

# Public Opinion, Political Psychology, and Citizenship

Thomas J. Leeper  
Department of Government  
London School of Economics and Political Science

March 4, 2016

## 1 Overview

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. The course will challenge assumptions about what democracy is and how it works, explore what it means to be a good citizen in a contemporary democracy, and provide students with insight into how democratic governments can and should respond to the public's views. The focus will be on how citizens form political opinions, think and reason about policy debates, and act on their opinions, especially outside of elections, across a broad array of country contexts.

## 2 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. Explain different conceptualizations of political representation and their empirical implications.
4. Evaluate arguments about the proper role of public opinion in democracy and government.
5. Apply knowledge of opinions and opinion measurement to the evaluation of survey public opinion research.

## 3 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment consists of in-class discussion activities and three out-of-class problem sets submitted near the beginning of the term.

### 3.1 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.

Given the discussion format of the course, some preparation is required on the part of each student for each seminar meeting:

- 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.
- Each student will for one week's meeting serve as discussion co-leader (there will be 2-3 discussion leaders per week). This requires them to review the discussion questions posted to Moodle and facilitate a conversation around the assigned readings. It also requires a short writing task, described next.

Each discussion leader should write a short (2-3 page; max 1500 words) reflection paper that synthesizes course readings for that week, raises questions unanswered by the texts, or proposes avenues for further theoretical development and/or empirical research. These should be opinionated essays that make an argument about public opinion; they should not be simply summaries of the readings.

Reflection papers should be shared with the instructor and classmates via Moodle by Friday at 12:00 (noon) with the expectation that fellow students provide peer feedback during the seminar. Students will also receive written feedback from the instructor. These papers will help students to formulate and consider potential research topics for their final paper.

Class will start each week with these students discussing their papers. All students should read the papers before class.

### 3.2 Problem Sets

Given the combination of a relatively short term (just 10 weeks) and the varied backgrounds of students enrolled in the course, there is little time to ensure an equal competence with the methods required for public opinion research. As such, there are three supplemental lectures available as slidecasts on Moodle that supply a basic introduction to methods of public opinion research: namely, (1) survey sampling, (2) quantitative analysis of survey data, and (3) experimental design and analysis. Students should view these lectures on their own time and may bring any questions to office hours.

In tandem with the online lectures, there are three problem sets for the course, which are designed to assess students' familiarity and competence with the basic (quantitative) methodological tools of public opinion research: experimental design and analysis, collection and analysis of original survey data, and the reanalysis of already collected survey (or survey-experimental) data. These problem sets are intended to prepare students for the methodological aspects of the exam.

Problem Set	Assigned	Due Date
Micro Analysis	Jan. 22	Jan. 26
Macro Analysis	Jan. 29	Feb. 2
Experimentation	Feb. 5	Feb. 9

In each problem set, students will answer a series of short prompts about methods of public opinion research and provide simple analyses (using the statistical software of their choice) using data provided by the instructor. This is useful primarily for gauging students' competence with these methods, which may be necessary for the exam, and for the instructor to possibly prepare additional instruction on these topics as needed.

## 4 Summative Assessment: Exam Paper

The exam for the course is an independent research paper of approximately 5,000 words that addresses an important political science question related to public opinion, political psychology, or political behaviour, offers a theoretical contribution toward understanding that question, and reports a planned empirical analysis to test that theory. The requirements for the empirical component are flexible and it can involve an original survey and/or experimental data collection, a pilot test of a proposed research design, qualitative data analysis (such as focus groups or semi-structured interviewing), the analysis of existing public opinion data, or a mix of these. Thus, while it is not expected that students conduct a large-scale study, they must conduct some novel data collection and/or analysis (even at a very small scale).

The exam is due **April 26, 2016 at 5pm**.

## 5 Course Outline

Class will meet at the following times and locations:

- Friday 15:00-17:00 (32L.G.02) in LT Weeks 1-9
- Monday 11:00-12:00 (OLD.3.24) in LT Weeks 10-11

The general schedule for the course is as follows. Details on the readings for each week are provided on the following pages.

- 
- 5.1 Week 1: Public Opinion and Democracy (Jan. 15)**
  - 5.2 Week 2: What are opinions? (Jan. 22)**
  - 5.3 Week 3: Measuring Opinions (Jan. 29)**
  - 5.4 Week 4: Opinion Dynamics and Change (Feb. 5)**
  - 5.5 Week 5: Opinion Responsiveness (Feb. 12)**
  - 5.6 Week 6: Reading Week (Feb. 19) - no class meeting**
  - 5.7 Week 7: Predispositions and Constraint (Feb. 26)**
  - 5.8 Week 8: Heuristics and Cognitive Biases (Mar. 4)**
  - 5.9 Week 9: Motivated Reasoning (Mar. 11)**
  - 5.10 Week 10/11: Political Identity (TBD)**
-

## 5.1 Week 1: Public Opinion and Democracy (Jan. 15)

- Chapters 7 (Available at: [https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e\\_course\\_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3\\_64769.pdf](https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e_course_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3_64769.pdf)) from Robert A. Dahl. *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1989.
- Chapters 3 (Available at: [https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e\\_course\\_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3\\_64770.pdf](https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e_course_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3_64770.pdf)) 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.
- James N. Druckman. Pathologies of studying public opinion, political communication, and democratic responsiveness. *Political Communication*, 31(3):467–492, August 2014.

*See Also:*

- 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.
- Lisa Disch. Toward a mobilization conception of democratic representation. *American Political Science Review*, 105(01):100–114, February 2011.
- 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 power. *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.
- 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.

## 5.2 Week 2: What are opinions? (Jan. 22)

- Chapter available at [https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e\\_course\\_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3\\_64771.pdf](https://library-2.lse.ac.uk/e-lib/e_course_packs/GV4J3/GV4J3_64771.pdf) 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.
- Chapter 3 (Available at <http://ebooks.cambridge.org.gate2.library.lse.ac.uk/ebook.jsf?bid=CB09780511818691>) from John Zaller. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1992.
- 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:*

- James N. Druckman and Arthur Lupia. Preference formation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3:1–24, 2000.
- Alice H. Eagly and Shelly Chaiken. The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25(5):582–602, 2007.
- 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 Social Psychology*, 3:136–314, 1969.
- Daniel Katz. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24(2):163, 1960.

### 5.3 Week 3: Measuring Opinions (Jan. 29)

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

*See Also:*

- 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.

## 5.4 Week 4: Opinion Dynamics and Change (Feb. 5)

- 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.

*See Also:*

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Richard Johnston and Henry E. Brady. The rolling cross-section design. *Electoral Studies*, 21(2):283–295, June 2002.
- 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.
- Wendy Wood. Attitude change: Persuasion and social influence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51:539–70, January 2000.
- 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.



## 5.5 Week 5: Opinion Responsiveness (Feb. 12)

- Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman. Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 101(4):637–655, November 2007.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo. The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19:123–205, 1986.

### *See Also:*

- Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1997.
- 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.
- Paul W. Holland. Statistics and causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960, 1986.
- 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 experimental 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.
- 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.

## **5.6 Week 6: Reading Week (Feb. 19) - 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 or even a relatively elaborated proposal for the exam paper. To obtain feedback on these ideas, students will be assigned to groups of 3-4 students. Groups will meet during Reading Week (at a time convenient for all involved) and provide peer feedback on these formulations. Written proposals should be distributed to group members in advance of the meetings via Moodle.

## 5.7 Week 7: Predispositions and Constraint (Feb. 26)

- 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.
- John R. Alford, Carolyn L. Funk, and John R. Hibbing. Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American Political Science Review*, 99(2):153–167, 2005.
- 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.
- Diana C. Mutz. Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):111–126, 2002.

*See Also:*

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

## 5.8 Week 8: Heuristics and Cognitive Biases (Mar. 4)

- 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.
- 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.
- Michael Bang Petersen, Rune Slothuus, Rune Stubager, and Lise Togeby. Deservingness versus values in public opinion on welfare: The automaticity of the deservingness heuristic. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(1):24–52, January 2011.
- 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.
- 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.

*See Also:*

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

## 5.9 Week 9: Motivated Reasoning (Mar. 11)

- 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.

*See Also:*

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

## 5.10 Week 10/11: Political Identity (TBD)

Some important notes:

- Due to scheduling conflicts, seminar meetings will be held in LT Weeks 10 and 11 on Monday from 11:00–12:00 in OLD.3.24
  - We will discuss the readings below during both weeks and have a concluding discussion at the end of class in Week 11
  - Student have the option of scheduling a one-on-one meeting with the instructor during Weeks 10 or 11 to discuss exam papers
- Steven Greene. Understanding party identification: A social identity approach. *Political Psychology*, 20(2):393–403, June 1999.
- Leonie Huddy. From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22(1):127–156, March 2001.
- Samara Klar. The influence of competing identities on political preferences. *Journal of Politics*, page In press, 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.

*See Also:*

- 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.