

**Voting Behavior**  
Elective MA course, Winter 2015  
4 CEU credits, 8 ECTS

Instructor: 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:** available time-slots can be booked via my webpages at [http://www.personal.ceu.hu/departs/personal/Gabor\\_Toka/](http://www.personal.ceu.hu/departs/personal/Gabor_Toka/) and <http://gabortoka.youcanbook.me/>

<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Course description .....	2
Lectures, seminars, demonstrations and exercises .....	2
Learning outcomes .....	2
Requirements .....	3
Readings .....	4
Topic 1: Introduction: the state of the art in voting behavior research .....	5
Topic 2: The rationality assumption and its alternatives. How formal models handle empirically intractable questions. Expressive vs. instrumental models and electoral participation as the classic example. The expressive motivation of citizen engagement, choices and turnout and its political impact .....	6
Topic 3: The “sociological” and “psychological” models of voting behavior as empirically-motivated alternatives to “rational” voter models.....	6
Topic 4: Reinterpreting the impact of partisanship, ideology and social group membership as cue-taking. Low information rationality, the Drunkard’s Search, schemata, shortcuts, and heuristics in citizen politics. Why are cues always double-edged swords? .....	7
Topic 5: Motivational and cognitive accounts of party identification. On-line vs. memory based information processing. Partisan projection effects as heuristics. Situations where information can change attitudes and where it really does not matter .....	8
Topic 6: The rationality assumption revisited on the example of electoral turnout. How electoral competition fails to provide for Downsian instrumental rationality among voters and yet produces enticements for emulating that behavior. Normatively undesirable outcomes and institutional reforms as possible remedy .....	9
Topic 7: Quasi-rational response-stimulus models of the electoral process: economic voting as a response to valence issues and political business cycles theories. How do political institutions enhance or constrain electoral accountability?.....	10
Topic 8: Cognitive and motivational limits to self-interested behavior in mass politics. Symbolic politics theory and foundations for pro-social behavior in the electoral arena.....	12
Topic 9: Do voters have positional policy preferences after all? How are they structured? Non-attitudes, response sets, attenuation effects, and belief systems. Issue publics and their relevance for preference aggregation in democracies .....	13
Topic 10: Controversies about issue voting and its measurement. Do elections give mandates to enact specific policies? Interpreting election outcomes, open-ended vs. closed-ended questions, and introspective responses. Path models, non-recursive specifications and omitted variable bias. Directional, salience and proximity models of relating personal issue preferences to the vote .....	14
Topic 11: How do voters relate information and policy preferences to vote choice? The impact of political sophistication, information costs, and uncertain party positions .....	15
Topic 12: Taking stock. The impact of public opinion and elections on governments and policy choices in democracies. Contradictory findings about responsiveness, accountability and the quality of electoral democracies. Further avenues for research.....	16

## **Course description**

Voting is central to the democratic process and to legitimating the office-holders and policies that it produces. Accordingly, it is the subject of an enormous literature that offers a uniquely rich and varied insight into theory and methods in contemporary political science. Political choice behavior does, at the same time, offer insights into human decision making, information aggregation problems, attitude formation and the impact of competition in general. This course mainly serves students with an interest in political communication and comparative politics; voting behavior and public opinion; empirical democratic theory and comparative political economy; and the methodology of quantitative research. It focuses on how citizens, with their limited resources and time available for engaging 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 and its use of scientific knowledge.

Specifically, the course examines various theories and the relevant evidence on how low-information rationality or blatant preference aggregation deficits are at work in citizens' voting behavior. 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 all 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, and what evidence contemporary scholarship offers on these questions. We will consider the difficult communication and cognitive processing problems that all political actors encounter in the political process, and highlight their relevance for democratic preference aggregation processes, while also giving some attention to 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***

Except in the first and last week of the semester, we will typically devote the second class of the week to an exercise, and will split the first between a seminar discussion about the readings and a lecture. Your contribution to exercises and seminar discussions will be graded (see below). The lecture slides and transcripts of the demonstrations will be available via the e-learning site of the course.

### ***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

### ***Requirements***

Your course grade will depend on your contributions to classroom discussions (task A, 25% of the grade) and in-class exercises (task B, 25% of the grade), as well as your score on two in-class tests that you can partially replace with a research paper (task C, 50% of the grade). Contributions to seminar discussions will be graded for showing in-depth, critical, but perceptive engagement with the assigned readings. It will be valued if you enable the class to spot both the potential errors and the normative, theoretical and practical implications of the readings with clear, respectful, well-argued but short contributions, without taking undue time for yourself and preventing others making a similar contribution (task A). We will also do a number of exercises during weeks 2-11 (task B). Sometimes this will take the form of a hands-on demonstration of a simple and short computer-assisted analysis which participants will then be asked to apply creatively on their own, and sometimes a competition between project teams in class in solving a practical task. It is expected that the first type of exercises will also be completed in class and everyone will submit via e-learning a short note on his or her individual solution to the task. Grading will merely focus on whether you completed the task and explained in written comments what you did and what comes out of the analysis, not on how brilliant the technical aspects – such as the statistical apparatus – of your solution were (which will presumably reflect what you did or did not learn in some other context before). Help will be provided in class to everyone as needed. These exercises are meant to serve not as a challenge but as an opportunity for everyone to successfully complete all of these hands-on exercises on their own and experience what it takes to do (even if just small bits of) the kind of analyses that we encounter in the readings. The second type of exercises, team projects, will ask you to do things like designing some aspects of the plan for an election campaign, or a questionnaire, or an experimental study. Every team member will contribute to the in-class presentation of the project and be graded separately for how thoughtfully and critically s/he utilized the ideas that we discussed or read about in the course or were otherwise covered via lectures. I will play chief judge, moderate the process and explain at the end who won that week and why. The ratio of type I exercises will largely depend on how much course participants desire to prioritize them over type II tasks.

Your task C will be to sit for two exams or submit a research essay. The tests will assess

your command of the methodological and theoretical issues covered by the readings. The first test (20% of the final grade) will come around week 9 and be short, closed-book, and focus on your command of some concepts that we learnt during the course. The second test (30% of the final grade) will be open-book and come in week 12. It will ask three essay questions that you will have to answer with a tight argument evaluating different positions in the scholarly literature. "Open-book" here means an exam where you can consult any resources (including files or printouts of your reading notes, course readings, etc.) except the internet and communicating with someone else in class. You will just have to quote your sources and provide an appropriate bibliographic reference every time you quote or paraphrase someone else.

Requirement C can also be satisfied by writing an original research paper on a topic of your choice. If you opt for paper writing, you will still take the first test but your grade on that will be overruled by your grade on the paper if the latter were better. You will need to get my approval for a paper topic before 15 February. The essay must be written in an academic journal format and present your own quantitative analysis of a question related to voting behavior or public opinion, rather than just summarize the relevant literature and your own findings (which you must do, nevertheless, and do so fairly and accurately). You are expected to assess the merits and drawbacks of alternative methods, theories, definitions, and interpretations. 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, 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 6,000 words (not counting tables and your list of references but including any notes adjoining the text). You will need to upload the final version of the paper to the e-learning site at least one week before the grades for the Winter semester are due. You will lose two percent of the points (i.e. the score you would get for the paper if you were on time with it) for every day of delay in submitting.

### ***Readings***

The readings are listed below by topics. Each topic save the first and the last will be covered in two classes (the very first class will be an introduction to the course and the very last an exam). All mandatory readings are marked with a # mark below. 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, Ebsco, or the e-learning site of the course.

One week of the semester will be devoted to each topic in the sequence shown below. 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 Helena Catt's *Voting Behaviour: A Radical Critique* (London, Leicester University Press, 1996), or, for a summary and extension of the same argument, 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 scholar level, then the following works will probably serve you well:

Bartels, Larry M. 2008. "The Study of Electoral Behavior." Extended version of a chapter forthcoming in Jan E. Leighley, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. Department of Politics, Princeton University. [Available from the working papers section of the author's webpage.]

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.

Evans, Jocelyn A.J. 2004. *Voters and Voting: An Introduction*. London: Sage.

Bittner, Amanda. 2011. *Platform or Personality? The Role of Party Leaders in Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leighley, Jan E., ed. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomassen, Jacques, ed. 2005. *The European Voter: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **Topic 1: Introduction: the state of the art in voting behavior research**

Readings:

# 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.

# Benjamin, Daniel J, and Jesse M Shapiro. 2009. "Thin-Slice Forecasts of Gubernatorial Elections." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91 (3): 523-536.

# Petrocik, John R. and Frederick T. Steeper. 2010. "The Politics Missed by Political Science." *The Forum*, Vol. 8 (3): Article 1. DOI: 10.2202/1540-8884.1384 Available at: <http://www.bepress.com/forum/vol8/iss3/art1>

Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gallego, Jorge, and Leonard Wantchekon. 2012. "Experiments on Clientelism and Vote-Buying." *Research in Experimental Economics* 15: 177-212.

**Topic 2: The rationality assumption and its alternatives. How formal models handle empirically intractable questions. Expressive vs. instrumental models and electoral participation as the classic example. The expressive motivation of citizen engagement, choices and turnout and its political impact**

Readings:

- # Brennan, Geoffrey, and James Buchanan. 1984. "Voter Choice and the Evaluation of Political Alternatives." *American Behavioral Scientist* 28 (2): 185-201.
- # Hamlin, Alan, and Colin Jennings. 2011. "Expressive Political Behaviour: Foundations, Scope and Implications." *British Journal of Political Science* 41 (3): 645-670.
- Brennan, Geoffrey, and Loren Lomasky. 1994. *Democracy and Decision: The Pure Theory of Electoral Preferences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Gary W. 1999. "Electoral Rules and the Calculus of Mobilization." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24: 387-420.
- 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.
- Brennan, Geoffrey, and Alan Hamlin. 1998. "Expressive Voting and Electoral Equilibrium." *Public Choice* 95: 149-75.
- Schuessler, Alexander A. 2000. *The Logic of Expressive Choice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**Topic 3: The “sociological” and “psychological” models of voting behavior as empirically-motivated alternatives to “rational” voter models**

Readings:

- # Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper, pp. 4-13, 296-300.
- # 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.
- 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.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1966. *Elections and the Political Order*. New York: John Wiley.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

**Topic 4: Reinterpreting the impact of partisanship, ideology and social group membership as cue-taking. Low information rationality, the Drunkard's Search, schemata, shortcuts, and heuristics in citizen politics. Why are cues always double-edged swords?**

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.
- # Sokhey, Anand Edward, and Scott D. McClurg. 2012. "Social Networks and Correct Voting." *Journal of Politics* 74 (3): 751-764.
- Ryan, John Barry. 2011. "Social Networks as a Shortcut to Correct Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4): 753-766.
- Armstrong, J. Scott, Kesten C. Green, Randall J. Jones, and Malcolm J. Wright. 2010. "Predicting Elections from Politicians' Faces." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 22 (4): 511-522.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2005. *Direct Democratic Choice: The Swiss Experience*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, Books.
- 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.
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. "Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases." *Science* 185: 1124-31.

**Topic 5: Motivational and cognitive accounts of party identification. On-line vs. memory based information processing. Partisan projection effects as heuristics. Situations where information can change attitudes and where it really does not matter**

Readings:

- # 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.
- # Mitchell, Dona-Gene. 2013. "In Search of Enduring Information Effects: Evidence from a Ten-week Panel Experiment." *Electoral Studies* 32 (1): 101-112.
- # Goldman, Seth K. 2012. "Effects of the 2008 Obama Presidential Campaign on White Racial Prejudice." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (4): 663-687.
- Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. 2013. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bafumi, Joseph, and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2009. "A New Partisan Voter." *The Journal of Politics* 71 (1): 1-24.
- Stokes, Donald E. 1966. "Some Dynamic Elements of Contests for the Presidency." *American Political Science Review* 60 (1): 19-28.
- 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.
- 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.
- Converse, Philip E. 1969. "Of Time and Partisan Stability." *Comparative Political Studies* 2: 139-71.



- Granberg, Donald, and Sören Holmberg. 1988. *The Political System Matters: Social Psychology and Voting Behavior in Sweden and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 38-59.
- Hatemi, Peter K., Carolyn L. Funk, Sarah E. Medland, Hermine M. Maes, Judy L. Silberg, Nicholas G. Martin, and Lindon J. Eaves. 2009. "Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Attitudes over a Life Time." *The Journal of Politics* 71 (03): 1141-1156.
- 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.
- Miller, Warren E., and Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 117-49.
- Niemi, Richard G., and M. Kent Jennings. 1991. "Issues and Inheritance in the Formation of Party Identification." *American Journal of Political Science* 35: 970-88.
- Redlawsk, David P. 2001. "You Must Remember This: A Test of the On-line Model of Voting." *Journal of Politics* 63: 29-58.
- 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.
- Taber, Charles, Damon Cann, and Simona Kucsova. 2009. "The Motivated Processing of Political Arguments." *Political Behavior* 31 (2): 137-155.
- 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 6: The rationality assumption revisited on the example of electoral turnout. How electoral competition fails to provide for Downsian instrumental rationality among voters and yet produces enticements for emulating that behavior. Normatively undesirable outcomes and institutional reforms as a remedy**

Readings:

Most of you will have read this article before but if not, then start with this:

- Lijphart, Arend. 1997. "Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma." *American Political Science Review* 91 (1): 1-14.
- # Cascio, Elizabeth U., and Ebonya Washington. 2014. "Valuing the Vote: The Redistribution of Voting Rights and State Funds following the Voting Rights Act of 1965." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129(1): 379-433. (This is a lengthy article with a very complex empirical analysis but you can get the gist of the argument and evidence if you read carefully pages 1-24 and the conclusions and just browse the rest.)
- # Hirczy, Wolfgang. 1995. "Explaining Near-Universal Turnout: The Case of Malta." *European Journal of Political Research* 27: 255-72.

- # Citrin, Jack, Eric Schickler, and John Sides. 2003. "What if Everyone Voted? Simulating the Impact of Increased Turnout in Senate Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (1): 75-90.
- Brennan, Jason. 2011. *The Ethics of Voting*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bernhagen, Patrick, and Michael Marsh. 2007. "The Partisan Effects of Low Turnout: Analyzing Vote Abstention as a Missing Data Problem." *Electoral Studies* 26 (3): 548-560.
- Griffin, John D., and Brian Newman. 2005. "Are Voters Better Represented?" *The Journal of Politics* 67 (4): 1206-1227.
- Miller, Grant. 2008. "Women's Suffrage, Political Responsiveness, and Child Survival in American History." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123 (3): 1287-1327.
- Birch, Sarah 2008. *Full Participation. A Comparative Study of Compulsory Voting*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Franklin, Mark N. 2003. *The Dynamics of Voter Turnout in Established Democracies Since 1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Revelli, Federico. 2013. "Tax Limits and Local Democracy." IEB Working Paper N. 2013/029. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2340420>.
- Blais, André. 2000. *To Vote or Not To Vote? The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Campbell, David E. 2006. *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89: 271-94.
- Cox, Gary W. 1999. "Electoral Rules and the Calculus of Mobilization." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24: 387-420.
- Mueller, Dennis C. 2003. *Public Choice III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303-32.
- Wall, Alan, *et al.* 2007. *Electoral Management Design: The International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: International IDEA.

**Topic 7: Quasi-rational response-stimulus models of the electoral process: economic voting as a response to valence issues and political business cycles theories. How do political institutions enhance or constrain electoral accountability?**

Readings:

- # Roberts, Andrew. 2008. "Hyperaccountability: Economic Voting in Central and Eastern Europe." *Electoral Studies* 27 (3): 533-546.
- # Saunders, Peter. 1995. "Privatization, Share Ownership and Voting." *British Journal of Political Science* 25 (1): 131-43.
- # 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.
- 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-

- Miller, Michael K. 2013. "For the Win! The Effect of Professional Sports Records on Mayoral Elections." *Social Science Quarterly* 94 (1): 59-78.
- Alesina, Alberto, Nouriel Roubini, and Gerald D. Cohen. 1997. *Political Cycles and the Macroeconomy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Burkovskaya, Anastasia. 2013. "Monetarniye politicheskiye biznes-tsikli: noviye demokratsii (Monetary Political Business Cycles: New Democracies)." *Quantile* (11): 75-90. Available at <http://quantile.ru/11/11-AB.pdf>. (In Russian.)
- 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.
- 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.
- Filippov, Mikhail G. 2002. "Russian Voting and the Initial Economic Shock of Hyperinflation." *Public Choice* 111 (1-2): 73-104.
- Harper, Marcus A. G. 2000. "Economic Voting in Postcommunist Eastern Europe." *Comparative Political Studies* 33: 1191-227.
- Hellwig, Timothy, and David Samuels. 2008. "Electoral Accountability and the Variety of Democratic Regimes." *British Journal of Political Science* 38 (1): 65-90.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Guy D. Whitten, eds. 2013. "Economics and Elections: Effects Deep and Wide." *Electoral Studies* 32 (3): 391-562.
- Nadeau, Richard, Richard G. Niemi and Antoine Yoshinaka. 2002. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context across Time and Nations." *Electoral Studies* 21: 403-23; and note [by the same authors] "Erratum: A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context across Time and Nations." *Electoral Studies* 21 (4): 540-2.
- 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.
- 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.)
- Sánchez-Cuenca, Ignacio. 2008. "How Can Governments Be Accountable If Voters Vote Ideologically?" In *Controlling Governments: Voters, Institutions, and Accountability* edited by José María Maravall and Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-81.
- Tucker, Joshua A. 2006. *Regional Economic Voting: Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, 1990-1999*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Topic 8: Cognitive and motivational limits to self-interested behavior in mass politics.  
Symbolic politics theory and foundations for pro-social behavior in the electoral arena**

Readings:

- # 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.
- # Feldman, Stanley, and Leonie Huddy. 2005. "Racial Resentment and White Opposition to Race-Conscious Programs: Principles or Prejudice?" *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (1): 168-183.
- # Glaser, James M. 2002. "White Voters, Black Schools: Structuring Racial Choices with a Checklist Ballot." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 35-46.
- Hutchings, Vincent L., and Ashley E. Jardina. 2009. "Experiments on Racial Priming in Political Campaigns." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12 (1): 397-402.
- Funk, Carolyn L. 2000. "The Dual Influence of Self-interest and Societal Interest in Public Opinion." *Political Research Quarterly* 53 (1): 37-62.
- Brennan, Geoffrey, and Loren Lomasky. 1994. *Democracy and Decision: The Pure Theory of Electoral Preferences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Andrea Louise. 2002. "Self-interest, Social Security, and the Distinctive Participation Patterns of Senior Citizens." *American Political Science Review* 96 (3): 565-574.
- Chong, Dennis. 2000. *Rational Lives: Norms and Values in Politics and Society*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Edelman, Murray J. (1964). 1985. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 22-43.
- Kinder, Donald R., and D. Roderick Kiewiet. 1981. "Sociotropic Politics: The American Case." *British Journal of Political Science* 11 (2): 129-61.
- Kramer, Gerald H. 1983. "The Ecological Fallacy Revisited: Aggregate versus Individual-Level Findings on Economics and Elections, and Sociotropic Voting." *American Political Science Review* 77: 92-111.
- Lewin, Leif. 1992. *Self-Interest and Public Interest in Western Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. ed. 1990. *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mueller, Dennis C. 2003. *Public Choice III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303-32.
- Sears, David O. 1993. "Symbolic Politics: A Socio-Psychological Theory." in *Explorations in Political Psychology*, ed. by Shanto Iyengar and William J. McGuire. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993, pp. 113-49.
- Sears, David O., and Carolyn L. Funk. 1991. "The Role of Self-Interest in Social and Political Attitudes." in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* Vol. 24, ed. by Mark P. Zanna. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp. 1-91.

**Topic 9: Do voters have positional policy preferences after all? How are they structured? Non-attitudes, response sets, attenuation effects, and belief systems. Issue publics 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*)
- # 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.
- # Kim, Young Mie. 2009. "Issue Publics in the New Information Environment: Selectivity, Domain Specificity, and Extremity." *Communication Research* 36 (2): 254-284.
- Alwin, Duane F., Ronald L. Cohen, and Theodore M. Newcomb. 1991. *Political Attitudes over the Life Span: The Bennington Women After Fifty Years*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder. 2008. "The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review* 102 (02): 215-232.
- Converse, Philip E. 2006. "Democratic Theory and Electoral Reality." *Critical Review: A Journal of Politics and Society* 18 (1): 297-329.
- 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.
- Fleishman, John A. 1988. "Attitude Organization in the General Public: Evidence for a Bidimensional Structure." *Social Forces* 67: 159-83.
- Hutchings, Vincent L. 2003. *Public Opinion and Democratic Accountability: How Citizens Learn about Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Oskamp, Stuart. 1991. *Attitudes and Opinions*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Edgeworth Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 134-53.
- 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.
- Alvarez, Michael J., and John Brehm. 2003. *Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and American Public Opinion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Andrews, Frank M. 1984. "Construct Validity and Error Components of Survey Measures: A Structural Modeling Approach." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48: 409-42.
- Piazza, Thomas, Paul M. Sniderman, and Phillip E. Tetlock. 1990. "Analysis of the Dynamics of Reasoning: A General-Purpose Computer-Assisted Methodology." in *Political Analysis Vol. 1*, ed. by James A. Stimson. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 99-119.
- Schwarz, Norbert, and Seymour Sudman eds. 1996. *Answering Questions: Methodology for*

*Determining Cognitive and Communicative Processes in Survey Research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- 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.
- Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. 2000. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

**Topic 10: Controversies about issue voting and its measurement. Do elections give mandates to enact specific policies? Interpreting election outcomes, open-ended vs. closed-ended questions, and introspective responses. Path models, non-recursive specifications and omitted variable bias. Directional, salience and proximity models of relating personal issue preferences to the vote**

Readings:

- # 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.
- # Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. van Houweling. 2008. "Candidate Positioning and Voter Choice." *American Political Science Review* 102 (3): 303-318.
- 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.
- Alvarez, R. Michael, Jonathan Nagler, and Jennifer R. Willette. 2000. "Measuring the Relative Impact of Issues and the Economy in Democratic Elections." *Electoral Studies* 19 (2-3): 237-53.
- 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.
- Harrop, Martin, and William L. Miller. 1987. *Elections and Voters: A Comparative Introduction*. London: Macmillan, pp. 130-62.
- Niemi, Richard G., and Herbert F. Weisberg. eds. 1993. *Classics in Voting Behavior*. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc, pp. 93-159.
- 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.
- Hershey, Marjorie Randon. 1992. "The Constructed Explanation: Interpreting Election Results in the 1984 Presidential Race." *The Journal of Politics* 54: 943-76.
- Kelley, Stanley, Jr. 1983. *Interpreting Elections*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 10-25, 43-71.
- 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
- Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. van Houweling. 2009. "The Electoral Implications of Candidate Ambiguity." *American Political Science Review* 103 (1): 59-82.
- Iversen, Torben. 1994. "Political Leadership and Representation in West European Democracies: A Test of Three Models of Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 38: 45-74.
- 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.
- Merrill, Samuel, III, and Bernard Grofman. 1999. *A Unified Theory of Voting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Western, Drew. 2007. *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation*. New York: PublicAffairs.

**Topic 11: How do voters relate information and policy preferences to vote choice? The impact of political sophistication, information costs, and uncertain party positions**

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. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (1): 194-230.
- 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](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rpande/papers/DoInformedVoters_Nov11.pdf).
- Fowler, Anthony, and Michele Margolis. 2014. "The Political Consequences of Uninformed Voters." *Electoral Studies* 34: 100-110.
- Singh, Shane P., and Jason Roy. 2014. "Political Knowledge, the Decision Calculus, and Proximity Voting." *Electoral Studies* 34: 89-99.
- Boudreau, Cheryl. 2009. "Making Citizens Smart: When Do Institutions Improve Unsophisticated Citizens' Decisions?" *Political Behavior* 31 (2): 287-306.
- 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.
- 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.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Caplan, Bryan. 2007. *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 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.
- Kuklinski, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2001. "Conceptual Foundations of Citizen Competence." *Political Behavior* 23 (3): 285-311.
- Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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
- 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.
- 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.
- Toka, Gabor. 2008. "Citizen Information, Election Outcomes and Good Governance." *Electoral Studies* 27 (1): 31-44.
- 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 12: Taking stock. The impact of public opinion and elections on governments and policy choices in democracies. Contradictory findings about responsiveness, accountability and the quality of electoral democracies. Further avenues for research**

Readings:

- # 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.
- # Keefer, Philip, and Razvan Vlaicu. 2008. "Democracy, Credibility, and Clientelism." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 24 (2): 371-406.



- # Brooks, Joel L. 1985. "Democratic Frustration in the Anglo-American Polities: A Quantification of Inconsistency between Mass Public Opinion and Public Policy." *Western Political Quarterly* 38 (2): 250-261.
- Roberts, Andrew. 2009. *The Quality of Democracy in Eastern Europe: Public Preferences and Policy Reforms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-48, 89-109.
- 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.
- Brace, Paul, Kellie Sims-Butler, Kevin Arceneaux, and Martin Johnson. 2002. "Public Opinion in the American States: New Perspectives Using National Survey Data." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 173-189.
- Brooks, Clem, and Jeff Manza. 2007. *Why Welfare States Persist: The Importance of Public Opinion in Democracies*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lenz, Gabriel S. 2012. *Follow the Leader? How Voters Respond to Politicians' Policies and Performance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilens, Martin. 2009. "Preference Gaps and Inequality in Representation." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 335-341.
- 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.
- Grossback, Lawrence J., David A.M. Peterson, and James A. Stimson. 2006. *Mandate Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Matusaka, John G. 2010. "Popular Control of Public Policy: A Quantitative Approach." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 5 (2): 133-167.
- Page, Benjamin I., and Jason Barabas. 2000. "Foreign Policy Gaps between Citizens and Leaders." *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (3): 339-364.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. 2000. *Elections As Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam, Susan Stokes, and Bernhard Manin, eds. 1999. *Democracy, Accountability and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soroka, Stuart N., and Christopher Wlezien. 2008. "On the Limits to Inequality in Representation." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (2): 319-327.
- Stimson, James A. 2004. *Tides of Consent: How Public Opinion Shapes American Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Thomassen, Jacques, and Hermann Schmitt. 1999. "Issue Congruence." In *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*, edited by Hermann Schmitt and Jacques Thomassen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 186-208.
- 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.