

John Bullock
Political Science
john.bullock@northwestern.edu
Office: Scott Hall 304
Office hours: MW 500pm-600pm
Winter 2018

Political Psychology

Political Science 390 (24104)
Parkes Hall 212, Mondays and Wednesdays, 330pm-450pm
<https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/67896>
Syllabus date: January 23, 2018 (8:49am)

This course is about ideas in psychology and their applications to politics. It has three parts.

The first part is about obedience, conformity, social pressure, and authoritarianism. These are old and important topics, but they do not often get an airing in political psychology courses. They should. In this part of the course, we will also take up some new and general research about personality and its connection to politics.

The second part is about how people interpret new information about politics and use it to update their beliefs. In this vein, we will talk about different ways in which media and savvy politicians can manipulate citizens, the surprising persistence of false beliefs about politics, and whether people can use “information shortcuts” to compensate for their lack of direct information about policies.

The third part of the course takes up group influences on political behavior, partisanship and ideology, and prejudice and racial campaigning (e.g., the “race card”). These topics may seem unrelated, but I hope to convince you that they are connected by several common threads.

Exams, Grading, and Absences

There will not be a final exam.

There will be three in-class exams. They are not cumulative; that is, each exam will cover a distinct set of topics. The first exam will count for 27.5% of your final grade; the second, for 27.5%; the third, for 45%. See below for the dates of the exams.

You may handwrite or type your exams. If you know that you want to type but will not have a laptop computer, please notify me as early in the semester as possible.

For the exams, you need to know the last names of all of the authors whose works are assigned in this course. If I ask about Milgram, you need to know what Milgram did. If I describe Milgram's experiments, you need to know that Milgram is the man who designed them.

Final paper option. You may write a final paper of 6 to 9 pages instead of taking the third exam. If you want to take this option, you must let me know by e-mail no later than March 1st. You will be required to write in response to one of at least two (and perhaps only two) prompts. The prompts will be distributed sometime on March 7th, and your paper will be due at 1159pm on March 14th. Do not send it by e-mail; instead, upload it to Canvas.

Syllabus exam. There will also be a special in-class exam during the first fifteen minutes of class on January 22nd. It will not be on the course material *per se*. Instead, it will be on the rules, guidelines, and ideas in this syllabus. You may refer to this syllabus as you take the exam, but to do well, it will help to have read the entire syllabus in advance.

If you score a 90 or above on the syllabus exam, your final grade for the semester will not be affected. If you score between 75 and 90, I will subtract two points from your final grade. If you score below 75, I will subtract five points from your final grade, and I will ask you to drop the course.

Exam pickup policy. To ensure the confidentiality of your grade, I will never leave your exam in a mailbox or give it to a friend.

Exam regrades. If you think that your exam has been graded in error, talk to me within ten days of the date on which exams were handed back in class.

Historically, the only successful regrade requests have been requests that students justify with reference to specific passages in the assigned reading. And if there are particular passages or other points that you want me to consider as I regrade your exam, you should send them to me by e-mail. I will not read handwritten explanatory notes.

If I regrade your exam, your grade may go down.

EXAM ABSENCES

If you are absent from an exam and do not have a good reason, your absence will not be excused. You'll get a 0 for the exam. *Think ahead. If you know that you are going to miss an exam, do not take the course.*

Baptisms, bar mitzvahs, bat mitzvahs, births, job interviews, weddings, and extracurricular activities (athletic or not) are never sufficient reasons for absence from an exam.

Please do not ask a coach to ask me that your absence from an exam be excused because you had to practice, play, or travel for a game. It won't make a difference to me, and you will be wasting the coach's time.

If you miss an exam and your absence is excused, you will need to take a make-up exam. There will only be one make-up exam for each regular exam, so make your arrangements as soon as possible. Send email to me to set a make-up time.

MOST EXAM GRADING WILL BE BLIND

Except for the syllabus exam, all exams will be graded blind. I will not know your exam grades until I calculate your overall grade for the semester.

TRANSLATION OF NUMBERS INTO LETTER GRADES

All of the grades that you receive in this course will be numbers. But I need to report letter grades to the Registrar's Office. This is how I will translate numbers into letter grades: 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 BE CURVED

At least 35% of students will receive an A- or an A on each exam and for an end-of-semester grade. To make this happen for any particular exam, I will calculate the raw score (out of 100) for the student at the 65th percentile of the grade distribution. Let this score be s . I will add $\min\{0, 90 - s\}$ points to this student's score, bringing it to 90. I will add the same number of points to every other student's score. I will use the same procedure to adjust the end-of-semester grades.

I will not use a similar procedure to adjust grades downward. The percentage of students receiving an A- or an A will not be capped; it may be higher than 35%.

GRADES WILL NOT BE ROUNDED UP

For example, if your final grade is 89.9, I will report a B+ to the Registrar's Office.

Research Participation Requirement

You are required to complete a research assignment that will entail up to four hours of participation in research studies. By participating, you will learn how studies are conducted. And at the end of the quarter, you will receive a description of the study's goal, result, and relevance to the course.

If you prefer not to participate in research, you may instead read a chapter about political-science research and writing a five-page reaction paper.

In the beginning of the quarter, you will receive email asking whether you prefer to participate in studies or to write a reaction paper. The email will also include information about how to complete either requirement.

If you do not complete this requirement during the current quarter, I will not report a grade to the registrar. If you do not complete this requirement during the current quarter or the next one, you will fail the course.

There are two exceptions to the requirement. If you are now enrolled in multiple courses that impose this requirement, you need to satisfy the requirement for only one of them. And if you completed the requirement in a previous quarter, you need not complete it for this course.

Office Hours

Office hours will take place on most Mondays and Wednesdays from 500pm to 600pm. 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/2018winter>. 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.

Questions That You Should Not Ask

I like to take questions, including naive questions. (Naive questions may be excellent questions.) I do not expect that you already know any of the material that we cover in this course. I also expect that you will be confused at times, and clarifying questions about confusing points are always in order. But there are a few questions that you should not ask. See <http://johnbullock.org/teaching/badQuestions.pdf> for details. *Reviewing that document is a requirement of this course.*

Readings

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

There is one required book: Stanley Milgram's *Obedience to Authority*, ISBN 978-0-06-176521-6. The assigned chapters will not be online. You should be able to find a copy at any good online bookstore or at Northwestern's bookstore. But wherever you shop, you should buy a copy soon, as the book is assigned very early in the semester. "The store was out of stock" is not an adequate excuse for not doing the reading.

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.

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/>.

WHAT WE WON'T COVER THIS YEAR

It's a big field, and we cannot have units on each important topic. To my mind, six omissions stand out: we will not have units on ideology, Bayesian updating, political knowledge, status quo bias and "system justification," or "myopic retrospection" in political judgments. If you have questions about these topics, feel free to ask me about them outside of class.

BACKGROUND IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

If you want background reading in psychology that is not explicitly political but that informs much of what we cover in this course, try these texts:

Kunda, Ziva. 1999. *Social Cognition: Making Sense of People*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. Dated but clear and useful. Note that many books share the title *Social Cognition*. This book and the next are the ones that you want.

Hamilton, David L., ed. 2005. *Social Cognition*. New York: Psychology Press. Thirty-eight important articles from the intersection of social and cognitive psychology.

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:

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.

January 8 (M): Overview; Obedience

*This syllabus. If you cannot read it before the first class, that's OK. But please read all of it before class on the 30th. Among other things, reading this syllabus may make you realize that you do not want to take this course.

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>.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. 1949. "The American Soldier—An Expository Review." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 13 (Autumn): 377-404. Just read through page 380.

Simon, Herbert A. 1990. "Invariants of Human Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 41: 1-20.

McGuire, William J. 1993. "The Poly-Psy Relationship: Three Phases of a Long Affair." In *Explorations in Political Psychology*, ed. Shanto Iyengar and William J. McGuire. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

January 10 (W): Obedience, continued

*Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper & Row. Chapters 1-6 and 8.

*Zimbardo, Philip. 2007. *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House. Read from page 275 through the top of page 281 and from page 285 through the top of page 289.

*Baumrind, Diana. 1964. "Some Thoughts on Ethics of Research: After Reading Milgram's 'Behavioral Study of Obedience'." *American Psychologist* 19 (June): 421-23.

*Milgram, Stanley. 1964. "Issues in the Study of Obedience: A Reply to Baumrind." *American Psychologist* 19 (November): 448-52.

Burger, Jerry M. 2009. "Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today?" *American Psychologist* 64 (January).

January 17 (W): Conformity and Social Pressure

*Asch, Solomon E. 1951. "Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments." In *Groups, Leadership, and Men*, ed. Harold Guetzkow. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press. Note an error on page 186, line 11: "small minorities provided" should be "small majorities provided."

*Ross, Lee, Günter Bierbrauer, and Susan Hoffman. 1976. "The Role of Attribution Processes in Conformity and Dissent: Revisiting the Asch Situation." *American Psychologist* 31 (February): 148-57.

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>.

Bond, Rod, and Peter B. Smith. 1996. "Culture and Conformity: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using Asch's (1952b, 1956) Line Judgment Task." *Psychological Bulletin* 119 (1): 111-37.

DellaVigna, Stefano, John A. List, and Ulrike Malmendier. 2009. "Testing for Altruism and Social Pressure in Charitable Giving." NBER Working Paper 15629. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15629>. The authors use a field and a survey experiment to estimate the parameters of a structural model. This is outside the scope of our course, but it's a very interesting idea. Note that "social pressure" here consists largely of asking people for money face-to-face.

Farrar, Cynthia, James S. Fishkin, Donald P. Green, Christian List, Robert C. Luskin, and Elizabeth Levy Paluck. 2010. "Disaggregating Deliberation's Effects: An Experiment within a Deliberative Poll." *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (2): 333-347. Part of this article takes up the possibility that deliberation can increase conformity.

Huckfeldt, Robert, Paul E. Johnson, and John Sprague. 2002. "Political Environments, Political Dynamics, and the Survival of Disagreement." *Journal of Politics* 64 (February): 1-21. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/2691662.pdf>.

January 22 (M): Syllabus Exam *and* Personality and Political Behavior

The exam will be given in the first fifteen minutes of class. See the “Exams” section of this syllabus for more details.

*Gosling, Sam. 2008. *Snoop: What Your Stuff Says about You*. New York: Basic Books. Read Chapter 2, which is an overview of the Big Five. Also read pages 141-48 in Chapter 7, which are about geographic variation in the distribution of the Big Five across the United States.

*Rentfrow, Peter Jason. 2010. “Statewide Differences in Personality: Toward a Psychological Geography of the United States.” *American Psychologist* 65 (6): 548-58.

*Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. 2011. “The Big Five Personality Traits in the Political Arena.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 265-87. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051010-111659>.

Vazire, Simine, and Erika N. Carlson. 2010. “Self-Knowledge of Personality: Do People Know Themselves?” *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 4 (August): 605-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00280.x>.

Gurven, Michael, Christopher Von Rueden, Maxim Massenkoff, Hillard Kaplan, and Marino Lero Vie. 2013. “How Universal Is the Big Five? Testing the Five-Factor Model of Personality Variation among Forager-Farmers in the Bolivian Amazon.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 104 (2): 354-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030841>.

Carney, Dana R., John T. Jost, Samuel Gosling, and Jeff Potter. 2008. “The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They Leave Behind.” *Political Psychology* 29 (December): 807-40. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/pops/2008/00000029/00000006/art00001>.

Mondak, Jeffery J., Matthew V. Hibbing, Damarys Canache, Mitchell A. Seligson, and Mary R. Anderson. 2010. “Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior.” *American Political Science Review* 104 (February): 85-110.

Nisbett, Richard E. 1980. “The Trait Construct in Lay and Professional Psychology.” In *Retrospections on Social Psychology*, ed. Leon Festinger. New York: Oxford University Press. An attack on the very concept of “personality.” The review of relevant research in this essay is now quite dated. But the essay is still useful, as it provides a framework that we can still use to evaluate and criticize the study of personality.

January 24 (W): Authoritarianism

*Hetherington, Marc J., and Jonathan D. Weiler. 2009. *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pages 1-11, Chapter 3, and Chapter 6.

*Adorno, T.W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. [1950] 1969. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapter 1: read carefully through Part A, and read the rest of the chapter more casually.

Brown, Roger. 2004. "The Authoritarian Personality and the Organization of Attitudes." In *Political Psychology: Key Readings*, ed. John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius. New York: Psychology Press. Originally published in 1965, in Roger Brown's own *Social Psychology*.

Feldman, Stanley. 2003. "Enforcing Social Conformity: A Theory of Authoritarianism." *Political Psychology* 24 (March): 41-74. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792510>. This is a relatively tough reading.

Pratto, Felicia, Jim Sidanius, Lisa M. Stallworth, and Bertram F. Malle. 1994. "Social Dominance Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67 (October): 741-63.

Martin, John Levi. 2001. "The Authoritarian Personality, 50 Years Later: What Lessons Are There for Political Psychology?" *Political Psychology* 22 (March): 1-26. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791902>.

Peterson, Bill E., Lauren E. Duncan, and Joyce S. Pang. 2002. "Authoritarianism and Political Impoverishment: Deficits in Knowledge and Civic Disinterest." *Political Psychology* 23 (March): 97-112. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792245>. A criticism of both *The Authoritarian Personality* and Altemeyer's work.

Lipset, Seymour M. 1959. "Democracy and Working-Class Authoritarianism." *American Sociological Review* 24 (August): 482-501. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2089536>.

January 29 (M): Exam 1

January 31 (W): Motivated Reasoning

*Lord, Charles. G., Lee Ross, and Mark R. Lepper. 1979. "Biased Assimilation and Attitude Polarization: The Effects of Prior Theories on Subsequently Considered Evidence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37 (November): 2098-2109. Each of the authors is a superb scholar, and this article is often considered a classic in the motivated reasoning literature. But it is actually quite flawed, and in lecture, I'll explain its flaws. Understanding them will help you to understand the very deep problems in much (not all) of the motivated reasoning literature.

*Cohen, Geoffrey L., Joshua Aronson, and Claude M. Steele. 2000. "When Beliefs Yield to Evidence: Reducing Biased Evaluation by Affirming the Self." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26 (9): 1151-1164. <http://psp.sagepub.com/content/26/9/1151>. You may skip Study 3. There is one big idea that I want you to get from the article, and you don't need to read Study 3 to get it.

Miller, Arthur G., John W. McHoskey, Cynthia M. Bane, and Timothy G. Dowd. 1993. "The Attitude Polarization Phenomenon: Role of Response Measure, Attitude Extremity, and Behavioral Consequences of Reported Attitude Change." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64 (April): 561-74. A strong challenge to the apparent Lord, Ross, and Lepper (1979) findings of attitude polarization (but not to their findings on biased assimilation).

Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2006. "Media Bias and Reputation." *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (2). This is not, strictly speaking, a political psychology article. But it does a very nice job of showing why the Lord, Ross, and Lepper (1979) data are not, in fact, evidence of biased assimilation. (See especially page 286, note 8. You can think of this article as expanding on the "herbal remedies for cancer" argument that Lord, Ross, and Lepper (1979) give at the end of their article.)

Kunda, Ziva. 1990. "The Case for Motivated Reasoning." *Psychological Bulletin* 108 (November): 480-98.

Ditto, Peter H., and David F. Lopez. 1992. "Motivated Skepticism: The Use of Differential Decision Criteria for Preferred and Nonpreferred Conclusions." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63 (October): 568-84. <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=fulltext&AN=00005205-199210000-00005&D=ovft>.

Kahan, Dan M., David A. Hoffman, Donald Braman, Danieli Evans, and Jeffrey J. Rachlinski. 2012. "'They Saw a Protest': Cognitive Illiberalism and the Speech-Conduct Distinction." *Stanford Law Review* 64 (April): 851-906.

Vallone, Robert. P., Lee Ross, and Mark R. Lepper. 1985. "The Hostile Media Phenomenon: Biased Perception and Perceptions of Media Bias in Coverage of the Beirut Massacre." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49: 577-85.

SELECTIVE EXPOSURE TO INFORMATION

The idea that people selectively expose themselves to information that is likely to confirm their prior beliefs is one aspect of motivated reasoning. It has proved controversial in the past, especially where politics is concerned. But evidence in favor of political selective exposure seems to be mounting.

*Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (July): 755-69. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00214.x>.

Sears, David O., and Jonathan L. Freedman. 1967. "Selective Exposure to Information: A Critical Review." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31 (Summer): 194-213.

Katz, Elihu. 1968. "On Reopening the Question of Selectivity in Exposure to Mass Communication." In *Theories of Cognitive Consistency: A Sourcebook*, ed. Robert P. Abelson, Elliot Aronson, William J. McGuire, Theodore M. Newcomb, Milton J. Rosenberg, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. Chicago: Rand McNally. Argues that selective exposure to information (e.g., the news) need not be intentional or even conscious.

Scherer, Aaron, John Jasper, and Andrew Smith. 2012. "Hope to Be Right: Biased Information Seeking Following Arbitrary and Informed Predictions." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. Further evidence for selective exposure.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use." *Journal of Communication* 59 (March): 19-39. Further evidence for selective exposure.

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

Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2006. "Media Bias and Reputation." *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (2). A market-driven, almost psychology-free explanation for selective exposure.

Nickerson, Raymond S. 1998. "Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises." *Review of General Psychology* 2 (June): 175-220.

February 5 (M): Heuristics and Cues

Most people know very little about politics. An important question in political psychology is whether they can nevertheless make good political decisions. That is a large part of what we'll discuss today.

*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>.

*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>. A useful polemic. Focus on Part II, in which Somin argues against the idea that cues can substitute for more direct knowledge of politics and policies.

*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>.

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*. Dense, and without any political content—but still recommended.

Cohen, Geoffrey L. 2003. "Party Over Policy: The Dominating Impact of Group Influence on Political Beliefs." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (November): 808-22.

Lichtenstein, Sara, Paul Slovic, Baruch Fischhoff, Mark Layman, and Barbara Combs. 1978. "Judged Frequency of Lethal Events." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory* 4 (November): 551-78. This takes a while to download.

Gigerenzer, Gerd. 1996. "On Narrow Norms and Vague Heuristics: A Reply to Kahneman and Tversky (1996)." *Psychological Review* 103 (July): 592-96. Gigerenzer may be the foremost critic of the Kahneman-Tversky work on heuristics.

Popkin, Samuel L. 1994. *The Reasoning Voter: Communication and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Some of this is bad—cf. the "tamale heuristic"—but it remains an accessible and influential statement of the view that cues are "information shortcuts" and are, on balance, a good thing.

Conlisk, John. 1996. "Why Bounded Rationality?" *Journal of Economic Literature* 34 (June): 669-700.

Kahneman, Daniel, Paul Slovic, and Amos Tversky, eds. 1982. *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Thirty-five articles about heuristics and biases. Some are classics. The average quality is high.

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

Plott, Charles R., and Kathryn Zeiler. 2007. "Exchange Asymmetries Incorrectly Interpreted as Evidence of Endowment Effect Theory and Prospect Theory?" *American Economic Review* 97 (September): 1449-66. The endowment effect is typically attributed to the "anchoring and adjustment" heuristic, which we will discuss today.

February 7 (W): Framing

"Framing" has two very different meanings. Psychologists chiefly study "equivalence framing." Political scientists chiefly study "issue framing." You need to understand the distinction.

*Druckman, James N. 2011. "What's It All About?: Framing in Political Science." In *Perspectives on Framing*, ed. Gideon Keren. New York: Psychology Press.

EQUIVALENCE FRAMING

*Druckman, James N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98 (November): 671-86.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4145331>.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1981. "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice." *Science* 211 (January): 453-58.

Levin, Irwin P., Gary J. Gaeth, Judy Schreiber, and Marco Lauriola. 2002. "A New Look at Framing Effects: Distribution of Effect Sizes, Individual Differences, and Independence of Types of Effects." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 88 (May): 411-29.

ISSUE FRAMING (AKA "EMPHASIS" FRAMING)

*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.

*Bai, Matt. 2012 March 28. "Obama vs. Boehner: Who Killed the Debt Deal?" *New York Times Magazine*: MM22. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/01/magazine/obama-vs-boehner-who-killed-the-debt-deal.html>. Long article. Leave enough time for it.

*See the interactive set of graphs at <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/10/05/business/economy/one-report-diverging-perspectives.html>. Read the accompanying article.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007a. "Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 101 (November): 637-55. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055407070554.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007b. "A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments." *Journal of Communication* 57 (March): 99-118. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118502245/abstract>. A theoretical complement to the other 2007 article by Chong and Druckman.

February 12 (M): Prospect Theory

*Quattrone, George A., and Amos Tversky. 1988. "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice." *American Political Science Review* 82 (September): 719-36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1962487>. Skip the "decision weights" part of the article. Not because it is wrong, but because the idea is poorly explained. I'll talk about it in class.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1979. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk." *Econometrica* 47 (March): 263-92. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1914185>. This article made prospect theory famous and did more than any other to help Kahneman win a Nobel Prize. It overlaps a lot with Quattrone and Tversky (1988).

Arceneaux, Kevin. 2012. "Cognitive Biases and the Strength of Political Arguments." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (April): 271-85.

Weaver, Ray, and Shane Frederick. 2012. "A Reference Price Theory of the Endowment Effect." *Journal of Marketing Research* 49 (October): 696-707. Most people who study prospect theory think that the endowment effect is due to loss aversion. The authors argue that it is instead due to "aversion to bad deals," where "bad" depends on your frame of reference. See <http://goo.gl/yy0qMI> for a brief introduction to the paper.

Polman, Evan. 2012. "Self-Other Decision Making and Loss Aversion." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* (November): 141-50. The author's argument is that we are less loss-averse when making decisions for others than when making decisions for ourselves. The finding holds even in situations of riskless choice.

Snowberg, Erik, and Justin Wolfers. 2010. "Explaining the Favorite-Longshot Bias: Is it Risk-Love or Misperceptions?" *Journal of Political Economy* 118 (4): 723-46.

February 14 (W): Exam 2

February 19 (M): Interlude on Causal Inference and the Trustworthiness of the the Social Sciences

How do we know whether X causes Y? We'll explore this topic by reviewing the logic of randomized experiments. I'll also speak about how causal inferences are drawn from nonexperimental data. If you don't understand the ideas in this class, there are important respects in which you won't understand the rest of the course.

My aim is not to teach you how to use particular methods but to give you enough information to help you understand what you'll see in the readings. (What I do here is no substitute for a course in statistics or econometrics, which everyone who wants to be a better social-science student should take.)

*Freedman, David A. 2005. *Statistical Models*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1. Do not be fooled by the title: this is exciting and it requires no background in statistics.

*Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2014. *Mastering 'Metrics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1. You can skip the appendix to the chapter.

*Hill, Russell A., and Robert A. Barton. 2005. "Red Enhances Human Performance in Contests." *Nature* 435 (7040): 293.

*Jones, Benjamin F., and Benjamin A. Olken. 2009. "Hit or Miss? The Effect of Assassinations on Institutions and War." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 1 (July): 55-87. Read only through page 72.

Keele, Luke. 2015. "The Discipline of Identification." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (January): 102-06.

Freedman, David A. 1991. "Statistical Models and Shoe Leather." *Sociological Methodology* 21: 291-313. The comments that follow this article are worthwhile, too.

Leamer, Edward E. 1983. "Let's Take the Con out of Econometrics." *American Economic Review* 73 (1): 31-43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1803924>.

Gelman, Andrew, and David Weakliem. 2009. "Of Beauty, Sex, and Power." *American Scientist* 97 (July-August): 310-16. On "statistical significance," the challenges that social scientists face when they try to estimate effects, and the dissemination of misleading results in academic journals and the popular press.

CAN YOU TRUST THE SOCIAL SCIENCES?

When can you trust the social sciences? Not as often as you would like. Most published research findings may be false. Most social scientists are too optimistic about their ability to discover general truths about people.

But don't surrender. There are guidelines that can help you distinguish good studies from bad ones. Some of these guidelines are easy to follow, and in this class, I'll describe them.

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

*Ioannidis, John P.A., Athina Tatsioni, and Fotini B. Karassa. 2011. "Who Is Afraid of Reviewers' Comments? Or, Why Anything Can Be Published and Anything Can Be Cited." *European Journal of Clinical Investigation* 40 (4): 285-87. We're better off with some form of peer review than without it. But there are major problems. This editorial will give you a sense of how the system works, with heavy emphasis on the problems. Don't worry if the first paragraph confuses you or if you don't always understand the aspects of the peer-review process that the authors are describing. Do identify and try to understand their main criticisms of the process.

Simmons, Joseph P., Leif D. Nelson, and Uri Simonsohn. 2011. "False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant." *Psychological Science* 22 (November): 1359-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>.

REPRODUCIBILITY OF RESULTS

*Open Science Collaboration. 2015. "Estimating the Reproducibility of Psychological Science." *Science* 349 (6251). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>.

Wicherts, Jelte M., Marjan Bakker, and Dylan Molenaar. 2011. "Willingness to Share Research Data Is Related to the Strength of the Evidence and the Quality of Reporting of Statistical Results." *PLOS One* 6 (November): 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026828>.

Gerber, Alan S., Neil Malhotra, Conor M. Dowling, and David Doherty. 2010. "Publication Bias in Two Political Behavior Literatures." *American Politics Research* 38 (4): 591-613. <http://apr.sagepub.com/content/38/4/591.full.pdf+html>. For more on publication bias, see

Gerber, Alan, and Neil Malhotra. 2008. "Do Statistical Reporting Standards Affect What Is Published?" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 3 (October): 313-26. <http://www.qjps.com/prod.aspx?product=QJPS&doi=100.00008024>.

Ioannidis, John P. A. 2005. "Why Most Published Research Findings Are False." *PLoS Med* 2 (August): 696-701. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>.

Levitt, Steven D., and John A. List. 2009. "Was There Really a Hawthorne Effect at the Hawthorne Plant? An Analysis of the Original Illumination Experiments." NBER Working Paper w15016. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15016>.

Sears, David O. 1986. "College Sophomores in the Laboratory: Influences of a Narrow Data Base on Social Psychology's View of Human Nature." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51 (September): 515-530. <http://www.psych.umn.edu/courses/spring06/borgidae/psy5202/sears1986.pdf>. But see also

Druckman, James N., and Cindy D. Kam. 2010. "Students as Experimental Participants: A Defense of the 'Narrow Data Base'." In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, ed. James N. Druckman, Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge University Press.

OTHER ISSUES

Cialdini, Robert B. 2009. "We Have to Break Up." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4 (January): 5-6. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/121666830/abstract>. On resistance to field experiments in social psychology.

Baumeister, Roy F., Kathleen D. Vohs, and David C. Funder. 2007. "Psychology as the Science of Self-Reports and Finger Movements: Whatever Happened to Actual Behavior?" *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2 (December): 396-403. <http://pps.sagepub.com/content/2/4/396.short>.

Gelman, Andrew. 2013. "Science Journalism and the Art of Expressing Uncertainty." *Symposium* (August). <http://www.symposium-magazine.com/science-journalism-and-the-art-of-expressing-uncertainty/>.

Meehl, Paul E. 1990. "Why Summaries of Research on Psychological Theories Are Often Uninterpretable." *Psychological Reports* 66: 195-244. <http://www.tc.umn.edu/~pemeehl/144WhySummaries.pdf>.

Koehler, Jonathan J. 1996. "The Base Rate Fallacy Reconsidered: Descriptive, Normative, and Methodological Challenges." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 19 (March): 1-53. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1468711>. A criticism of many studies that purport to show widespread "base-rate neglect" in people's thinking about probabilities.

February 21 (W): Interlude on Causal Inference in the Social Sciences, continued

February 26 (M): Groups and Partisanship

*http://electionstudies.org/nesguide/toptable/tab2a_1.htm. This table shows you the proportions of Americans that call themselves Democrats and Republicans. It also shows you how those proportions have changed (or not) over time.

*Fiorina, Morris P. 2011. *Culture War?* 3rd ed. New York: Pearson Longman. Chapter 4 and either Chapter 5 or Chapter 6. This is not political psychology, but it is a well-written discussion of basic ideas and facts.

*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 <https://academic.oup.com/poq/article/76/4/819/1910358>.

Fowler, Anthony. 2018. "Partisan Tribalism or Policy Voting?" https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QxDrA_vzO-x_FxPmVQ1lLnPdFS3XmG7a/view.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. For a lot of background on "party identification" in America. As with *Culture War?*, this is not very psychological reading, but it does a good job of providing an overview.

Huddy, Leonie. 2013. "From Group Identity to Political Cohesion and Commitment." In *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tajfel, Henri. 1982. "Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations." *Annual Review of Psychology* 33: 1-39. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245?journalCode=psych>.

Greene, Steven. 1999. "Understanding Party Identification: A Social Identity Approach." *Political Psychology* 20 (June): 393-403. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/0162-895X.00150/pdf>

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>

Bartels, Larry M. 2002. "Beyond the Running Tally: Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions." *Political Behavior* 24 (June): 117-50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1558352>.

February 28 (W): Explicit Prejudice, Implicit Prejudice, and Racial “Priming”

* George H.W. Bush’s ad about Willie Horton and Michael Dukakis (1988). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Io9KMSSEZ0Y>.

* Jesse Helms’ “hands” ad (1990). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KIyewCdXMzk>.

*Huber, Gregory A., and John S. Lapinski. 2006. “The ‘Race Card’ Revisited: Assessing Racial Priming in Policy Contests.” *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (April): 421-40. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00192.x>.

*Mendelberg, Tali. 2008b. “Racial Priming Revived.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (March): 109-23. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592708080092.

*Huber, Gregory A., and John S. Lapinski. 2008. “Testing the Implicit-Explicit Model of Racialized Political Communication.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (March): 125-34. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592708080109.

*Mendelberg, Tali. 2008a. “Racial Priming: Issues in Research Design and Interpretation.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (March): 135-40. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592708080110.

March 5 (M): Explicit Prejudice, Implicit Prejudice, and Racial “Priming,” continued

March 7 (W): Implicit Attitudes and Automatic Reactions

*Zajonc, Robert B. 1980. “Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences.” *American Psychologist* 35 (February): 151-75.

*Ballew, Charles C., and Alexander Todorov. 2007. “Predicting Political Elections from Rapid and Unreflective Face Judgments.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104 (46): 17948-17953.

*Gladwell, Malcolm. 2005. *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*. New York: Little, Brown. Chapter 3. Read 77-88; skim the rest. This is a quick and gentle introduction to ideas that are taken up in more detail by Greenwald et al.

*Greenwald, Anthony G, Debbie E McGhee, and Jordan LK Schwartz. 1998. “Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 (6): 1464-80.

Zajonc, Robert B. 1968. "Attitudinal Effects of Mere Exposure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 9 (June): 1-27.

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

Bargh, John A., and Tanya L. Chartrand. 1999. "The Unbearable Automaticity of Being." *American Psychologist* 54 (July): 462-79. Read up to page 468. Skim the rest.

Duckworth, Kimberly L., John A. Bargh, Magda Garcia, and Shelly Chaiken. 2002. "The Automatic Evaluation of Novel Stimuli." *Psychological Science* 13 (November): 513-19.

March 12 (M): Reducing Prejudice; Conclusion of the Course

In addition to discussing prejudice-reduction strategies, we'll review major points made throughout the course. We may touch on prominent topics that didn't make it onto the syllabus.

*Enos, Ryan D. 2014. "Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (10): 3699-3704. A cautionary tale.

*Broockman, David, and Joshua Kalla. 2016. "Durably Reducing Transphobia: A Field Experiment on Door-to-Door Canvassing." *Science* 352 (6282): 220-224.

*Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, and Donald P. Green. 2009. "Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice." *Annual Review of Psychology* 60: 339-67. <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607>. You may also be interested in a supplementary table in which the authors summarize most of the prejudice-reduction field experiments that have ever been conducted. It's available from <http://goo.gl/BeSzcB>.

*Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. 2009. "Reducing Intergroup Prejudice and Conflict Using the Media: A Field Experiment in Rwanda." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96 (3): 574-87.

*Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, Seth A. Green, and Donald P. Green. 2018. "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited." *Behavioural Public Policy* 3. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/W2JKF>.

Sommers, Samuel R. 2006. "On Racial Diversity and Group Decision Making: Identifying Multiple Effects of Racial Composition on Jury Deliberations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90 (4): 597-612. <http://goo.gl/AbwGWb>. Several flaws in the analysis of the experiment make it hard to be confident of the findings. Even so, the experiment and the ideas are interesting and impressive. You may also be interested in Dan Kahan's blog post on the topic (<http://goo.gl/dTjBWd>) and in related nonexperimental research about the effects of racial diversity in U.S. appellate courts (<http://doi.org/bcqr>).

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

Lord, Charles G., Mark R. Lepper, and Elizabeth Preston. 1984. "Considering the Opposite: A Corrective Strategy for Social Judgment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47 (June): 1231-43.

Gibson, James L. 1998. "A Sober Second Thought: An Experiment in Persuading Russians to Tolerate." *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (July): 819-50.

Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, and Kerry Kawakami. 2003. "Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 6 (January): 5-21.
<http://gpi.sagepub.com/content/6/1/5.short>.

Fearon, James D., Macartan Humphreys, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2009. "Can Development Aid Contribute to Social Cohesion After Civil War? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Post-Conflict Liberia." *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 99 (May): 287-91.

March 14 (W): Exam 3; Papers Due

Papers are due for those who opt to write a paper instead of taking the third exam.