

New Perspectives on Political Behavior

This course is designed to introduce and investigate scholarship on the forefront of political behavior research. The goal of the course is for researchers to gain insight into new methods and areas of inquiry in political behavior research and to be able to use these insights for research design.

The course is structured around two themes, both broadly defined:

1. Political behavior as a function of individual psychology.
2. Political behavior as a function of the environment.

The course is divided into seven modules (see below) exploring aspects of these themes. Each module will be explored using a combination of lecture, discussion, and the building of research designs.

Readings by Topic

Readings have been selected with a heavy emphasis on *very* recent research – much of which has not yet been published. This comes with advantages, for example it allows us to engage with work that is truly on the cutting edge and also to learn by evaluating work that may not be a finished product. However, it also obviously comes with the disadvantage of the impetus falling on us to evaluate the quality of the research.

Below is a list of readings to be covered in the course. Readings should be completed before the module is covered. Working papers will be provided.

1. Political Cognition
 - (a) Milton Lodge and Charles S Taber. *The rationalizing voter*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
 - (b) Michael Bang Petersen and Lene Aarøe. Politics in the mind's eye: Imagination as a link between social and political cognition. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2), 2013.
2. Understanding biased political decision-making
 - (a) Gregory Huber, Seth J Hill, and Gabriel S Lenz. Sources of bias in retrospective decision-making: Experimental evidence on voters' limitations in controlling incumbents. *American Political Science Review*, 106(4):720–41, 2012.
 - (b) Kevin Arceneaux. Cognitive biases and the strength of political arguments. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(2):271–285, 2012.

- (c) Toby Bolsen, James N Druckman, and Fay Lomax Cook. The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, pages 1–28, 2013.
 - (d) Daniel M. Butler. Discounting disagreement: Experimental evidence on how legislators’ rationalizations contribute to polarization. 2013. Working Paper: Yale University.
3. Behavior as a function of biology
- (a) John R Hibbing, Kevin B Smith, and John R Alford. *Predisposed: Liberals, Conservatives, and the Biology of Political Differences*. Routledge, 2013.
 - (b) Peter K Hatemi, Rose McDermott, Lindon J Eaves, Kenneth S Kendler, and Michael C Neale. Fear as a disposition and an emotional state: A genetic and environmental approach to out-group political preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2013.
 - (c) Peter K Hatemi. The influence of major life events on economic attitudes in a world of gene-environment interplay. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2013.
 - (d) Evan Charney and William English. Genopolitics and the science of genetics. *American Political Science Review*, pages 1–14, 2013.
 - (e) Larry Bartels. Your genes influence your political views. so what? Accessed: 2014-01-02.
[Available:]<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2013/11/12/your-genes-influence-your-political-views-so-what/>
 - (f) John Hibbing. Why biology belongs in the study of politics. Accessed: 2014-01-02.
[Available:]<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2013/11/27/why-biology-belongs-in-the-study-of-politics/>
4. Behavior as a function of identity
- (a) Michael M. Bechtel, Jens Hainmueller, and Yotam M. Margalit. Preferences for international redistribution: The divide over the eurozone bailouts. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2014.
 - (b) Andrew Healy and Neil Malhotra. Childhood socialization and political attitudes: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Politics*, 75(4):1–34, 2013.
 - (c) Michele Margolis. Don’t lose control: How partisanship and the political landscape shape religious behaviors. 2013. Working Paper: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 - (d) Gregory Huber and Neil Malhotra. Dimensions of political homophily: Isolating choice homophily along political characteristics. 2013. Working Paper: Yale University.
5. What is context and can the effects of context be identified?
- (a) Eitan Hersh and Clayton Nall. A direct-observation approach to identify small-area variation in political behavior: The case of income, partisanship, and geography. 2013. Working paper, Yale University.
 - (b) Ryan D. Enos. What tearing down public housing projects teaches us

- about the effect of racial threat on political participation. 2013. Working Paper, Harvard University.
- (c) Ryan D. Enos. The causal effect of intergroup contact on exclusionary attitudes. 2013. Working Paper: Harvard University.
 - (d) Cara Wong, Jake Bowers, Tarah Williams, and Katherine Drake. Bringing the person back in: Boundaries, perceptions, and the measurement of racial context. *Journal of Politics*, 1(1):1–18, 2012.
 - (e) Clayton Nall and Jonathan Mummolo. Why partisans don't sort: How neighborhood quality concerns limit americans' pursuit of like-minded neighbors. 2013. Working Paper: Stanford University.
6. Behavior as a function of context
- (a) Ryan D. Enos and Noam Gidron. Intergroup behavioral strategies as contextually determined: Experimental evidence from israel. 2014. Working Paper: Harvard University.
 - (b) Clayton Nall. The political consequences of spatial policies: How interstate highways caused geographic polarization. 2013. Working Paper, Stanford University.
 - (c) Avidit Acharya, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. The political legacy of american slavery. 2013. Working Paper: University of Rochester.
 - (d) Daniel J. Hopkins. All politics is national. 2013. Working Paper: Georgetown University.
 - (e) Daniel J. Hopkins. Misplaced: The limits of contextual influence on americans' political attitudes. 2013. Working Paper: Georgetown University.
7. The effects of Scientifically Elusive Phenomenon (studying phenomenon we can neither ask about, nor manipulate)
- (a) Ryan D. Enos and Anthony Fowler. Pivotality and turnout: Evidence from a field experiment in the aftermath of a tied election. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 2014.
 - (b) Eitan D Hersh. Long-term effect of september 11 on the political behavior of victims families and neighbors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(52):20959–20963, 2013.
 - (c) Ariel White. Immigration enforcement and voter behavior: Effects of the secure communities program. 2013. Working Paper: Harvard University.
 - (d) Seth Stephens-Davidowitz. The effects of racial animus on a black presidential candidate: Using google search data to find what surveys miss. 2013. Working Paper, Harvard University.
 - (e) Ryan D. Enos and Anthony Fowler. Aggregate effects of large-scale gotv campaigns: Evidence from 400 million voter contacts. 2014. Working Paper: Harvard University.