GV4J3
Public Opinion, Political Psychology, and Citizenship

Dr Thomas J. Leeper
Office: CON 3.21
Office hours: By appointment via LfY
Email: t.leeper@lse.ac.uk

Course website:
`https://moodle.lse.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=5109`
Reading list:
`https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e_course_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3_64769.pdf`

The purpose of this course is to explore issues related to public opinion, including what opinions are and how they are formed, what factors do and do not influence opinion development and change, how opinions drive citizens' political thinking and behaviour, and what implications these psychological processes have for the role of public opinions in democratic government. Students will leave the course with a thorough theoretical understanding of political opinions, their origins, and their possible effects through exposure to philosophical perspectives, contemporary case studies, and a broad set of empirical research.

1 Objectives and Evaluation

After this course, students should be able to:

1. Explain what opinions are and how they are formed.
2. Describe properties of public opinion at the individual and aggregate levels.
3. Evaluate political psychological theories and normative arguments about public opinion.
4. Evaluate the quality of empirical public opinion research.
5. Explain and apply quantitative and qualitative methods to the study of public opinion.

It is important to note that this is a research seminar that is informed by original political science research and evaluated through participants' own original research paper. It may be useful to think of the course as a "mini-dissertation" project.

2 Summative Assessment: Exam Paper

The exam for the course is an independent research paper of approximately 5,000 words that:

1. addresses an important political science question related to public opinion, political psychology, or political behaviour,

2. offers a theoretical contribution toward understanding that question, and

3. reports an original empirical analysis that tests that theory.

Original data analysis (and possibly data collection) are required, though the particular form of the empirical component can be qualitative, quantitative, or both. Some examples of empirical projects include: an original survey and/or experimental data collection, a pilot test of a proposed research design (and the description of a more complete empirical design), qualitative data analysis (such as focus groups, semi-structured interviewing, content analysis, etc.), the analysis of existing public opinion data (e.g., surveys, cross-national comparisons, election results, etc.), or some mix of these. While it is not expected that students conduct a large-scale study, they must conduct some novel data collection and/or analysis.

Students pursuing original data collection (of any kind) must comply with the LSE Research Ethics Policy[1] and complete an ethical self-assessment form (to be signed by the instructor) before gathering any data.

The exam essay will be marked according to guidelines available in the Government Department MSc Handbook. Marks are assigned according to the conventional LSE scale and written feedback will be provided on the assessed essay.

The essay is due **Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 5:00pm**.

3 Formative Activities and Assessment

Formative assessment consists of (1) a 2-page written proposal for the final essay and an associated literature review, (2) four out-of-class problem sets submitted near the beginning of the term, and (3) in-class discussion activities.

3.1 Research Proposal

In preparation for the final exam, students will prepare a short, 2-page proposal to be submitted in Week 6 of Lent Term that outlines a possible project for the assessed essay. This document should state a research topic and clear research question, make reference to relevant theoretical and empirical literature, and propose a basic design for addressing the question. Students should focus on one topic, but can present up to two distinct ideas if they are undecided about what to do. The proposal should be uploaded to Moodle by the beginning of Week 6.

Students should then meet one-on-one with the instructor during Week 6 to discuss the ideas, receive feedback, and make plans for the final paper. Once a topic is agreed, student should use Week 6 to complete an annotated bibliography of 5–10 relevant studies (from reading list and elsewhere) that motivate the final project and upload it to Moodle.

Once finalized, 3–4 students per week will be asked to briefly present their projects for peer feedback during class meetings in Weeks 9–10 of term. These presentations should be oral and last about 5 minutes.

---

[1]`http://www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/researchAndDevelopment/researchDivision/`
`policyAndEthics/ethicsGuidanceAndForms.aspx`

3.2   Problem Sets

Given the combination of an assessed essay as the sole summative assessment, a relatively short term (10 weeks), and the varied backgrounds of students enrolled in the course, short problem sets applying different research methods in public opinion are due in the first four weeks of the course (Weeks 2–5). These provide an opportunity to both gain methodological competence to critique readings in the course and prepare the final exam project.

Problem Set	Due Date
Week 1: Interviewing	January 16
Week 2: Trends and toplines	January 23
Week 3: Correlation and regression	January 30
Week 4: Experimentation	February 6

The problem sets take the form of "replication" activities, in which the data from a published research article is made available and students are asked to reproduce the results of the paper from the original data and explain the logic of the underlying methods. The problem sets are mandatory but are not marked. Please treat them as an opportunity to self-evaluate and learn and to approach the instructor with any hesitations you may have. Collaboration is allowed, but each student should submit an individual assignment. Marking rubrics will be provided.

3.3   Discussion Activities

The course will primarily involve student-led discussions with the exception of a few lecture elements surrounding methodological issues in public opinion research. The course is structured as a "reading group," where every student is expected to have read all assigned readings and should be able to summarize and critique each reading if asked to do so.

In preparing for discussion students should be able to summarize and critique several key parts of each article:

1. What is the research question?

2. What is the theory? Is it clearly argued and reasonable?

3. To which literature does the article contribute?

4. What are the hypotheses or expectations? Do these derive clearly from theory? Are they falsifiable?

5. What is the method of analysis? How are data collected? How appropriate are the method and data?

6. What are the results? Do they support the proposed theory?

It may be useful to write out answer to each of these questions for every article.

Additionally, given the discussion format of the course, every week, every student must post 1 or 2 discussion questions to Moodle based upon the topic of the week and the assigned readings. These are due by Thursday at 17:00 (5:00pm) prior to class.

4   Course Outline

Class will meet at the following times and locations:

- Friday 15:00-17:00 (TW1.3.01) in LT Weeks 1–5,7–11

The course does not meet during reading week (LT Week 6). The general schedule for the course is as follows. Details on the readings for each week are provided on the following pages.

4.1 Week 1: Conceptualizations of "Public" "Opinion" (Jan. 13)

Last part of class will focus on material covered by Problem Set 1, which is due on Moodle by the beginning of Week 2.

– Chapters 3[2] from Susan Herbst. *Numbered Voices: How Opinion Polling Has Shaped American Politics*. University Of Chicago Press, 1995.

– Jane J. Mansbridge. Rethinking representation. *American Political Science Review*, 97(04):515–528, December 2003.

– Lisa Disch. Toward a mobilization conception of democratic representation. *American Political Science Review*, 105(1):100–114, February 2011.

– Pamela Johnston Conover, Donald D. Searing, and Ivor Crewe. The elusive ideal of equal citizenship: Political theory and political psychology in the United States and Great Britain. *The Journal of Politics*, 66(4):1036–1068, July 2008.

See Also:
– Nadia Urbinati and Mark E. Warren. The concept of representation in contemporary democratic theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1):387–412, June 2008.

– James N. Druckman. Pathologies of studying public opinion, political communication, and democratic responsiveness. *Political Communication*, 31(3):467–492, August 2014.

– Robert A. Dahl. *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1989.

– William H. Riker. *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation Between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice*. Waveland Press, 1988.

– Walter Lippmann. *Public Opinion*. CreateSpace, 1922.

– Walter Lippmann. *The Phantom Public*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ, 1928.

– Robert A. Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2006.

– Hanna Fenichel Pitkin. *The Concept of Representation*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1967.

– Anthony Downs. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row, New York, 1957.

– John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. *Stealth Democracy: American's Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2002.

– Lawrence R. Jacobs and Benjamin I. Page. Who influences U.S. foreign policy? *American Political Science Review*, 99(1):107–123, April 2005.

– Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz. Two faces of powerel. *American Political Science Review*, 56(4):947–952, 1962.

– James S. Fishkin. Beyond polling alone: The quest for an informed public. *Critical Review*, 18(1):157–165, 2006.

– Chapter 8 from E.E. Schattschneider. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. Dryden Press, Hinsdale, IL, 1975.

---

[2] `https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=24aad0aa-b22c-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb`

– Herbert McClosky, Paul J. Hoffmann, and Rosemary O'Hara. Issue conflict and consensus among party leaders and followers. *American Political Science Review*, 54(2):406–427, 1960.

– Robert S. Erikson. Constituency opinion and Congressional behavior: A reexamination of the Miller-Stokes representation data. *American Journal of Political Science*, 22(3):511–535, 1978.

4.2 Week 2: Voting Behaviour (Jan. 20)

First part of class will focus on material covered by Problem Set 2, which is due on Moodle by the beginning of Week 3.

– Kathleen M. McGraw, Milton Lodge, and Patrick K. Stroh. On-line processing in candidate evaluation: The effects of issue order, issue importance, and sophistication. *Political Behavior*, 12(1):41–58, 1990.

– Jane Green and Sara Binzer Hobolt. Owning the issue agenda: Party strategies and vote choices in british elections. *Electoral Studies*, 27:460–476, 2008.

– Strephen M. Utych and Cindy D. Kam. Viability, information seeking, and vote choice. *Journal of Politics*, 76(1):152–166, January 2014.

– Richard R. Lau, Parina Patel, Dalia F. Fahmy, and Robert R. Kaufman. Correct voting across thirty three democracies: A preliminary analysis. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(2):239–259, April 2014.

See Also:
– Sheena S. Iyengar and Mark R. Lepper. When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6):995–1006, December 2000.

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

– V.O. Key. *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality in Presidential Voting 1936-1960.* Random House, 1966.

– Edward G. Carmines and James a. Stimson. The two faces of issue voting. *American Political Science Review*, 74(1):78, March 1980.

– Larry M. Bartels. Issue voting under uncertainty: An empirical test. *American Journal of Political Science*, 30(4):709–728, 1986.

– George Rabinowitz and Stuart Elaine MacDonald. A directional theory of issue voting. *American Political Science Review*, 83(1):93–121, 1989.

– Richard R. Lau and David P. Redlawsk. Voting correctly. *American Political Science Review*, 91(3):585–598, 1997.

– Deborah Jordan Brooks. Testing the double standard for candidate emotionality: Voter reactions to the tears and anger of male and female politicians. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(02):597–615, May 2011.

– Sara Binzer Hobolt. When Europe matters: The impact of political information on

voting behaviour in EU referendums. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*, 15(1):85–109, April 2005.

– Gary C. Jacobson. How do campaigns matter? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1):31–47, May 2015.

– Thomas J. Rudolph and Elizabeth Popp. An information processing theory of ambivalence. *Political Psychology*, 28(5):563–585, October 2013.

– Chris Wells, Justin Reedy, John Gastil, and Carolyn Lee. Information distortion and voting choices: The origins and effects of factual beliefs in initiative elections. *Political Psychology*, 30(6):953–969, December 2009.

– Peter Selb, Hanspeter Kriesi, Regula Hänggli, and Mirko Marr. Partisan choices in a direct-democratic campaign. *European Political Science Review*, 1(01):155–172, 2009.

4.3   Week 3: What are attitudes? (Jan. 27)

First part of class will focus on material covered by Problem Set 3, which is due on Moodle by the beginning of Week 4.

– Chapter 7[3] from Alice H. Eagly and Shelly Chaiken. Attitude structure and function. In D.T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey, editors, *Handbook of Social Psychology*, chapter 7, pages 269–322. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1998.

– Christopher D. Johnston and Julie Wronski. Personality dispositions and political preferences across hard and easy issues. *Political Psychology*, page In press, 2013.

– Penny S. Visser, George Y. Bizer, and Jon A. Krosnick. Exploring the latent structure of strength-related attitude attributes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38(06):1–67, 2006.

See Also:
– Alice H. Eagly and Shelly Chaiken. The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25(5):582–602, 2007.

– James N. Druckman and Arthur Lupia. Preference formation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3:1–24, 2000.

– Alice H Eagly and Shelly Chaiken. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, Orland, FL, 1993.

– Russell H. Fazio. Attitudes as object-evaluation associations of varying strength. *Social Cognition*, 25(5):603–637, October 2007.

– Icek Ajzen. Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52:27–58, 2001.

– Richard E. Petty and Jon A. Krosnick, editors. *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and Consequences*. Psychology Press, New York, 1995.

– Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley. *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1953.

– William J. McGuire. The nature of attitudes and attitude change. *The Handbook of*

---

[3]https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=25aad0aa-b22c-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb

Social Psychology, 3:136–314, 1969.

– Daniel Katz. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24(2):163, 1960.

– John Zaller. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1992.

– Eva M. Pomerantz, Shelly Chaiken, and Rosalind S. Tordesillas. Attitude strength and resistance processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(3):408—-419, 1995.

– Wendy Wood. Attitude change: Persuasion and social influence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51:539–70, January 2000.

– Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman. Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 101(4):637–655, November 2007.

– Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo. The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19:123–205, 1986.

– Jon A. Krosnick. The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2):196–210, August 1988.

– Dolores Albarracín and Amy L. Mitchell. The role of defensive confidence in preference for proattitudinal information: How believing that one is strong can sometimes be a defensive weakness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12):1565–84, December 2004.

– Penny S. Visser and Robert R. Mirabile. Attitudes in the social context: The impact of social network composition on individual-level attitude strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6):779–795, 2004.

– Allyson L. Holbrook, Matthew K. Berent, Jon A. Krosnick, Penny S. Visser, and David S. Boninger. Attitude importance and the accumulation of attitude-relevant knowledge in memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5):749–769, May 2005.

– Jason Barabas, Jennifer Jerit, William Pollock, and Carlisle Rainey. The question(s) of political knowledge. *American Political Science Review*, 108(4):840–855, November 2014.

– Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1997.

– Milton Lodge and Kathleen M. McGraw, editors. *Political Judgment: Structure and Process*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, 1995.

– Milton Lodge, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. The responsive voter: Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(2):309–326, 1995.

– Shanto Iyengar. Framing responsibility for political issues: The case of poverty. *Political Behavior*, 12(1):19–40, 1990.

– Richard R. Lau and David P. Redlawsk. Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision making. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(4):951–971, 2001.

– Kimmo Grönlund and Henry Milner. The determinants of political knowledge in comparative perspective. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 29(4):386–406, December 2006.

– James Tilley and Christopher Wlezien. Does political information matter? an experi-

mental test relating to party positions on Europe. *Political Studies*, 56(1):192–214, March 2008.

– Diana C. Mutz. Impersonal influence: Effects of representations of public opinion on political attitudes. *Political Behavior*, 14(2):89–122, 1992.

– Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin H. Phillips. Gay rights in the states: Public opinion and policy responsiveness. *American Political Science Review*, 103(3):367–386, August 2009.

– James N. Druckman and Thomas J. Leeper. Is public opinion stable? resolving the micro/macro disconnect in studies of public opinion. *Daedalus*, 141(4):50–68, October 2012.

– Benjamin I. Page, Robert Y. Shapiro, and Glenn R. Dempsey. What moves public opinion? *American Political Science Review*, 81(1):23, March 1987.

– Michael B. MacKuen, Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. Macropartisanship. *American Political Science Review*, 83(4):1125–1142, 1989.

– Christopher Wlezien. The public as thermostat: Dynamics of preferences for spending. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39(4):981–1000, 2012.

– James N. Druckman and Thomas J. Leeper. Learning more from political communication experiments: Pretreatment and its effects. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4):875–896, February 2012.

– Martin Gilens. Political ignorance and collective policy preferences. *American Political Science Review*, 95(2):379–396, April 2001.

– David Sanders. The effects of deliberative polling in an EU-wide experiment: Five mechanisms in search of an explanation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 36(2006):1–24, February 2012.

– Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1992.

– Kenneth Mulligan, Tobin Grant, and Daniel Bennett. The dynamics of public opinion on cultural policy issues in the U.S., 1972–2010. *Political Behavior*, 35(4):807–829, December 2013.

– Silvia Knobloch-Westerwick. Selective exposure and reinforcement of attitudes and partisanship before a presidential election. *Journal of Communication*, pages no–no, June 2012.

– Magdalena E. Wojcieszak. Deliberation and attitude polarization. *Journal of Communication*, 61(4):596–617, August 2011.

4.4 Week 4: Media and Social Influence (Feb. 3)

First part of class will focus on material covered by Problem Set 4, which is due on Moodle by the beginning of Week 5.

– Marta Fraile and Shanto Iyengar. Not all news sources are equally informative: A cross-national analysis of political knowledge in Europe. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 19(3):275–294, 2014.

– Thomas E. Nelson, Zoe M. Oxley, and Rosalee A. Clawson. Toward a psychology of framing effects. *Political Behavior*, 19(3):221–246, 1997.

– Lauren Feldman. The opinion factor: The effects of opinionated news on information processing and attitude change. *Political Communication*, 28(2):163–181, 2011.

– Samara Klar. Partisanship in a social setting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2014.

See Also:

– Diana C. Mutz and Paul S. Martin. Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The role of mass media. *American Political Science Review*, 95(1):97–114, March 2001.

– Diana C. Mutz. Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):111–126, 2002.

– James N. Druckman and Kjersten R. Nelson. Framing and deliberation: How citizens' conversations limit elite influence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4):729–745, October 2003.

– Joanne M. Miller and Jon A. Krosnick. News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Politically knowledgeable citizens are guided by a trusted source. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(2):301–315, 2000.

– Sophie K. Lecheler and Claes H. de Vreese. Getting real: The duration of framing effects. *Journal of Communication*, 61(5):959–983, October 2011.

– Kimberly Gross. Framing persuasive appeals: Episodic and thematic framing, emotional response, and policy opinion. *Political Psychology*, 29(2):169–192, April 2008.

– Pablo J. Boczkowski, Eugenia Mitchelstein, and Martin Walter. Convergence across divergence: Understanding the gap in the online news choices of journalists and consumers in Western Europe and Latin America. *Communication Research*, 38(3):376–396, December 2011.

– Robert S. Erikson and Laura Stoker. Caught in the draft: The effects of vietnam draft lottery status on political attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2):1–17, May 2011.

– Diana C. Mutz. Impersonal influence: Effects of representations of public opinion on political attitudes. *Political Behavior*, 14(2):89–122, 1992.

– William Hart, Dolores Albarracín, Alice H. Eagly, Inge Brechan, Matthew J Lindberg, and Lisa Merrill. Feeling validated versus being correct: A meta-analysis of selective exposure to information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4):555–588, July 2009.

– Natalie Jomini Stroud. Polarization and partisan selective exposure. *Journal of Communication*, 60(3):556–576, August 2010.

– Stefano DellaVigna and Ethan Kaplan. The fox news effect: Media bias and voting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3):1187–1234, August 2007.

– Bethany L. Albertson and Adria Lawrence. After the credits roll: The long-term effects of educational television on public knowledge and attitudes. *American Politics Research*, 37(2):275–300, March 2009.

– Miller McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27:415–444, 2001.

– Robert Huckfeldt and John D. Sprague. *Citizens, Politics and Social Communication: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign.* Cambridge University Press, New York, 2006.

– David W. Nickerson. Is voting contagious? evidence from two field experiments. *American Political Science Review*, 102(01):49–57, February 2008.

– W. Lance Bennett and Shanto Iyengar. A new era of minimal effects? the changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication*, 58:707–731, 2008.

– Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman. Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1):103–126, June 2007.

– James N. Druckman, Jordan Fein, and Thomas J. Leeper. A source of bias in public opinion stability. *American Political Science Review*, 106(2):430–454, 2012.

– Alan S. Gerber, James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw. How large and long-lasting are the persuasive effects of televised campaign ads? results from a large scale randomized experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 105(1):135–150, March 2011.

4.5   Week 5: Motivated Reasoning (Feb. 10)

Note: Research proposal is due to Moodle by Monday of Week 6. Please book a one-on-one meeting with the instructor via LSE for You.

– Ziva Kunda. The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3):480–498, November 1990.

– Mark B. Reed and Lisa G. Aspinwall. Self-affirmation reduces biased processing of health-risk information. *Motivation and Emotion*, 22(2):99–132, 1998.

– Philip E. Tetlock, Linda Skitka, and Richard Boettger. Social and cognitive strategies for coping with accountability: Conformity, complexity, and bolstering. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(4):632–40, October 1989.

– Serena Chen, David Shechter, and Shelly Chaiken. Getting at the truth or getting along: Accuracy- versus impression-motivated heuristic and systematic processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2):262–275, 1996.

See Also:
– Lilach Nir. Motivated reasoning and public opinion perception. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(3):504–532, March 2011.

– Charles S. Taber and Milton Lodge. Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3):755–769, July 2006.

– James N. Druckman and Toby Bolsen. Framing, motivated reasoning, and opinions about emergent technologies. *Journal of Communication*, 61(4):659–688, August 2011.

– Rune Slothuus and Claes H. de Vreese. Political parties, motivated reasoning, and issue framing effects. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(3):630–645, 2010.

– Thomas J. Leeper and Rune Slothuus. Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion formation. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 35(S1):129–156, February 2014.

– Daniel C. Molden and E. Tory Higgins. Motivated thinking. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Thinking and Reasoning*, chapter 13, pages 295–318. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

– David P. Redlawsk, Andrew J. W. Civettini, and Karen M. Emmerson. The affective tipping point: Do motivated reasoners ever 'get it'? *Political Psychology*, 31(4):563–593,

July 2010.

– James N. Druckman. The politics of motivation. *Critical Review*, 24(2):199–216, 2012.

– James N. Druckman, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. How elite partisan polarization affects public opinion formation. *American Political Science Review*, 107(1):57–79, January 2013.

– Toby Bolsen, James N. Druckman, and Fay Lomax Cook. The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, July 2013.

– Philip Solomon Hart and Erik C. Nisbet. Boomerang effects in science communication: How motivated reasoning and identity cues amplify opinion polarization about climate mitigation policies. *Communication Research*, 39(6):701–723, August 2011.

– Eric W. Groenendyk. *Competing Motives in the Partisan Mind.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2013.

– Geoffrey L. Cohen, David A. Sherman, Anthony Bastardi, Lillian Hsu, Michelle Mc-Goey, and Lee Ross. Bridging the partisan divide: Self-affirmation reduces ideological closed-mindedness and inflexibility in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(3):415–430, 2007.

– Arie W. Kruglanski and D.M. Webster. Motivated closing of the mind: 'seizing' and 'freezing'. *Psychological review*, 103(2):263–83, April 1996.

– Peter H. Ditto, James A. Scepansky, Geoffrey D. Munro, Anne Marie Apanovitch, and Lisa K. Lockhart. Motivated sensitivity to preference inconsistent information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(1):53–69, 1998.

– David P. Redlawsk, Andrew J. W. Civettini, and Karen M. Emmerson. The affective tipping point: Do motivated reasoners ever 'get it'? *Political Psychology*, 31(4):563–593, July 2010.

4.6   Week 6: Reading Week (Feb. 17) – no class meeting

There will be no class meeting on February 19 (LT Week 6) due to LT Reading Week. By this point in the course, students should have an idea in mind for their final exam essay topic and should have uploaded a 2-page proposal to Moodle by the end of Week 5. Please schedule a meeting with the instructor during Week 6 to discuss your proposal and then use the remainder of the week to prepare an annotated bibliography or literature review related to your proposal.

4.7   Week 7: Emotion and/or Cognition (Feb. 24)

– Jennifer S. Lerner and Dacher Keltner. Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice. *Cognition & Emotion*, 14(4):473–493, 2000.

– Leonie Huddy, Stanley Feldman, Charles S. Taber, and Gallya Lahav. Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3):593–608, 2005.

– Ted Brader, Nicholas A. Valentino, and Elizabeth Suhay. What triggers public opposition to immigration? anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4):959–978, October 2008.

– Jonathan St B T Evans. Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social

cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59:255–78, January 2008.

See Also:

– Bethany L. Albertson. Religious appeals and implicit attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 32(1):109–130, February 2011.

– Cindy D. Kam. Implicit attitudes, explicit choices: When subliminal priming predicts candidate preference. *Political Behavior*, 29(3):343–367, March 2007.

– Kevin Arceneaux and Ryan J. Vander Wielen. The effects of need for cognition and need for affect on partisan evaluations. *Political Psychology*, 34(1):23–42, 2013.

– Shanto Iyengar, Guarav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3):405–431, September 2012.

– Tali Mendelberg. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2010.

– George E. Marcus, W. Russell Neuman, and Michael B. Mackuen. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2000.

– Antoine J. Banks and Nicholas A. Valentino. Emotional substrates of white racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 00(00):no–no, January 2012.

– Jonathan McDonald Ladd and Gabriel S. Lenz. Does anxiety improve voters' decision making? *Political Psychology*, 32(2):347–361, April 2011.

– Neil Malhotra and Alexander G. Kuo. Emotions as moderators of information cue use: Citizen attitudes toward hurricane katrina. *American Politics Research*, 37(2):301–326, March 2009.

– Nicholas A. Valentino, Vincent L. Hutchings, Antoine J. Banks, and Anne K. Davis. Is a worried citizen a good citizen? emotions, political information seeking, and learning via the internet. *Political Psychology*, 29(2):247–273, April 2008.

– Kimberly Gross and Lisa D'Ambrosio. Framing emotional response. *Political Psychology*, 25(1):1–29, February 2004.

– Ayelet Fishbach, James Y. Shah, and Arie W. Kruglanski. Emotional transfer in goal systems. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(6):723–738, November 2004.

– Robin L. Nabi. A cognitive-functional model for the effects of discrete negative emotions on information processing, attitude change, and recall. *Communication Theory*, 9(3):292–320, August 1999.

– E. Tory Higgins. Beyond pleasure and pain. *The American Psychologist*, 52(12):1280–1300, December 1997.

4.8 Week 8: Political Identity, Values, and Other Predispositions (Mar. 3)

– John R. Alford, Carolyn L. Funk, and John R. Hibbing. Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American Political Science Review*, 99(2):153–167, 2005.

– David O. Sears and Carolyn L. Funk. The role of self-interest in social and political attitudes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 24:1–91, 1991.

– Leonie Huddy. From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22(1):127–156, March 2001.

– Ismail K. White, Chyrl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen. Selling out? the politics of navigating conflicts between racial group interest and self-interest. *American Political Science Review*, 108(4):783–800, November 2014.

See Also:

– Claudine Gay. Putting race in context: Identifying the environmental determinants of black racial attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, 98(04):547–562, November 2004.

– Samara Klar. The influence of competing identities on political preferences. *Journal of Politics*, 75(4):1108–1124, October 2013.

– Steven Greene. Understanding party identification: A social identity approach. *Political Psychology*, 20(2):393–403, June 1999.

– Elizabeth Suhay and Toby Epstein Jayaratne. Does biology justify ideology? the politics of genetic attribution. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(2):497–521, Dec 2013.

– Melinda S. Jackson. Priming the sleeping giant: The dynamics of latino political identity and vote choice. *Political Psychology*, 32(4):691–716, August 2011.

– Sonia K. Kang and Galen V. Bodenhausen. Multiple identities in social perception and interaction: Challenges and opportunities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1):547—574, January 2015.

– Leonie Huddy, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aarøe. Expressive partisanship: Campaign involvement, political emotion, and partisan identity. *American Political Science Review*, 109(1), February 2015.

– Megan L. Knowles and Wendi L. Gardner. Benefits of membership: The activation and amplification of group identities in response to social rejection. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(9):1200, 2008.

– Sonia K. Kang and Galen V. Bodenhausen. Multiple identities in social perception and interaction: Challenges and opportunities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1):547—574, January 2015.

– Ismail K. White, Chyrl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen. Selling out? the politics of navigating conflicts between racial group interest and self-interest. *American Political Science Review*, 108(4):783–800, November 2014.

– Donald P. Green and Bradley Palmquist. How stable is party identification? *Political Science*, 16(4):437–466, 1994.

– Alan S. Gerber, Gregory a. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. Personality and the strength and direction of partisan identification. *Political Behavior*, August 2011.

– John T. Jost, Christopher M. Federico, and Jaime L Napier. Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60:307–37, January 2009.

– Stanley Feldman. Structure and consistency in public opinion: The role of core beliefs and values. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32(2):416, May 1988.

– Shawn Treier and D. Sunshine Hillygus. The nature of political ideology in the contemporary electorate. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73(4):679–703, December 2009.

– Paul R. Brewer and Kimberly Gross. Values, framing, and citizens' thoughts about

policy issues: Effects on content and quantity. *Political Psychology*, 26(6):929–948, December 2005.

– Philip E. Converse. The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In David Apter, editor, *Ideology and Discontent*, pages 206–261. Free Press, New York, 1964.

– M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi. Continuity and change in political orientations: A longitudinal study of two generations. *American Political Science Review*, 69(4):1316, December 1975.

– Dean Lacy. A theory of nonseparable preferences in survey responses. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(2):239–258, 2001.

– Mark A. Peffley and Jon Hurwitz. A hierarchical model of attitude constraint. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(4):871–890, 1985.

– Christopher M. Federico, Agnieszka Golec, and Jessica L Dial. The relationship between the need for closure and support for military action against Iraq: Moderating effects of national attachment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(5):621–32, May 2005.

– Evan Charney and William English. Candidate genes and political behavior. *American Political Science Review*, 106(01):1–34, February 2012.

– Anthony C. Lopez and Rose McDermott. Adaptation, heritability, and the emergence of evolutionary. *Political Psychology*, In press, 2012.

4.9 Week 9: Student Presentations (Mar. 10)

Students will sign-up after reading week for a presentation slot in either Week 9 or Week 10.

4.10 Week 10: Student Presentations (Mar. 17)

Students will sign-up after reading week for a presentation slot in either Week 9 or Week 10.

4.11 Week 11: Judgement and Decision-Making; Conclusion (Mar. 24)

– Sara Binzer Hobolt. Taking cues on Europe? voter competence and party endorsements in referendums on European integration. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(2):151–182, March 2007.

– Andrew J. Healy, Neil Malhotra, and Cecilia Hyunjung Mo. Irrelevant events affect voters' evaluations of government performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(29):12804–12809, July 2010.

– Michael Bang Petersen, Daniel Sznycer, Leda Cosmides, and John Tooby. Who deserves help? evolutionary psychology, social emotions, and public opinion about welfare. *Political Psychology*, 33(3):395–418, June 2012.

See Also:
– Michael Bang Petersen, Rune Slothuus, Rune Stubager, and Lise Togeby. Deserving-

ness versus values in public opinion on welfare: The automaticity of the deservingness heuristic. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(1):24–52, January 2011.

– Gary Marks and Norman Miller. Ten years of research on the false-consensus effect: An empirical and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 102(1):72–90, 1987.

– Andrew J. Healy. Random events, economic losses, and retrospective voting: Implications for democratic competence. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 5(2):193–208, August 2010.

– Richard R. Lau and David P. Redlawsk. Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision making. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(4):951–971, 2001.

– Logan Dancey and Geoffrey D. Sheagley. Heuristics behaving badly: Party cues and voter knowledge. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(2):312–325, November 2012.

– Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157):1124–1131, September 1974.

– Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481):453–458, January 1981.

– Daniel Kahneman. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Penguin, 2012.

– Dan Ariely. *Predictably Irrational*. HarperCollins, 2008.

– James H. Kuklinski and Norman L. Hurley. On hearing and interpreting political messages: A cautionary tale of citizen cue-taking. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(3):729–751, 1994.

– Kevin Arceneaux. Can partisan cues diminish democratic accountability? *Political Behavior*, 30(2):139–160, October 2007.

– Nicholas A. Valentino, Vincent L. Hutchings, and Ismail K. White. Cues that matter: How political ads prime racial attitudes during campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):75–90, 2002.

– Noam Lupu. Party brands and partisanship: Theory with evidence from a survey experiment in argentina. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(1):49–64, January 2013.

– Shira Dvir-Gvirsman. Size matters: The effects of political orientation, majority status, and majority size on misperceptions of public opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 79(1):1–27, Feb 2015.

– Jennifer L. Merolla, Laura B. Stephenson, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. Can canadians take a hint? the (in)effectiveness of party labels as information shortcuts in canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 41(3):673–696, 2008.

– Shelly Chaiken. Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(5):752–766, 1980.

– James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schweider, Robert F. Rich, and David Schwieder. Misinformation and the currency of democratic citizenship. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(3):790–816, 2000.

– Simona Botti and Sheena S. Iyengar. The dark side of choice: When choice impairs social welfare. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 25(1):24–38, 2006.

4.12 Appendix: Survey Research Methods

Students analysing survey data may find some of the following readings useful.

– Eleanor Singer and Mick P. Couper. The effect of question wording on attitudes toward prenatal testing and abortion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 78(3):751–760, Sep 2014.

– Roger Tourangeau and Kenneth A. Rasinski. Cognitive processes underlying context effects in attitude measurement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3):299–314, 1988.

– George F. Bishop, Alfred Tuchfarber, and R.W. Oldendick. Opinions on fictitious issues: The pressure to answer survey questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50(2):240–250, 1986.

– John Zaller and Stanley Feldman. A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3):579–616, 1992.

– Susan Banducci and Daniel Stevens. Surveys in context: How timing in the electoral cycle influences response propensity and satisficing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 79(S1):214–243, Jan 2015.

– Robert M. Groves, Floyd J. Fowler, Mick P. Couper, James M. Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. *Survey Methodology*. Wiley-Interscience, second edition, 2009.

– Sharon Lohr. *Sampling: Design and Analysis*. Advanced (Cengage Learning). Cengage Learning, 2009.

– Adam J. Berinsky, Eleanor Neff Powell, Eric Schickler, and Ian Brett Yohai. Revisiting public opinion in the 1930s and 1940s. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(03):515–520, June 2011.

– Howard Schuman and Stan Presser. *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1981.

– Nora Cate Schaeffer and Stanley Presser. The science of asking questions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29:65–88, 2003.

– Jon A. Krosnick, Charles M. Judd, and Bernd Wittenbrink. The measurement of attitudes. In Dolores Albarracín, Blair T. Johnson, and Mark P. Zanna, editors, *Handbook of Attitudes and Attitude Change*, chapter 2, pages 21–76. Erlbaum, Mahway, NJ, 2005.

– Melanie A. Revilla, Willem E. Saris, and Jon A. Krosnick. Choosing the number of categories in agree-disagree scales. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 43(1):73–97, 2013.

– David Scott Yeager, Samuel B. Larson, Jon A. Krosnick, and Trevor Tompson. Measuring Americans' issue priorities: A new version of the most important problem question reveals more concern about global warming and the environment. Unpublished paper, 2010.

– Jon A. Krosnick, Allyson L. Holbrook, Matthew K. Berent, Richard T. Carson, W. Michael Hanemann, Raymond J. Kopp, Robert Cameron Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. Kerry Smith, Wendy R. Moody, Melanie C. Green, and Michael Conaway. The impact of 'no opinion' response options on data quality. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66:371–403, 2002.

– Henry E. Brady. Contributions of survey research to political science. *PS: Political*

Science & Politics, 33(1):47—-57, 2000.

– Stanley Feldman. Measuring issue preferences: The problem of response instability. *Political Analysis*, 1(1):25–60, 1989.

– R. Michael Alvarez and Charles H. Franklin. Uncertainty and political perceptions. *Journal of Politics*, 56(3):671–688, 1994.

– Jonathan P. Schuldt, Sara H. Konrath, and Norbert Schwarz. 'Global warming' or 'climate change'?: Whether the planet is warming depends on question wording. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(1):115–124, February 2011.

– D. Sunshine Hillygus, Natalie M. Jackson, and McKenzie Young. Professional respondents in nonprobability online panels. In Mario Callegaro, Reg Baker, Jelke Bethlehem, Anja S. G"oritz, Jon A. Krosnick, and Paul J. Lavrakas, editors, *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective*, chapter 10. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 2014.

– Mario Callegaro, Reg Baker, Jelke Bethlehem, Anja S. Göritz, Jon A. Krosnick, and Paul J. Lavrakas, editors. *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective*. Wiley, West Sussex, UK, 2014.

– Hans-Jürgen Andreß, Katrin Golsch, and Alexander W. Schmidt. *Applied Panel Data Analysis for Economic and Social Surveys*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2013.

– Stephen Ansolabehere, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Jr. Snyder. The strength of issues: Using multiple measures to gauge preference stability, ideological constraint, and issue voting. *American Political Science Review*, 102(02):215–232, June 2008.

– Richard Johnston and Henry E. Brady. The rolling cross-section design. *Electoral Studies*, 21(2):283–295, June 2002.

– Adeline Delavande and Charles F. Manski. Probabilistic polling and voting in the 2008 Presidential election: Evidence from the American Life Panel. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(3):433–459, May 2010.

– Brian J. Gaines, James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. The logic of the survey experiment reexamined. *Political Analysis*, 15(1):1–20, October 2007.