POLI 632: Voting Behaviour and Public Opinion

Department of Political Science
McGill University
Winter 2026

Instructor:	Mark Williamson	**Time**:	Wednesdays 2:35 to 5:25pm
Email:	mark.williamson@mcgill.ca	**Place:**	LEA 424

Course Description: How do voters choose which political parties and politicians to support? What is the role of public opinion in a democracy? How can we accurately measure peoples' political beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours? This course explores how the mass public thinks about and engages in politics, with a focus on recent developments in the study of political behaviour. Through seminar discussions, we will learn about cutting edge research on ideology, partisanship, polarization, social identities, information processing, and policy feedback. Readings will draw on studies from Canada, the United States, and other advanced democracies. Students will gain exposure to key tools of political behaviour research – including surveys, experiments, and research designs for causal inference – and have the opportunity to apply them to their own areas of interest.

Learning Objectives: By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Understand major theories of political behaviour and how they can be tested empirically
- Identify how public opinion shapes and is shaped by policymaking and the political context
- Critically consume public opinion data and academic research
- Develop their own designs to answer research questions
- Apply core scholarly skills of engaging with existing literature, providing feedback to peers, and conducting and presenting research

Land Acknowledgment: McGill University is on land which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst Indigenous peoples, including the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabeg nations. We acknowledge and thank the diverse Indigenous people whose footsteps have marked this territory on which peoples of the world now gather.

Acknowledging the history of this land is a sign of respect toward its original peoples, but also a call to action for all those who benefit from the land today. I encourage you to learn more about the Indigenous history of Tiohtià:ke/Montreal and reflect on how you can use what you learn in this course to promote improved relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Course Organization

Class Meetings: We will meet every Wednesday from 2:35 to 5:25pm in Leacock 424. See below for expectations of seminar attendance.

Drop-in Hours: The instructor holds drop-in hours to discuss course material and assignments on Mondays 2:40-5:00pm, either virtually via Zoom (link) or in-person at 3610 McTavish rm. 26-4. Please sign up for a meeting time using the link here. Drop-in hours will be subject to change, but the times listed at that link will be kept updated.

Course Website: There is a course website on MyCourses. There is no assigned textbook. All important documents (syllabus, readings, etc.) will be posted there. It is your responsibility to regularly check the page for updates. Course assignments will also be submitted there.

Evaluation

There are several skills that are essential to participating actively in a scholarly research community. This course aims to provide you with opportunities to practice each of these skills, organized under the following categories:

Engaging with the literature

In-class participation: 15%

Providing and receiving feedback

Discussant presentation: 10% (Due: Assigned throughout term)
Pre-print peer review: 10% (Due: February 10)
POLI 632 outline peer review: 10% (Due: March 10)

Conducting and presenting research (Final Project)

- Outline: 10% (Due: February 24)
- Conference-style presentation: 10% (Due: April 8)
- Full report: 35% (Due: April 13)

For all assignments, use a standard 12-point font, double-spacing, and 1 inch margins. The assignment descriptions below set out page limits; the instructor will not read any content beyond these limits.

In-Class Participation: As this is a seminar course with no lecturing, your active participation is essential. You are expected to attend each class having completed the required readings and to be ready to engage thoughtfully with the material. Participation involves not only speaking but also actively listening, asking questions, and contributing to a collaborative learning environment. Some weeks, we will do a "tour of the table" and you will be expected to provide your thoughts on the readings for discussion by the class.

You will be graded based on your participation and engagement in seminar discussions. Around Week 7, I will share a 'preview' of your participation grade; this is not your

final grade, which may end up being higher or lower. If you have concerns about your participation grade, please speak to the instructor.

If you are sick, please do not come to class. You are permitted one absence throughout the term, no questions asked. For this one-time absence, you do not need to notify me. Any absence beyond this will affect your participation grade. Please get in touch with the instructor if you have to miss more than one session due to illness. Alternatively, if you attend every class, your lowest participation grade will automatically be dropped.

To participate effectively, students must prepare before class to discuss the readings. The following questions may be helpful to guide your reading:

1. What are the central points or arguments being made in the reading?

2. What kind of evidence has the author(s) used to support their argument, and how did they develop or gather it?

3. If applicable: What are the dependent and independent variables? How were they measured?

4. How does the week's reading relate to other course material and themes?

5. How do you evaluate the author's arguments? In what respects are you persuaded, and in what respects are you not?

6. What are the implications of this research for how we think about politics?

7. How could we improve and build upon this research in future studies?

Discussant presentation: At most major academic conferences, a "discussant" provides oral feedback and commentary on a paper or group of papers. Being a good discussant is an important and underappreciated skill. For each week in the term, one student will practice this skill by providing comments on **three** of the assigned readings (your choice of which papers). In class on January 7, we will assign students to each week. Your presentation should last no more than 10 minutes. Given this constraint, do not summarize the papers! Or at least keep any summary extremely minimal. In POLI 632, everyone in the room already read the papers and, in real conferences, everyone just watched a 15 minute presentation on them. Instead, focus your discussion on highlighting key themes across the papers, assessing strengths and weaknesses, offering constructive ideas for improvement, and discussing implications for the literature and/or society at large. See here, here, and here for helpful advice on how to do this well. You may not use slides for your presentation. You will be graded on the quality of your discussion and your synthesis of the papers.

Pre-print peer review: The publication process can be slow, with journal articles sometimes coming out years after they were first drafted. Therefore, if you only keep up with recent research by subscribing to journals' email alerts for new publications (which I nonetheless suggest you do!), you will be behind the "cutting edge" of current research. Alternatively, you can attend conferences and departmental seminars where new research is being presented and seek out "pre-print" manuscripts shared by authors online.

For this assignment, you will find and review an **unpublished** paper on a topic of your choice, although it (i) must relate to voting behaviour and/or public opinion, broadly construed; and (ii) have been posted online in the last three years. These kinds of manuscripts can be found on SSRN, OSF/SocArXiv, NBER, APSA pre-prints, and

social media (John Holbein shares a lot of new work). You may also find working papers on the academic websites of authors you already know. Make sure you confirm the paper is unpublished, since authors often also post pre-prints online after acceptance.

After finding a paper that interests you, you will write a 2-3 page formal peer review as if a journal asked you to be a referee for a submission. You will evaluate the paper with an eye to assessing its strengths, weaknesses, and contribution to the literature. See here and here for advice on how to do this well. You will be graded on the quality of your comments. An example peer review will be provided on MyCourses.

Outline peer review: A major problem with academic peer review is that it often comes too late. Authors may have already collected data and lack resources to go back in the field to implement changes suggested by peer reviewers. For this reason, there is an increasing emphasis on submitting pre-analysis plans for feedback from peers *before* research is conducted. For this assignment, you will practice offering this kind of feedback to one of your fellow POLI 632 colleagues. You will be assigned by the instructor to read another student's final project outline (see below) and write a two-page memo highlighting the strengths of the proposal, potential challenges and pitfalls, and, most importantly, ways that the project could be improved going forward. Your goal is to understand the author's goal with the research and help them move toward it constructively. You will be graded by the instructor on the quality of the comments you provide.

Final Project: Students have two options for their final project: either (i) draft a pre-analysis plan for a research design that could be used to answer a question in the study of political behaviour and public opinion; or (ii) analyze existing data to answer such a research question. The specific requirements for each item differ slightly; a full assignment description will be posted to MyCourses. Students interested in option (ii) should have experience in data analysis, either through POLI 618, 666, 667 or advanced undergraduate coursework. Do not think of option (i) as less useful to your graduate research career: these pre-analysis plans can be used to apply for grants or advance your thesis. Students are strongly encouraged to consult with the instructor about their project idea during weekly drop-in hours.

Final Project Outline: Regardless of which option you choose for the final project, you must submit a two-page outline that clearly lays out the following:

- Research Question: What do you want to learn? Why is this important?
- Theory and Hypotheses: What do you expect to find? Why?
- Variables: How will you measure the main concepts of interest in your study?
- Empirical Design: How will you collect the data? Does your study involve an experiment? How will you use the data you collect to answer your research question?

Conference-style presentation: An essential skill for any academic (or anybody working in research) is the ability to concisely and effectively communicate your work to others through oral presentations. In the last class of the term, you will practice this skill by giving a 10 minute talk on your final project (the exact time will depend on class enrolment). There is a standard format for these kinds of presentations that is not always clear to early career scholars. In general, you will want to discuss the following: the motivation for the project, the research question, the theory and hypotheses, the empirical strategy,

the (proposed) analysis, the findings (if available), and concluding thoughts. Deviating too much from this framework is likely to confuse audiences. See here, here and here for advice on how to do conference presentations well. You will be graded on the clarity and conciseness of your talk.

Course Policies

Language of Submission: In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded. Conformément à la Charte des droits de l'étudiant de l'Université McGill, chaque étudiant a le droit de soumettre en français ou en anglais tout travail écrit devant être noté.

Academic Integrity: McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures" (see McGill's guide to academic honesty for more information).

Late policy: All assignments are due at 11:59pm on MyCourses on the dates specified above. 5 percentage points per day will be deducted for all late assignments, including on weekends, for up to a total of 25 points (5 days). Late assignments will not be accepted after five days and will instead be assigned a grade of zero. If you face extraordinary circumstances and require an extension, please contact the instructor (appropriate documentation is required). The late policy does not apply to the discussant presentation or peer review assignments, which must be submitted before class. Please note that "K" grades (i.e. extensions beyond the term) will not be granted for this class.

Generative AI: Students may use generative AI programs as a tool to support their learning in this class. This technology should not be used to write passages of written or oral assignments, generate complete ideas, produce critiques of the readings, or serve as an authoritative source of factual information. Students are expected to complete the readings themselves and be the first and primary source for the ideas and presentation of those ideas in all evaluation components (participation, peer reviews, final project, etc.). That being said, AI is permitted and may be helpful for the following tasks: lightly editing written work (e.g. phrasing, word choice); probing the logic of students' own arguments and ideas; understanding difficult passages or interpreting statistical analyses in the readings; and identifying initial citations that students can use to find other relevant work (note: AI can generate fake citations; always cross-reference with Google Scholar or similar databases). Students may not under any circumstances upload any other students' written work to any generative AI program. The instructor will not use AI detection software to vet student work, but violations of the above policies will be treated as an infringement of the university's standards for academic integrity and subject to applicable disciplinary procedures. Finally, students are encouraged to consider the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of AI use before deciding on whether and how to use this technology.

Communication: Please check your McGill email and MyCourses regularly for course updates. When emailing the instructor, please use your McGill email account and include

POLI 632 in your subject line. I will do my best to respond within 48 hours – please do not expect instant replies to emails, especially in the evening or over the weekend. Please email for logistical issues or clarification. For more substantive issues, please see me during drop-in hours.

Decorum: Students are expected to arrive to class on time and behave in a manner that is respectful to the professors and to fellow students. Opinions held by other students should be respected; harassment, derogatory comments, personal attacks on others, or interrupting the class will not be tolerated. Please avoid the use of cell phones and electronics for non-class related purposes.

Accommodation: Students experiencing an extraordinary personal situation, or a temporary illness may request additional assistance and support in order to meet certain academic obligations. The Student Accessibility and Achievement Office is available to meet with students to discuss ways to provide some flexibility in the program and to accommodate particular circumstances. Students must be prepared to provide supporting documentation when seeking considerations. Students who wish to request academic accommodation must do so before the last day of the term as specified in the University Calendar.

Students who register with Student Accessibility and Achievement have the same personal rights and responsibilities and academic rights and responsibilities as all McGill students. For more information, please consult the McGill Student Rights and Responsibilities web page and the Policy Concerning the Rights of Students with Disabilities.

Students who, because of religious commitments, cannot undertake or submit an assessment task in a course have the right to request reasonable accommodation in fulfilling the assessment in accordance with the Policy for the Accommodation of Religious Holy Days. Pregnant students and students caring for dependents have the right to request reasonable accommodation in fulfilling an assessment in a course in accordance with the Guidelines for the Academic Accommodation of Pregnant Students and Students Caring for Dependants.

Extraordinary Circumstances: In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's or instructor's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.

Course Outline & Readings

Note: weekly readings and topics are subject to change. Refer to MyCourses for the most up-to-date version of the syllabus. All readings, videos and other course materials will be posted on MyCourses. For each week in the term, please read articles/chapters before the indicated date in the schedule below.

Week 1: Introduction   Jan. 7

- This syllabus
- Torreblanca, Carolina, William Dinneen, Grossman, Guy, and Yiqing Xu. "The Credibility Revolution in Political Science." (2025).

- Samii, Cyrus. "Methodologies for 'Political Science as Problem Solving.'" In The Oxford Handbook of Engaged Methodological Pluralism in Political Science, edited by Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Dino P. Christenson, and Valeria Sinclair-Chapman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023.

- Nosek, Brian A., et al. 2018. "The Preregistration Revolution." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115 (11): 2600–2606.

- Cameron D. Anderson and Laura B. Stephenson. 2011. The Puzzle of Elections and Voting in Canada. In *The Puzzle of Elections and Voting in Canada,* 1–39. University of British Columbia Press, January

- Elisabeth Gidengil. 2022. Voting Behaviour in Canada: The State of the Discipline. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 55, no. 4 (December): 916–938

Week 2: Measuring public opinion   Jan. 14

- Greta Krippner (2000). "How to Read a (Quantitative) Journal Article.

- Rosalee A. Clawson and Zoe M. Oxley. 2020. *Public opinion: Democratic ideals, democratic practice.* CQ Press (Ch.1 Appendix)

- Schaeffer, Nora Cate, and Stanley Presser. "The science of asking questions." *Annual review of sociology* 29, no. 1 (2003): 65-88.

- Sniderman, Paul M., and J. N. Druckman. "The logic and design of the survey experiment." *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science* (2011): 102-114.

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

- Sniderman, Paul M. "Some advances in the design of survey experiments." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21, no. 1 (2018): 259-275.

Week 3: Information processing and opinion formation   Jan. 21

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

- Rosalee A. Clawson and Zoe M. Oxley. 2020. *Public opinion: Democratic ideals, democratic practice.* CQ Press (Chapter 4)

- John Zaller and Stanley Feldman. 1992. A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American journal of political science,* 579–616

- Charles S. Taber and Milton Lodge. 2006. Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American journal of political science* 50 (3): 755–769

- Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. "The responsive voter: Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation." American political science review 89, no. 2 (1995): 309-326.

Week 4: Political knowledge and sophistication   Jan. 28

- Elisabeth Gidengil et al. 2004. *Citizens.* Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press (Chapters 3-4)

- Robert C. Luskin and John G. Bullock. 2011. "Don't Know" Means "Don't Know": DK Responses and the Public's Level of Political Knowledge. *The Journal of Politics* 73, no. 2 (April): 547–557

- Larry M. Bartels. 2005. Homer gets a tax cut: Inequality and public policy in the American mind. Publisher: Cambridge University Press, *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (1): 15–31

- Andrew C. Eggers, Daniel Rubenson, and Peter J. Loewen. 2022. Who Votes More Strategically? Evidence from Canada. *The Journal of Politics* 84, no. 3 (July): 1862–1868

- Kraft, Patrick W. "Women also know stuff: challenging the gender gap in political sophistication." American Political Science Review 118, no. 2 (2024): 903-921.

Week 5: Participation   Feb. 4

- Blais, André. To vote or not to vote?: The merits and limits of rational choice theory. University of Pittsburgh Pre, 2000. (Chapter 1)

- Fowler, James H., Laura A. Baker, and Christopher T. Dawes. "Genetic variation in political participation." *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 2 (2008): 233-248.

- Fujiwara, Thomas, Kyle Meng, and Tom Vogl. "Habit formation in voting: Evidence from rainy elections." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 8, no. 4 (2016): 160-188.

- Alan S. Gerber, Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 1 (February): 33–48

- Daniel Rubenson et al. 2007. Does low turnout matter? Evidence from the 2000 Canadian federal election. *Electoral Studies* 26 (3): 589–597

- Pulejo, Massimo. "Private response to exclusionary welfare policy: Evidence from Italian municipalities." *Journal of Public Economics* 248 (2025): 105425.

<div style="text-align: center; color: red;">**Pre-print peer review due: Feb. 10**</div>

Week 6: Foundational influences on vote choice   Feb. 11

- Elisabeth Gidengil et al. 2012. *Dominance and decline: Making sense of recent Canadian elections.* University of Toronto Press (Chapters 1, 3)

- Sarah Wilkins-Laflamme. 2016. The Changing Religious Cleavage in Canadians' Voting Behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 49, no. 3 (September): 499–518

- David A. Armstrong II, Jack Lucas, and Zack Taylor. 2022. The urban-rural divide in Canadian Federal elections, 1896–2019. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 55 (1): 84–106

- M. Kent Jennings, Laura Stoker, and Jake Bowers. 2009. Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined. *The Journal of Politics* 71, no. 3 (July): 782–799

- Erikson, Robert S., and Laura Stoker. "Caught in the draft: The effects of Vietnam draft lottery status on political attitudes." *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 2 (2011): 221-237.

- Caprara, Gian Vittorio, Shalom Schwartz, Cristina Capanna, Michele Vecchione, and Claudio Barbaranelli. "Personality and politics: Values, traits, and political choice." Political psychology 27, no. 1 (2006): 1-28.

Week 7: Proximate influences on vote choice   Feb. 18

- Amanda Bittner. 2018. Leaders always mattered: The persistence of personality in Canadian elections. *Electoral Studies* 54:297–302

- Jason Roy and Christopher Alcantara. 2015. The Candidate Effect: Does the Local Candidate Matter? *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 25, no. 2 (April): 195–214

- Cameron D. Anderson. 2010. Economic Voting in Canada: Assessing the Effects of Subjective Perceptions and Electoral Context. In *Voting Behaviour in Canada,* edited by Cameron D. Anderson and Laura Stephenson, 139–162

- Bélanger, Éric, and Bonnie M. Meguid. "Issue salience, issue ownership, and issue-based vote choice." Electoral studies 27, no. 3 (2008): 477-491.

- Fournier, Patrick, Richard Nadeau, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. "Time-of-voting decision and susceptibility to campaign effects." Electoral studies 23, no. 4 (2004): 661-681.

- Pons, Vincent. "Will a five-minute discussion change your mind? A countrywide experiment on voter choice in France." American Economic Review 108, no. 6 (2018): 1322-1363.

<p style="text-align:center; color:red;">**Final project outline due: Feb. 24**</p>

Week 8: Ideology and partisanship   Feb. 25

- Éric Bélanger and Laura B. Stephenson. 2010. Parties and partisans: the influence of ideology and brokerage on the durability of partisanship in Canada. In *Voting Behaviour in Canada,* edited by Cameron D. Anderson and Laura Stephenson, 107–136

- Christopher Cochrane. 2015. *Left and Right: The Small World of Political Ideas.* McGill-Queen's Press - MQUP, October (Ch. 8, "The Rise of Left/Right in Canadian Politics")

- Eric Merkley. 2022. Polarization Eh? Ideological Divergence and Partisan Sorting in the Canadian Mass Public. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 86, no. 4 (December): 932–943

- Green, Donald P., Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters. Yale University Press, 2004. (Chapter 2)

- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Helmut Norpoth, William G. Jacoby & Herbert F. Weisberg (2008). The American Voter Revisited. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (Chapter 6)

- Brader, Ted, Joshua A. Tucker, and Dominik Duell. "Which parties can lead opinion? Experimental evidence on partisan cue taking in multiparty democracies." Comparative Political Studies 46, no. 11 (2013): 1485-1517.

Week 9: Reading Week   Mar. 4

Outline peer review due: Mar. 10

Week 10: Gender and race   Mar. 11

- Gidengil, Elisabeth, and Dietlind Stolle. "Beyond the gender gap: the role of gender identity." The Journal of Politics 83, no. 4 (2021): 1818-1822.

- Quinn M. Albaugh et al. 2025. From gender gap to gender gaps: Bringing nonbinary people into political behavior research. *Perspectives on Politics* 23 (1): 286–304

- Susanne Schwarz and Alexander Coppock. 2022. What Have We Learned about Gender from Candidate Choice Experiments? A Meta-Analysis of Sixty-Seven Factorial Survey Experiments. *The Journal of Politics* 84, no. 2 (April): 655–668

- Lewis Krashinsky. 2025. How Canada Compares: The Politics of White Identity, Racial Resentment, and Racial Attitudes in North America. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (June): 1–26

- Goodyear-Grant, Elizabeth, and Erin Tolley. "Voting for one's own: Racial group identification and candidate preferences." Politics, Groups, and Identities 7, no. 1 (2019): 131-147.

- Matthew Polacko and Allison Harell. 2023. Racial discrimination at the polls? The Canadian case of Jagmeet Singh. *Politics, Groups, and Identities,* 1–20

Week 11: Polarization   Mar. 18

- Iyengar, Shanto, Yphtach Lelkes, Matthew Levendusky, Neil Malhotra, and Sean J. Westwood. "The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States." *Annual review of political science* 22, no. 1 (2019): 129-146.

- Druckman, James N., and Matthew S. Levendusky. "What do we measure when we measure affective polarization?." Public opinion quarterly 83, no. 1 (2019): 114-122.

- Nicholas J. Caruana, R. Michael McGregor, and Laura B. Stephenson. 2015. The Power of the Dark Side: Negative Partisanship and Political Behaviour in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 4 (December): 771–789

- Richard Johnston. 2023. Affective Polarization in the Canadian Party System, 1988–2021. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 56, no. 2 (June): 372–395

- Broockman, David E., Joshua L. Kalla, and Sean J. Westwood. "Does affective polarization undermine democratic norms or accountability? Maybe not." American Journal of Political Science 67, no. 3 (2023): 808-828.

- Hartman, Rachel, Will Blakey, Jake Womick, Chris Bail, Eli J. Finkel, Hahrie Han, John Sarrouf et al. "Interventions to reduce partisan animosity." Nature human behaviour 6, no. 9 (2022): 1194-1205.

Week 12: Media and Misinformation   Mar. 25

- Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. *Changing minds or changing channels?: Partisan news in an age of choice.* University of Chicago Press, 2022. (Chapter 3)

- Erin Tolley. 2015. *Framed: Media and the coverage of race in Canadian politics.* UBC Press (Chapter 2)

- Barberá, Pablo, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A. Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. "Tweeting from left to right: Is online political communication more than an echo chamber?." *Psychological science* 26, no. 10 (2015): 1531-1542.

- Aengus Bridgman et al. 2020. The causes and consequences of COVID-19 misperceptions: Understanding the role of news and social media. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* 1 (3)

- Berinsky, Adam J. *Political Rumors: Why We Accept Misinformation and How to Fight It.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2023. (Chapter 4)

- Pennycook, Gordon, and David G. Rand. "Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning." *Cognition* 188 (2019): 39-50.

Week 13: Accountability and policy feedback   Apr. 1

- Stefaan Walgrave et al. 2023. Inaccurate Politicians: Elected Representatives' Estimations of Public Opinion in Four Countries. *The Journal of Politics* 85, no. 1 (January): 209–222

- Daniel M. Butler and David W. Nickerson. 2011. Can learning constituency opinion affect how legislators vote? Results from a field experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6 (1): 55–83

- Martin Gilens. 2005. Inequality and democratic responsiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69 (5): 778–796

- Stuart N. Soroka and Christopher Wlezien. 2004. Opinion representation and policy feedback: Canada in comparative perspective. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 37 (3): 531–559

- Christopher H. Achen and Larry M. Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for realists: Why elections do not produce responsive government.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Chapter 11)

- Healy, Andrew, and Neil Malhotra. "Retrospective voting reconsidered." Annual review of political science 16, no. 1 (2013): 285-306.

Week 14: Final Project Presentations **Apr. 8**

Final Project Due: Apr. 13