Syllabus for *The Social Logic of Politics*
Department of Political Science
Aarhus University
Autumn Term 2015

David Hendry*

Social influence plays a central role in political behavior. Though the dominant observational and experimental paradigms for understanding political behavior tend to treat people purely as individuals, political scientists are becoming increasingly aware of the need to account for social interactions. Individuals are embedded within families, workplaces, neighborhoods, schools, social networks, and so on, each of which can have a potentially profound impact on the diversity of political ideas, social groups, and opportunities for political action to which they are exposed. Understanding the social influence process is therefore critical for understanding a wide variety of political outcomes.

The course is broadly divided into four sections:

1. Theoretical Models of Social Influence

    The theories and models presented in this section cover, among other topics, how and why people form social relationships, how social relationships structure opportunities, impose costs, and lead to returns, and how individual-level motivation interacts with the behavior of others to generate aggregate outcomes.

2. Empirical Research on Group Behavior and the Effects of Groups on Individuals

    The research in this section is largely rooted in the tradition of experimental social psychology and covers topics such as social conformity, the development of group identities and norms, and intergroup relations.

3. Empirical Research on the Effects of Social Context

    The research in this section largely comes from the individual-level tradition of public opinion research, but considers the ways in which the social and political environment interacts with individual traits to produce attitudes and behaviors.

4. Theoretical and Empirical Research on Social Network Analysis

    Social science research has traditionally explained social and political phenomena using actors, institutions, organizations, and so on, as the units of analysis. The research covered in this section takes the perspective that the relationships between units are the key to understanding important outcomes.

---
*Office 1341-124, david.hendry@ps.au.dk

Meeting Time and Place

Weeks 37–41 and 43–51, Wednesdays, 14:00–17:00, Building 1330, Room 038

Learning Objectives

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Develop research questions regarding the relationship between social and political outcomes

- Derive observable implications and testable hypotheses from political science theories of social interactions

- Explain the methodological difficulties of empirically examining the effects of social interactions on political outcomes

- Identify and apply appropriate methods for analyzing quantitative data on social interactions

- Synthesize results across various political science perspectives that address social influence processes into well-written and well-structured essays

Exam and Assignments

The final exam is a seven-day written assignment analyzing a topic outlined by the instructor. Students will have some flexibility regarding the structure of the exam. Empirical data to be used during the exam will be provided by the instructor.

In addition, students will each complete three essays during the course in which they synthesize and critically examine a week's readings. Essays will be 4–6 pages, double-spaced (roughly 1200–1800 words) each and must be written in English. Early in the course, students will sign up for the specific weeks that they wish to complete the essays. During the week that an essay is due, students are required to submit their essays to the instructor via email by 17:00 on the day prior to the class meeting. Further details will be given on the first day of class.

Reading Material

The assigned material for the course includes about 2400 pages including three required books and empirical research articles. All readings are available in the required books, online, or in the course packet and should be completed for the day that they are listed in the schedule. The required books for the course are as follows:

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Sherif, Muzafer, O.J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif. 2010 [1961]. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Knoke, David. 1990. *Political Networks: The Structural Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Software

The course will go through some demonstrations of how to construct theoretical simulation models and perform empirical research using freely available software (e.g., R, Pajek, NetLogo). Details will be given during the course.

Course Website

All information about the course will be posted on Blackboard. Any changes to the syllabus and additional materials will be made available there.

Schedule

The general schedule for the course follows. Students are expected to complete all of the readings for the assigned week prior to the start of class.

Models of Social Interaction I (Week 37)

This week is intended to give students an introduction to social scientific thinking about social interactions. We will address the usefulness of theoretical models and how they might help ground our thinking about social interactions and politics. Additionally, a few of the more famous and influential models of social interactions are introduced.

Readings

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company. (Chs. 1–2).

Lave, Charles A., and James G. March. 1975. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America. (pp. 1–25).

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embed-dedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3): 481–510. doi: 10.1002/9780470755679.

Miller, John H., and Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (pp. 1–17).

See Also

Kuran, Timur. 1995. *Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social Consequences of Preference Falsification.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sprague, John. 1982. "Is There a Micro-Theory Consistent with Contextual Analysis?" In *Strategies of Political Inquiry*, ed. Elinor Ostrom. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage pp. 99–121.

Models of Social Interaction II (Week 38)

This week, we continue with the topics from last week, but go into more depth about the specifics. We will see that the simple theoretical model-building process can get very complex very quickly, particularly when we think about how the motivations of individuals relate to societal-level outcomes. Individuals interact with other individuals according to certain rules, these interactions lead to population-level outcomes, population-level outcomes in turn affect how individuals behave, all in a large feedback loop.

Readings

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. (Chs. 3–4).

Lave, Charles A., and James G. March. 1975. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America. (pp. 341–360).

See Also

Miller, John H., and Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (pp. 141–154).

Schelling, Thomas C. 1971. "Dynamic Models of Segregation." *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1(2): 143–186. doi: 10.1080/0022250x.1971.9989794.

Kollman, Ken, John H. Miller, and Scott E. Page. 1997. "Political Institutions and Sorting in a Tiebout Model." *American Economic Review* 87(5): 977–992.

Clark, W.A.V. 1991. "Residential Preferences and Neighborhood Racial Segregation: A Test of the Schelling Segregation Model." *Demography* 28(1): 1–19. doi: 10.2307/2061333.

Models of Social Interaction III (Week 39)

This week, we complete our focus on theoretical models of social interactions having only scratched the surface. We continue with some of the material from the previous weeks, but also begin to think about how social interactions lead to norms, institutions, and culture when they play out over very long time spans. Note: Some of this material is quite technical. You are not expected to understand all of the mathematical detail presented, but it will be worthwhile to attempt to struggle through it.

Readings

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. (Ch. 5).

Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books. (Chs. 1, 4).

See Also

Boyd, Robert, and Peter J. Richerson. 1985. *Culture and the Evolutionary Process.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 1–18; 32–38; 60–80; 204–223).

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company. (Chs. 6–8).

Axelrod, Robert. 1997. *The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-Based Models of Competition and Collaboration.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowles, Samuel. 2006. *Microeconomics: Behavior, Institutions, and Evolution.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Group Behavior and Group Effects I (Week 40)

This week, we begin our explicit focus on how individuals relate to groups and how groups behave. The readings here argue that attachment to groups is a fundamental aspect of human behavior. We consider how this foundational human motive manifests early in life and what the political implications are.

Readings

Sherif, Muzafer, O.J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif. 2010 [1961]. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. (Chs. 1–3).

Conover, Pamela Johnston. 1988. "The Role of Social Groups in Political Thinking." *British Journal of Political Science* 18(1): 51–76. doi: 10.1017/s0007123400004956.

Mutz, Diana C. 1998. *Impersonal Influence: How Perceptions of Mass Collectives Affect Political Attitudes.* New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 1).

See Also

Baumeister, Roy F., and Mark R. Leary. 1995. "The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motive." *Psychological Bulletin* 117(3): 497–529. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497.

Gonsalkorale, Karen, and Kipling D. Williams. 2009. "The KKK Won't Let Me Play: Ostracism Even by a Despised Outgroup Hurts." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 37(6): 1176–1186. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.392.

Finifter, Ada. 1974. "The Friendship Group as a Protective Environment for Political Deviants." *American Political Science Review* 68(2): 607–625. doi: 10.2307/1959508.

Kelley, Harold H. 1952. "Two Functions of Reference Groups." In *Readings in Social Psychology*, ed. Guy E. Swanson, Theodore M. Newcombe, and Eugene L. Hartley. Revised ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company pp. 410–414.

Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth. 1984. *The Spiral of Silence: Public Opinion–Our Social Skin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huckfeldt, Robert, Paul Allen Beck, Russell J. Dalton, and Jeffrey Levine. 1995. "Political Environments, Cohesive Social Groups, and the Communication of Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(4): 1025–1054. doi: 10.2307/2111668.

Group Behavior and Group Effects II (Week 41)

This week, we continue with our focus on the relationship between individuals and groups. We cover how attachment to groups can lead to positive and negative biases toward ingroup and outgroup members, as well as intergroup competition and hostility. We go on to cover some old and new research on how the negative effects of intergroup competition can be mitigated under certain circumstances.

Readings

Sherif, Muzafer, O.J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif. 2010 [1961]. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. (Chs. 4–5).

Sherif, Muzafer. 1958. "Superordinate Goals in the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict." *American Journal of Sociology* 63(4): 349–356. doi: 10.1086/222258.

Sinclair, Stacey, Elizabeth Dunn, and Brian Lowery. 2005. "The Relationship Between Parental Racial Attitudes and Children's Implicit Prejudice." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 41(3): 283–289. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2004.06.003.

Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. 2009. "Reducing Intergroup Prejudice and Conflict Using the Media: A Field Experiment in Rwanda." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96(3): 574–587. doi: 10.1037/a0011989.

Tropp, Linda R., and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2003. "Relationships Between Intergroup Contact and Prejudice Among Minority and Majority Status Groups." *Psychological Science* 16(2): 951–957. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01643.x.

See Also

Czopp, Alexander M., and Margo J. Monteith. 2003. "Confronting Prejudice (Literally): Reactions to Confrontations of Racial and Gender Bias." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29(4): 532–544. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250923.

Sechrist, Gretchen B., and Charles Stangor. 2001. "Perceived Consensus Influences Intergroup Behavior and Stereotype Accessibility." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80(4): 645–654. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.80.4.645.

Oliver, J. Eric, and Janelle Wong. 2003. "Intergroup Prejudice in Multiethnic Settings." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(4): 567–582. doi: 10.1111/1540-5907.00040.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Linda R. Tropp. 2011. *When Groups Meet: The Dynamics of Intergroup Contact.* New York: Psychology Press.

Stangor, Charles, Gretchen B. Sechrist, and John T. Jost. 2001. "Changing Racial Beliefs by Providing Consensus Information." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27(4): 486–496. doi: 10.1177/0146167201274009.

Group Behavior and Group Effects III (Week 43)

This week, we continue our focus on individual attachment to groups. The major focus of the readings is how individuals may alter their attitudes and behaviors depending on the behaviors of other individuals in important reference groups. Importantly, the authors here show that individuals may (under certain circumstances) be pressured to behave in ways that they otherwise would not when they observe and are observed by members of reference groups.

Readings

Sherif, Muzafer, O.J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif. 2010 [1961]. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. (Chs. 6, 8).

Asch, Solomon E. 1955. "Opinions and Social Pressure." *Scientific American* 193(5): 31–35.

Deutsch, Morton, and Harold B. Gerard. 1955. "A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences Upon Individual Judgment." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 51(3): 629–636. doi: 10.1037/h0046408.

Festinger, Leon. 1957. "A Theory of Social Comparison Processes." *Human Relations* 7(2): 117–140. doi: 10.1177/001872675400700202.

Gerber, Alan S., 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(1): 33–48. doi: 10.1017/s000305540808009x.

See Also

Asch, Solomon E. 1956. "Studies of Independence and Conformity: I. A Minority of One Against a Unanimous Majority." *Psychological Monographs* 70(9): 1–70.

Asch, S.E. 1951. "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments." In *Groups, Leadership and Men*, ed. Harold Guetzkow. New York: Russell and Russell pp. 177–190.

Hardin, Curtis D., and E. Tory Higgins. 1996. "Shared Reality: How Social Verification Makes the Subjective Objective." In *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: The Interpersonal Context*, ed. Richard M. Sorrentino, and E. Tory Higgins. New York: Guilford Press pp. 28–84.

Reno, Raymond R., Robert B. Cialdini, and Carl A. Kallgren. 1993. "The Transsituational Influence of Social Norms." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64(1): 104–112. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.1.104.

Sherif, Muzafer. 1935. "A Study of Some Social Factors in Perception." *Archives of Psychology* 27(187).

Group Behavior and Group Effects IV (Week 44)

This week, we continue with our focus on groups, but shift our attention to laboratory research on how group-level characteristics develop from individual-level social interactions. Building on our previous focus on differences in how individuals behave when others are or are not observing, the research covered here presents empirical findings and theoretical implications about what these behaviors mean for group- and societal-level outcomes.

Readings

Mesoudi, Alex, and Andrew Whiten. 2008. "The Multiple Roles of Cultural Transmission Experiments in Understanding Human Cultural Evolution." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B* 363(1509): 3489–3501. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2008.0129.

Jacobs, Robert C., and Donald T. Campbell. 1961. "The Perpetuation of Arbitrary Traditions Through Several Generations of a Laboratory Microculture." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62(3): 649–658. doi: 10.1037/h0044182.

Baum, William M., Peter J. Richerson, Charles M. Efferson, and Brian M. Paciotti. 2004. "Cultural Evolution in Laboratory Microsocieties Including Traditions of Rule Giving and Rule Following." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 25(5): 305–326. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.05.003.

Efferson, Charles, Rafael Lalive, Peter J. Richerson, Richard McElreath, and Mark Lubell. 2008. "Conformists and Mavericks: The Empirics of Frequency-Dependent Cultural Transmission." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 29(1): 56–64. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.08.003.

See Also

Mesoudi, Alex, and Andrew Whiten. 2004. "The Hierarchical Transformation of Event Knowledge in Human Cultural Transmission." *Journal of Cognition and Culture* 4(1): 1–24. doi: 10.1163/156853704323074732.

Mesoudi, Alex, Andrew Whiten, and Robin Dunbar. 2010. "A Bias for Social Information in Human Cultural Transmission." *British Journal of Psychology* 97(3): 405–423. doi: 10.1348/000712605X85871.

Kashima, Yoshihisa. 2000. "Maintaining Cultural Stereotypes in the Serial Production of Narratives." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26(5): 594–604. doi: 10.1177/0146167200267007.

Kirby, Simon, Hannah Cornish, and Kenny Smith. 2008. "Cumulative Cultural Evolution in the Laboratory: An Experimental Approach to the Origins of Structure in Human Language." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105(31): 10681–10686. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0707835105.

Caldwell, Christine A., and Ailsa E. Millen. 2008. "Studying Cumulative Cultural Evolution in the Laboratory." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B* 363(1509): 3529–3539. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2008.0133.

Mesoudi, Alex. 2009. "How Cultural Evolutionary Theory Can Inform Social Psychology and Vice Versa." *Psychological Review* 116(4): 929–952. doi: 10.1037.

Social Context I (Week 45)

This week, we shift our focus to the large body of political science scholarship on social context effects. The social context determines whether an individual is (locally) in the majority or minority politically, racially, religiously, and so on, and many scholars have found that this status correlates with political attitudes and behaviors. Here we focus primarily on the effects of social context on political participation.

Readings

Putnam, Robert D. 1966. "Political Attitudes and the Local Community." *American Political Science Review* 60(3): 640–654. doi: 10.2307/1952976.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 1979. "Political Participation and the Neighborhood Social Context." *American Journal of Political Science* 23(3): 579–592. doi: 10.2307/2111030.

Großer, Jens, and Arthur Schram. 2006. "Neighborhood Information Exchange and Voter Participation: An Experimental Study." *American Political Science Review* 100(2): 235–248. doi: 10.1017/s0003055406062137.

Hiskey, Jonathan T., and Shaun Bowler. 2005. "Local Context and Democratization in Mexico." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 57–71. doi: 10.1111/j.0092-5853.2005.00110.x.

Kenny, Christopher. 1992. "Political Participation and Effects from the Social Environment." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(1): 259–267. doi: 10.2307/2111432.

See Also

Canache, Damarys. 1994. "Looking Out My Back Door: The Neighborhood Context and Perceptions of Relative Deprivation." *Political Research Quarterly* 47(3): 547–571. doi: 10.1177/106591299604900305.

King, Gary. 1996. "Why Context Should Not Count." *Political Geography* 15(2): 159–164. doi: 10.1016/0962-6298(95)00079-8.

Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Election*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam, James G. Gimpel, and Joshua J. Dyck. 2006. "Residential Concentration, Political Socialization, and Voter Turnout." *Journal of Politics* 68(1): 156–167. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00377.x.

Durkheim, Emile. 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. New York: The Free Press.

Eulau, Heinz. 1986. *Politics, Self and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 1986. *Politics in Context*. New York: Agathon.

Langton, Kenneth P., and Ronald Rapoport. 1975. "Social Structure, Social Context and Partisan Mobilization: Urban Workers in Chile." *Comparative Political Studies* 88(3): 318–344. doi: 10.1177/001041407500800303.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1948. *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Baker, Andy, Barry Ames, and Lucio R. Renno. 2006. "Social Context and Campaign Volatility in New Democracies: Networks and Neighborhoods in Brazil's 2002 Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 383–399. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00190.x.

Social Context II (Week 46)

This week, we continue and wrap up our focus on social context effects. Whereas we previously focused on behavioral outcomes, here we focus on how an individual's status within a social context correlates with their attitudes about members of other societal groups.

Readings

Amir, Yehuda. 1969. "Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations." *Psychological Bulletin* 71(5): 319–342. doi: 10.1037/h0027352.

Oliver, J. Eric, and Tali Mendelberg. 2000. "Reconsidering the Environmental Determinants of White Racial Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science* 44(3): 574–589. doi: 10.2307/2669265.

Baybeck, Brady. 2006. "Sorting Out the Competing Effects of Racial Context." *Journal of Politics* 68(2): 386–396. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00414.x.

Campbell, Andrea Louise, Cara Wong, and Jack Citrin. 2006. "'Racial Threat,' Partisan Climate, and Direct Democracy: Contextual Effects in Three California Initiatives." *Political Behavior* 28(2): 129–150. doi: 10.1007/s11109-006-9005-6.

See Also

Dinesen, Peter Thisted, and Kim Mannemar Sønderskov. 2015. "Ethnic Diversity and Trust: Evidence from the Micro-Context." *American Sociological Review* 80(3): 550–573. doi: 10.1177/0003122415577989.

Levitan, Lindsey Clark, and Penny S. Visser. 2008. "The Impact of Social Context on Resistance to Persuasion: Effortful versus Effortless Responses to Counter-Attitudinal Information." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 44(3): 640–649. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2007.03.004.

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Merton, Robert K. 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure.* New York: Free Press.

Wong, Cara J. 2010. *Boundaries of Obligation in American Politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

MacKuen, Michael, and Courtney Brown. 1987. "Political Context and Attitude Change." *American Political Science Review* 81(2): 471–490. doi: 10.2307/1961962.

Social and Political Networks I (Week 47)

This week, we begin our final broad theme of the course by focusing on social science applications of social network analysis. In order to ground our thinking for the remainder of the course, we will focus on readings that introduce basic concepts of network science that are used across disciplines and how they relate specifically to social and political applications. Note: Social network analysis can be quite technical. While it is not important that you understand all of the mathematical detail in the course's remaining readings, it is important that you attempt to struggle through it. It will be worthwhile in the end.

Readings

Watts, Duncan J. 2004. "The 'New' Science of Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 243–270. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.30.020404.104342.

Miller, John H., and Scott E. Page. 2007. *Complex Adaptive Systems.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (pp. 154–165).

Monge, Peter R., and Noshir Contractor. 2003. *Theories of Communication Networks.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 1).

Knoke, David. 1990. *Political Networks: The Structural Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 1).

See Also

Wasserman, Stanley, and Katherine Faust. 1994. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications.* New York: Cambridge University Press. (pp. 1–22).

Nooy, Wouter De, Andrej Mrvar, and Vladimir Batagelj. 2005. *Exploratory Social Network Analysis with Pajek.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, Matthew O. 2008. *Social and Economic Networks.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Christakis, Nicholas A., and James H. Fowler. 2011. *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives.* New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Sinclair, Betsy. 2012. *The Social Citizen.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Social and Political Networks II (Week 48)

This week, similar to the first week of the course, we largely focus on theoretical models. But now we incorporate the concepts of social network analysis and focus on relationships rather than individuals, groups, or societies as the important factors affecting social and political outcomes.

Readings

Burt, Ronald S. 1980. "Models of Network Structure." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6: 79–141. doi: 10.1146/annurev.so.06.080180.00455.

Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360–1380. doi: 10.1086/225469.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 1983. "Social Contexts, Social Networks, and Urban Neighborhoods: Environmental Constraints on Friendship Choice." *American Journal of Sociology* 89(3): 651–669. doi: 10.1086/227908.

See Also

Granovetter, Mark. 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." *Sociological Theory* 1: 201–233. doi: 10.2307/202051.

Burt, Ronald S. 1987. "Social Contagion and Innovation: Cohesion versus Structural Equivalence." *American Journal of Sociology* 92(6): 1287–1335. doi: 10.2307/2393431.

Montgomery, James D. 1992. "Job Search and Network Composition: Implications of the Strength-Of-Weak-Ties Hypothesis." *American Sociological Review* 57(5): 586–596. doi: 10.2307/2095914.

Friedkin, Noah E. 1982. "Information Flow Through Strong and Weak Ties in Intraorganizational Social Networks." *Social Networks* 3(4): 273–285. doi: 10.1016/0378-8733(82)90003-X.

Social and Political Networks III (Week 49)

This week, we shift our focus to empirical research on the structure of social networks. The readings focusing on the so-called "small-world problem" attempt to map networks and determine whether human social networks have consistent and naturally occurring features. The remaining research presented here attempts to use a known relational structure to demonstrate how individuals influence other individuals in particular ways given the structure of their social connections.

Readings

Milgram, Stanley. 1967. "The Small-World Problem." *Psychology Today* 2(1): 60–67.

Travers, Jeffrey, and Stanley Milgram. 1969. "An Experimental Study of the Small World Problem." *Sociometry* 32(4): 425–443. doi: 10.2307/2786545.

Watts, Duncan J. 1999. "Networks, Dynamics, and the Small-World Phenomenon." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(2): 493–527. doi: 10.1086/210318.

Bond, Robert M., Christopher J. Fariss, Jason J. Jones, Adam D.I. Kramer, Cameron Marlow, Jaime E. Settle, and James H. Fowler. 2012. "A 61-Million-Person Experiment in Social Influence and Political Mobilization." *Nature* 489(7415): 295–298. doi: 10.1038/nature11421.

Nickerson, David. 2008. "Is Voting Contagious? Evidence From Two Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 49–57. doi: 10.1017/s0003055408080039.

See Also

Dodds, Peter Sheridan, Roby Muhamad, and Duncan J. Watts. 2003. "An Experimental Study of Search in Global Social Networks." *Science* 301(5634): 827–829. doi: 10.1126/science.1081058.

Rand, David G., Samuel Arbesman, and Nicholas A. Christakis. 2011. "Dynamic Social Networks Promote Cooperation in Experiments with Humans." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108(48): 19193–19198. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1108243108.

Newman, M.E.J. 2000. "Models of the Small World." *Journal of Statistical Physics* 101(3–4): 819–841.

Willer, Robb, Ko Kuwabara, and Michael W. Macy. 2009. "The False Enforcement of Unpopular Norms." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(2): 451–490. doi: 10.1086/599250.

Social and Political Networks IV (Week 50)

This week, building on what we have learned previously, we consider how network structures affect the flow of information. Much previous social science literature argues that elites influence citizens via the mass media. The research presented this week suggests that individuals' fellow citizens act as important filters of mass media information.

Readings

Katz, Elihu. 1957. "The Two-Step Flow of Communication: An Up-to-Date Report on a Hypothesis." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 21(1): 61–78. doi: 10.1086/266687.

de Vreese, Claes H., and Hajo G. Boomgaarden. 2006. "Media Message Flows and Interpersonal Communication: The Conditional Nature of Effects on Public Opinion." *Communication Research* 33(1): 19–37. doi: 10.1177/0093650205283100.

Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1987. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1197–1216. doi: 10.2307/1962585.

Mutz, Diana. 2002. "Cross-Cutting Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 111–126. doi: 10.1017/s0003055402004264.

See Also

Latane, Bibb. 1996. "Dynamic Social Impact: The Creation of Culture by Communication." *Journal of Communication* 46(4): 13–25. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1996.tb01501.x.

Visser, Penny S., and Robert R. Mirabile. 2004. "Attitudes in the Social Context: The Impact of Social Network Composition on Individual-Level Attitude Strength." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87(6): 779–795. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.779.

Katz, Elihu, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. 1955. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Gibson, James L. 2001. "Social Networks, Civil Society, and the Prospects for Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1): 51–69. doi: 10.2307/2669359.

Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1995. *Citizens, Politics, and Communication: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Social and Political Networks V (Week 51)

This week, we wrap up the course on the social logic of politics by covering the frontier of political applications of social network analysis. The readings this week cover empirical research on how the focus on relationships and network structure can be applied to settings other than individual-to-individual social interactions.

Readings

Fowler, James H. 2006. "Connecting the Congress: A Study of Cosponsorship Networks." *Political Analysis* 14(4): 456–487. doi: 10.1093/pan/mpl002.

Knoke, David. 1990. *Political Networks: The Structural Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press. (Chs. 7–8).

Maoz, Zeev, Lesley G. Terris, Ranan D. Kuperman, and Ilan Talmud. 2006. "Structural Equivalence and International Conflict, 1816–2001: A Network Analysis of Affinities and Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(5): 664–689. doi: 10.1177/0022002706291053.

See Also

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Dino P. Christenson, and Matthew P. Hitt. 2013. "Quality Over Quantity: Amici Influence and Judicial Decision Making." *American Political Science Review* 107(3): 446–460. doi: 10.1017/S000305541300021X.

Carpenter, Daniel, Kevin Esterling, and David Lazer. 2003. "The Strength of Strong Ties: A Model of Contact-Making in Policy Networks with Evidence from U.S. Health Politics." *Rationality and Society* 15(4): 411–440. doi: 10.1177/1043463103154001.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam, and James H. Fowler. 2010. "Legislative Success in a Small World: Social Network Analysis and the Dynamics of Congressional Legislation." *Journal of Politics* 72(1): 124–135. doi: 10.1017/s002238160999051x.

Maoz, Zeev. 2010. *Networks of Nations: The Evolution, Structure, and Impact of International Networks, 1816–2001.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Maoz, Zeev. 2012. "How Network Analysis Can Inform the Study of International Relations." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 29(3): 247–256. doi: 10.1177/0738894212443341.

Carpenter, Daniel P., Kevin M. Esterling, and David M. Lazer. 2004. "Friends, Brokers, and Transitivity: Who Informs Whom in Washington Politics?" *Journal of Politics* 66(1): 224–246. doi: 10.1046/j.1468-2508.2004.00149.x.