

Voting Behavior

Elective MA course, Winter 2020

4 CEU credits, 8 ECTS

Preliminary draft version: August 15, 2019

Instructor: Gábor Tóka

http://www.personal.ceu.hu/departs/personal/Gabor_Toka/

Department of Political Science

Central European University

Classes: time slots and venue as announced at <http://politicalscience.ceu.hu/course-schedules>

Office hours: appointments can be arranged via <http://gabortoka.youcanbook.me/>

Course description

Elections are central to the democratic process and to legitimating office-holders and policies in contemporary polities, increasingly even in political systems that are not truly democratic. This course examines how individual citizens use these opportunities to make an input in the political process. This topic is the subject of an enormous literature that offers a uniquely rich and varied insight into theory and methods in contemporary political science, and also touches upon more general questions regarding human decision making, information aggregation problems, attitude formation and the impact of competition on social outcomes in general. This course focuses mostly on issues relevant for political communication and comparative politics; voting behavior and public opinion; empirical democratic theory and comparative political economy; and the methodology of quantitative research. In particular, it queries how individual citizens, with their limited resources and motivation to engage with politics, perform their role as ultimate decision-makers in democratic politics. This angle gives us an interesting perspective on the entire democratic political process and allows us to inspect the content and empirical validity of its normative foundations. Hence, the course serves as an intermediate-level introduction to the study of political behavior, choice and attitude formation. It has a strongly interdisciplinary approach and always keeps an eye on actual political practice.

For the Winter 2020 semester, the course is going to be redesigned so that we can continuously link class discussions to issues and topics as they emerge in the American presidential election season. The reason is that these are probably the best documented and certainly the most talked about elections around the world today, and provide high-level but also very accessible analytical material about virtually all practical, normative, organizational, strategic and psychological questions that surround democratic elections today. Thus they provide us with an excellent opportunity to survey evidence about contemporary democratic innovations (in the US and elsewhere) that are meant to empower voters and enrich their choice experience. Above all, the course examines the preconditions and limits for low-information rationality and preference aggregation failures in the electoral arena. In other words, we will ask how social cleavages, economic conditions, ideology, political issues, party identification,

factual information, campaigns and various other factors impact on how voters decide, and what this implies for the quality of democracy and citizen influence on public policy. We will also explore how institutional contexts have an influence on whether elections hold policy-makers accountable to citizens and responsive to popular preferences. We will consider the difficult communication and cognitive processing problems that all political actors encounter, and highlight their relevance for democratic preference aggregation and the practical lessons that can be drawn for party strategists and political information campaigns. The course reviews a large variety of state-of-the-art empirical research and stresses the importance of first-hand experience in reading and critically discussing cutting edge research output instead of cherry-picking ideas from textbooks, essays, and popular science. Thus, it also pays attention to the philosophy, design and methods of contemporary quantitative and experimental analyses in social research and should improve your understanding of these.

Lectures, seminars, demonstrations, and exercises

Approximately one class will be devoted to each topic in the sequence shown below. Note that the list of topics is provisional and is subject to change until the release of the final syllabus in November 2019. The classes will mix exercises, student presentations, and conference-style discussion of the readings. Your contributions to the weekly classes will be graded (see below). If you do not do your homework, there will be no way to hide this in class. But if you do your part in the days before each class, then you can enjoy and develop your skills in intelligent, attentive, goal-oriented but none-is-left-behind and fun conversations that will help us dissect complex analyses, challenging intellectual problems, and uphill tasks for political campaigners.

Learning outcomes

- Familiarity with theories, concepts, empirical regularities and research strategies in voting behavior research
- Ability to conceive, elaborate and argue for campaign tools with reference to what scholarly analyses reveal about voting behavior and public opinion
- Reason analytically, apply abstract models to complex empirical situations and engage with different intellectual traditions, subfields, research designs and methodologies in the social sciences
- Improved ability to design high-quality academic or applied research in a rigorous and consistent manner
- Ability for effective oral presentation of scholarly thoughts, developing listening and discussion skills with initiative and autonomy in various professional contexts
- Improved understanding of the potential and limits of statistical analyses and experimental research especially with respect to the establishment of causality; improved appreciation of the potential of qualitative research and rigorous description

Course requirements and assessment

- Attendance and active class-room participation (15% of the final grade)
- Written responses to study questions (30% of the final grade)
- In-class presentations (10% of the final grade)
- Final paper (45% of the final grade)

Details:

The classes require active participation and careful preparation via reading the required materials and occasional online research. The meetings will typically be of the seminar-type, with multiple shorter presentations, followed and/or interrupted by Q&A and with discussion about the readings. Before the first class of each week, participants will submit their short individual responses to a few study questions related to the readings. A good response will show that you covered the assigned readings, can apply the concepts they use, and are able to engage critically with their central arguments. There will be no need to demonstrate that you remember technical details and trivia. The responses will be graded and we will discuss possible answers and their merits in class.

Contributions to seminar discussions will be graded for showing in-depth, critical, but perceptive engagement with the assigned readings and any other class material distributed several days before the class. It will be valued if you enable the class to spot errors of argumentation and the normative, theoretical and practical implications with clear, respectful, well-argued, but short contributions, without taking undue time for yourself and preventing others making a similar contribution. You will all do short individual presentations too based on independent library and online research into a relatively narrow topic, like how recent scholarly works and policy papers find about the methods, frequency and typical circumstances of vote buying. Presentations will be graded for how much they advance group knowledge with new, engagingly presented, well-structured, accurate, comprehensible and substantially relevant information on insightful theories, interesting empirics, and practically relevant ideas about how to do things (like research or political campaigns).

Your final task will be to submit a research essay by 7 April. You will need to get my approval for the topic and outline of the paper before 20 February, and are strongly encouraged to bring preliminary drafts or short presentations of various sections to consultations during office hours throughout the semester. The paper can do any one of three things. First, it can provide a highly structured, thoughtful and comprehensive overview of the state of the art in the scholarly literature regarding some aspects of elections and voting. Such reviews should be based on a clear, precise and defensible identification of the key questions and methodological challenges in the given field, and a highly synthesized, accurate, candid and critical summary of the main findings on the given issue, their theoretical implications, and the most important questions that remain unresolved. I.e., an annotated bibliography summarizing paper after paper with some ad hoc and unstructured commentary will not do. Second, your essay could be a case study of a recent regulatory reform concerning the conduct of elections and/or campaigns. Such papers must clearly identify the novelty of their contribution, its theoretical relevance, and how the new insight was generated. Use primary sources to establish accurately and authoritatively the facts of the story, the chronology of events, the outcome, and the stated goals and likely motivation of the key actors involved. Discuss the plausibility of various possible explanations (covering self-interested, norm-regarding as well as other-regarding explanations) for the deliberate choices of the various actors and what may have been just unintended consequences that they could not avoid. Collect as comprehensive evidence as possible about the effect of the reform and assess it methodically. Third, your essay can present your own qualitative, quantitative or experimental analysis of a question related to voting behavior or public opinion.

Such analyses must focus on a clearly identified and arguably pressing gap in human knowledge, present a convincing way of generating a novel insight into it, and present the analysis in a properly documented, argued and transparent way.

In either case, the topic of the paper may overlap with any other paper that you write in other courses or contexts, but its content must not. The essay has to assess the merits and drawbacks of alternative arguments, methods, theories, definitions, and interpretations as it suits the topic. There must be a clear and circumspect reasoning about why one (if any) of the arguments, methods, etc. is better than some others encountered in the literature. Concepts must be clearly defined and empirical assertions carefully documented. A reference must be formally cited any time the ideas, research findings, or data of someone else is mentioned or otherwise utilized. A list of references has to be provided at the end of the paper, and this, of course, must list no more and no less than every work actually referred to in the paper. The whole paper has to be no more than 5,000 words (excluding tables and your list of references but including any notes adjoining the text) and follow an academic journal format throughout. You will need to upload the final version of the paper to the e-learning site of the course. Two percent of the points on the paper will be deducted for every day of delay in submitting it. Plagiarism will be hunted down by all means and sanctioned the harshest way allowed by relevant CEU policies.

Absence from class is accepted within the limits of usual departmental policies, but earn you zero points on the exercises/discussion components of the class you missed. You can compensate for this by submitting a 1000-word position paper discussing what ideas for the design of election campaigns or the ideal design of democratic elections can be extracted from the mandatory readings of the week, how the articles support the importance of the idea (device) in question, and what may be missing from the necessary evidence that you would like to have before you design a campaign/election following the useful ideas that you extract from the readings. Position papers will be graded for relevance and coherence of argumentation; precision, conciseness and comprehensiveness in interpreting the readings; and fairness and reasonable skepticism towards the achievements and shortcomings of research.

PROVISIONAL LIST OF TOPICS FOR THE 2019/2020 ACADEMIC YEAR

1. Timing: rules and conventions about the calling of elections and their political impact
2. Canvassing: the nuts and bolts of get-out-the-vote campaigns and how they transform political parties
3. Advertising: How to go about it if you were a candidate and what to demand, anticipate, and infer if you were a voter?
4. Televised debates: impact, practices, actors, rules, and normative issues
5. Public opinion polls in election campaigns: function, variety, impact, quality, aggregation, and problems of (self-)regulation in small and big markets
6. Candidate traits: what citizens watch out for and what they punish?
7. Exploiting fiscal illusions: how, when, and with what impact? Is there anything that can prevent deceit?
8. Redistributive policies, constituency service, pork-barrel, and clientelism: conceptual distinction, legality, and impact mechanisms?
9. Voters who go with the flow: motivation for flock behavior, herding, cue-taking, and who is helped by structural bias in the influence of social environment?

10. Can money advantage and media monopoly be defeated in elections?
11. How can you make voters care about remote issues like climate change and why do they seem so indifferent?
12. Vote buying: conceptual differences from pork and barrel, policy impact, administration, possible remedies, and the cost/benefit calculus of electoral gains
13. When can scandals and corruption cost you votes and how they influence citizens' political behavior when they do not impact votes directly?
14. What can candidates achieve by emotional appeals and is there any problem there that we should be concerned about? Can ethnic and racial prejudice be combatted during or outside of election campaigns?
15. Terrorist threats, emergencies and the rally-around-the-flag effects in politics
16. Strategies and opportunities for persuading and moving voters
17. Why do voters not follow their self-interest? Would it be better if they did?
18. In what sense are voters (not) rational at all? What public benefits and public bads may follow from this and how they can be maximized and minimized?
19. Can we reliably model how better informed citizens would vote?
20. Would election results be any different in a fully informed electorate?
21. Did the Median Voter Theorem ever suggest that elections are good for anything?
22. What does the empirical evidence cumulated in 70 years tell us about the validity of the Median Voter Theorem?

Reading lists: as pointed out above, the list of topics – and hence readings – in the course is currently undergoing a major revision. For a taster of what you may expect, please refer to the extract from the 2018/2019 version of the course syllabus below. A final list of topics and a corresponding reading list will be released in November 2019. Note, however, that the reading lists may keep changing throughout the Winter semester as the course evolves. Mandatory readings will always be limited in length to the equivalent of 40-60 pages with a conventional layout for scholarly works plus illustrations and appendices a week, and made available at least a week in advance so that you can engage with them in depth. Updated versions of the syllabus will be made available through the e-learning site of the course.

General readings

In the CEU library, you find most books related to our topics at shelf reference numbers 324, 303, and 302. The articles appearing among the recommended readings are nearly all available from the CEU library in hard copy and/or electronic form through JSTOR or Ebsco. The reading list may change even the week before a given class (but not after), so you'd better check it on the e-learning site of the course before you start preparing for a class.

Note that the course will not cover all existing perspectives on electoral research but focuses on the international mainstream. For a critical opinion on this you can check out for, e.g., Patrick Dunleavy's "Political Behavior: Institutional and Experimental Approaches", in *A New Handbook in Political Science*, ed. by Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 276-93). For an introduction to the basic technical terms and statistical concepts used in survey research see pp. 202-12 of David Broughton's *Public Opinion Polling and Politics in Britain* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995) and pp. 1-26 of

David Denver's *Elections and Voting Behaviour in Britain* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 2nd ed. 1994). For some healthy skepticism regarding how much a course like this can tell you about how to win elections, consult Petrocik, John R., and Frederick T. Steeper. 2010. "The Politics Missed by Political Science." *The Forum* 8 (3): Article 1. If you look for concise overviews of electoral research and related issues at the graduate student level instead, then the following works will probably serve you well:

- Arzheimer, Kai, and Jocelyn Evans, eds. 2008. *Electoral Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Bartels, Larry M., and Christopher H. Achen. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blais, André, Jean-François Laslier, and Karine van der Straeten, eds. 2016. *Voting Experiments*. New York: Springer.
- Borgida, Eugene, Christopher M. Federico, and John L. Sullivan, eds. 2009. *The Political Psychology of Democratic Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J., and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, eds. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eijk, Cees van der, and Mark Franklin. 2009. *Elections and Voters*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erikson, Robert S., and Christopher Wlezien. 2012. *The Timeline of Presidential Elections: How Campaigns Do (and Do Not) Matter*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leighley, Jan E., ed. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2018. *Why Bother With Elections?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sides, John, and Lynn Vavreck. 2013. *The Gamble: Choice and Chance in the 2012 Presidential Election*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thomassen, Jacques, ed. 2005. *The European Voter: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LIST OF TOPICS AND READINGS FOR THE 2018/2019 ACADEMIC YEAR

Mandatory readings are marked with #.

Topic 1. Introduction to the course. The role of elections in the political system. Possible problems with electoral systems, party systems, competition, information environments, and citizens. Normative benchmarks that we can use to evaluate election outcomes

Readings:

- # Achen, Christopher, and Larry Bartels. 2016. "Democracy for Realists: Holding Up a Mirror to the Electorate." *Juncture* 22 (4): 269-275.
- # Haushofer, Johannes, and Ernst Fehr. 2014. "On the Psychology of Poverty." *Science* 344 (6186): 862-867.
- # Moscrop, David. 2015. "You're Not the Voter You Think You Are." *MacLean's.ca*, 8 September 2015. URL: <http://www.macleans.ca/politics/ottawa/youre-not-the-voter-you-think-you-are>. Accessed on 16 November 2015.
- # Holmberg, Sören, Bo Rothstein, and Naghmeh Nasiritousi. 2009. "Quality of Government: What You Get." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12 (1): 135-161.
- Ackerman, Bruce, and James Fishkin. 2004. *Deliberation Day*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Szwarcberg, Mariela. 2015. *Mobilizing Poor Voters: Machine Politics, Clientelism, and Social Networks in Argentina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2015. *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina: Politics, Poverty, and Social Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutherland, Stuart. (1992) 2007. *Irrationality*. London: Pinter & Martin.
- Hagopian, Frances. 2009. "Parties and Voters in Emerging Democracies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Riker, William H. 1982. *Liberalism against Populism: A Confrontation between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Esaiasson, Peter, and Hanne Marthe Narud, eds. 2013. *Between-Election Democracy: The Representative Relationship after Election Day*. London: ECPR Press.
- Griffin, John D., and Brian Newman. 2005. "Are Voters Better Represented?" *The Journal of Politics* 67 (4): 1206-1227.
- Dryzek, John S., and Christian List. 2002. "Social Choice Theory and Deliberative Democracy: A Reconciliation." *British Journal of Political Science* 33 (1): 1-28.

Topic 2: Modeling the electoral process from candidate emergence to policy outcomes. The rationality assumption and its alternatives in the study of political behavior. How formal models handle empirically intractable questions. Formal models of majority rule and the median voter theorem. Expressive vs. instrumental models and electoral participation as the classic example. The political impact of the expressive motivation of citizen engagement, choices and turnout and the implications for representative democracy

You must peruse the first two chapters of the Hinich-Munger textbook (see below; it really is a very easy text and much shorter than it seems from the page numbers!) before you sit down to read the mandatory readings of this week. If the ideas are familiar, then just browse it extremely quickly; otherwise read it carefully as it will be essential for understanding what we discuss in class. Hinich, Melvin J., and Michael C. Munger. 1997. *Analytical Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-48.

Readings:

- # Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper, pp. 4-13, 296-300.
- # Congleton, Roger. 2003. "The Median Voter Model." In *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice*, edited by Charles K. Rowley and Friedrich Schneider. Kluwer Academic Press, pp. 707-712. URL: <http://rdc1.net/forthcoming/medianvt.pdf>, accessed on 21 January 2016.
- # Brennan, Geoffrey, and James Buchanan. 1984. "Voter Choice and the Evaluation of Political Alternatives." *American Behavioral Scientist* 28 (2): 185-201.
- Brennan, Geoffrey, and Alan Hamlin. 1998. "Expressive Voting and Electoral Equilibrium." *Public Choice* 95: 149-75.
- Brennan, Geoffrey, and Loren Lomasky. 1994. *Democracy and Decision: The Pure Theory of Electoral Preferences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christmann, Anna. 2013. "Anti-minority Votes and Judicial Review." *Acta Politica* 48 (4): 429-458.
- Coleman, Stephen. 2013. *How Voters Feel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Gary W. 1999. "Electoral Rules and the Calculus of Mobilization." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24: 387-420.
- Hamlin, Alan, and Colin Jennings. 2011. "Expressive Political Behaviour: Foundations, Scope and Implications." *British Journal of Political Science* 41 (3): 645-670.
- Huddy, Leonie, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aarøe. 2015. "Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity." *American Political Science Review* 109 (1): 1-17.
- Nyhan, Brendan, and Jason Reifler. 2018. "The Roles of Information Deficits and Identity Threat in the Prevalence of Misperceptions." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*: FirstView.
- Tóka, Gábor. 2009. "Expressive Versus Instrumental Motivation of Turnout, Partisanship, and Political Learning." In *The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems*, edited by Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 269-288.
- Zoonen, Liesbet van. 2004. "Imagining the Fan Democracy." *European Journal of Communication* 19 (1): 39-52.

Topic 3: The “sociological” (or Columbia) model of voting behavior as the first empirically-motivated alternative to “rational” voter models. The earliest empirical studies of voting behavior and Berelson’s non-spatial low information rationality model. Interpersonal influence and group membership as the archetypical cue-providers. Cross-national and temporal variation in the association between large social groups and party alternatives in established democracies. The hierarchy, universality, inertia, decline, and effect of cleavages in Stein Rokkan’s work. The freezing hypothesis and the evidence

Readings:

- # Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet (1944). 1948. *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*, 2nd ed. New York-London: Columbia University Press, pp. VII-XXV, 74-5, 80-1, 87-99, 150-8.
- # Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Public Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 14-7, 72-5, 88-9, 108-15, 305-23.
- # Franklin, Mark N. 2009. "Epilogue (November 2008): Cleavage Politics in the 21st Century." In *Electoral Change: Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*, edited by Mark N. Franklin, Thomas T. Mackie, Henry Valen and *et al.* London: ECPR Press.
- Bartolini, Stefano, and Peter Mair. 1990. *Identity, Competition, and Electoral Availability: The Stabilisation of the European Electorates 1885-1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartolini, Stefano. 2000. *The Political Mobilisation of the European Left, 1860-1980: The Class Cleavage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellucci, Paolo, and Oliver Heath. 2012. "The Structure of Party-Organization Linkages and the Electoral Strength of Cleavages in Italy, 1963–2008." *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (1): 107-135.
- Cutler, Fred. 2002. "The Simplest Shortcut of All: Sociodemographic Characteristics and Electoral Choice." *The Journal of Politics* 64 (2): 466-490.
- Dalton, Russell J. 1996. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, 2nd ed. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, pp. 165-95.
- De La O, Ana L., and Jonathan A. Rodden. 2008. "Does Religion Distract the Poor? Income and Issue Voting Around the World." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (4-5): 437-476.
- Denver, David. 1994. *Elections and Voting Behaviour in Britain*, 2nd ed. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 60-78.
- Enyedi, Zsolt. 2005. "The Role of Agency in Cleavage Formation." *European Journal for Political Research* 44 (5): 697–720.
- Evans, Geoffrey, and Nan Dirk de Graaf, eds. 2013. *Political Choice Matters: Explaining the Strength of Class and Religious Cleavages in Cross-national Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, Stephen D., Anthony F. Heath, David Sanders, and Maria Sobolewska. 2015. "Candidate Ethnicity and Vote Choice in Britain." *British Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 883-905.
- Gunther, Richard, Hans-Jürgen Puhle, and José Ramón Montero, eds. 2007. *Democracy*,

- Intermediation, and Voting on Four Continents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1995. *Citizens, Politics, and Social Communication: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 2015. "How Do Campaigns Matter?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 31-47.
- Knutsen, Oddbjorn, and Elinor Scarbrough. 1995. "Cleavage Politics." In *The Impact of Values*, edited by Jan van Deth and Elinor Scarbrough. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 492-523.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1979. "Religious vs. Linguistic vs. Class Voting: The "Crucial Experiment" of Comparing Belgium, Canada, South Africa, and Switzerland." *American Political Science Review* 73 (2): 442-458.
- Lipset, Seymour M., and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments. Introduction." in *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*, ed. by Seymour M. Lipset and Stein Rokkan. New York: The Free Press, pp. 1-64.
- Mair, Peter. 2001. "The Freezing Hypothesis: An Evaluation." In *Party Systems and Voter Alignments Revisited*, edited by Lauri Karvonen and Stein Kuhnle. London: Routledge, pp. 27-44.
- Rovny, Jan. 2015. "Party Competition Structure in Eastern Europe: Aggregate Uniformity versus Idiosyncratic Diversity?" *East European Politics & Societies* 29 (1): 40-60.
- Ryan, John Barry. 2011. "Social Networks as a Shortcut to Correct Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4): 753-766.
- Samuels, David, and Cesar Zucco. 2015. "Crafting Mass Partisanship at the Grass Roots." *British Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 755-775.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 20-34.
- Sokhey, Anand Edward, and Scott D. McClurg. 2012. "Social Networks and Correct Voting." *Journal of Politics* 74 (3): 751-764.
- Tóka, Gábor, and Tania Gosselin. 2010. "Persistent Political Divides, Electoral Volatility and Citizen Involvement: The Freezing Hypotheses in the 2004 European Election." *West European Politics* 33 (3): 608-633.

Topic 4: The (socio-)psychological (a.k.a. Michigan or party identification) model of voting behavior. Motivational and cognitive accounts of partisanship. On-line vs. memory based information processing. Motivated reasoning and partisan projection effects as heuristics. Relationship to expressive rationality. Situations where information can change attitudes and where it really does not matter

Readings:

- # Conroy-Krutz, Jeffrey, Devra C. Moehler, and Rosario Aguilar. 2016. "Partisan Cues and Vote Choice in New Multiparty Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 49 (1): 3-35.
- # Herman, Lise Esther. 2017. "Democratic Partisanship: From Theoretical Ideal to Empirical Standard." *American Political Science Review* 111 (4): 738-754.
- Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. 2013. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Converse, Philip E. 1969. "Of Time and Partisan Stability." *Comparative Political Studies* 2: 139-71.
- Druckman, James N., and Arthur Lupia. 2016. "Preference Change in Competitive Political Environments." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19 (1): 13-31.
- Duch, Raymond M., and Randolph T. Stevenson. 2011. "Context and Economic Expectations: When Do Voters Get it Right?" *British Journal of Political Science* 41 (1): 1-31.
- Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, and Ebonya Washington. 2010. "Party Affiliation, Partisanship, and Political Beliefs: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 104 (4): 720-744.
- Goldman, Seth K. 2012. "Effects of the 2008 Obama Presidential Campaign on White Racial Prejudice." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (4): 663-687.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia, and Jingbo Meng. 2009. "Looking the Other Way: Selective Exposure to Attitude-Consistent and Counterattitudinal Political Information." *Communication Research* 36 (3): 426-448.
- Kroh, Martin, and Peter Selb. 2009. "Inheritance and the Dynamics of Party Identification." *Political Behavior* 31 (4): 559-574.
- Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. 1995. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *American Political Science Review* 89: 309-26.
- Miller, Warren E., and Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 117-49.
- Mitchell, Dona-Gene. 2013. "In Search of Enduring Information Effects: Evidence from a Ten-week Panel Experiment." *Electoral Studies* 32 (1): 101-112.
- Nyhan, Brendan John Carey, Benjamin Valentino, and Mingnan Liu. 2016. "An Inflated View of the Facts? How Preferences and Predispositions Shape Conspiracy Beliefs about the Deflategate Scandal." *Research & Politics* (July-September).
- Redlawsk, David P. 2001. "You Must Remember This: A Test of the On-line Model of Voting." *Journal of Politics* 63: 29-58.
- Rekker, Roderik, Loes Keijsers, Susan Branje, and Wim Meeus. 2017. "The Dynamics of

- Political Identity and Issue Attitudes in Adolescence and Early Adulthood." *Electoral Studies* 46 (April): 101-111.
- Schmitt, Hermann, and Sören Holmberg. 1995. "Political Parties in Decline?" in *Citizens and the State*, ed. by Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Dieter Fuchs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 95-133.
- Weisberg, Herbert F., and Steven H. Greene. 2003. "The Political Psychology of Party Identification." in *Electoral Democracy*, ed. by Michael B. MacKuen and George Rabinowitz. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 83-124.

Topic 5: Modern generalizations of low information rationality (or satisficing) models. Schemata, shortcuts, and heuristics in citizen politics. Why are cues always double-edged swords? Is there a place for liberal nudge-paternalism in elections?

Readings:

- # Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88 (1): 63-76.
- # Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 951-71.
- # Todorov, Alexander, Anesu N. Mandisodza, Amir Goren, and Crystal C. Hall. 2005. "Inference of Competence from Faces Predict Election Outcomes." *Science* 308: 1623-1626.
- Baum, Matthew A., and Angela S. Jamison. 2006. "The Oprah Effect: How Soft News Helps Inattentive Citizens Vote Consistently." *The Journal of Politics* 68 (4): 946-959.
- Bos, Linda, Wouter van der Brug, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2013. "An Experimental Test of the Impact of Style and Rhetoric on the Perception of Right-wing Populist and Mainstream Party Leaders." *Acta Politica* 48 (2): 192-208.
- Boudreau, Cheryl, and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2010. "The Blind Leading the Blind: Who Gets Polling Information and Does it Improve Decisions?" *The Journal of Politics* 72 (2): 513-527
- Boudreau, Cheryl. 2009. "Closing the Gap: When Do Cues Eliminate Differences between Sophisticated and Unsophisticated Citizens?" *The Journal of Politics* 71 (3): 964-976.
- Dahlberg, Stefan, and Eelco Harteveld. 2016. "Left-right Ideology as an Inferential Device in Multiparty Systems: Can Citizens Overcome Low Information by Imputing Parties' Policy Positions?" *Electoral Studies* 42: 175-187.
- Dewan, Torun, Macartan Humphreys, and Daniel Rubenson. 2014. "The Elements of Political Persuasion: Content, Charisma and Cue." *The Economic Journal* 124 (574): F257-F292.
- Garthwaite, Craig, and Timothy J. Moore. 2013. "Can Celebrity Endorsements Affect Political Outcomes? Evidence from the 2008 US Democratic Presidential Primary." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 29 (2): 355-384.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, and Dieter Fuchs. 1989. "The Left-Right Schema." in *Continuities in Political Action*, ed. M. Kent Jennings and Jan W. van Deth. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 203-34.
- Kroh, Martin. 2009. "The Ease of Ideological Voting." In *The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems*, edited by Hans-Dieter Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 220-236.
- Lupia, Arthur, and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma. Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCubbins, Mathew D., and Daniel B. Rodriguez. 2006. "When Does Deliberating Improve Decision Making?" *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 15 (1): 9-50.
- Popkin, Samuel L. 2006. "The Factual Basis of "Belief Systems": A Reassessment." *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society* 18 (1): 233-254.

- Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody, and Phillip E. Tetlock. 1993. *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 18-27, 117-35.
- Stoker, Gerry, Colin Hay, and Matthew Barr. 2016. "Fast Thinking: Implications for Democratic Politics." *European Journal of Political Research* 55 (1): 3-21
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. "Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases." *Science* 185: 1124-31.

Topic 6: Do voters have positional policy preferences after all? How are they structured? Are they self-interested, other-regarding, or what? Non-attitudes, response sets, attenuation effects, and belief systems. Issue publics, framing, and their relevance for preference aggregation in democracies

Readings:

- # Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." in *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. by David Apter. New York: Free Press, pp. 206-61. Reprinted in *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society* 18 (1): 1-74. (Only two sections are mandatory readings, which are pp. 44-52 of the 2006 reprint in *Critical Review*)
- # Sears, David O., and Carl P. Hensler, and Leslie K. Speer. 1979. "Whites' Opposition to 'Busing': Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics?" *American Political Science Review* 73 (2): 369-84.
- # Glaser, James M. 2002. "White Voters, Black Schools: Structuring Racial Choices with a Checklist Ballot." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 35-46.
- Andrews, Frank M. 1984. "Construct Validity and Error Components of Survey Measures: A Structural Modeling Approach." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48: 409-42.
- Edelman, Murray J. (1964). 1985. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 22-43.
- Feldman, Stanley. 1990. "Measuring Issue Preferences: The Problem of Response Stability." in *Political Analysis Vol. 1*, ed. by James A. Stimson. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 25-60.
- Funk, Carolyn L. 2000. "The Dual Influence of Self-interest and Societal Interest in Public Opinion." *Political Research Quarterly* 53 (1): 37-62.
- Hatemi, Peter K., and Rose McDermott. 2016. "Give Me Attitudes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19 (1): 331-350.
- Kim, Young Mie. 2009. "Issue Publics in the New Information Environment: Selectivity, Domain Specificity, and Extremity." *Communication Research* 36 (2): 254-284.
- Kinder, Donald R., and D. Roderick Kiewiet. 1981. "Sociotropic Politics: The American Case." *British Journal of Political Science* 11 (2): 129-61.
- Lewin, Leif. 1992. *Self-Interest and Public Interest in Western Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lupia, Arthur. 2016. *Uninformed: Why People Seem to Know So Little about Politics and What We Can Do about It*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 132-48.
- Mueller, Dennis C. 2003. *Public Choice III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303-32.
- Oskamp, Stuart. 1991. *Attitudes and Opinions*, 2nd ed. Edgeworth Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 134-53.
- Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in American's Policy Preferences*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-37.
- Sher, Shlomi, and Craig R. M. McKenzie. 2014. "Options as Information: Rational Reversals of Evaluation and Preference." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 143 (3): 1127-1143.

- Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody, and James H. Kuklinski. 1993. "The Principle-Policy Puzzle: The Paradox of American Racial Attitudes." in Paul M. Sniderman, Richard A. Brody, and Phillip E. Tetlock, *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 58-69.
- Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of Survey Response: Answering Questions vs. Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 579-616.

Topic 7: Issues and candidate issue positions as determinants of election outcomes. Open-ended questions and introspective responses versus recursive and non-recursive path models as tools of measuring issue voting. Controversies about the normative desirability of issue voting and vote advice applications

Readings:

- # Stokes, Donald E. 1966. "Some Dynamic Elements of Contests for the Presidency." *American Political Science Review* 60 (1): 19-28.
- # Blais, André, Mathieu Turgeon, Elisabeth Gidengil, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau. 2004. "Which Matters Most? Comparing the Impact of Issues and the Economy in American, British and Canadian Elections." *British Journal of Political Science* 34 (3): 555-63.
- # De Vries, Catherine E., and Hector Solaz. 2017. "The Electoral Consequences of Corruption." *Annual Review of Political Science* 20 (1): 391-408.
- # Blais, André, Elisabeth Gidengil, Patrick Fournier, Neil Nevitte, Joanna Everitt, and Jiyoung Kim. 2010. "Political Judgments, Perceptions of Facts, and Partisan Effects." *Electoral Studies* 29 (1): 1-12.
- # Sievert, Jacqueline M., Michael K. McDonald, Charles J. Fagan, and Niall Michelsen. 2016. "Yes, But Did They Learn Anything? An Experimental Investigation of Voter Decision Making on Foreign Policy Issues." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49 (4): 880-884.
- Hershey, Marjorie Randon. 1992. "The Constructed Explanation: Interpreting Election Results in the 1984 Presidential Race." *The Journal of Politics* 54: 943-76.
- Kirzinger, Ashley, Elise Sugarman, and Mollyann Brodie. 2016. "Kaiser Health Tracking Poll: October 2016." Available from <http://kff.org/health-costs/poll-finding/kaiser-health-tracking-poll-october-2016/> accessed on 7 November 2016.
- Adams, James, Lawrence Ezrow, and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. 2011. "Is Anybody Listening? Evidence That Voters Do Not Respond to European Parties' Policy Statements During Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (2): 370-382.
- Anker, Hans. 1992. *Normal Vote Analysis*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, pp. 1-19.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 44-63.
- De Sio, Lorenzo, and Till Weber. 2014. "Issue Yield: A Model of Party Strategy in Multidimensional Space." *American Political Science Review* 108 (4): 870-885
- Garzia, Diego. 2010. "The Effects of VAAs on Users' Voting Behaviour: An Overview." In *Voting Advice Applications in Europe: The State of the Art*, edited by Lorella Cedroni and Diego Garzia. Napoli: Scripta, pp. 13-34.
- Heath, Anthony, John Curtice, Roger Jowell, Geoffrey Evans, Julia Field, and Sharon Witherspoon. 1991. *Understanding Political Change: The British Voter 1964-1987*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 32-51.
- Kelley, Stanley, Jr. 1983. *Interpreting Elections*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 10-25, 43-71.
- Kitschelt, Herbert, Zdenka Mansfeldova, Radoslaw Markowski, and Gábor Tóka. 1999. *Post-Communist Party Systems: Competition, Representation, and Inter-Party Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niemi, Richard G., and Herbert F. Weisberg. eds. 1993. *Classics in Voting Behavior*.

- Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc, pp. 93-159.
- Shamir, Michal, Jacob Shamir, and Tamir Sheafer. 2008. "The Political Communication of Mandate Elections." *Political Communication* 25 (1): 47-66.
- Tavits, Margit. 2008. "Policy Positions, Issue Importance, and Party Competition in New Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (1): 48-72.

Topic 8: Directional, salience, discounting and proximity models of relating personal issue preferences to the vote

Readings:

- # Iversen, Torben. 1994. "Political Leadership and Representation in West European Democracies: A Test of Three Models of Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (1): 45-74.
- # Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. van Houweling. 2008. "Candidate Positioning and Voter Choice." *American Political Science Review* 102 (3): 303-318.
- Adams, James F., Samuel III Merrill, and Bernard Grofman. 2005. *A Unified Theory of Party Competition: A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Budge, Ian, and Dennis Farlie. 1983. "Party Competition - Selective Emphasis or Direct Confrontation? An Alternative View with Data." in *Western European Party Systems: Continuity and Change*, ed. by Hans Daalder and Peter Mair. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 267-305.
- Budge, Ian, and Dennis J. Farlie. 1983. *Explaining and Predicting Elections: Issue Effects and Party Strategies in Twenty-three Democracies*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kedar, Orit. 2009. *Voting for Policy, Not Parties: How Voters Compensate for Power Sharing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macdonald, Stuart Elaine, George Rabinowitz, and Ola Listhaug. 1998. "On Attempting to Rehabilitate the Proximity Model: Sometimes the Patient Just Can't Be Helped." *The Journal of Politics* 60 (3): 653-690.
- Macdonald, Stuart Elaine, George Rabinowitz, and Ola Listhaug. 2001. "Sophistry versus Science: On Further Efforts to Rehabilitate the Proximity Model." *The Journal of Politics* 63 (2): 482-500.
- Merrill, Samuel, III, and Bernard Grofman. 1999. *A Unified Theory of Voting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Therriault, Andrew. 2015. "Whose Issue Is It Anyway? A New Look at the Meaning and Measurement of Issue Ownership." *British Journal of Political Science* 45 (04): 929-938.
- Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. van Houweling. 2009. "The Electoral Implications of Candidate Ambiguity." *American Political Science Review* 103 (1): 59-82.
- Walgrave, Stefaan, Jonas Lefevere, and Anke Tresch. 2012. "The Associative Dimension of Issue Ownership." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (4): 771-782.
- Weber, Till. 2015. "Synergy in Spatial Models of Voting: How Critical Cases Show that Proximity, Direction and Discounting are Friends, not Foes." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 25 (4): 504-529.

- Western, Drew. 2007. *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Westholm, Anders. 1997. "Distance versus Direction: The Illusory Defeat of Proximity Theory." *American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 865-885.
- Westholm, Anders. 2001. "On the Return of Epicycles: Some Crossroads in Spatial Modeling Revisited." *The Journal of Politics* 63 (2): 436-481.

Topic 9: Are better-informed voters better voters?

Readings:

- # Pande, Rohini. 2011. "Can Informed Voters Enforce Better Governance? Experiments in Low-Income Democracies." *Annual Review of Economics* 3 (1): 215-237. URL: <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rpande/papers/caninformedvotersenforcebettergovernance.pdf>
- # Bartels, Larry M. 2005. "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (1): 15-31.
- # Lupia, Arthur, Adam Seth Levine, Jesse O. Menning, and Gisela Sin. 2007. "Were Bush Tax Cut Supporters 'Simply Ignorant'? A Second Look at Conservatives and Liberals in 'Homer Gets a Tax Cut'." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (4): 773-784.
- # Bartels, Larry M. 2007. "Homer Gets a Warm Hug: A Note on Ignorance and Extenuation." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (4): 785-790.
- # Lupia, Arthur. 2016. *Uninformed: Why People Seem to Know So Little about Politics and What We Can Do about It*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 105-131.
- Adserà, Alicia, Carles Boix, and Mark Payne. 2003. "Are You Being Served? Political Accountability and Quality of Government." *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 19: 445-90.
- Barabas, Jason, William Pollock, and Joseph Wachtel. 2011. "Informed Consent: Roll-Call Knowledge, the Mass Media, and Political Representation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Seattle, WA, 1-4 September 2011.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., Selvan Kumar, Rohini Pande, and Felix Su. 2011. "Do Informed Voters Make Better Choices? Experimental Evidence from Urban India." Manuscript. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. Available at http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rpande/papers/DoInformedVoters_Nov11.pdf.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boudreau, Cheryl. 2009. "Making Citizens Smart: When Do Institutions Improve Unsophisticated Citizens' Decisions?" *Political Behavior* 31 (2): 287-306.
- Caplan, Bryan. 2007. *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fujiwara, Thomas, and Leonard Wantchekon. 2013. "Can Informed Public Deliberation Overcome Clientelism? Experimental Evidence from Benin." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5 (4): 241-255.
- Craig R.M. McKenzie, and Michael J. Liersch. 2011. "Misunderstanding Savings Growth: Implications for Retirement Savings Behavior." *Journal of Marketing Research* 48 (SPL): S1-S13.
- Toka, Gabor. 2008. "Citizen Information, Election Outcomes and Good Governance." *Electoral Studies* 27 (1): 31-44.
- Goren, Paul. 2013. *On Voter Competence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Topic 10: How do voters relate information and policy preferences to vote choice? The impact of risk aversion, time horizon, political sophistication, information costs, and uncertain party positions

Readings:

- # Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (1): 194-230.
- # Blais, André, and Anja Kilibarda. 2016. "Correct Voting and Post-Election Regret." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49 (4): 761-765.
- Althaus, Scott L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvarez, R. Michael. 1997. *Information and Elections*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Andersen, Robert, Anthony Heath, and James Tilley. 2005. "Political Knowledge and Enlightened Preferences: Party Choice through the Electoral Cycle." *British Journal of Political Science* 35 (2): 285-302.
- Arnold, Jason Ross. 2012. "The Electoral Consequences of Voter Ignorance." *Electoral Studies* 31 (4): 796-815.
- Fishkin, James. 1995. *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*. Expanded ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fishkin, James S., and Robert C. Luskin. 1999. "Bringing Deliberation to the Democratic Dialogue." in *The Poll with a Human Face: The National Issues Convention Experiment in Political Communication*, ed. by Maxwell E. McCombs and Amy Reynolds. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 3-38.
- Fowler, Anthony, and Michele Margolis. 2014. "The Political Consequences of Uninformed Voters." *Electoral Studies* 34: 100-110.
- Kuklinski, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2001. "Conceptual Foundations of Citizen Competence." *Political Behavior* 23 (3): 285-311.
- Lau, Richard R., David J. Andersen, and David P. Redlawsk. 2008. "An Exploration of Correct Voting in Recent U.S. Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 395-411.
- Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupia, Arthur. 2016. *Uninformed: Why People Seem to Know So Little about Politics and What We Can Do about It*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 218-39.
- Luskin, Robert C. 2003. "The Heavenly Public: What Would a Fully Informed Citizenry Be Like?" in *Electoral Democracy*, ed. by Michael B. MacKuen and George Rabinowitz. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 238-61.
- Singh, Shane P., and Jason Roy. 2014. "Political Knowledge, the Decision Calculus, and Proximity Voting." *Electoral Studies* 34: 89-99.
- Tóka, Gábor. 2003, 2004. "Can Voters Be Equal? [Parts 1-2.]" *The Review of Sociology* 9 (2): 51-72, and 10 (1): 47-65.
- Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Topic 11: How do political institutions enhance or constrain electoral accountability? Do they promote economic underachievement in the process? Incumbency- and policy-oriented economic voting and political business cycles

Readings:

- # Healy, Andrew, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2014. "Substituting the End for the Whole: Why Voters Respond Primarily to the Election-Year Economy." *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (1): 31-47.
- # Hernández, Enrique, and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2016. "The Electoral Consequences of the Financial and Economic Crisis in Europe." *European Journal of Political Research* 55 (2): 203-224.
- # Roberts, Andrew. 2008. "Hyperaccountability: Economic Voting in Central and Eastern Europe." *Electoral Studies* 27 (3): 533-546.
- Alt, James E., and Shanna S. Rose. 2009. "Context-Conditional Political Budget Cycles." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Bermeo, Nancy, and Larry Bartels, eds. 2014. *Mass Politics in Tough Times: Opinions, Votes, and Protest in the Great Recession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bouvet, Florence, and Sharmila King. 2016. "Income inequality and election outcomes in OECD countries: New evidence following the Great Recession of 2008–2009." *Electoral Studies* 41: 70-79.
- Brug, Wouter van der, Cees van der Eijk, and Mark Franklin. 2007. *The Economy and the Vote. Economic Conditions and Elections in Fifteen Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Kadt, Daniel, and Evan S. Lieberman. 2015. "Do citizens reward good service? Voter responses to basic service provision in southern Africa." Working Paper No. 161, Afrobarometer. URL: http://afrobarometer.org/publications?field_publication_type_tid=7 accessed on 5 December 2015.
- Duch, Raymond M., and Randolph T. Stevenson. 2008. *The Economic Vote: How Political Institutions and Economic Institutions Condition Election Results*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Geoffrey, and Robert Andersen. 2006. "The Political Conditioning of Economic Perceptions." *The Journal of Politics* 68 (1): 194-207.
- Funke, Manuel, Moritz Schularick, and Christoph Trebesch. 2016. "Going to Extremes: Politics after Financial Crises, 1870–2014." *European Economic Review* 88 (September): 227-260.
- Hellwig, Timothy, and David Samuels. 2008. "Electoral Accountability and the Variety of Democratic Regimes." *British Journal of Political Science* 38 (1): 65-90.
- Miller, Michael K. 2013. "For the Win! The Effect of Professional Sports Records on Mayoral Elections." *Social Science Quarterly* 94 (1): 59-78.
- Nannestad, Peter, and Martin Paldam. 1994. "The VP-Function: A Survey of the Literature on Vote and Popularity Functions after 25 Years." *Public Choice* 79: 213-45.
- Paldam, Martin. 1991. "How Robust Is the Vote Function? A Study of Seventeen Nations over Four Decades." in *Economics and Politics: the Calculus of Support*, ed. by Helmut

- Norpoth, Michael S. Lewis-Beck, and Jean Dominique Lafay. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 9-32.
- Paler, Laura. 2013. "Keeping the Public Purse: An Experiment in Windfalls, Taxes, and the Incentives to Restrain Government." *American Political Science Review* 107 (4): 706-725.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr., and Guy D. Whitten. 1993. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 391-414. (See also Whitten, Guy D., and Harvey D. Palmer. 1999. "Cross-National Analyses of Economic Voting." *Electoral Studies* 18: 49-67.)
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2017. "State of the Field: Party Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Perspectives on the European and Latin American Economic Crises." *European Journal of Political Research* 56 (2): 218-233.
- Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A., and Margit Tavits. 2016. *Clarity of Responsibility, Accountability, and Corruption*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Xezonakis, Georgios, Spyros Kosmidis, and Stefan Dahlberg. 2016. "Can Electors Combat Corruption? Institutional Arrangements and Citizen Behaviour." *European Journal of Political Research* 55 (1): 160-176.

Topic 12: The impact of public opinion and elections on governments and policy choices in democracies. Contradictory findings about responsiveness, policy representation, and the quality of electoral democracies

Readings:

- # Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2015. "From Mass Preferences to Policy." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 147-165.
- # Keefer, Philip. 2007. "Clientelism, Credibility, and the Policy Choices of Young Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (4): 804-821.
- # Cole, Shawn, Andrew Healy, and Eric Werker. 2012. "Do Voters Demand Responsive Governments? Evidence from Indian Disaster Relief." *Journal of Development Economics* 97 (2): 167-181.
- Besley, Timothy, and Robin Burgess. 2002. "The Political Economy of Government Responsiveness: Theory and Evidence from India." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117 (4): 1415-1451.
- Brooks, Clem, and Jeff Manza. 2007. *Why Welfare States Persist: The Importance of Public Opinion in Democracies*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Charron, Nicholas, and Andreas Bågenholm. 2016. "Ideology, Party Systems and Corruption Voting in European Democracies." *Electoral Studies* 41: 35-49.
- Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Erikson, Robert S. 2015. "Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 11-29.
- Gilens, Martin. 2009. "Preference Gaps and Inequality in Representation." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 335-341.
- Glaeser, Edward L., and Andrei Shleifer. 2005. "The Curley Effect: The Economics of Shaping the Electorate." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 21 (1): 1-19.
- Gray, Virginia, David Lowery, Matthew Fellowes, and Andrea McAtee. 2004. "Public Opinion, Public Policy, and Organized Interests in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 57 (3): 411-420.
- Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2005. "Abandoning the Middle: The Bush Tax Cuts and the Limits of Democratic Control." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (1): 33-53.
- Keefer, Philip, and Razvan Vlaicu. 2008. "Democracy, Credibility, and Clientelism." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 24 (2): 371-406.
- Lenz, Gabriel S. 2012. *Follow the Leader? How Voters Respond to Politicians' Policies and Performance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lupia, Arthur, Yanna Krupnikov, Adam Seth Levine, Spencer Piston, and Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar. 2010. "Why State Constitutions Differ in their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage." *The Journal of Politics* 72 (4): 1222-1235.
- Matsusaka, John G. 2010. "Popular Control of Public Policy: A Quantitative Approach." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 5 (2): 133-167.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Roberts, Andrew. 2009. *The Quality of Democracy in Eastern Europe: Public Preferences and*

- Policy Reforms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-48, 89-109.
- Roberts, Andrew. 2018. "Millionaires and the Public in Czech Politics." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34 (6): 353-366.
- Saiegh, Sebastián M. 2015. "Using Joint Scaling Methods to Study Ideology and Representation: Evidence from Latin America." *Political Analysis* 23 (3): 363-384.
- Stimson, James A. 2004. *Tides of Consent: How Public Opinion Shapes American Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wessels, Bernhard. 1999. "System Characteristics Matter: Empirical Evidence from Ten Representation Studies." In *Policy Representation in Western Democracies*, edited by Warren Miller, Roy Pierce, Jacques Thomassen, Richard Herrera, Sören Holmberg, Peter Esaiasson and Bernhard Wessels. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 137-161.