
MACS 30122 - Political Behavior and Computational Social Science

Computational Social Science - Division of the Social Sciences
University of Chicago - **Spring/2020**

Instructor: [Dr. Diogo Ferrari](#)
e-mail: diogoferrari@uchicago.edu
Office: 1155 E. 60th St. Room 221
Office-hours: Monday 15:00-17:00 (or by appointment)

Meeting day/time MoWeFr 9:30-10:20
Location: Public Policy 140B

Overview

This course introduces a combination of topics and theories of political behavior, with a particular focus on mass or public, i.e., non-professional politicians, behavior. In the first part of the course, we will cover different approaches to study political attitudes and behavior, including political psychology, political sociology, and rational choice behavioral models. In the second part of the course, we will discuss some methodological challenges to study attitudes and behavior and how computational methods can contribute to advance our knowledge in that area. Students will have the chance to develop their own project, with the instructor's guidance, and apply CSS approaches to study aspects of the political behavior of their choice.

Prerequisites: none.

Objectives

The course will:

1. Introduce some core classical and contemporary political behavior theories
2. Built the substantive foundation for further studies on political behavior
3. Introduce some important methodological aspects and challenges that are crucial for studies in that area
4. Introduce and debate how modern computational and machine learning methods and online data can be used to study political attitudes and behavior
5. Develop the ability to present and communicate a research paper in a safe, conference-like environment
6. Develop the ability to provide constructive feedback to other people's written work and oral presentation
7. Develop the ability to engage in a constructive theoretical debate
8. Be an informed reader of political science literature and non-academic political news about political behavior

Course structure

Overview

The course is divided into two main parts. The first focuses on developing substantive background, and the second discusses some computational and methodological aspects of studying political behavior and opinion.

Students participation: This course requires active participation and is largely based on the readings and class discussions. Being able to present your work or the results of your research clearly and effectively is an

essential skill for professionals both in academic and non-academic environments. This course seeks to develop substantive and methodological backgrounds alongside skills required by the social aspects of professional life.

To that end, the class will mimic a professional environment. Each class will have a *presenter student*, a *discussant student*, and the *audience*, which will be composed by the rest of the class and the instructor. At the beginning of the quarter, students will select at least one class topic that they want to *present* and another they want to *discuss*. Depending on the size of the class, students may select more than one topic for each role.

Each class will begin with a 20 minutes presentation prepared by the *presenter student* with the *REQUIRED* reading(s) of the day. Students will present the content, and optionally extend or propose extensions for the paper, empirically or theoretically, during their presentation. See section [Presentation guidelines](#).

The presentation will be followed by a shorter 15 minutes presentation by the *discussant student* who will select at least one reading (more than one is optional) from the list of *RECOMMENDED* reading(s). The *discussant student* will briefly present that paper and, based on that paper, discuss some points of the main presentation. After the presentation of the *discussant student*, we will open the floor for questions and debate, which will be directed by the instructor.

The *audience* have to submit at least one question about the main paper the night before the class. After class, the audience will write short and constructive feedback using Google docs about the presentation (less than 100 words). They will also grade the presentation to provide feedback for the *presenter* and *discussant* using the following criteria:

Criteria	Score	Details
Clarity	0 – 5	Easy to follow the explanation/presentation
Pace	0 – 5	Ideas delivered at a good pace
Organization	0 – 5	Good transition between ideas
Content	0 – 5	Amount of information was appropriate
Language	0 – 5	Good use of vocabulary technical
Timing	0 – 5	The use of time was appropriate (finished on time)
Quality of the slides	0 – 5	Slides clear and easy to follow

- *Note:* both presentations of *student presenter* and *student discussant* will get the numerical grade, but only the former will get the written constructive feedback. Privately, the *presenter student* will receive the written feedback, which will be completely anonymized before delivery, and both *presenter student* and *discussant student* will receive their score statistics.

Final paper: Each student will prepare a ten pages max double-spaced final paper due to the end of the quarter. The final paper must contain a brief introduction, a section with a literature review, and a final section with a research idea/proposal or an empirical analysis based on the literature review. A conclusion or final discussion section is optional. The research idea can extend the literature discussed in the final paper or propose a novel application. It must be based on one of the topics of the course, which the student is free to select. The final paper must use at least **five** papers in the literature review. The papers must include at least two that are indicated in the readings (recommended or required) of the topic chosen, but the student is free to select the other three or more. The papers will be graded using the following rubric.

Criteria	Score	Details
Number of papers to used (min 5)	0 – 10	max(10, number of papers used)
Relevance	0 – 10	Relevance, for the topic, of the papers chosen
Clarity of the review	0 – 10	How clear and well the paper presents the arguments
Transition of ideas	0 – 10	How well the paper move from one idea to another
Extension/Research idea	0 – 10	Connection between research idea and literature review

Presentation guidelines

Presenter and *discussant* students can use any software they like to create the presentation (PowerPoint, beamer, etc.). They should try to follow these guidelines when preparing their presentations. When preparing the presentation, try to provide the audience with a clear picture of the following:

1. What is the research question?
2. Are the concepts clearly defined or vaguely provided?
3. What are the causal mechanisms or associations investigated in the study?
4. What are the hypotheses?
5. Which empirical approach was adopted? Which data, if any, was used?
6. How the research design helps to answer the theoretical question or hypothesis?
7. What are the findings

Effort estimate

The total average expected weekly effort required by this course is described in the table below:

Activity	Number per class	Time/Activity	Time/week
Mandatory			
- Class attendance		50m	2h30m
- Required readings	± 1 paper (±25pgs)	2h	6h
- Provide feedback to presenter	1	5m	15m
- Provide feedback to discussant	1	3m	9m
- Write and submit required reading question	1	1m	3m
TOTAL		2h59m	8h57m
Optional			
- Recommended readings (optional)	± 4 papers (± 100 pgs)	-	-

Evaluation

Evaluation

Component	Weight	Note
Research Project	35%	100% graded by instructor
Presentation score	20%	Weighted average of students (20%) and instructor (80%) evaluations
Discussion score	20%	Weighted average of students (20%) and instructor (80%) evaluations
Feedback	10%	Students can earn 1 point per class by submitting their feedback to presenter and discussant after every class
Questions	10%	Students can earn 1 point per class by submitting their question about the required reading of the day
Attendance/Participation	5%	Graded to the students that attended the sections and participated in all activities

Grading Scale

Quality Performance	Letter Grade	Points		Round interval
		min	max	
Excellent	A	93	100	[92.5, 100]
	A-	90	92	[89.5, 92.5)
Good	B+	87	89	[86.5, 89.5)
	B	83	86	[82.5, 86.5)
	B-	80	82	[79.5, 82.5)
Satisfactory	C+	77	79	[76.5, 79.5)
	C	70	76	[69.5, 76.5)
Unsatisfactory	D	51	69	[50, 69.5)
Failure	F	0	50	[0, 50)

Rounding If needed, the point scale will be rounded using the [round half up](#) rule. It means, for instance, that any grade $x \in [92.5, 93.5)$ becomes 93, and a grade $x \in [91.5, 92.5)$ becomes 92. An exception applies to the bottom of the scale, as indicated in the table above.

Diversity Statement

This course is open to all students who meet the academic requirements for participation. Any student who has a documented need for accommodation should contact Student Disability Services (773-702-6000 or disabilities@uchicago.edu) and the instructor as soon as possible.

It is my intent that students from all diverse backgrounds and perspectives be well-served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. Please let me know ways to improve the effectiveness of the course for you personally, or for other students or student groups. Your suggestions are encouraged and appreciated.

It is my intent to present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity: gender identity, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, nationality, religion, and culture. I will attempt to foster an environment in which each class member is able to hear and respect one another. It is my intent to maintain an atmosphere of trust and safety in the classroom. Please let me know if something said or done in the classroom, by either myself or other students, is particularly troubling or causes discomfort or offense. While our intention may not be to cause discomfort or offense, the impact of what happens throughout the course is not to be ignored and is something that I consider to be very important and deserving of attention. If and when this occurs, there are several ways to alleviate some of the discomfort or hurt you may experience:

1. Discuss the situation privately with me. I am always open to listening to students' experiences and want to work with students to find acceptable ways to process and address the issue.
2. Discuss the situation with the class. Chances are there is at least one other student in the class who had a similar response to the material. Discussion enhances the ability for all class participants to have a fuller understanding of context and impact of course material and class discussions.
3. Notify me of the issue through another source such as your preceptor, a trusted faculty member, or a peer. If for any reason you do not feel comfortable discussing the issue directly with me, I encourage you to contact your preceptor and/or your program's Diversity and Inclusion representative: Darcy Heuring (MAPSS), Matthias Staisch (CIR), and Chad Cyrenne (Computation). You are also welcome and encouraged to contact the Faculty Director of your program.

The University of Chicago is committed to diversity and rigorous inquiry from multiple perspectives. The MAPSS, CIR, and Computation programs share this commitment and seek to foster productive learning environments based upon inclusion, open communication, and mutual respect for a diverse range of identities,

experiences, and positions. Any suggestions for how we might further such objectives both in and outside the classroom are appreciated and will be given serious consideration. Please share your suggestions or concerns with your instructor, your preceptor, or your program's Diversity and Inclusion representatives: Darcy Heuring (MAPSS), Matthias Staisch (CIR), and Chad Cyrenne (Computation). You are also welcome and encouraged to contact the Faculty Director of your program.

Policy on academic honesty

The University of Chicago has a [formal policy on academic honesty](#) that you are expected to adhere to. Here are some guidelines we expect you to follow:

1. Courtesy, honesty, and respect should be shown by students toward faculty members, guest lecturers, administrative support staff, and fellow students. Similarly, students should expect faculty to treat them fairly, showing respect for their ideas and opinions and striving to help them achieve maximum benefits from their experience in the School.
2. Academic dishonesty can encompass many activities, which includes plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, falsification of records or official documents, intentional misuse of equipment or materials (including library materials), and aiding and abetting the perpetration of such acts. One of the gravest academic dishonesty is plagiarism: knowingly handing in someone else's work as your own, whether it be work done by another student in the class or available publicly on the Internet.
3. The preparation of solutions for problem sets, papers, and examinations, assigned on an individual basis, must represent each student's own effort. Therefore:
 - You **MUST NOT** copy or use someone else's work (with or without their permission) in your own solution. You have to write your own.
 - **DO NOT** post your solutions to problem sets or exams in publicly-accessible websites, like pastebin, a public GitHub repository, GitHub gists, etc. While these tools may seem like convenient mechanisms for sharing code with an instructor/TA or with a project partner, they can also expose your code to other students in the class. If you do post your solution in a publicly-accessible location, and we find out about it outside of a plagiarism incident, you will just get a warning. However, if another student in the class uses code that you posted on such a site (even if you did not intend for that code to be used by someone else), you be considered an equally guilty party in a plagiarism offense, and will receive the exact same penalty as the student who used your code.

Schedule

Week	Weekday	Date	Class:Topic	Assignment
1	Mon	Mar 30	Day 1: Course Introduction	
1	Wed	Apr 01	Day 2: Cambridge Analytica	
1	Fri	Apr 03	Day 3: <i>Columbia Model</i>	
2	Mon	Apr 06	Day 4: Networks and Context	
2	Wed	Apr 08	Day 5: Minimal Effects and Agenda Setting	
2	Fri	Apr 10	Day 6: <i>Michigan Model</i>	
3	Mon	Apr 13	Day 7: Partisanship	
3	Wed	Apr 15	Day 8: Political Sophistication	
3	Fri	Apr 17	Day 9: Socialization	
4	Mon	Apr 20	Day 10: <i>Rational Behavioral Model</i>	
4	Wed	Apr 22	Day 11: Rational Voter and Heuristic	
4	Fri	Apr 24	Day 12: Genetics	
5	Mon	Apr 27	Day 13: Media and Campaigns	
5	Wed	Apr 29	Day 14: Party Cues	
5	Fri	May 01	Day 15: Ideology	
6	Mon	May 04	Day 16: Personality I	
6	Wed	May 06	Day 17: Personality II	
6	Fri	May 08	Day 18: Emotion	
7	Mon	May 11	Day 19: Surveying Opinion and Survey Questions	
7	Wed	May 13	Day 20: Measuring Preferences	
7	Fri	May 15	Day 21: Experiments	
8	Mon	May 18	Day 22: Content and Sentiment Analysis I	
8	Wed	May 20	Day 23: Text as Data and Open-ended survey questions	
8	Fri	May 22	Day 24: Studying online content	
9	Mon	May 25	Day 25: NO CLASS : Memorial day	
9	Wed	May 27	Day 26: Social Media: Measuring Attitudes	
9	Fri	May 29	Day 27: Social Media: Social Online Network	
10	Mon	Jun 01	Day 28: Social Media: Inferring attitude and demographics	
10	Wed	Jun 03	Day 29: Social Media: Inferring socio-demographics II	
10	Fri	Jun 05	Day 30: NO CLASS : College Reading Period	

Readings

Part I: Topics and Theories of Political Behavior

Day 1: Course Introduction

Mon, Mar 30

Day 2: Cambridge Analytica

Wed, Apr 01

- **REQUIRED**
 - John, O. P., Srivastava, S., et al. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In Pervin, L. A. and John, O. P., editors, *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, volume 2, pages 102–138. Guilford (**Sections: Introduction, Discovery of the big five in Cattell’s Variable List**)
 - Hern, Alex (2018) Cambridge Analytica: how did it turn clicks into votes? (available at <https://bit.ly/2t09kQq>)
 - Chang, Alvin (2018) The Facebook and Cambridge Analytica scandal, explained with a simple diagram (available at <https://bit.ly/31VULXS>)
 - Aichholzer, J. (2020). Voting by your personality? Working paper. Online. <http://ispp.org/wp/ispp-blog/voting-by-your-personality/>
- **RECOMMENDED**
 - Bakker, B., Schumacher, G., and Rooduijn, M. (2020). The populist appeal: Personality and anti-establishment communication. PsyArXiv (forthcoming *The Journal of Politics*)
 - John, O. P., Srivastava, S., et al. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In Pervin, L. A. and John, O. P., editors, *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, volume 2, pages 102–138. Guilford
 - DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., and Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 93(5):880
 - Fezell, J. and Krupnikov, Y. (2018). What’s true, and fake, about the facebook effect. *Behavioral Scientist*. Available at: <https://behavioralscientist.org/whats-true-and-fake-about-the-facebook-effect/> (access Feb 22, 2020)
 - Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., and Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-ipip scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality. *Psychological assessment*, 18(2):192

Day 3: Columbia Model

Fri, Apr 03

- **REQUIRED**
 - Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., and Gaudet, H. (1968[1944]). *The people’s choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign*. Columbia University Press, New York, USA and London, UK, 3rd edition (**Chapters: 3 (Predisposition: SES/Religion/Age), 6 (Cross-pressure) 7 (Types os change) 8 (Activation), 9 (Reinforcement), 15 (Social Groups) 16 (Flow of Communication)**)
- **RECOMMENDED**
 - Taber, C. S. (2011). *Political cognition and public opinion*. volume 1. Oxford University Press

Day 4: Networks and Context

Mon, Apr 06

- **REQUIRED**
 - **T** Zuckerman, A. S. (2005). *The social logic of politics: Personal networks as contexts for political behavior*. Temple University Press (**Chapter 1**)
- **RECOMMENDED**
 - Zuckerman, A. S., Valentino, N. A., and Zuckerman, E. W. (1994). A structural theory of vote choice: Social and political networks and electoral flows in britain and the united states. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(4):1008–1033

- **T** Huckfeldt, R., Johnson, P. E., and Sprague, J. (2005). Individuals, dyads, and networks: Autoregressive patterns of political influence. In Zuckerman, A. S., editor, *The social logic of politics: Personal networks as contexts for political behavior*, pages 21–49. Temple University Press, Philadelphia
- **T** Levine, J. (2005). Choosing alone? the social network basis of modern political choice. In Zuckerman, A. S., editor, *The Social Logic of Politics. Personal Networks as Contexts for Political Behavior*, pages 132–151. Temple University Press, Philadelphia
- **T** Knoke, D. (1994). *Political networks: the structural perspective*, volume 4. Cambridge University Press
- Robert Huckfeldt, Jeffery J. Mondak, M. H. M. T. P. and Reilly, J. (2013). Networks, interdependence, and social influence in politics. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 21, pages 662–698. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/9780199760107>

Day 5: Minimal Effects and Agenda Setting

Wed, Apr 08

- **REQUIRED**

- Iyengar, S., Peters, M. D., and Kinder, D. R. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the “not-so-minimal” consequences of television news programs. *American political science review*, 76(4):848–858

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Finkel, S. E. (1993). Reexamining the “minimal effects” model in recent presidential campaigns. *The Journal of Politics*, 55(1):1–21
- **T** Zaller, J. (1996). The myth of massive media impact revived: New support for a discredited idea. In *Political persuasion and attitude change*, volume 17. University of Michigan Press Ann Arbor
- Dalton, R. J., Beck, P. A., and Huckfeldt, R. (1998). Partisan cues and the media: Information flows in the 1992 presidential election. *American Political Science Review*, 92(1):111–126
- Hillygus, D. S. and Shields, T. G. (2008). *The persuadable voter: Wedge issues in presidential campaigns*. Princeton University Press (**Chapter 4**)
- Krosnick, J. A. and Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2):497–512
- Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass communication & society*, 3(2-3):297–316

Day 6: Michigan Model

Fri, Apr 10

- **REQUIRED**

- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., and Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The american voter*. University of Chicago Press (Chapters: 7 (The Impact of Party Identification))

- **RECOMMENDED**

- **T** Bartels, L. M. (2010). The study of electoral behavior. In Leighley, J. E., editor, *The Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior*, pages 239–261. Oxford University Press New York
- **T** Jacoby, W. G. (2010). The american voter. In Leighley, J. E., editor, *The Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior*, pages 239–261. Oxford University Press New York
- **T** Lewis-Beck, M. S., Norpoth, H., Jacoby, W. G., and Weisberg, H. F. (2008). *The American voter revisited*. University of Michigan Press

Day 7: Partisanship

Mon, Apr 13

- **REQUIRED**

- Reiter, H. L. (1989). Party decline in the west a skeptic’s view. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1(3):325–348

- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Clarke, H. D. and Stewart, M. C. (1998). The decline of parties in the minds of citizens. *Annual review of political science*, 1(1):357–378
 - Bartels, L. M. (2000). Partisanship and voting behavior, 1952-1996. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 35–50
 - Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (2002). *Parties without partisans: Political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford University Press (**Chapters 2, 4**)
 - **T** Wattenberg, M. P. (2009). *The decline of American political parties, 1952-1996*. Harvard University Press (**Chapter 1 and 2**)
 - Mason, L. (2015). “i disrespectfully agree”: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1):128–145

Day 8: Political Sophistication

Wed, Apr 15

- *REQUIRED*
 - **T** Carpini, M. X. D. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. Yale University Press (**Chapter 1**)
- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In Apter, D. E., editor, *Ideology and discontent*. The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, NY
 - Sartori, G. (1969). Politics, ideology, and belief systems. *American Political Science Review*, 63(2):398–411
 - Neuman, W. R. (1981). Differentiation and integration: Two dimensions of political thinking. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(6):1236–1268
 - **T** Neuman, W. R. (1986). *The paradox of mass politics: Knowledge and opinion in the American electorate*. Harvard University Press
 - **T** Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., and Tetlock, P. E. (1993). *Reasoning and choice: Explorations in political psychology*. Cambridge University Press
 - **T** Carpini, M. X. D. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. Yale University Press (**Intro**)

Day 9: Socialization

Fri, Apr 17

- *REQUIRED*
 - Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., and Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3):782–799
- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Sears, D. O. and Brown, C. (2013). Childhood and adult political development. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 3, pages 59–95. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1017/9780199760107>
 - Sears, D. O. and Valentino, N. A. (1997). Politics matters: Political events as catalysts for preadult socialization. *American Political Science Review*, 91(1):45–65
 - Aldrich, J. H., Montgomery, J. M., and Wood, W. (2011). Turnout as a habit. *Political behavior*, 33(4):535–563
 - Wolak, J. and McDevitt, M. (2011). The roots of the gender gap in political knowledge in adolescence. *Political Behavior*, 33(3):505–533
 - Fitzgerald, J. and Curtis, K. A. (2012). Partisan discord in the family and political engagement: A comparative behavioral analysis. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1):129–141

Day 10: Rational Behavioral Model

Mon, Apr 20

- *REQUIRED*
 - Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper and Row (**Chapter 3**)

- Fiorina, M. P. (1978). Economic retrospective voting in american national elections: A micro-analysis. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 426–443

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Feldman, S. (1982). Economic self-interest and political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 446–466
- Chong, D., Citrin, J., and Conley, P. (2001). When self-interest matters. *Political Psychology*, 22(3):541–570
- Gomez, B. T. and Wilson, J. M. (2001). Political sophistication and economic voting in the american electorate: A theory of heterogeneous attribution. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 899–914
- Chong, D. (2013). Degrees of rationality in politics. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 4, pages 96–129. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107>
- Redlawsk, D. P. and Lau, R. R. (2013). Behavioral decision-making. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 5, pages 130–164. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107>
- Sears, D. O., Lau, R. R., Tyler, T. R., and Allen, H. M. (1980). Self-interest vs. symbolic politics in policy attitudes and presidential voting. *American Political Science Review*, 74(3):670–684

Day 11: Rational Voter and Heuristic

Wed, Apr 22

- **REQUIRED**

- Lupia, A. (1994). Shortcuts versus encyclopedias: Information and voting behavior in california insurance reform elections. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1):63–76

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Kuklinski, J. H. and Quirk, P. J. (2001). Conceptual foundations of citizen competence. *Political Behavior*, 23(3):285–311
- MacKuen, M. B., Erikson, R. S., and Stimson, J. A. (1992). Peasants or bankers? the american electorate and the us economy. *American Political Science Review*, 86(3):597–611
- Mutz, D. C. (1993). Direct and indirect routes to politicizing personal experience: Does knowledge make a difference? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, pages 483–502
- Kiewiet, D. R. and Rivers, D. (1984). A retrospective on retrospective voting. *Political behavior*, 6(4):369–393
- Kuklinski, J. H. and Quirk, P. J. (2000). Reconsidering the rational public: Cognition, heuristics, and mass opinion. In Lupia, A., McCubbins, M. D., and Popkin, S. L., editors, *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology, page 153–182. Cambridge University Press
- Denzau, A. T. and North, D. C. (2000). Shared mental models: Ideologies and institutions. In Lupia, A., McCubbins, M. D., and Popkin, S. L., editors, *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology, page 23–46. Cambridge University Press

Day 12: Genetics

Fri, Apr 24

- **REQUIRED**

- Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., and Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American political science review*, 99(2):153–167

- **RECOMMENDED**

- **T** Clawson, R. A. and Oxley, Z. M. (2016). *Public opinion: Democratic ideals, democratic practice*. CQ Press (**Chapter 2**)
- Funk, C. L. (2013). Genetic foundations of political behavior. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 8, pages 237–261. Ox-

ford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107>

Day 13: Media and Campaigns

Mon, Apr 27

- **REQUIRED**

- Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame? *Journal of Politics*, 63(4):1041–1066

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Huber, G. A. and Arceneaux, K. (2007). Identifying the persuasive effects of presidential advertising. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):957–977
- Valentino, N. A. and Nardis, Y. (2013). Political communication: Form and consequence of the information environment. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 18, pages 559–590. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb/9780199760107>
- Nelson, T. E., Oxley, Z. M., and Clawson, R. A. (1997). Toward a psychology of framing effects. *Political behavior*, 19(3):221–246

Day 14: Party Cues

Wed, Apr 29

- **REQUIRED**

- Levendusky, M. (2009). *The partisan sort: How liberals became Democrats and conservatives became Republicans*. University of Chicago Press (**chapter 1, 2, 6**)

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Steenbergen, M. R., Edwards, E. E., and De Vries, C. E. (2007). Who’s cueing whom? mass-elite linkages and the future of european integration. *European Union Politics*, 8(1):13–35
- Levendusky, M. S. (2010). Clearer cues, more consistent voters: A benefit of elite polarization. *Political Behavior*, 32(1):111–131
- Boudreau, C. and MacKenzie, S. A. (2014). Informing the electorate? how party cues and policy information affect public opinion about initiatives. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1):48–62
- Zingher, J. N. and Flynn, M. E. (2019). Does polarization affect even the inattentive? assessing the relationship between political sophistication, policy orientations, and elite cues. *Electoral Studies*, 57:131–142

Day 15: Ideology

Fri, May 01

- **REQUIRED**

- Abramowitz, A. I. and Saunders, K. L. (2006). Exploring the bases of partisanship in the american electorate: Social identity vs. ideology. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(2):175–187
- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., and Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on facebook. *Science*, 348(6239):1130–1132 (FB researcher on Science about polarization)

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Sartori, G. (1969). Politics, ideology, and belief systems. *American Political Science Review*, 63(2):398–411
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., Lelkes, Y., et al. (2012). Affect, not ideology: a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76
- Rogowski, J. C. and Sutherland, J. L. (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior*, 38(2):485–508
- Feldman, S. (2013). Political ideology. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 19, pages 591–626. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb/9780199760107>

Day 16: Personality I

Mon, May 04

- **REQUIRED**

- Caprara, G. V. and Vecchione, M. (2013). Personality approaches to political behavior. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 2. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/9780199760107>

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., and Swann Jr, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the big-five personality domains. *Journal of Research in personality*, 37(6):504–528
- Chirumbolo, A. and Leone, L. (2010). Personality and politics: The role of the hexaco model of personality in predicting ideology and voting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(1):43–48

Day 17: Personality II

Wed, May 06

- **REQUIRED**

- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., and Ha, S. E. (2010). Personality and political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1):111–133

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., and Anderson, M. R. (2010). Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1):85–110
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., and Dowling, C. M. (2012). Personality and the strength and direction of partisan identification. *Political Behavior*, 34(4):653–688

Day 18: Emotion

Fri, May 08

- **REQUIRED**

- Brader, T. and Marcus, G. E. (2013). Emotion and political psychology. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 6, pages 165–204. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/9780199760107>

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Rogowski, J. C. and Sutherland, J. L. (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior*, 38(2):485–508
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., Lelkes, Y., et al. (2012). Affect, not ideology: a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76
- Mutz, D. C. (2018). Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(19):E4330–E4339
- Marcus, G. E. and MacKuen, M. B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 87(3):672–685

Part II: Measuring Opinion and Behavior

Day 19: Surveying Opinion and Survey Questions

Mon, May 11

- **REQUIRED**

- Donsbach, W. and Traugott, M. W. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research*. Sage (**Chapter 20, 23, 25**)
- Salganik, M. (2019). *Bit by bit: Social research in the digital age*. Princeton University Press (**Chapter 3**)

- *RECOMMENDED*
 - **T** Price, V. and Neijens, P. (1997). Opinion quality in public opinion research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 9(4):336–360
 - Donsbach, W. and Traugott, M. W. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research*. Sage (**Chapter 28**)
 - Wang, W., Rothschild, D., Goel, S., and Gelman, A. (2015). Forecasting elections with non-representative polls. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 31(3):980–991
 - Khan, M. R., Manoj, J., Singh, A., and Blumenstock, J. (2015). Behavioral modeling for churn prediction: Early indicators and accurate predictors of custom defection and loyalty. In *2015 IEEE International Congress on Big Data*, pages 677–680. IEEE
 - Lau, R. R., Kleinberg, M. S., and Ditonto, T. M. (2018). Measuring voter decision strategies in political behavior and public opinion research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(S1):911–936

Day 20: Measuring Preferences

Wed, May 13

- *REQUIRED*
 - Zaller, J. and Feldman, S. (1992). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American journal of political science*, pages 579–616
- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Epstein, L. and Mershon, C. (1996). Measuring political preferences. *American journal of political science*, pages 261–294
 - Feldman, S. (1989). Measuring issue preferences: The problem of response instability. *Political Analysis*, 1:25–60
 - Leeper, T. J., Hobolt, S. B., and Tilley, J. (2019). Measuring subgroup preferences in conjoint experiments. *Political Analysis*, pages 1–15
 - Luskin, R. C. (1987). Measuring political sophistication. *American journal of political science*, pages 856–899

Day 21: Experiments

Fri, May 15

- *REQUIRED*
 - Gerber, A. S. and Green, D. P. (2000). The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment. *American political science review*, 94(3):653–663
- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Green, D. P. and Kern, H. L. (2012). Modeling heterogeneous treatment effects in survey experiments with bayesian additive regression trees. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3):491
 - Kramer, A. D., Guillory, J. E., and Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24):8788–8790
 - Corstange, D. (2016). Anti-american behavior in the middle east: evidence from a field experiment in lebanon. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1):311–325

Day 22: Content and Sentiment Analysis I

Mon, May 18

- *REQUIRED*
 - Pang, B., Lee, L., et al. (2008). Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 2(1–2):1–135 (**Sections 1 to 3**)
 - Sajid, H. (2019). Deep learning for sentiment analysis. online. Medium
- *RECOMMENDED*
 - Laver, M. and Garry, J. (2000). Estimating policy positions from political texts. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 619–634
 - Benoit, K., Conway, D., Lauderdale, B. E., Laver, M., and Mikhaylov, S. (2016). Crowd-sourced text analysis: Reproducible and agile production of political data. *American Political Science Review*, 110(2):278–295

- Tausczik, Y. R. and Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: Liwc and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 29(1):24–54
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2016). *The content analysis guidebook*. sage (**Chapter 9**)

Day 23: Text as Data and Open-ended survey questions

Wed, May 20

- **REQUIRED**

- Grimmer, J. and Stewart, B. M. (2013). Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political analysis*, 21(3):267–297

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Roberts, M. E., Stewart, B. M., Tingley, D., Lucas, C., Leder-Luis, J., Gadarian, S. K., Albertson, B., and Rand, D. G. (2014). Structural topic models for open-ended survey responses. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(4):1064–1082
- DiMaggio, P., Nag, M., and Blei, D. (2013). Exploiting affinities between topic modeling and the sociological perspective on culture: Application to newspaper coverage of us government arts funding. *Poetics*, 41(6):570–606
- Hopkins, D. J. and King, G. (2010). A method of automated nonparametric content analysis for social science. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(1):229–247
- Armony, A. C. and Velásquez, N. (2015). Anti-chinese sentiment in latin america: An analysis of online discourse. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 20(3):319–346
- Riff, D., Lacy, S., Fico, F., and Watson, B. (2019). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Routledge (**Chapter 2 and 3**)
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., and Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human communication research*, 28(4):587–604

Day 24: Studying online content

Fri, May 22

- **REQUIRED**

- Herring, S. C., Barab, S., Kling, R., and Gray, J. (2004). An approach to researching online behavior. *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning*, 338

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Buettner, R. and Buettner, K. (2016). A systematic literature review of twitter research from a socio-political revolution perspective. In *2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*, pages 2206–2215. IEEE

Day 25:

Mon, May 25 (*NO CLASS*: Memorial day)

Day 26: Social Media: Measuring Attitudes

Wed, May 27

- **REQUIRED**

- Jamal, A. A., Keohane, R. O., Romney, D., and Tingley, D. (2015). Anti-americanism and anti-interventionism in arabic twitter discourses. *Perspectives on Politics*, 13(1):55–73

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Magdy, W., Darwish, K., and Weber, I. (2015). # failedrevolutions: Using twitter to study the antecedents of isis support. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02401*
- Su, L. Y.-F., Xenos, M. A., Rose, K. M., Wirz, C., Scheufele, D. A., and Brossard, D. (2018). Uncivil and personal? comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the facebook pages of news outlets. *New Media & Society*, 20(10):3678–3699
- Filer, T. and Fredheim, R. (2016). Sparking debate? political deaths and twitter discourses in argentina and russia. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(11):1539–1555
- Massanari, A. (2017). # gamergate and the fapping: How reddit’s algorithm, governance, and culture support toxic technocultures. *New Media & Society*, 19(3):329–346
- Tamburrini, N., Cinnirella, M., Jansen, V. A., and Bryden, J. (2015). Twitter users change word usage according to conversation-partner social identity. *Social Networks*, 40:84–89

Day 27: Social Media: Social Online Network

Fri, May 29

- **REQUIRED**

- Goel, S., Mason, W., and Watts, D. J. (2010). Real and perceived attitude agreement in social networks. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(4):611

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Onnela, J.-P. and Reed-Tsochas, F. (2010). Spontaneous emergence of social influence in online systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(43):18375–18380
- Jones, J. J., Settle, J. E., Bond, R. M., Fariss, C. J., Marlow, C., and Fowler, J. H. (2013). Inferring tie strength from online directed behavior. *PloS one*, 8(1)
- Bakshy, E., Eckles, D., Yan, R., and Rosenn, I. (2012). Social influence in social advertising: evidence from field experiments. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on electronic commerce*, pages 146–161
- Romero, D. M., Meeder, B., and Kleinberg, J. (2011). Differences in the mechanics of information diffusion across topics: idioms, political hashtags, and complex contagion on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 695–704

Day 28: Social Media: Inferring attitude and demographics

Mon, Jun 01

- **REQUIRED**

- Preoțiuc-Pietro, D., Liu, Y., Hopkins, D., and Ungar, L. (2017). Beyond binary labels: political ideology prediction of twitter users. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 729–740
- Rao, D., Yarowsky, D., Shreevats, A., and Gupta, M. (2010). Classifying latent user attributes in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international workshop on Search and mining user-generated contents*, pages 37–44

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Zhong, Y., Yuan, N. J., Zhong, W., Zhang, F., and Xie, X. (2015). You are where you go: Inferring demographic attributes from location check-ins. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 295–304
- Burger, J. D., Henderson, J., Kim, G., and Zarrella, G. (2011). Discriminating gender on twitter. In *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1301–1309. Association for Computational Linguistics
- Sap, M., Park, G., Eichstaedt, J., Kern, M., Stillwell, D., Kosinski, M., Ungar, L., and Schwartz, H. A. (2014). Developing age and gender predictive lexica over social media. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1146–1151

Day 29: Social Media: Inferring socio-demographics II

Wed, Jun 03

- **REQUIRED**

- Preoțiuc-Pietro, D., Lampos, V., and Aletras, N. (2015). An analysis of the user occupational class through twitter content. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1754–1764

- **RECOMMENDED**

- Culotta, A., Kumar, N. R., and Cutler, J. (2015). Predicting the demographics of twitter users from website traffic data. In *AAAI*, volume 15, pages 72–8. Austin, TX
- Ciot, M., Sonderegger, M., and Ruths, D. (2013). Gender inference of twitter users in non-english contexts. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1136–1145
- Nguyen, D., Smith, N. A., and Rosé, C. P. (2011). Author age prediction from text using linear regression. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACL-HLT workshop on language technology for cultural heritage, social sciences, and humanities*, pages 115–123. Association for Computational Linguistics

- Nguyen, D., Gravel, R., Trieschnigg, D., and Meder, T. (2013). "how old do you think i am?" a study of language and age in twitter. In *Seventh International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*
- Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J., and Schnoebelen, T. (2014). Gender identity and lexical variation in social media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(2):135–160

Day 30:

*Fri, Jun 05 (*NO CLASS*: College Reading Period)*

References

- Abramowitz, A. I. and Saunders, K. L. (2006). Exploring the bases of partisanship in the american electorate: Social identity vs. ideology. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(2):175–187.
- Aichholzer, J. (2020). Voting by your personality? Working paper. Online. <http://ispp.org/wp/ispp-blog/voting-by-your-personality/>.
- Aldrich, J. H., Montgomery, J. M., and Wood, W. (2011). Turnout as a habit. *Political behavior*, 33(4):535–563.
- Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., and Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American political science review*, 99(2):153–167.
- Armony, A. C. and Velásquez, N. (2015). Anti-chinese sentiment in latin america: An analysis of online discourse. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 20(3):319–346.
- Bakker, B., Schumacher, G., and Rooduijn, M. (2020). The populist appeal: Personality and anti-establishment communication. PsyArXiv (forthcoming *The Journal of Politics*).
- Bakshy, E., Eckles, D., Yan, R., and Rosenn, I. (2012). Social influence in social advertising: evidence from field experiments. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on electronic commerce*, pages 146–161.
- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., and Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on facebook. *Science*, 348(6239):1130–1132.
- Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J., and Schnoebelen, T. (2014). Gender identity and lexical variation in social media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(2):135–160.
- Bartels, L. M. (2000). Partisanship and voting behavior, 1952-1996. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 35–50.
- Bartels, L. M. (2010). The study of electoral behavior. In Leighley, J. E., editor, *The Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior*, pages 239–261. Oxford University Press New York.
- Benoit, K., Conway, D., Lauderdale, B. E., Laver, M., and Mikhaylov, S. (2016). Crowd-sourced text analysis: Reproducible and agile production of political data. *American Political Science Review*, 110(2):278–295.
- Boudreau, C. and MacKenzie, S. A. (2014). Informing the electorate? how party cues and policy information affect public opinion about initiatives. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1):48–62.
- Brader, T. and Marcus, G. E. (2013). Emotion and political psychology. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 6, pages 165–204. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Buettner, R. and Buettner, K. (2016). A systematic literature review of twitter research from a socio-political revolution perspective. In *2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*, pages 2206–2215. IEEE.
- Burger, J. D., Henderson, J., Kim, G., and Zarrella, G. (2011). Discriminating gender on twitter. In *Proceedings of the conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1301–1309. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., and Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The american voter*. University of Chicago Press.
- Caprara, G. V. and Vecchione, M. (2013). Personality approaches to political behavior. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 2. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.

- Carpini, M. X. D. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. Yale University Press.
- Chirumbolo, A. and Leone, L. (2010). Personality and politics: The role of the hexaco model of personality in predicting ideology and voting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(1):43–48.
- Chong, D. (2013). Degrees of rationality in politics. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 4, pages 96–129. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www.oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Chong, D., Citrin, J., and Conley, P. (2001). When self-interest matters. *Political Psychology*, 22(3):541–570.
- Ciot, M., Sonderegger, M., and Ruths, D. (2013). Gender inference of twitter users in non-english contexts. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1136–1145.
- Clarke, H. D. and Stewart, M. C. (1998). The decline of parties in the minds of citizens. *Annual review of political science*, 1(1):357–378.
- Clawson, R. A. and Oxley, Z. M. (2016). *Public opinion: Democratic ideals, democratic practice*. CQ Press.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In Apter, D. E., editor, *Ideology and discontent*. The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, NY.
- Corstange, D. (2016). Anti-american behavior in the middle east: evidence from a field experiment in lebanon. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1):311–325.
- Culotta, A., Kumar, N. R., and Cutler, J. (2015). Predicting the demographics of twitter users from website traffic data. In *AAAI*, volume 15, pages 72–8. Austin, TX.
- Dalton, R. J., Beck, P. A., and Huckfeldt, R. (1998). Partisan cues and the media: Information flows in the 1992 presidential election. *American Political Science Review*, 92(1):111–126.
- Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (2002). *Parties without partisans: Political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford University Press.
- Denzau, A. T. and North, D. C. (2000). Shared mental models: Ideologies and institutions. In Lupia, A., McCubbins, M. D., and Popkin, S. L., editors, *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology, page 23–46. Cambridge University Press.
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., and Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 93(5):880.
- DiMaggio, P., Nag, M., and Blei, D. (2013). Exploiting affinities between topic modeling and the sociological perspective on culture: Application to newspaper coverage of us government arts funding. *Poetics*, 41(6):570–606.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., and Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-ipp scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality. *Psychological assessment*, 18(2):192.
- Donsbach, W. and Traugott, M. W. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research*. Sage.
- Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper and Row.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame? *Journal of Politics*, 63(4):1041–1066.
- Epstein, L. and Mershon, C. (1996). Measuring political preferences. *American journal of political science*, pages 261–294.
- Feezell, J. and Krupnikov, Y. (2018). What’s true, and fake, about the facebook effect. *Behavioral Scientist*. Available at: <https://behavioralscientist.org/whats-true-and-fake-about-the-facebook-effect/> (access Feb 22, 2020).

- Feldman, S. (1982). Economic self-interest and political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 446–466.
- Feldman, S. (1989). Measuring issue preferences: The problem of response instability. *Political Analysis*, 1:25–60.
- Feldman, S. (2013). Political ideology. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 19, pages 591–626. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Filer, T. and Fredheim, R. (2016). Sparking debate? political deaths and twitter discourses in argentina and russia. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(11):1539–1555.
- Finkel, S. E. (1993). Reexamining the” minimal effects” model in recent presidential campaigns. *The Journal of Politics*, 55(1):1–21.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1978). Economic retrospective voting in american national elections: A micro-analysis. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 426–443.
- Fitzgerald, J. and Curtis, K. A. (2012). Partisan discord in the family and political engagement: A comparative behavioral analysis. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1):129–141.
- Funk, C. L. (2013). Genetic foundations of political behavior. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 8, pages 237–261. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Gerber, A. S. and Green, D. P. (2000). The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment. *American political science review*, 94(3):653–663.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., and Dowling, C. M. (2012). Personality and the strength and direction of partisan identification. *Political Behavior*, 34(4):653–688.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., and Ha, S. E. (2010). Personality and political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1):111–133.
- Goel, S., Mason, W., and Watts, D. J. (2010). Real and perceived attitude agreement in social networks. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(4):611.
- Gomez, B. T. and Wilson, J. M. (2001). Political sophistication and economic voting in the american electorate: A theory of heterogeneous attribution. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 899–914.
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., and Swann Jr, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the big-five personality domains. *Journal of Research in personality*, 37(6):504–528.
- Green, D. P. and Kern, H. L. (2012). Modeling heterogeneous treatment effects in survey experiments with bayesian additive regression trees. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3):491.
- Grimmer, J. and Stewart, B. M. (2013). Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political analysis*, 21(3):267–297.
- Herring, S. C., Barab, S., Kling, R., and Gray, J. (2004). An approach to researching online behavior. *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning*, 338.
- Hillygus, D. S. and Shields, T. G. (2008). *The persuadable voter: Wedge issues in presidential campaigns*. Princeton University Press.
- Hopkins, D. J. and King, G. (2010). A method of automated nonparametric content analysis for social science. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(1):229–247.

- Huber, G. A. and Arceneaux, K. (2007). Identifying the persuasive effects of presidential advertising. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):957–977.
- Huckfeldt, R., Johnson, P. E., and Sprague, J. (2005). Individuals, dyads, and networks: Autoregressive patterns of political influence. In Zuckerman, A. S., editor, *The social logic of politics: Personal networks as contexts for political behavior*, pages 21–49. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Iyengar, S., Peters, M. D., and Kinder, D. R. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the “not-so-minimal” consequences of television news programs. *American political science review*, 76(4):848–858.
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., Lelkes, Y., et al. (2012). Affect, not ideology: a social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76.
- Jacoby, W. G. (2010). The american voter. In Leighley, J. E., editor, *The Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior*, pages 239–261. Oxford University Press New York.
- Jamal, A. A., Keohane, R. O., Romney, D., and Tingley, D. (2015). Anti-americanism and anti-interventionism in arabic twitter discourses. *Perspectives on Politics*, 13(1):55–73.
- Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., and Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3):782–799.
- John, O. P., Srivastava, S., et al. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In Pervin, L. A. and John, O. P., editors, *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, volume 2, pages 102–138. Guilford.
- Jones, J. J., Settle, J. E., Bond, R. M., Fariss, C. J., Marlow, C., and Fowler, J. H. (2013). Inferring tie strength from online directed behavior. *PloS one*, 8(1).
- Khan, M. R., Manoj, J., Singh, A., and Blumenstock, J. (2015). Behavioral modeling for churn prediction: Early indicators and accurate predictors of custom defection and loyalty. In *2015 IEEE International Congress on Big Data*, pages 677–680. IEEE.
- Kiewiet, D. R. and Rivers, D. (1984). A retrospective on retrospective voting. *Political behavior*, 6(4):369–393.
- Knoke, D. (1994). *Political networks: the structural perspective*, volume 4. Cambridge University Press.
- Kramer, A. D., Guillory, J. E., and Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24):8788–8790.
- Krosnick, J. A. and Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2):497–512.
- Kuklinski, J. H. and Quirk, P. J. (2000). Reconsidering the rational public: Cognition, heuristics, and mass opinion. In Lupia, A., McCubbins, M. D., and Popkin, S. L., editors, *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology, page 153–182. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuklinski, J. H. and Quirk, P. J. (2001). Conceptual foundations of citizen competence. *Political Behavior*, 23(3):285–311.
- Lau, R. R., Kleinberg, M. S., and Ditonto, T. M. (2018). Measuring voter decision strategies in political behavior and public opinion research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82(S1):911–936.
- Laver, M. and Garry, J. (2000). Estimating policy positions from political texts. *American Journal of Political Science*, pages 619–634.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., and Gaudet, H. (1968[1944]). *The people’s choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign*. Columbia University Press, New York, USA and London, UK, 3rd edition.
- Leeper, T. J., Hobolt, S. B., and Tilley, J. (2019). Measuring subgroup preferences in conjoint experiments. *Political Analysis*, pages 1–15.

- Levendusky, M. (2009). *The partisan sort: How liberals became Democrats and conservatives became Republicans*. University of Chicago Press.
- Levendusky, M. S. (2010). Clearer cues, more consistent voters: A benefit of elite polarization. *Political Behavior*, 32(1):111–131.
- Levine, J. (2005). Choosing alone? the social network basis of modern political choice. In Zuckerman, A. S., editor, *The Social Logic of Politics. Personal Networks as Contexts for Political Behavior*, pages 132–151. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Lewis-Beck, M. S., Norpoth, H., Jacoby, W. G., and Weisberg, H. F. (2008). *The American voter revisited*. University of Michigan Press.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., and Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human communication research*, 28(4):587–604.
- Lupia, A. (1994). Shortcuts versus encyclopedias: Information and voting behavior in california insurance reform elections. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1):63–76.
- Luskin, R. C. (1987). Measuring political sophistication. *American journal of political science*, pages 856–899.
- MacKuen, M. B., Erikson, R. S., and Stimson, J. A. (1992). Peasants or bankers? the american electorate and the us economy. *American Political Science Review*, 86(3):597–611.
- Magdy, W., Darwish, K., and Weber, I. (2015). # failedrevolutions: Using twitter to study the antecedents of isis support. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02401*.
- Marcus, G. E. and MacKuen, M. B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review*, 87(3):672–685.
- Mason, L. (2015). “i disrespectfully agree”: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1):128–145.
- Massanari, A. (2017). # gamergate and the fapping: How reddit’s algorithm, governance, and culture support toxic technocultures. *New Media & Society*, 19(3):329–346.
- Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., and Anderson, M. R. (2010). Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1):85–110.
- Mutz, D. C. (1993). Direct and indirect routes to politicizing personal experience: Does knowledge make a difference? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, pages 483–502.
- Mutz, D. C. (2018). Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(19):E4330–E4339.
- Nelson, T. E., Oxley, Z. M., and Clawson, R. A. (1997). Toward a psychology of framing effects. *Political behavior*, 19(3):221–246.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2016). *The content analysis guidebook*. sage.
- Neuman, W. R. (1981). Differentiation and integration: Two dimensions of political thinking. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(6):1236–1268.
- Neuman, W. R. (1986). *The paradox of mass politics: Knowledge and opinion in the American electorate*. Harvard University Press.
- Nguyen, D., Gravel, R., Trieschnigg, D., and Meder, T. (2013). ” how old do you think i am?” a study of language and age in twitter. In *Seventh International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Nguyen, D., Smith, N. A., and Rosé, C. P. (2011). Author age prediction from text using linear regression. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACL-HLT workshop on language technology for cultural heritage, social sciences, and humanities*, pages 115–123. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Onnela, J.-P. and Reed-Tsochas, F. (2010). Spontaneous emergence of social influence in online systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(43):18375–18380.
- Pang, B., Lee, L., et al. (2008). Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 2(1-2):1–135.
- Preoțiu-Pietro, D., Lampos, V., and Aletras, N. (2015). An analysis of the user occupational class through twitter content. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1754–1764.
- Preoțiu-Pietro, D., Liu, Y., Hopkins, D., and Ungar, L. (2017). Beyond binary labels: political ideology prediction of twitter users. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 729–740.
- Price, V. and Neijens, P. (1997). Opinion quality in public opinion research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 9(4):336–360.
- Rao, D., Yarowsky, D., Shreevats, A., and Gupta, M. (2010). Classifying latent user attributes in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international workshop on Search and mining user-generated contents*, pages 37–44.
- Redlawsk, D. P. and Lau, R. R. (2013). Behavioral decision-making. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 5, pages 130–164. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Reiter, H. L. (1989). Party decline in the west a skeptic’s view. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1(3):325–348.
- Riff, D., Lacy, S., Fico, F., and Watson, B. (2019). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Routledge.
- Robert Huckfeldt, Jeffery J. Mondak, M. H. M. T. P. and Reilly, J. (2013). Networks, interdependence, and social influence in politics. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 21, pages 662–698. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Roberts, M. E., Stewart, B. M., Tingley, D., Lucas, C., Leder-Luis, J., Gadarian, S. K., Albertson, B., and Rand, D. G. (2014). Structural topic models for open-ended survey responses. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(4):1064–1082.
- Rogowski, J. C. and Sutherland, J. L. (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior*, 38(2):485–508.
- Romero, D. M., Meeder, B., and Kleinberg, J. (2011). Differences in the mechanics of information diffusion across topics: idioms, political hashtags, and complex contagion on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 695–704.
- Sajid, H. (2019). Deep learning for sentiment analysis. online. Medium.
- Salganik, M. (2019). *Bit by bit: Social research in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.
- Sap, M., Park, G., Eichstaedt, J., Kern, M., Stillwell, D., Kosinski, M., Ungar, L., and Schwartz, H. A. (2014). Developing age and gender predictive lexica over social media. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1146–1151.
- Sartori, G. (1969). Politics, ideology, and belief systems. *American Political Science Review*, 63(2):398–411.
- Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass communication & society*, 3(2-3):297–316.

- Sears, D. O. and Brown, C. (2013). Childhood and adult political development. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 3, pages 59–95. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Sears, D. O., Lau, R. R., Tyler, T. R., and Allen, H. M. (1980). Self-interest vs. symbolic politics in policy attitudes and presidential voting. *American Political Science Review*, 74(3):670–684.
- Sears, D. O. and Valentino, N. A. (1997). Politics matters: Political events as catalysts for preadult socialization. *American Political Science Review*, 91(1):45–65.
- Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., and Tetlock, P. E. (1993). *Reasoning and choice: Explorations in political psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Steenbergen, M. R., Edwards, E. E., and De Vries, C. E. (2007). Who’s cueing whom? mass-elite linkages and the future of european integration. *European Union Politics*, 8(1):13–35.
- Su, L. Y.-F., Xenos, M. A., Rose, K. M., Wirz, C., Scheufele, D. A., and Brossard, D. (2018). Uncivil and personal? comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the facebook pages of news outlets. *New Media & Society*, 20(10):3678–3699.
- Taber, C. S. (2011). *Political cognition and public opinion*. volume 1. Oxford University Press.
- Tamburrini, N., Cinnirella, M., Jansen, V. A., and Bryden, J. (2015). Twitter users change word usage according to conversation-partner social identity. *Social Networks*, 40:84–89.
- Tausczik, Y. R. and Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: Liwc and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 29(1):24–54.
- Valentino, N. A. and Nardis, Y. (2013). Political communication: Form and consequence of the information environment. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford handbook of political psychology*, volume 1, chapter 18, pages 559–590. Oxford University Press, 2 edition. <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199760107>.
- Wang, W., Rothschild, D., Goel, S., and Gelman, A. (2015). Forecasting elections with non-representative polls. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 31(3):980–991.
- Wattenberg, M. P. (2009). *The decline of American political parties, 1952-1996*. Harvard University Press.
- Wolak, J. and McDevitt, M. (2011). The roots of the gender gap in political knowledge in adolescence. *Political Behavior*, 33(3):505–533.
- Zaller, J. (1996). The myth of massive media impact revived: New support for a discredited idea. In *Political persuasion and attitude change*, volume 17. University of Michigan Press Ann Arbor.
- Zaller, J. and Feldman, S. (1992). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American journal of political science*, pages 579–616.
- Zhong, Y., Yuan, N. J., Zhong, W., Zhang, F., and Xie, X. (2015). You are where you go: Inferring demographic attributes from location check-ins. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 295–304.
- Zingher, J. N. and Flynn, M. E. (2019). Does polarization affect even the inattentive? assessing the relationship between political sophistication, policy orientations, and elite cues. *Electoral Studies*, 57:131–142.
- Zuckerman, A. S. (2005). *The social logic of politics: Personal networks as contexts for political behavior*. Temple University Press.
- Zuckerman, A. S., Valentino, N. A., and Zuckerman, E. W. (1994). A structural theory of vote choice: Social and political networks and electoral flows in britain and the united states. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(4):1008–1033.