

John Bullock
Political Science
john.bullock@northwestern.edu
Winter 2021

Political Behavior

Political Science 413 (28767)
Scott Hall 212, Wednesdays, 200pm-450pm
<https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/133168>
Syllabus date: January 27, 2021 (11:43am)

This course is about the ways in which people develop and act on their political preferences. Our initial focus is on elections: we consider basic models of elections, campaigns, and participation. But we turn gradually to more general topics: partisanship, race, political sophistication, media effects, and the effects of families and schools.

Every U.S. doctoral program in political science has a course like this one. It is intended for first-year Ph.D. students. Its purpose is not to teach the state of the art in our discipline. Instead, its main purpose is historical: it is to acquaint you with ideas that have shaped the field over time.

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

Assignments and Grades

Each student must write two responses, each 2-3 pages long and accounting for 10% of the overall grade. Discussion accounts for 30% of the final grade. A final paper, no more than 15 pages long, accounts for 50% of the final grade. You are also required to come to office hours at least once by February 10th: see the “Office Hours” section of this syllabus for details.

DISCUSSION

Discussion will be based heavily on the readings.

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

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

At least 24 hours before the start of class, students who are going to present must post at least one page of notes on their presentations to the "Discussions" section of the Canvas site. These notes will be part of the final discussion grade for the term.

READING RESPONSES

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

I am assigning a few short passages from textbooks: one by Erikson and Tedin, the other by Patrick Fisher. Do not write responses that are mainly about these readings.

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

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

You must submit your first response by February 17th. You may turn in only one response per week, and I will not grant deadline extensions for the responses. Remember, you need to write only two of them.

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

See the "Writing for Me" section of this syllabus for further instructions.

FINAL PAPER

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

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

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

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

The paper should be no more than 15 pages long, not counting a standalone list of references on the last page. It is due 900am on March 17th. Remember that, during your required meeting with me, we will discuss topics that you have in mind: I don't want you to take on topics that are too big.

Upload the paper through the "Assignments" section of the Canvas site. Do not send a copy by e-mail.

WRITING FOR ME

I've posted memos about the [writing](#) and [formatting](#) of assignments. They set forth rules and guidelines to follow when you write papers in my courses. Please read them carefully.

When you upload your reading responses and your final paper, you may use the PDF format. But I prefer that you upload Word files or leave links to Google documents. I prefer Word and Google because they're better at handling comments and markup than any PDF program, and I will sometimes leave comments on your papers.

MAPPING BETWEEN NUMBERS AND LETTER GRADES

All of the grades that you receive in this course will be letter grades, e.g., A, B+. To compute an average grade for the semester that I can report to the Registrar's Office, I will translate those letter grades into numbers, average the numbers, and then translate the average back into a letter

grade. This is the mapping between letter grades and numbers: below 60 = F, 60 to 63 = D–, 63 to 67 = D, 67 to 70 = D+, 70 to 73 = C–, 73 to 77 = C, 77 to 80 = C+, 80 to 83 = B–, 83 to 87 = B, 87 to 90 = B+, 90 to 93 = A–, 93 and above = A.

GRADES WILL NOT BE ROUNDED UP

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

Readings

One book is required: Morris Fiorina's *Unstable Majorities*, ISBN 978-0817921156.

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

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

FINDING THE READINGS

There is no packet of course readings. 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 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. I recommend that you start your searches in the same way.

You may need to use an on-campus computer or to connect through the Northwestern VPN. If you don't know what a VPN is, see <http://www.it.northwestern.edu/oncampus/vpn/>.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

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

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

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

BACKGROUND READINGS IN STATISTICS

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

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton. Excellent. The focus is on the application of quantitative methods to practical problems. The discussion is relatively informal—which doesn't mean that it's all easy to digest.

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2014. *Mastering 'Metrics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. The undergraduate version of MHE. Also excellent.

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 book is better than *Statistics* but also more advanced. Chapters 1-5 are excellent for self-study if you do the exercises.

Office Hours

Office hours will be held at <https://northwestern.zoom.us/j/9431220423>. Please make appointments through <https://www.slotted.co/2021winter>. When you make an appointment, please add a comment indicating what you would like to talk about when we meet.

By February 10th, you are required to have met me at least once in office hours. Please make a 30-minute appointment. We will speak for at least part of the time about your ideas for a final paper—please come prepared.

Apart from the required meeting, 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.

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

January 13 (W): Basic Models of Voting and Election Outcomes

*Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: HarperCollins. Read Chapter 3, pages 51-69 of Chapter 4, and pages 114-22 of Chapter 8.

*Hinich, Melvin J., and Michael C. Munger. 1997. *Analytical Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Read Chapter 2.

*Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapters 2, 4, and 10.

*Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Preface, Chapter 1, and Chapter 4. In Chapter 4, skip the “Statistical Models” section.

Grofman, Bernard. 2004. “Downs and Two-Party Convergence.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 25-46. <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104711>.

Hall, Andrew B, and Daniel M Thompson. 2018. “Who Punishes Extremist Nominees? Candidate Ideology and Turning Out the Base in US Elections.” *American Political Science Review* 112 (3): 509-24.

Healy, Andrew, and Neil Malhotra. 2013b. “Retrospective Voting Reconsidered.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 285-306.

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

Osborne, Martin J. 1995. “Spatial Models of Political Competition under Plurality Rule: A Survey of Some Explanations of the Number of Candidates and the Positions They Take.” *Canadian Journal of Economics*: 261-301.

January 20 (W): Partisanship

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

PARTISANSHIP

*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 81-87.

*Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapters 1, 2, and 8.

*Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 5, pages 84-91.

*Fiorina, Morris P. 2017. *Unstable Majorities: Polarization, Party Sorting & Political Stalemate*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Chapter 6.

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4 and 5.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 6.

Barber, Michael, and Jeremy C Pope. 2019. "Does party trump ideology? Disentangling party and ideology in America." *American Political Science Review* 113 (1): 38–54.

Green, Donald P. 2013. "Breaking Empirical Deadlocks in the Study of Partisanship: An Overview of Experimental Research Strategies." *Politics and Governance* 1 (1): 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.12924/pag2013.01010006>. Useful framing of the pre-experimental literature, and a nice introduction to Gerber, Huber, and Washington (2010).

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

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

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

Bullock, John G. 2020. "Party Cues." In *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Persuasion*, ed. Elizabeth Suhay, Bernard Grofman, and Alexander Trechsel. New York: Oxford University Press. http://johnbullock.org/papers/2019-08-14_Bullock_PartyCuesReview.pdf. Review of research, especially experimental research, on the effects of party cues. The review is not comprehensive: I dug into a few questions about the effects of party cues, but there are other worthy questions about cues that I didn't have the space to take up.

January 27 (W): Partisan Polarization in the Mass Public

*Fiorina, Morris P. 2017. *Unstable Majorities: Polarization, Party Sorting & Political Stalemate*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Read Chapters 1-5. The rest is good but not assigned.

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

*Druckman, James N., Samara Klar, Yanna Krupnikov, Matthew Levendusky, and John Barry Ryan. N.d. "(Mis)-Estimating Affective Polarization." Forthcoming in *Journal of Politics*. Available from Canvas.

Lelkes, Yphtach. 2016. "Mass Polarization: Manifestations and Measurements." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80 (S1): 392-410.

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://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfs059>.

Klar, Samara, Yanna Krupnikov, and John Barry Ryan. 2018. "Affective Polarization or Partisan Disdain? Untangling a Dislike for the Opposing Party from a Dislike of Partisanship." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (2): 379-90.

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

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

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

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.

Galvin, Daniel J. 2013. "Presidential Partisanship Reconsidered: Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, and the Rise of Polarized Politics." *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (1): 46-60.

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

Karol, David, and Chloe N Thurston. 2020. "From Personal to Partisan: Abortion, Party, and Religion among California State Legislators." *Studies in American Political Development* 34 (1): 91-109.

February 03 (W): Campaigns

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

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

Kalla, Joshua L., and David E. Broockman. 2018. "The Minimal Persuasive Effects of Campaign Contact in General Elections: Evidence from 49 Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 112 (1): 148-66.

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

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

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

Enos, Ryan D, and Eitan D Hersh. 2015. "Party Activists as Campaign Advertisers: The Ground Campaign as a Principal-Agent Problem." *American Political Science Review* 109 (2): 252-78.

Finkel, Steven E. 1993. "Reexamining the 'Minimal Effects' Model in Recent Presidential Campaigns." *Journal of Politics* 55 (1): 1-21.

Hersh, Eitan D., and Bryan Schaffner. 2013. "Targeted Campaign Appeals and the Value of Ambiguity." *Journal of Politics* 75.

Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

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

Matthews, J. Scott. 2018. "Issue Priming Revisited: Susceptible Voters and Detectable Effects." *British Journal of Political Science* 28. A response to Lenz.

February 10 (W): Participation

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

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

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Eitan Hersh. 2012. "Validation: What Big Data Reveal about Survey Misreporting and the Real Electorate." *Political Analysis* 20 (Autumn): 437-59. About misreporting of turnout in surveys.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Eitan Hersh. 2013. "Gender, Race, Age and Voting: A Research Note." *Politics and Governance* 1 (2): 132-37.

Blais, André. 2000. *To Vote or Not to Vote?* University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bonilla, Tabitha, and Alvin B. Tillery. 2020. "Which Identity Frames Boost Support for and Mobilization in the #BlackLivesMatter Movement? An Experimental Test." *American Political Science Review* 114 (4): 947-62.

Burch, Traci. 2013. *Trading Democracy for Justice: Criminal Convictions and the Decline of Neighborhood Political Participation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cohn, Nate. 2016 January 07. "Why Polls Have Been Wrong Recently." *New York Times*. <http://nyti.ms/1JwXWcF>. On likely-voter screens.

DellaVigna, Stefano, John A. List, Ulrike Malmendier, and Gautam Rao. 2016. "Voting to Tell Others." *The Review of Economic Studies* 84 (1): 143-81.

Gentzkow, Matthew. 2006. "Television and Voter Turnout." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 71 (August): 931-72. Also recommended for the unit on media effects. See comments on it in that section of this syllabus.

Green, Donald P., and Alan S. Gerber. 2019. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Authoritative review of methods to increase voter turnout.

Hersh, Eitan D. 2015. *Hacking the Electorate: How Campaigns Perceive Voters*. New York: Cambridge University Press. What can campaigns predict about you from the public information that is available in the voter rolls?

Leighley, Jan E., and Jonathan Nagler. 2013. *Who Votes Now? Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States*.

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

Washington, Ebonya. 2006. "How Black Candidates Affect Voter Turnout." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121 (August): 973-98. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.121.3.973>.

February 17 (W): Race and Racism

Many of the recommended readings in this unit are not about race; instead, they are about tolerance and about other kinds of intergroup attitudes.

*Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Chapter 5.

*Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Chapter 6.

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

*Kinder, Donald R., and Allison Dale-Riddle. 2012. *The End of Race? Obama, 2008, and Racial Politics in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 2. Read pages 26-38 and 46-56. Skim the rest.

*Kuziemko, Ilyana, and Ebonya Washington. 2018. "Why Did the Democrats Lose the South? Bringing New Data to an Old Debate." *American Economic Review* 108 (10): 2830-67.

Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2018. *Deep Roots: How Slavery Still Shapes Southern Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chong, Dennis, and Reuel Rogers. 2005. "Racial Solidarity and Political Participation." *Political Behavior* 27 (4): 347-74.

Hersh, Eitan D., and Clayton Nall. 2016. "The Primacy of Race in the Geography of Income-Based Voting: New Evidence from Public Voting Records." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (2): 289-303.

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2009. "No More Wilder Effect, Never a Whitman Effect: When and Why Polls Mislead about Black and Female Candidates." *Journal of Politics* 71 (July): 769-81. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5962084>.

Merseth, Julie Lee. 2018. "Race-ing Solidarity: Asian Americans and Support for Black Lives Matter." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 6 (3): 337-56.

Schickler, Eric. 2016. *Racial Realignment: The Transformation of American Liberalism, 1932-1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Westwood, Sean J, and Erik Peterson. 2020. "The Inseparability of Race and Partisanship in the United States." *Political Behavior*: 1-23.

White, Ismail K, Chryl N Laird, and Troy D Allen. 2014. "Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts Between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." *American Political Science Review* 108 (4): 783-800.

White, Ismail K., and Chryl N. Laird. 2020. *Steadfast Democrats: How Social Forces Shape Black Political Behavior*. Vol. 19 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

February 25 (W): Political Sophistication, Nonattitudes, and "Information Shortcuts"

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

POLITICAL SOPHISTICATION AND NONATTITUDES

*Converse, Philip E. [1964] 2006. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." *Critical Review* 18 (Winter-Summer): 1-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913810608443650>.

The whole thing is worthwhile, but you may skim Sections I-II and skip Sections VIII-IX.

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

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

*Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2008. "The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review* 102 (May): 215-32. http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055408080210. This is a difficult article. Most of the math is simple, but there is a lot of it.

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

Freeder, Sean, Gabriel S. Lenz, and Shad Turney. 2019. "The Importance of Knowing 'What Goes with What': Reinterpreting the Evidence on Policy Attitude Stability." *Journal of Politics* 81. <https://doi.org/10.1086/700005>. Response to Ansolabehere et al (2008). Note also [a few corrections](#) that make the analyses easier to understand.

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

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

CUES AS SHORTCUTS

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

*Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (February): 194-230. <http://www>.

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

[jstor.org/stable/2111700](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2111700). The “Resources” section of the course web site contains a page of notes on this article that may be helpful.

*Somin, Ilya. 1998. “Voter Ignorance and the Democratic Ideal.” *Critical Review* 12 (4): 413-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913819808443511>. I recommend the entire article, but you are required to read only to page 431.

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

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

Page, Benjamin I. 2015. “That Same Old Song: Somin on Political Ignorance.” *Critical Review* 27 (3-4): 375-79.

March 03 (W): Family Influences, Socialization, and Education

FAMILY INFLUENCES, SOCIALIZATION, AND PUBLIC OPINION

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

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

*Healy, Andrew, and Neil Malhotra. 2013a. “Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *Journal of Politics* 75 (4): 1023-37. In the second column of page 1033, “6.6%” should be “6.6 percentage points.” And in the first column of page 1034, “9.2%” should be “9.2 percentage points.”

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

Washington, Ebonya L. 2008. “Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers’ Voting on Women’s Issues.” *American Economic Review* 98 (March): 311-32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29729973>.

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

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC OPINION

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

*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 131-138.

*Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Pages 40-42.

*Marshall, John. 2019. "The Anti-Democrat Diploma: How High School Education Decreases Support for the Democratic Party." *American Journal of Political Science* 63 (1): 67-83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12409>.

Bullock, John G. N.d. "Education and Attitudes toward Redistribution in the United States." Forthcoming in *British Journal of Political Science*. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123419000504>.

Mendelberg, Tali, Katherine T. McCabe, and Adam Thal. 2017. "College Socialization and the Economic Views of Affluent Americans." *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3): 606-623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12265>.

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

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

March 10 (W): Media Effects

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

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

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

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

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

Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." *American Political Science Review* 87 (June): 267-85. It's very difficult, perhaps impossible, to learn about media effects—that is, to learn with confidence—from survey data alone. You should not try to do so. But in the past, many scholars did try. And of all the survey-only efforts, this one may be the best. It is certainly interesting and clever.

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

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

Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2010. "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers." *Econometrica* 78 (January): 35-71.

Gerber, Alan S., James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw. 2011. "How Large and Long-Lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 105 (01): 135-50.

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

[1540-5907.2009.00377.x/full](https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/16077). Although the authors' code is not available online, the results have been replicated by Jens Hainmueller, and his code can be found at <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/16077>.

Martin, Gregory, and Josh McCrain. 2019. "Local News and National Politics." *American Political Science Review* 113 (2).

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

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