. They must pertain chiefly to the current week's reading. They may focus on a small part of the assigned reading. I encourage you to talk about the readings with each other, but each of you should write responses on your own.

Whenever you refer to a specific passage or claim in the assigned readings, be sure to mention the relevant page numbers. You can do this briefly and informally: "Smith says X (page 92)." You must cite the page numbers in the printed text, not the page numbers of the PDF file or any other page numbers.

Responses are due 24 hours before the beginning of class. They should be posted in the appropriate thread of the "Discussions" section of the course web site—not sent by e-mail.

You must submit your first response by May 8th. You may turn in only one response per week. I will not grant deadline extensions for the reading responses. Remember, you need to write only two of them.

By early June, I expect that I will have graded and returned only those responses that you wrote by early May.

See the “Format of Assignments” section of this syllabus for further instructions. If you fail to follow those formatting instructions, I will automatically lower your grade: an A will become an A–, a B will become a B–, and so on.

FINAL PAPER

Your final paper must trace the progress of an idea in political science. Start by identifying a question that interests you—preferably one that relates to the assigned reading. Then find copies of the *American Political Science Review* that were published in the 1950s, either through the library or through JSTOR. Look at the article titles and abstracts until you find an article that covers your topic. (You may need to look well into the decade.) Do the same thing for the next five decades. At the end of this stage, you will have selected one article from each decade.

Next, write one or two paragraphs for yourself about each article. What is the main question? What is the theory? To what previous work do they refer? What are the data? What methods did the authors use? What are their main conclusions? Answer these questions for each article, bearing in mind that your goal is to trace the progress of a question over six decades of research.

Your paper should start with a paragraph that introduces the question and previews the way that the research unfolds. The concluding paragraph should summarize: was progress regular or staccato? Were there big moments in which large advances were made? Within the discipline, were there disagreements about how the question should be approached? In answering these questions, your aim should be to help me understand how we got from the 1950s to where we are now.

Be sure to include the title of each article in the body of your paper.

The paper should be no more than 15 pages long, not counting a standalone list of references on the last page. It is due 900am on June 14th. Please meet me before May 14th to discuss potential topics: I don't want you to take on topics that are too big. Upload the paper through the “Assignments” section of the Canvas site and slip hard copy under the door of my office. Do not send a copy by e-mail.

I will not reply to email about the final paper that is sent after June 3rd unless the questions are about formatting or are otherwise purely procedural. Please plan accordingly.

WRITING FOR ME

I've posted [a memo](#) that sets forth rules and guidelines to follow when you write papers in my courses. Please read every word, including every item in the long list at the end of the memo. If there is something in the memo that you don't understand, just ask me about it.

If you don't follow the rules and guidelines—and you can't explain why—you will do poorly in this course.

FORMAT OF ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments must be double-spaced and set in a 12-to-13-point font. The font must be serifed; this rules out Arial, Calibri, Helvetica, and other sans-serif fonts. The font must not be monospaced; this rules out, e.g., Courier. Margins must be between 1" and 1.33" on each side.

Your name, the date of submission, and "PLSC 390: Political Behavior," should appear in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of every assignment. For reading responses, also include the name of the unit as given in this syllabus (e.g., "Tolerance"). The upper right-hand corner of every subsequent page should bear your last name, the page number, and "PLSC 390: Reading Response" or "PLSC 390: Final Paper."

MAPPING BETWEEN NUMBERS AND LETTER GRADES

All of the grades that you receive in this course will be letter grades, e.g., A, B+. To compute an average grade for the semester that I can report to the Registrar's Office, I will translate those letter grades into numbers, average the numbers, and then translate the average back into a letter grade. This is the mapping between letter grades and numbers: below 60 = F, 60 to 63 = D-, 63 to 67 = D, 67 to 70 = D+, 70 to 73 = C-, 73 to 77 = C, 77 to 80 = C+, 80 to 83 = B-, 83 to 87 = B, 87 to 90 = B+, 90 to 93 = A-, 93 and above = A.

GRADES WILL NOT BE ROUNDED UP

Grades will not be rounded up. For example, a final grade of 92.9 will be reported to the Registrar as an A-.

Readings

Required readings are marked with an asterisk. The other readings in the syllabus are recommended but not required.

I expect to make small changes to the reading list throughout the term. Whenever I make changes especially worth noting, I'll send an announcement via email.

FINDING THE READINGS

There is no packet of course readings, and you should print or acquire the readings yourself. Most are available online, either from URLs that are given in this syllabus or from the course website.

If there is no URL in the syllabus and the course website doesn't have the article, please search for it online. *You are responsible for locating every one of the assigned readings.*

I find most of the course readings (except those available through Canvas) by searching Google Scholar. To use it effectively, you may need to use an on-campus computer or to connect through the Northwestern VPN. If you don't know what a VPN is, see <http://www.it.northwestern.edu/oncampus/vpn/>.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

Almost all of my recommendations are topic-specific, and they therefore appear below, in the sections on specific topics. But I also recommend two general texts to you:

Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth A., Michael W. Wagner, William H. Flanigan, and Nancy H. Zingale. 2018. *Political Behavior of the American Electorate*. 14th ed ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.

Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman.

BACKGROUND READINGS IN STATISTICS

There is no statistics prerequisite, but many of the assigned articles use simple statistics. If you want to better understand the statistical methods that you encounter in the articles, I recommend:

Levitt, Steven D., and Stephen J. Dubner. 2005. *Freakonomics*. New York: Harper Perennial. Pages 162-68 are a very casual introduction to regression analysis.

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2014. *Mastering 'Metrics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. The focus is on the application of quantitative methods to practical problems.

Freedman, David, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 1998. *Statistics*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton. Presumes almost no background. There is now a fourth edition; I haven't read it.

Freedman, David A. 2009. *Statistical Models: Theory and Practice*. Revised ed. New York: Cambridge University Press. This is better than *Statistics* but also more advanced. Chapters 1-5 are excellent for self-study if you do the exercises.

Office Hours

Office hours will take place on the times specified at <https://www.slotted.co/2018spring>. They will be held at my office: Scott Hall 304. You do not need to make an appointment in advance, but I prefer that you do. Making an appointment also reduces the probability that you will need to wait while I'm meeting with other students.

You cannot sign up for my office hours through Canvas. Instead, please make appointments through <https://www.slotted.co/2018spring>. When you make an appointment, please add a comment indicating what you would like to talk about when we meet.

If all office-hours slots are full—you can tell by checking the slotted.co site—I generally will not be able to meet with you during or immediately after office hours.

April 4 (Wed): Introduction

*Feynman, Richard P. 1974. "Cargo Cult Science." Excerpts from a Caltech commencement address.

Jordan, Christian H., and Mark P. Zanna. 1999. "How to Read a Journal Article in Social Psychology." In *The Self in Social Psychology*, ed. Roy F. Baumeister. Philadelphia: Psychology Press. <http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/~sspencer/readart.pdf>.

Elster, Jon. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 11 (Equilibrium) and 14 (Bargaining).

April 11 (Wed): Axioms about Choice; Utility; Uncertainty, Risk, and Time Preferences

*Kreps, David M. 1990. *A Course in Microeconomic Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Reach Chapters 2 and 3, but skim pages 37-69, 87-98, and 103-110.

*Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. van Houweling. 2009. "The Electoral Implications of Candidate Ambiguity." *American Political Science Review* 103 (February): 83-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090066>. In political science, we often think about what voters' risk preferences imply for their preferences over candidates. E.g., should candidates be clear or vague about their positions? That is the focus of this article.

*Cowen, Tyler. 2007. "Caring about the Distant Future: Why It Matters and What It Means." *University of Chicago Law Review* 74 (Winter): 5-40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4495594>.

RECOMMENDED READINGS ABOUT CHOICE

Morrow, James D. 1994. *Game Theory for Political Scientists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 2 is a gentle guide to many of the ideas that we'll discuss in this class.

McCarty, Nolan, and Adam Meirowitz. 2007. *Political Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2-3.

Brady, Henry E., and Stephen Ansolabehere. 1989. "The Nature of Utility Functions in Mass Publics." *American Political Science Review* 83 (March): 143-63. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1956438>. Especially 143-53 and 158-61.

Kreps, David M. 1988. *Notes on the Theory of Choice*. Boulder, CO: Westview. Informal and fast-paced. The print in my paperback copy is very blurry, and I suspect that this is a problem with all paperback copies of the book. The hardcover copies seem to be better.

Tversky, Amos. 1969. "Intransitivity of Preferences." *Psychological Review* 76 (January): 31-48. <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=toc&SEARCH=00006832-196901000-00000.kc&LINKPOS=3&D=ovft>. Simple experimental investigations.

Rubinstein, Ariel. 2006. *Lecture Notes in Microeconomic Theory: The Economic Agent*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Get the latest version for free at <http://arielrubinstein.tau.ac.il/Rubinstein2007.pdf>.

Luce, R. Duncan. 1959. *Individual Choice Behavior: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Wiley. Chapter 1.

RECOMMENDED READINGS ABOUT REVEALED PREFERENCES AND UTILITY FUNCTIONS

Brady, Henry E., and Stephen Ansolabehere. 1989. "The Nature of Utility Functions in Mass Publics." *American Political Science Review* 83 (March): 143-63. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1956438>. Focus on 143-50 and 158-61.

Jacoby, William G. 2006. "Value Choices and American Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (July): 706-23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3694244>. Focus on 706-15 and 720-22.

RECOMMENDED READINGS ABOUT UNCERTAINTY, RISK, AND TIME PREFERENCES

Jacobs, Alan M., and J. Scott Matthews. 2012. "Why Do Citizens Discount the Future? Public Opinion and the Timing of Policy Consequences." *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (October): 903-35.

Rabin, Matthew. 2000. "Risk Aversion and Expected-Utility Theory: A Calibration Theorem." *Econometrica* 68 (September): 1281-92.

Machina, Mark J. 1987. "Choice under Uncertainty: Problems Solved and Unsolved." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 1 (Summer): 121-154. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1942952>.

Samuelson, William, and Richard Zeckhauser. 1988. "Status Quo Bias in Decision Making." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 1 (1): 7-59.

O'Donoghue, Ted, and Matthew Rabin. 1999. "Doing It Now Or Later." *American Economic Review* 89 (March): 103-24. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/116981>.

April 18 (Wed): Political Sophistication, Nonattitudes, and “Information Shortcuts”

We’ll first consider political sophistication and nonattitudes. Then we’ll turn to the possibility that “source cues” can be used as “shortcuts” to help uninformed people act as they would if they were informed.

POLITICAL SOPHISTICATION AND NONATTITUDES

*Luskin, Robert C. 1987. “Measuring Political Sophistication.” *American Journal of Political Science* 31 (November): 856-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111227>. Read the first eight pages; skim the remainder.

*Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.

*Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2008. “The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting.” *American Political Science Review* 102 (May): 215-32. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055408080210. This is a difficult article. Most of the math is simple, but there is a lot of it. Try reading the article twice before lecture: read first to get the gist; the second time, try to work through the math.

Converse, Philip E. [1964] 2006. “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.” *Critical Review* 18 (Winter-Summer): 1-74. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/ftinterface~content=a791297569~fulltext=713240930>.

Converse, Philip E. 1970. “Attitudes and Non-Attitudes: Continuation of a Dialogue.” In *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems*, ed. Edward R. Tufte. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Achen, Christopher H. 1975. “Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response.” *American Political Science Review* 69 (December): 1218-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1955282>. A criticism of Converse’s (1964, 1970) work on nonattitudes. See also three critical responses and Achen’s rejoinder in the December 1976 APSR: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1959386?seq=10>.

Converse, Philip E. 2000. “Assessing the Capacity of Mass Electorates.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 331-53.

Hill, Jennifer L., and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2001. “An Extension and Test of Converse’s ‘Black-and-White’ Model of Response Stability.” *American Political Science Review* 95 (June): 397-413.

Dobrzynska, Agnieszka, and André Blais. 2008. "Testing Zaller's Reception and Acceptance Model in an Intense Election Campaign." *Political Behavior* 30 (2): 259-75. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/062977q481183807/>.

Wilson, Timothy D., Samuel Lindsey, and Tonya Y. Schooler. 2000. "A Model of Dual Attitudes." *Psychological Review* 107 (January): 101-26.

Luskin, Robert C. 1990. "Explaining Political Sophistication." *Political Behavior* 12 (December): 331-61.

Gilens, Martin. 2001. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 95 (2): 379-96.

Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Still the most comprehensive treatment of what Americans know and don't know about politics. And it is not as dated as you might think: this story doesn't change much over time.

CUES AS SHORTCUTS

*Somin, Ilya. 1998. "Voter Ignorance and the Democratic Ideal." *Critical Review* 12 (4): 413-58. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a791282780~db=all>. I recommend the entire article, but you are required to read only to page 431.

*Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88 (March): 63-76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2944882>.

*Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (February): 194-230. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111700>. The "Resources" section of the course web site contains a page of notes on this article that may be helpful.

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

Althaus, Scott L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Part 2.

April 25 (Wed): Partisanship and Partisan Polarization in the Mass Public

We start with basic ideas about partisanship. We then turn to the idea that Americans are polarizing along partisan lines.

PARTISANSHIP

*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 81-89.

*Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 6. The book is an update of *The American Voter* (Campbell et al. 1960), a highly influential but now rather dated book. You may also want to examine Chapter 4 (“Partisan Choice”), but it is not required.

Hersh, Eitan D. 2015. *Hacking the Electorate: How Campaigns Perceive Voters*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Especially Chapter 5. What can campaigns predict about you if they know your party registration, and how well can they predict it?

Green, Donald P. 2013. “Breaking Empirical Deadlocks in the Study of Partisanship: An Overview of Experimental Research Strategies.” *Politics and Governance* 1 (1): 6-15. Somewhat advanced. Useful framing of the pre-experimental literature, and a nice introduction to Gerber, Huber, and Washington (2010).

Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, and Ebonya Washington. 2010. “Party Affiliation, Partisanship, and Political Beliefs: A Field Experiment.” *American Political Science Review* 104 (November): 720-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000407>. Think about how to manipulate partisanship in an experiment. In this article, the authors show you how to do it rather simply.

Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapters 1, 2, and 8. Available from the course web site. The authors’ main argument is that party identification is very stable over time.

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4 and 5. http://resources.library.yale.edu/ereserves/default.asp?class=PLSC238A&File=PLSC_238A_2.pdf.

McGrath, Mary C. 2017. “Economic Behavior and the Partisan Perceptual Screen.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 11 (4): 363-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/100.00015100>.

Bullock, John G. 2011. “Elite Influence on Public Opinion in an Informed Electorate.” *American Political Science Review* 105 (September): 496-515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000165>.

Readings marked by an asterisk (*) are required. All others are optional.

PARTISAN POLARIZATION IN THE MASS PUBLIC

*Gelman, Andrew. 2015 November 29. "Where's the Partisan Polarization on Abortion?" <https://goo.gl/Uk9rPP>. Focus above all on the first figure.

*Fiorina, Morris P., and Samuel J. Abrams. 2008. "Political Polarization in the American Public." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 563-88. Read pages 574-82, focusing on the "Polarized Choices" and "Party Sorting" sections. Be sure that you understand the arguments in both sections or that you come to class with specific questions about them.

*Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (Fall): 405-31. Skip 421-27. And note that there is an error on page 412: see <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/76/4/819.full.pdf+html>.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2006. "Purple America." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (2): 97-118. <http://www.stanford.edu/~jrodde/jep.20.2.pdf>.

Abramowitz, Alan I., and Kyle L. Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *Journal of Politics* 70 (April): 542-55. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022381608080493.

Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel A. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2008. "Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings." *Journal of Politics* 70 (April): 556-60. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S002238160808050X.

Jacobson, Gary C. 2006. *A Divider, Not a Uniter: George W. Bush and the American People*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Of late, there has been particular interest in partisan polarization with respect to survey responses, especially responses to questions about factual beliefs. You may be interested in:

Prior, Markus, Gaurav Sood, and Kabir Khanna. 2015. "You Cannot Be Serious: The Impact of Accuracy Incentives on Partisan Bias in Reports of Economic Perceptions." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10 (4): 489-518.

Bullock, John G., Alan S. Gerber, Seth J. Hill, and Gregory A. Huber. 2015. "Partisan Bias in Factual Beliefs about Politics." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10 (December): 519-78.

Schaffner, Brian F., and Samantha Luks. 2018. "Misinformation or Expressive Responding? What an Inauguration Crowd Can Tell Us about the Source of Political Misinformation in Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (1): 135-47.

May 2 (Wed): Family Influences, Socialization, and Education

FAMILY INFLUENCES, SOCIALIZATION, AND PUBLIC OPINION

*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 123-31 and pages 142-54. In the latter part, skip the short section entitled “Generations and Political Polarization.”

*Jennings, M. Kent, Laura Stoker, and Jake Bowers. 2009. “Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined.” *Journal of Politics* 71 (3): 782-99. <http://jakebowers.org/PAPERS/JenStokBow2009.pdf>.

*Healy, Andrew, and Neil Malhotra. 2013. “Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *Journal of Politics* 75 (4): 1023-37.

Glynn, Adam N., and Maya Sen. 2015. “Identifying Judicial Empathy: Does Having Daughters Cause Judges to Rule for Women’s Issues?” *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (1): 37-54.

Washington, Ebonya L. 2008. “Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers’ Voting on Women’s Issues.” *American Economic Review* 98 (March): 311-32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29729973>. This article is mainly about representation, but I am sneaking it into the public opinion part of the course.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1968. “The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child.” *American Political Science Review* 62 (March): 169-84. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1953332>.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1971. “The Division of Political Labor Between Mothers and Fathers.” *American Political Science Review* 65 (March): 69-82. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1955044>.

Barker, David C., and James D. Tinnick III. 2006. “Competing Visions of Parental Roles and Ideological Constraint.” *American Political Science Review* 100 (May): 249-63. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055406062149.

Freese, Jeremy, Brian Powell, and Lala Carr Steelman. 1999. “Rebel Without a Cause or Effect: Birth Order and Social Attitudes.” *American Sociological Review* 64 (April): 207-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657528>.

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC OPINION

*Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford. Pages 204-206. There is an important idea in these three pages, and I will be asking you about it.

*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 131-138. Do not write a reading response that is mainly about this reading.

*Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Westview Press. Pages 40-42. Do not write a reading response that is mainly about this reading.

*Marshall, John. 2019. "The Anti-Democrat Diploma: How High School Education Decreases Support for the Democratic Party." *American Journal of Political Science*. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/jmarshall/files/the_anti-democrat_diploma_v4.pdf.

Mendelberg, Tali, Katherine T. McCabe, and Adam Thal. 2017. "College Socialization and the Economic Views of Affluent Americans." *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12265>.

Dee, Thomas S. 2004. "Are There Civic Returns to Education?" *J. Pub. Econ* 88: 1697-1720.

Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 2006. "Learning to Love Globalization: Education and Individual Attitudes toward International Trade." *International Organization* 60 (2): 469-98. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3877900>.

Key, Jr., V. O. 1961. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Knopf. Chapter 13, "The Educational System."

Stouffer, Samuel A. 1955. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. New York: Doubleday. Chapters 4 and 5. Dated, but deservedly influential.

Sullivan, John L., James Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1982. *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pages 114-126.

MacMullen, Ian. 2011. "On Status Quo Bias in Civic Education." *Journal of Politics* 73 (July): 872-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611000521>. An excellent political theory article.

Merelman, Richard M. 1980. "Democratic Politics and the Culture of American Education." *American Political Science Review* 74 (June): 319-32. This article is a work of political theory. Some of the ideas in it are radical. Some are ridiculous. Some are profound. There are short follow-ups to this article in the same issue of the APSR, but I don't find them edifying.

May 9 (Wed): Media Effects

*Snyder, Jr., James M., and David Strömberg. 2010. "Press Coverage and Political Accountability." *Journal of Political Economy* 118 (2): 355-408.

*Huber, Gregory A., and Kevin Arceneaux. 2007. "Identifying the Persuasive Effects of Presidential Advertising." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (4): 957-77. You may skip the part about mechanisms (pages 969-71).

Kern, Holger Lutz, and Jens Hainmueller. 2009. "Opium for the Masses: How Foreign Media Can Stabilize Authoritarian Regimes." *Political Analysis* 17 (4): 377-99.

Gentzkow, Matthew. 2006. "Television and Voter Turnout." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 71 (August): 931-72. Excellent.

Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2006. "Media Bias and Reputation." *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (2)

Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." *American Political Science Review* 87 (June): 267-85. It's very difficult, perhaps impossible, to learn a lot about media effects—that is, to learn with confidence—from survey data alone. I would never recommend that anyone try to do so. But in the past, many scholars did try. And of all the survey-only efforts, this one may be the best. It is certainly interesting and clever.

Gerber, Alan S., Dean Karlan, and Daniel Bergan. 2009. "Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Public Opinions." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1 (2): 35-52. <http://isps.research.yale.edu/uploads/publications/74.pdf>.

Arceneaux, Kevin, Martin Johnson, and Chad Murphy. 2012. "Polarized Political Communication, Oppositional Media Hostility, and Selective Exposure." *Journal of Politics*.

Eisensee, Thomas, and David Strömberg. 2007. "News Droughts, News Floods, and U.S. Disaster Relief." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122 (2): 693-728. <http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/122/2/693.short>.

Gerber, Alan S., James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw. 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 (01): 135-50.

Ladd, Jonathan McDonald, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2009. "Exploiting a Rare Communication Shift to Document the Persuasive Power of the News Media." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (2): 394-410. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2009.00377.x/full>.

Mutz, Diana C. 1998. *Impersonal Influence: How Perceptions of Mass Collectives Affect Political Attitudes*. New York: Cambridge University Press. The biggest idea here is that perceptions of broad social conditions—can be quite influential. And one comes by these “sociotropic” considerations largely through the media.

Prior, Markus. 2009. “The Immensely Inflated News Audience: Assessing Bias in Self-Reported News Exposure.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (Spring): 130-43. Beware self-reports of media exposure. On the other hand, they are probably not *entirely* useless: see page 378 of the article by Snyder and Strömberg.

May 16 (Wed): Participation

“Participation” can take many forms: donating to a campaign, going to a rally, trying to persuade someone to vote for a particular candidate, and so on. But the lion’s share of the participation literature is about voter turnout. When you come to class, be prepared to tell me why. The answer is not in the readings.

*Cohn, Nate. 2016 January 07. “Why Polls Have Been Wrong Recently.” *New York Times*. <http://nyti.ms/1JwXWcF>.

*Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. “Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation.” *American Political Science Review* 89 (June): 271-94. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2082425>.

*Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. “Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment.” *American Political Science Review* 102 (February): 33-48. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?aid=1720748>.

Ansola-behere, Stephen, and Eitan Hersh. 2012. “Validation: What Big Data Reveal about Survey Misreporting and the Real Electorate.” *Political Analysis* 20 (Autumn): 437-59.

Gentzkow, Matthew. 2006. “Television and Voter Turnout.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 71 (August): 931-72. This is a relatively difficult article. Unless you have already covered fixed-effects regression in one of your other courses, please do not focus on this article in your reading responses.

Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2015. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. By far the most comprehensive and authoritative review of the topic. The focus is on field-experimental research about turnout.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. “Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28 (December): 664-83.

Readings marked by an asterisk (*) are required. All others are optional.

Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. White Plains, New York: Longman.

May 23 (Wed): Campaigns

Many articles assigned in other units could also have been assigned in this one.

*Hillygus, D. Sunshine, and Simon Jackman. 2003. "Voter Decision Making in Election 2000: Campaign Effects, Partisan Activation, and the Clinton Legacy." *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (October): 583-96.

*Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (October): 821-37.

*Hirano, Shigeo, Gabriel S. Lenz, Maksim Pinkovskiy, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2013. "Voter Learning in State Primary Elections." *American Journal of Political Science*. Excellent.

Panagopoulos, Costas, and Donald P. Green. 2008. "Field Experiments Testing the Impact of Radio Advertisements on Electoral Competition." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (1): 156-68. Partly about the importance of name recognition.

Kam, Cindy D., and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2013. "Name Recognition and Candidate Support." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (4): 971-86.

Arceneaux, Kevin, and Robin Kolodny. 2009. "Educating the Least Informed: Group Endorsements in a Grassroots Campaign." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 755-70.

May 30 (Wed): No Class

June 6 (Wed): Simple Models of Election Outcomes

*Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: HarperCollins. Chapters 3-4.

*Gelman, Andrew, and Gary King. 1993. "Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23 (October): 409-51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/194212>.

*Hibbs, Jr., Douglas A. 2008. "Implications of the 'Bread and Peace' Model for the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election." *Public Choice* 137 (September): 1-10. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/f533t53183x419wl/?p=fce77dfbc1834fe6989ce602f9dee31b>. Update of Hibbs (2000) that contains a very accurate forecast of the 2008 presidential election. But note that the assigned article is from 2008, not 2000.

Achen, Christopher H. 1992. "Social Psychology, Demographic Variables, and Linear Regression: Breaking the Iron Triangle in Voting Research." *Political Behavior* 14 (September): 195-211. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/586227>.

Bartels, Larry M., and John Zaller. 2001. "Presidential Vote Models: A Recount." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34 (1): 9-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096501000026>.

Fair, Ray C. 2009. "Presidential and Congressional Vote-Share Equations." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1): 55-72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25193867>.

Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Preface and Chapters 1-4.

Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 8.

Hibbs, Douglas A. 2000. "Bread and Peace Voting in U.S. Presidential Elections." *Public Choice* 104 (July): 149-80. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/v1j0j1v6601pw691/fulltext.pdf>.

Kayser, Mark Andreas, and Michael Peress. 2012. "Benchmarking across Borders: Electoral Accountability and the Necessity of Comparison." *American Political Science Review* 106 (August): 661-84. In part, this is an argument that political scientists have been *underestimating* the effects of the economy on election outcomes.

Kelley, Jr., Stanley, and Thad W. Mirer. 1974. "The Simple Act of Voting." *American Political Science Review* 68 (June): 572-91. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1959506>.

Rosenstone, Stephen J. 1983. *Forecasting Presidential Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.