

John Bullock  
Department of Political Science  
77 Prospect, Room D235  
[john.bullock@yale.edu](mailto:john.bullock@yale.edu)  
Office hours: T 115pm-215pm  
Fall 2013

# Political Preferences and American Political Behavior

Political Science 210a/801a  
77 Prospect Street (ISPS), Room B012  
Tuesday 330pm-520pm  
Syllabus date: September 30, 2013 (6:14pm)

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. In class, we will sometimes work through these parts step by step. But this is unlikely to help you if you don't also try to work through the arguments for yourself outside of class—so please do wrestle with the mathematical and statistical arguments that you encounter in the readings.

I've recommended additional books and articles for most classes. If you have trouble understanding something or want more detail, they may help. Graduate students will especially profit from knowing most of these texts.

## Assignments and Grades

Three response papers are required; each of them accounts for 10% of the overall grade. Discussion accounts for 30% of the overall grade, and the final paper (no more than 12 pages long) counts for 40% of it.

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

### READING RESPONSES

Each student must write three reading responses. These responses should be 2-3 pages long. They should critique—not summarize—one or more of the assigned readings in a given week. They must pertain chiefly to the current week's reading (rather than to reading from previous or subsequent weeks). They may focus on a small part of the assigned reading. I encourage students to talk about the readings with each other, but each student should write responses on his 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)."

Responses are due 24 hours before the beginning of class. They should be posted in the appropriate thread of the "Forums" section of the course web site—not sent by e-mail or uploaded through the "Drop Box" on the course web site.

You must submit your first response paper by October 15th and your second response paper by November 5th. No student may turn in more than one response per week. I will not grant deadline extensions for the reading responses. (Remember, you only need to write three of them.)

*Before coming to class, each student should read all of the week's posted reading responses and be prepared to talk about them.*

See the "Format of Assignments" section of this syllabus for further instructions.

### DISCUSSION

Discussion will be based heavily on the readings.

Each student is required to lead the first part of one seminar's discussion. This student 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 recapping any particular reading.) The discussion grade is based on discussion throughout the semester, but this presentation will be weighted heavily in determination of 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 upload at least one page of notes on their presentation through the classesv2 drop box. They must do this at least 24 hours before the start of class.

#### 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.

The paper should be no more than 12 pages long, not counting a standalone list of references on the last page. It is due at 800am on the last day of exams. By that time, you should have uploaded it through the classesv2 dropbox *and* put hard copy in my ISPS mailbox. (ISPS is open Monday through Friday until 430pm.) Do not send a copy by e-mail.

#### FORMAT OF ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments must be double-spaced and set in a 12-to-13-point serif font. The font may 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 210a/801a: 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 210a/801a: Reading Response.” For the final paper, substitute “Final Paper” for “Reading Response.”

*Acceptable file formats.* I prefer to receive files in Rich Text Format (RTF). Please don't send files in .docx or .odf format.

*Posting reading responses to the “Forums” section of the course web site.* If you copy your response from Microsoft Word to the “Forums” section of the course web site, you may notice that the response is preceded, in the Forums section, by many lines of XML: for example,

```
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml> <o:DocumentProperties>  
<o:Revision>0</o:Revision> <o:TotalTime>0</o:TotalTime>  
<o:Pages>1</o:Pages> <o:Words>636</o:Words> <o:Characters>3627  
</o:Characters> <o:Company>N/A</o:Company> <o:Lines>30</o:Lines>  
<o:Paragraphs>8</o:Paragraphs> <o:CharactersWithSpaces>4255  
</o:CharactersWithSpaces> <o:Version>14.0</o:Version>  
</o:DocumentProperties>
```

and lines of that sort. A bit of XML syntax is OK, but don't submit a response in which so much garbage of this sort appears. Instead, copy your response to a plain-text editor (e.g., Notepad or TextEdit). Then copy the response from the plain-text editor into the Forums section of the web site.

## Office Hours

Office hours take place on most Tuesdays from 115pm through 215pm at 77 Prospect Street, Room D235.

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.

Do not send e-mail to set up an appointment. Instead, use the “Sign-up” tool at the classesv2 web site. When you sign up, please add a comment indicating what you would like to talk about when we meet.

If office hours are full—you can tell by checking the “Sign-up” tool at the classesv2 site—I generally will *not* be able to meet with you during or immediately after office hours. If you do not have an appointment, please do not come to my office at 215pm expecting that we will be able to meet.

## 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 e-mail.

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

the “Resources” section of the classesv2 web site. If there is no URL in the syllabus and the classesv2 site doesn’t have the article, try searching for it online.

In most cases, you will need to use an on-campus computer or to connect through the Yale VPN to download the articles. If you don’t know what a VPN is, see <http://www.yale.edu/its/network/vpn.html>.

## September 3: Overview; Axioms about Choice

\*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>.

\*Kreps, David M. 1990. *A Course in Microeconomic Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 2. Skim 37-69.

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

### OTHER 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.

### ALSO RECOMMENDED

Key, Jr., V. O. 1961. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Knopf. Pages 3-18.

## September 10: Revealed Preferences; Utility Functions

\*Kreps, David M. 1990. *A Course in Microeconomic Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 3. Skim 87-98 and 103-110, picking up on 110 with the Harsanyi doctrine.

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.

## September 17: Risk Aversion, Uncertainty, and Time Preferences

\*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>.

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>.

Norton, Michael I., Jeana H. Frost, and Dan Ariely. 2007. "Less Is More: The Lure of Ambiguity, or Why Familiarity Breeds Contempt." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92 (1): 97-105. A second or third cousin to Tomz and van Houweling (2009). This article is about personal relationships rather than candidate choice, and it is less directly about risk aversion.

## September 24: No Class

### October 1: Political Sophistication and “Information Shortcuts”

What is political sophistication? Why is it important? Can people who know little about politics act as though they are well-informed by using “information shortcuts”? Ask these questions as you read this week’s articles.

\*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.

\*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>.

\*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.

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

Luskin, Robert C. 1987. “Measuring Political Sophistication.” *American Journal of Political Science* 31 (November): 856-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111227>. Probably the most prominent article on measurement of sophistication.

Bendor, Jonathan, and John G. Bullock. 2008. “Lethal Incompetence: Voters, Officials, and Systems.” *Critical Review* 20 (March): 1-24. [http://bullock.research.yale.edu/papers/lethal\\_final.pdf](http://bullock.research.yale.edu/papers/lethal_final.pdf).

McKelvey, Richard D., and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1986. “Information, Electoral Equilibria, and the Democratic Ideal.” *Journal of Politics* 48 (November): 909-937. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131005>.

Kahneman, Daniel, Paul Slovic, and Amos Tversky, eds. 1982. *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel T. Kahneman. 1974. “Heuristics and Biases: Judgment under Uncertainty.” *Science* 185 (September): 1124-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1738360>. Reprinted in *Judgment under Uncertainty*.



Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1996. "On the Reality of Cognitive Illusions." *Psychological Review* 103 (July): 582-91. <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=fulltext&AN=00006832-199607000-00007&D=ovft>. This is a reply by Kahneman and Tversky to one of their most persistent critics, Gerd Gigerenzer. See also Gigerenzer's response and Kahneman and Tversky's rejoinder in the same issue.

Todd, Peter M., and Gerd Gigerenzer. 2000. "Précis of *Simple Heuristics that Make Us Smart*." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 23 (October): 727-41. See also the many replies and the authors' rejoinder in the same issue.

DellaVigna, Stefano. 2009. "Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (June): 315-72.

DellaVigna, Stefano, and Matthew Gentzkow. 2009. "Persuasion: Empirical Evidence." Working Paper 15298. National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15298>.

McFadden, Daniel. 1999. "Rationality for Economists?" *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 19 (December): 73-105. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/15g4273vr16q383t/>. An alternative to DellaVigna's surveys.

## October 8: "Nonattitudes" and Attitude Formation

\*Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2-4. Zaller's book is probably the best-known work in political psychology from the previous two decades. Focus most on Chapter 4, but to make sense of it, you will need to read the preceding chapters.

\*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](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055408080210). See related notes in the "Resources" section of the classesv2 site.

Broockman, David E. 2013. "An Artificial Disconnect: The Extreme Public and Its Moderate Representatives." University of California at Berkeley. Manuscript. [http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~broockma/broockman\\_extreme\\_public.pdf](http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~broockma/broockman_extreme_public.pdf).

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/>.

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>.  
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. <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.331>. <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.331>.

## October 15: Partisanship

\*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.

\*Green, Donald P. 2011. "Breaking Empirical Deadlocks in the Study of Partisanship: An Overview of Experimental Research Strategies." <http://goo.gl/hPfg>. Useful framing of the pre-experimental literature, and a nice introduction to Gerber, Huber, and Washington (2010).

\*Gerber, Alan S., and Gregory A. Huber. 2009. "Partisanship and Economic Behavior: Do Partisan Differences in Economic Forecasts Predict Real Economic Behavior?" *American Political Science Review* 103 (August): 407-26. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?aid=6101708>.

\*Iyengar, Shanto, Kyu S. Hahn, Jon A. Krosnick, and John Walker. 2008. "Selective Exposure to Campaign Communication." *Journal of Politics* 70 (January): 186-200.

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://journals.cambridge.org/repo\\_A79mjyfg](http://journals.cambridge.org/repo_A79mjyfg). 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. 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.

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>.

## October 22: Social Influence and Group Identity

\*Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 6.

\*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>. Another good example of the use of field experiments to provide strong evidence of something that is very hard to study well with other methods.

\*Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106 (August): 517-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305>.

Cohen-Cole, Ethan, and Jason M. Fletcher. 2008. "Detecting Implausible Social Network Effects in Acne, Height, and Headaches: Longitudinal Analysis." *BMJ* 337. <http://www.bmj.com/content/337/bmj.a2533.full.pdf>.

Berinsky, Adam J. 1999. "The Two Faces of Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science*: 1209-30. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2991824>.

Druckman, James N., and Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence." *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (October): 729-45.

Mutz, Diana C. 1992. "Impersonal Influence: Effects of Representations of Public Opinion on Political Attitudes." *Political Behavior* 14 (June): 89-122. See also the note on Mutz's book in the "Media Effects" section.

*Political Behavior* 32 (3), September 2010. Special issue devoted to new research on social-pressure field experiments.

## October 29: Media Effects

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

\*Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." *American Political Science Review* 87 (June): 267-85.

\*Huber, Gregory A., and Kevin Arceneaux. 2007. "Identifying the Persuasive Effects of Presidential Advertising." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (4): 957-77.

\*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*.

DellaVigna, Stefano, and Ethan Kaplan. 2007. "The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122 (August): 1187-1234. <http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/122/3/1187.abstract>.

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 public opinion has relatively little influence on one's own views, but sociotropic considerations—perceptions of broad social conditions—can be quite influential. And one comes by these sociotropic considerations largely through the media.

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

## November 5: 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.

\*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>.

\*Gentzkow, Matthew. 2006. "Television and Voter Turnout." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 71 (August): 931-72. [http://faculty.chicagogsb.edu/matthew.gentzkow/research/tv\\_turnout.pdf](http://faculty.chicagogsb.edu/matthew.gentzkow/research/tv_turnout.pdf).

\*Nie, Norman H., Jane Junn, and Kenneth Stehlik-Barry. 1996. *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Particular chapters to be determined.

Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94 (September): 653-62. The first political science article about a field experiment in decades. Historically important, and the main findings have held up over time.

Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2008. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. 2nd ed. ed. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. A review of the field-experimental literature on 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.

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

See also the list of readings in the "Voter Turnout" section of Alan Gerber's syllabus for Collective Action and Collective Choice (PLSC 802).

## November 12: 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.

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*.

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.

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

## November 19: 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.

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.

## November 26: November Recess

## December 3: Holding Politicians Accountable

I will use the last half-hour of this class to recap the most important ideas that we have covered in the previous classes.

\*Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Preface and Chapters 1-2.

\*Fearon, James D. 1999. "Electoral Accountability and the Control of Politicians: Selecting Good Types Versus Sanctioning Poor Performance." In *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, ed. Adam Przeworski, Susan Stokes, and Bernard Manin. New York: Cambridge University Press.

\*Ashworth, Scott, and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2013 February 1. "Disasters and Incumbent Electoral Fortunes: No Implications for Democratic Competence." University of Chicago. Manuscript. This paper is relatively tough. Before you read it, read <http://goo.gl/QIIsh>, which is an easy and breezy introduction to the main idea. After you read the article, think: are these results important? Why or why not?

Jones, Philip Edward. 2011. "Which Buck Stops Here? Accountability for Policy Positions and Policy Outcomes in Congress." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (July): 764-82

Achen, Christopher H., and Larry M. Bartels. 2013. "Blind Retrospection: Why Shark Attacks Are Bad for Democracy." Princeton University. Manuscript. [https://my.vanderbilt.edu/larrybartels/files/2011/12/CSDI\\_WP\\_05-2013.pdf](https://my.vanderbilt.edu/larrybartels/files/2011/12/CSDI_WP_05-2013.pdf).

Ashworth, Scott. 2012. "Electoral Accountability: Recent Theoretical and Empirical Work." *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 183-201.

Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2006. *Who Leads Whom? Presidents, Policy, and the Public*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, Sanford C., and Gregory A. Huber. 2007. "The Effect of Electoral Competitiveness on Incumbent Behavior." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 2 (2): 107-38.

Jessee, Stephen A. 2010. "Partisan Bias, Political Information and Spatial Voting in the 2008 Presidential Election." *Journal of Politics* 72.

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.

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