

John Bullock  
Department of Political Science  
[john.bullock@yale.edu](mailto:john.bullock@yale.edu)  
Office hours: W 1030am-1130am, 77 Prospect, Room D235  
2014 Spring

# Political Psychology

Political Science 201b / Psychology 332b

Course URL: <https://classesv2.yale.edu>

Syllabus date: January 12, 2014 (6:28pm)

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, Section Requirements, and Absences

There are three in-class exams. They are not cumulative; that is, each exam will cover a distinct set of topics. The first exam counts for 20% of your final grade; the second, for 25%; the third, for 30%. See below for the dates of the exams.

There is no final exam.

You may write a final paper of 7 to 10 pages instead of taking the third exam. If you want to take this option, you must let your TA know by e-mail no later than noon on April 14th. 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 April 17th, and your paper will be due at 1159pm on April 30th (the last day of reading period). Do not send it by e-mail; instead, upload it to your "Drop Box" at the classesv2 site.

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.

*Exam pickup policy.* If you are not in class when exams are handed back, meet with your TA. I will not have your exam, and to ensure the confidentiality of your grade, your TA will not 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 your TA. If your TA does not change the grade, you are welcome to talk to me.

Whether regrade requests are made of a TA or of me, they must be made 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.

## SECTIONS AND SECTION ABSENCES

Section begins on the third week of class. The teaching assistants are Cameron Ballard-Rosa, Petr Gocev, and Luis Schiumerini. Cameron's sections will be held on Thursdays at 330pm and 430pm. Petr's sections will be held on Mondays and Wednesdays at 500pm. Luis's sections will be held on Tuesdays at 925am and 1030am.

Section attendance is required, and your section discussion grade will count for 25% of your final grade. Students who attend every section but speak rarely or never will receive a 30 (out of 100) for their section discussion grades.

You may be absent from section once without penalty. You will need a Dean's Excuse for further absences. Section grades will be reduced by ten percentage points for each unexcused absence.

You may switch sections through the fourth week of the semester *if* you get the approval of the TA into whose section you want to move. (Don't try to clear it with me. I'll just refer you to the TA.) The TA may refuse your request, e.g., because the section into which you want to switch is already full.

If you switch from one TA's section to another TA's section, both TAs will need to know. So send e-mail to both of them.

### EXAM ABSENCES

If you are absent from an exam and do not have a Dean's Excuse, your absence is very unlikely to 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.

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. The TAs are in charge of the make-up exams: get in touch with them to set your make-up time.

### EXAM GRADING WILL BE BLIND

All exams will be graded blind. In most cases, I will not know your exam grades until I calculate your final grade and submit it to the Registrar. The TAs will know your final grades only after they have been submitted to the Registrar.

In the middle of the semester, the Registrar sometimes asks professors to notify the college deans about students who are doing poorly. If he makes that request this year, I will find out which students have averaged a C+ or below on the exams that have been given, and I will write a short note to the relevant college deans. I will also check your grades if your residential college dean asks me how you are doing in the course. These are the only exceptions to the blind grading policy.

### 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 70th 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.

## Office Hours

Office hours take place on most Wednesdays from 1030am through 1130am 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.

To find out whether office hours will be held on a particular Wednesday, check the "Sign-up" tool at the classesv2 web site. If no office hours are listed for a particular Wednesday, office hours will not be held on that day.

Do not send e-mail to set up an appointment. Instead, use the Sign-up tool. 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—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 1130am expecting that we will be able to meet.

## Prerequisite

Parts of the course require you to multiply and divide simple fractions without using a calculator. (Paper and pencil are fine.) Example:  $\frac{17}{4} \times \frac{11}{3}$ .

## 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 four questions that you should not ask:

1. "My grades so far are X and Y. What's my average grade?" See the first two pages of this syllabus. They tell you how exams and section discussion are weighted.
2. "I missed your lecture. What did we cover?" Check the relevant part of this syllabus. We probably covered what the syllabus said that we would cover. For more information, borrow notes from a fellow student.
3. "What's going to be on the exam?" The standard answer is always "The exam covers the topics and assigned readings that we've dealt with since the start of the semester." Of

course, questions about particular topics are always welcome. They are best asked in class, not by e-mail.

4. “I typed my exam. And I just realized that I uploaded the wrong file—a file containing the wrong versions of my answers. Although the exam is over, will you please grade a different file, instead of the one that I uploaded?” No. If you type your exam, take care to upload the correct file.

## 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>.

There is one required book: Stanley Milgram’s *Obedience to Authority*, ISBN 978-0-06-176521-6. The assigned chapters will not be online. I’ve asked the Yale Bookstore to make copies available. Of course, you are free to order it from online bookstores. But however you get it, get it soon, because it is assigned early in the semester.

### WHAT WE WON’T COVER THIS YEAR

It’s a big field, and we cannot have units on each important topic. To my mind, three omissions stand out: we will not have units on ideology, priming, or status quo bias and “system justification.” (We have a unit on what political scientists call “priming,” but social psychologists mean something different by the term, and we have no unit that corresponds to priming in the social psychology sense.) If you have questions about these topics, feel free to ask me about them outside of class.

Two other topics that may be covered in other years: “political sophistication” and the psychology of economic evaluations.

### BACKGROUND IN POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

If you want background reading in psychology that is explicitly political, try these texts:

Kinder, Donald R. 1998. "Opinion and Action in the Realm of Politics." In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Daniel T. Gilbert and Susan T. Fiske. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. This is a detailed survey of political psychology. Available from the "Resources" section of the course web site.

Sears, David O., Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis, eds. 2003. *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. This is not a survey of the field; it does not even attempt to cover most of the field. But it is the most influential political psychology book of the last 22 years.

#### 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 IN STATISTICS

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

Tufte, Edward R. 1974. *Data Analysis for Politics and Policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. <http://www.edwardtufte.com/tufte/dapp/>.

Freedman, David, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 1998. *Statistics*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton. There is now a fourth edition; I haven't read it.

Freedman, David A. 2005. *Statistical Models*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-4 in this edition or 1-5 in the revised edition. This book is more advanced than the other two. It's great for self-study, although the author is sometimes too terse for my taste.

## January 13 (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 Friday 1/17.

\*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 15 (W): Obedience

We will watch Milgram's documentary of the Yale obedience studies. Note the explanation of Milgram's procedure. Focus on the way in which people obey even as they protest.

## January 17 (F): 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. [Orbis link](#).

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

Burger, Jerry M. 2009. "Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today?" *American Psychologist* 64 (January). <http://www.scu.edu/cas/psychology/faculty/upload/Replicating-Milgram.pdf>.

## January 22 (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.

\*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. [Orbis link](#).

\*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 27 (M): Interlude: Causal Inference in the Social Sciences

How do we know whether X causes Y? We'll explore this topic and related topics, largely 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. For example, see Biostatistics 505, Econ 131, Polisci 500, Stat 102, and Stat 363.)



\*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. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 2. Chapter 1 is also highly recommended. If you reach Chapter 1 and are confused by the discussion of FUQs, see <http://www.mostlyharmlesseconometrics.com/2012/11/938/>.

\*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.

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.

## January 29 (W): Interlude: When Can You Trust the Social Sciences?

Not as often as you would like. Most published research findings are 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. I mentioned some of them in the previous class; I'll mention more of them in this class.

\*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. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2362.2010.02272.x/pdf>. 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.

\*Kahneman, Daniel. 2012. "A Proposal to Deal with Questions about Priming Effects." <http://www.decisionsciencenews.com/2012/10/05/kahneman-on-the-storm-of-doubts-surrounding-social-priming-research/>. See also <http://www.nature.com/news/psychologists-strike-a-blow-for-reproducibility-1.14232>.

\*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.

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? Publication Bias in Two Leading Political Science Journals." *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>.

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>.

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>.

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.

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.

## February 3 (M): Personality and Political Behavior

\*Gosling, Sam. 2008. *Snoop: What Your Stuff Says about You*. New York: Basic Books. Chapter 2.

\*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>.

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.

## February 5 (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.

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. [Orbis link](#).

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>.

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

February 10 (M): Exam 1

February 12 (W): No Class

February 17 (M): 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. [Orbis link](#). 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>.

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. [Orbis link](#). A strong challenge to the apparent Lord, Ross, and Lepper (1979) findings of attitude polarization (but not to their findings on biased assimilation).

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

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. "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers." University of Chicago. Manuscript. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w12707>. 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 19 (W): Persistence of False Beliefs

\*Ross, Lee, Mark R. Lepper, and Michael Hubbard. 1975. "Perseverance in Self-Perception and Social Perception: Biased Attributional Processes in the Debriefing Paradigm." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 32 (May): 880-92. [Orbis link](#).

\*Kuklinski, James H., Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schwieder, and Robert F. Rich. 2000. "Misinformation and the Currency of Democratic Citizenship." *Journal of Politics* 62 (August): 790-816. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/0022-3816.00033>.

\*Gilbert, Daniel T., Romin W Tafarodi, and Patrick S. Malone. 1993. "You Can't Not Believe Everything You Read." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 65 (2).

Lepper, Mark R., Lee Ross, and Richard R. Lau. 1986. "Persistence of Inaccurate Beliefs about the Self: Perseverance Effects in the Classroom." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50 (March): 482-91.

Craig Anderson's articles on belief perseverance, all available from <http://www.psychology.iastate.edu/faculty/caa/abstracts/Belief.Persev.html>.

## February 24 (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. [Orbis link](#).

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. [Orbis link](#). 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.

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 26 (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.

### 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

\*Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. 1997. “Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance.” *American Political Science Review* 91 (September): 567-94. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2952075>.

\*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](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055407070554).

\*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. 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.

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.



## March 3 (M): Bayesian Updating

\*Matthews, Robert. 2005. "Why Do People Believe Weird Things?" *Significance* 2 (4): 182-184.

\*Bullock, John G. 2009. "Partisan Bias and the Bayesian Ideal in the Study of Public Opinion." *Journal of Politics* 71 (July): 1109-24. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0022381609090914](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022381609090914).

Tetlock, Philip E. 2005. *Expert Political Judgment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 4. I recommend skimming: at least on first reading, don't try to read too intensely.

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>.

Edwards, Ward. 1982. "Conservatism in Human Information Processing." In *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, ed. Daniel Kahneman, Paul Slovic, and Amos Tversky. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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>. Difficult.

Gerber, Alan, and Donald P. Green. 1998. "Rational Learning and Partisan Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (July): 794-818. Partly a response to Achen (1992).

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.

## March 5 (W): Exam 2

## March 24 (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.

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.

## March 26 (W): Groups and Partisanship

\*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>.

## March 31 (M): Explicit Prejudice, Implicit Prejudice, and Racial "Priming"

\*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](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](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](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592708080110).

## April 2 (W): No Class

## April 7 (M): Race, Implicit Attitudes, and Automatic Reactions

\*Zajonc, Robert B. 1980. "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences." *American Psychologist* 35 (February): 151-75. [Orbis link](#).

\*Bargh, John A., and Tanya L. Chartrand. 1999. "The Unbearable Automaticity of Being." *American Psychologist* 54 (July): 462-79. [Orbis link](#). Skim from 468 on.

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

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

## April 9 (W): Reducing Prejudice

\*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 the course web site.

\*Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. 2009. "Reducing Intergroup Prejudice and Conflict Using the Media: A Field Experiment in Rwanda." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. [http://betsylevypaluck.com/Paluck 2009 JPSP Rwanda.pdf](http://betsylevypaluck.com/Paluck%202009%20JPSP%20Rwanda.pdf).

\*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>.

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.

### April 14 (M): Conclusion

We'll review major points made throughout the course. We may touch on prominent topics that didn't make it onto the syllabus.

### April 16 (W): Exam 3

### April 30 (W): Papers Due

(For those who opt to write a paper instead of taking the third exam.)