

Government 401

Spring Semester, 2017

T/Th 12:30-1:50 p.m.

Tyler Hall 113

http://jsettle.blogs.wm.edu/teaching/govt401_s17/

Blackboard Course Website

Professor Jaime Settle

Tyler Hall 368

jsettle@wm.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m., or by appointment

Social and Psychological Influences on Political Behavior

In this seminar, we will explore in depth the contributions to political behavior stemming from innate differences in biology, exposure to the immediate social environment, and the interaction between these influences. Much of the reading you encounter in this class has been published in the last five years and reflects the new directions—and consequently off-the-beaten-path approaches—undertaken by scholars on the cutting edge of political behavior research.

A scan of the reading schedule in this syllabus will give you an idea of the range of topics we will encounter. Our work will be to synthesize the readings to understand the points of consensus, contention, and uncertainty in what we think we know about why and how people think, feel, and act in the political realm.

Teaching Philosophy

The subject matter of a course serves as a tool to help you develop skills to become a better thinker and communicator. The goals for this course are for you to:

Ask good questions. Learning necessitates curiosity.

Assess and synthesize information. Use the course material to arrive at informed opinions.

Engage in analytical reasoning. Respectfully discuss and deliberate ideas.

Communicate effectively. Continue to improve the skills necessary to write or present a clearly argued and well-developed discourse.

Course Philosophy

The senior seminar in the Government Department is designed to challenge you to think more integrally about a particular topic than time usually permits in an introductory course or upper division elective. Consequently, you will have to work harder—both in the amount of time you devote to this course and in the amount of cognitive effort you expend. You should adjust your class and extracurricular schedule accordingly to account for the high demands of this experience, or you should adjust your expectations for your seminar grade to reflect the competing pressures on your time.

I will run this course like an introductory graduate seminar, because I am confident that you are capable of engaging with the material at that level. However, the purpose of this course is not to prepare you for graduate school (although it will be good practice); rather, the goal of the seminar experience is to push you to fully implement the skills you've developed throughout your liberal arts curriculum, with the hope that you will be able to transfer your mastery of these skills to the

demands of your post-collegiate life. Although it is unlikely that you will be regularly asked to write extensive research proposals or papers in a job outside of academia, you *will* be expected to think clearly, write concisely, and speak coherently. The requirements of this course are designed to help you improve in those domains. Thus, the *process* of analyzing extant research and contributing to our body of knowledge is arguably more important than the content you will learn in this seminar.

I encourage you to take ownership over this capstone experience and I hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to challenge yourself. I recognize that GOVT 401 is only one of your classes in a full course load, and that many of you have important work and family obligations outside of school. If you take your education seriously and communicate with me (with plenty of advance notice) about obstacles or challenges that may affect your performance in the course, I am happy to work with you to find solutions to help you succeed.

Course Requirements

While there are no tests for this course, there will be a significant amount of writing required. You cannot pass this course without completing all assignments.

Assignment

Participation (including the “Extra Stuff”)	20%
Skill Building Exercises (4)	10%
Critique-Response Thread Papers (4)	25%
Other Writing Assignments (3)	15%
Independent Research	30%

Seminar Participation

Regular attendance is a necessary, but insufficient condition, to earn full points for class participation. Participation is weighted so heavily in this course because unlike your lecture-based courses, where the professor typically sets the agenda for discussion, what we talk about each day will be largely determined by the clarifications, questions, and critiques you all have of the readings. Therefore, it is critical that you arrive each day fully prepared to participate. My expectation is that before class starts, you have: 1) Read, and taken notes, on the assigned readings; 2) identified important questions raised by the readings; 3) read your classmates’ critique and response papers; and 4) formed an initial idea about how you would design research to address unresolved issues found in the readings. You will not be penalized for misinterpreting or incorrectly understanding the class material. You will be penalized for failing to be prepared, failing to comment, or failing to ask questions during class.

Keep these three ideas in mind throughout the semester as we explore various topics:

1. How does the choice of theoretical and methodological approach shape what we know about a topic?
2. What don’t we know yet about the topic? How would we go about investigating it?
3. Is it important to ask this research question? Why does the answer to that question matter?

Class attendance is required, though participation points will not be awarded simply for showing up. You have three unexcused absences; each unexcused absence after the third will result in a two-point deduction in your participation grade. Habitual tardiness to class bothers me and extreme cases can affect your participation grade; if you anticipate that you will be late with some frequency

(for example, if you have a class on the other side of campus with a long-winded professor), please make me aware of the situation and plan to sit near the door.

Skill Building Exercises (4 assignments, one-three paragraphs in length)

The purpose of these skill-building exercises is for you to develop and practice the skills you will need to successfully complete the Critique and Response Thread Papers. These exercises are also an opportunity to get feedback from me on your writing so you have a clearer understanding of my expectations for future assignments. The assignments are intentionally short. However, while each of these exercises is a “low stakes” assignment and is only worth a small percent of your overall grade, I encourage you to do your best work so that you can learn as much as possible from the comments that I give you.

Critique and Response Papers (4 papers, one-two page single spaced each)

The students completing the Critique-Response Thread assignment(s) will steer the direction of the discussion for each class session. More information is provided on a separate handout, but the basic idea is as follows. For each class session, we will have two students who start the discussion on the theoretical aspects of the readings and two students who start the discussion on the methodological aspects of the readings. The first student in each pair (the “initiator”) writes a one-two page (single spaced) critique of one or more specific facets of the readings, and includes two-three discussion questions. The second student in each pair (the “responder”) will write a one-page (single-spaced) response that directly addresses one or more issues raised by the initiator, or answers one of the discussion questions posed.

Please pay careful attention to the due dates on these assignments, as they need to be completed well in advance of the day on which the readings are assigned, in order to allow the threads to be posted and read before class. Each student in the class will serve in each capacity once—as a theory initiator, a theory responder, a methods initiator, and a methods responder.

Other Short Writing Assignments

Most class sessions will be jump-started by the Critique-Response Thread process outlined above. However, on three occasions, the seminar instead will be facilitated by an assignment that everyone completes. More information will be provided on these assignments, but they will also be one-two page (single-spaced) papers.

Connected Assignment: Tuesday, March 21st

Thinking Fast and Slow Assignment: Thursday, April 6th

Synthesis Assignment: Friday, April 21st

Extra Stuff

The senior seminars in the Government Department carry four credits worth of work. In addition to the heavier reading and writing load, this also provides for more “contact time.” To meet that expectation, you are required to do three other things:

1. Dr. Lilliana Mason will be on campus February 9th and 10th. There are two extra events you must attend:
 - a. Methods Roundtable, Thursday, February 9th Time TBA (probably around 4pm)
 - b. Government Department Colloquium Talk, Friday, February 10th at 12:00 p.m.

2. The Government Department supports a collaborative subject pool for survey and experimental research conducted by students and faculty. You will have the opportunity to participate as a subject in one or more research projects this semester. An alternative writing assignment will be offered to students who do not want to participate in the Omnibus Project or are not old enough to participate. The total time required will be approximately one hour.

3. You will submit a portfolio at the end of the semester, including all of your short written assignments and a self-reflection essay.

Independent Research Project:

The hallmark of the senior seminar experience is the opportunity to write a paper that makes an original contribution to our knowledge of some aspect of political science: in our case, the social and psychological contributions to political behavior. More detail will be provided in another handout, but the final product will be 15-20 pages in length, and can take the form of a grant proposal, a research design proposal, or a full-fledged research paper that both reviews extant knowledge and analyzes primary data.

The assignment is worth 30% of your final grade. This will be broken down in the following way:

- Article Review Assignment: Friday, February 3rd (5%)
- Paper Topic: Friday, February 17th (10%)
- Workshop Day: Thursday, March 2nd (5%)
- Research Design Prospectus: Friday, March 17th (10%)
- First Draft: Friday, April 7th (35%)
- Final Draft: Friday, May 5th (but preferably earlier) (35%)

You will receive a 2% bonus on your overall grade on the project if you leave your final paper under my door or in my mailbox by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, May 1st.

Grading

I reserve A's for excellent work. B's are for solid, above-average work while C's are for work of average quality. D's indicate work that is below average, and F's indicate work that is substantially below expectations.

100-93	A	89-87	B+	79-77	C+	
92-90	A-	86-83	B	76-73	C	
		82-80	B-	72-70	C-	etc.

It is imperative that you turn your critique-response papers in on time, as your classmates' ability to complete their own work and come prepared for class depends on it. Therefore, if you post your paper to Blackboard late, at all, you will automatically receive a 50 on the assignment. That essentially works out to an entire letter grade lower (reducing an A- to a B+) on your final grade. I cannot stress enough how important it is that you post that assignment on time.

For all other assignments, I have a less rigid policy. I will collect assignments at the beginning of class, and assignments turned in after class are subject to a 10% penalty. After that first day, assignments will be penalized an additional half-letter grade (5%) for each day (or fraction there of) they are late until the maximum grade possible is a 60. Weekend days count. So, if you turn in an assignment after class but before midnight on the day the assignment is due, the maximum grade

possible is a 90. An assignment turned in the day after the due date will receive a maximum score of 85; two days late will receive a maximum of 80; three days late, 75, etc. If you are submitting your paper late, you must email it to me for time-stamping purposes and submit a hard copy ASAP. I will not accept assignments after the Friday of the last week of classes. Computer malfunctions will not be considered a legitimate excuse for the late submission of assignments, so plan accordingly.

Extra credit will not be available. Consequently, it is imperative that you do your best on each and every assignment. I do not communicate about grades over email. If you are not in class the day an assignment is passed back, it is your responsibility to come to my office hours or make an appointment to pick it up.

If you are dissatisfied with your grade on an assignment, you can choose between two options. If you want to talk about your work and discuss ways you can improve on *future* assignments, I am happy to meet with you in office hours or by appointment. You cannot appeal your grade after we have this conversation. Therefore, if you are positive that you want to appeal your grade, you need to write a one-page double-spaced explanation of why you think your work merits a higher grade. After reading your appeal, I will re-grade your assignment. Your grade can go up, stay the same, or go down. We will *then* schedule a meeting to talk about your work.

Plagiarism

I assume that students take the Honor Code and plagiarism as seriously as I do and that academic misconduct will not become an issue in this class. For any questions about policies regarding cheating, plagiarism, or other types of academic dishonesty, please see the William and Mary Honor Council's web site and the discussion of the Honor Code and plagiarism in the Student Handbook. I will initiate an Honor Council proceeding for any student whom I judge to have plagiarized any part of their work or to have cheated in any way, and at a bare minimum, I will recommend that the student receive an F for the course.

Misc. Policies

Turn off your cell phones before coming to class. If you are expecting an important call, tell me before class, keep your phone on vibrate, and leave quietly when you receive the call.

I prefer that you do not use your laptop in class. We will discuss this in more detail on the first day of class, but if you feel that you must use your laptop, please be especially conscious of the signals you are sending to me and to your peers with your body language and eye contact.

William & Mary accommodates students with disabilities in accordance with federal laws and university policy. Any student who needs an accommodation based on the impact of a learning, psychiatric, physical, or chronic health diagnosis should contact Student Accessibility Services staff at 757-221-2509 or at sas@wm.edu to determine if accommodations are warranted and to obtain an official letter of accommodation. For more information, please see www.wm.edu/sas.

Course Materials

I recommend that you purchase the following books, although there will be copies of the books available on reserve in the library. While they are on sale in the campus bookstore, I am confident sleuthing on Amazon, half.com, or abebooks.com will result in used copies at lower cost.

Hibbing, John R., Kevin B. Smith, and John R. Alford. 2014. *Predisposed: Liberals, Conservatives, and the Biology of Political Differences*. New York: Routledge

Christakis, Nicholas and James Fowler. 2009. *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives*. New York: Little, Brown and Company

Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux

In addition to these three texts, additional original research articles and readings will be available via the course website on Blackboard.

Writing Resources

This course is writing-intensive and I expect students to produce concise and precise prose. Toward this end, I recommend that you consult at least one of the following writing guides if you are consistently receiving negative feedback about the quality of your writing.

Strunk Jr., William I. and E.B. White. 1999. *The Elements of Style*, 4th Edition. Longman.

Zinsser, William. 1998. *On Writing Well*. New York: Harper.

Readings and Calendar

I reserve the right to make minor modifications to the assigned reading but I will not increase the reading load

Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Social Psychological Political Science

**Th January 19th
Logistics Day**

Hatemi, Peter and Rose McDermott. 2011. *Man is by Nature a Political Animal: Evolution, Biology, and Politics*. Chapter 1

Biological Origins of Political Behavior

**Tu January 24th
Classic and Not-So-Classic Takes on Political Ideology**

SBE #1 DUE

Campbell et al. 1960. *The American Voter*, excerpt from Chp. 9 (188-194)

Conover and Feldman. 1981. “The Origins and Meaning of Liberal/Conservative Self-Identifications.” *American Journal of Political Science* 25(4): 617-625

Jost and Amodio. 2003. “Political Ideology as Motivated Social Cognition: Behavioral and Neuroscientific Evidence.” *Motivation and Emotion* 36:55-64

Smith, Kevin B, Douglas R Oxley, Matthew V Hibbing, John R Alford, and John R Hibbing. 2011. “Linking Genetics and Political Attitudes: Reconceptualizing Political Ideology.” *Political Psychology* 32(3): 369–397.

**Th January 26th NO CLASS MEETING
A Research Methods Detour**

These readings should serve as references for your CRT papers and your research paper. I encourage you to familiarize yourself with them although we will not discuss them in depth until later in the semester:

King, Keohane, and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. 1994. Chapter 1, 4-5. (*Pay special attention to Chapter 1 starting on page 14 if you are having trouble selecting a research topic*)

Trochim and Donnelly, “Research Methods Knowledge Base.” Excerpt

Tu January 31st
Why Study the Biology of Political Behavior?

Find one academic (peer-reviewed) article that connects to your research project. Read the handout posted on Blackboard about conducting a literature review, and come prepared with questions about the assignment due Friday.

SBE #2 DUE

Read these as a pair:

Hibbing, John R. 2013. “Ten Misconceptions Concerning Neurobiology and Politics.” *Perspectives on Politics* 11(02): 475–489

Schlozman, Kay Lehman. 2013. “Two Concerns About Ten Misconceptions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 11(02): 490–491.

Read these as a pair:

Charney, Evan. 2008. “Genes and Ideologies.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6(02): 299-319. ONLY READ PAGES 304-312

Alford, John R, Carolyn L Funk, and John R Hibbing. 2008. “Beyond Liberals and Conservatives to Political Genotypes and Phenotypes.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6(02): 321-328. READ ONLY PAGES 324-325

Th February 2nd
Biology of Attitudes

SBE #3 DUE

Predisposed, Chapters 5-7

F February 3rd
ARTICLE REVIEW ASSIGNMENT DUE

Tu February 7th
Classic Takes on Partisanship

Campbell, et al. 1960, excerpts from Chapter 10 (218-227, 249-250, required; 227-248 optional)

Green, Palmquist and Schickler 2002, Chapters 1-2

Predisposed, Chapter 4, pages 89-96

**Th February 9th
Expressive Partisanship**

SBE #4 DUE

Huddy, Leonie, Lilliana Mason, Lene Aaroe. 2015. “Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity.” *American Political Science Review* 109(1): 1-17.

Mason, Lilliana. 2015. “I Disrespectfully Agree: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59(1): 128-145.

Mason, Lilliana. 2016. “A Cross-Cutting Calm: How Social Sorting Drives Affective Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80(S1): 351–377

SSRMC Event: Measurement Roundtable, Time and Place TBA

F February 10th

Dr. Lily Mason Colloquium Talk, 12:00 p.m.

**Tu February 14th
“Big Five” Personality Traits and Political Behavior**

Mondak, JJ, MV Hibbing, D Canache, MA Seligson, and MR Anderson. 2010. “Personality and Civic Engagement: an Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior.” *American Political Science Review* 104(01): 85–110.

Rentfrow, Peter J, Samuel D Gosling, and Jeff Potter. 2008. “A Theory of the Emergence, Persistence, and Expression of Geographic Variation in Psychological Characteristics.” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 3(5): 339–369.

Kosinski, Michal, David Stillwell, and Thore Graepel. 2013. “Private Traits and Attributes Are Predictable From Digital Records of Human Behavior.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110(15): 5802–5805.

**Th February 16th
Authoritarianism**

Martin, John Levi. 2001. “The Authoritarian Personality, 50 Years Later: What Questions Are There for Political Psychology?” *Political Psychology* 22(1): 1–26.

Predisposed, Chapter 4, pages 96-114

Taub, Amanda. “The Rise of American Authoritarianism.” Vox. Available at <http://www.vox.com/2016/3/1/11127424/trump-authoritarianism>

Rahn, Wendy and Eric Oliver. “Trump’s Voters Aren’t Authoritarians, New Research Says. So What Are They?” Monkey Cage. Available at https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/09/trumps-voters-arent-authoritarians-new-research-says-so-what-are-they/?utm_term=.abfc93c6def6

F February 17th
PAPER TOPIC DUE

Tu February 21st
Genes, Stress, and Voting

Settle, Jaime E., Christopher T. Dawes, Peter John Loewen and Costas Panagopouous. “Negative Affectivity, Political Contention, and Turnout: A Genopolitics Field Experiment.” *Political Psychology*, forthcoming.

Waismel-Manor, Israel, Gal Ifergane, and Hagit Cohen. 2011. “When Endocrinology and Democracy Collide: Emotions, Cortisol and Voting at National Elections.” *European Neuropsychopharmacology* 21(11): 789–795.

French, Jeffrey A, et al. 2014. “Cortisol and Politics: Variance in Voting Behavior is Predicted by Baseline Cortisol Levels.” *Physiology & Behavior* 133:61-67

Th February 23rd
Facial Appearance

Todorov, A. 2005. “Inferences of Competence From Faces Predict Election Outcomes.” *Science* 308(5728): 1623–1626.

Antonakis, J, and O Dalgas. 2009. “Predicting Elections: Child's Play!” *Science* 323(5918): 1183–1183.

Lenz, Gabriel S. and Chappell Lawson. 2011. “Looking the Part: Television Leads Less Informed Citizens to Vote Based on Candidates’ Appearance.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3): 574–589

Ahler, Douglas, et al. 2016. “Face Value? Experimental Evidence that Candidate Appearance Influences Electoral Choice.” *Political Behavior* forthcoming

**Tu February 28th
Biology and Polarization**

Predisposed, Chapter 9

Klofstad, Casey A, Rose McDermott, and Peter K Hatemi. 2012. “The Dating Preferences of Liberals and Conservatives.” *Political Behavior* 35: 519-538.

McDermott, Rose, Dustin Tingley and Peter Hatemi. 2014. “Assortative Mating on Ideology Could Operate Through Olfactory Cues.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58(4): 997-1005

Th March 2nd

INDEPENDENT PROJECT WORKSHOP DAY

Social Origins of Political Behavior

**Tu March 14th
Social Network Theory**

Sinclair, Betsy. 2012. *The Social Citizen*. Preface and Chapter 1

Christakis and Fowler. 2009. *Connected*. Preface, Chapter 1, and Chapter 7

**Th March 16th
Political Disagreement**

Klofstad, Casey A, Anand Edward Sokhey, and Scott D McClurg. 2012. “Disagreeing About Disagreement: How Conflict in Social Networks Affects Political Behavior.” *American Journal of Political Science* 57(1): 120–134.

Finifter, Ada W. 1974. “The Friendship Group as a Protective Environment for Political Deviants.” *The American Political Science Review* 68 (2): 607–625.

McClurg, Scott D. 2006. “Political Disagreement in Context: the Conditional Effect of Neighborhood Context, Disagreement and Political Talk on Electoral Participation.” *Political Behavior* 28(4): 349–366.

**F March 17th
RESEARCH DESIGN PROSPECTUS DUE**

**Tu March 21st
Connected**

Christakis and Fowler. 2009. *Connected*. Chapters 5-6 (pp. 135-209)

CONNECTED ASSIGNMENT DUE

**Th March 23rd
Political Behavior on Social Media**

boyd, danah, and Kate Crawford. 2012. “Critical Questions for Big Data.” *Information, Communication & Society* 15(5): 662–679.

Christakis and Fowler. 2009. *Connected*. Chapter 8

Settle, Jaime E. Chapters 2 and 3 of *Newspaper to News Feed: How the Social Communication of Politics Affectively Polarizes the American Public*

**T March 28th
Social Influence on Social Media**

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.

Aral, Sinan, and Dylan Walker. 2013. “Tie Strength, Embeddedness & Social Influence: Evidence From a Large Scale Networked Experiment.” *Embeddedness & Social Influence: Evidence From a Large Scale Networked Experiment (January 8, 2013)*.

**Th March 30th
Polarization and Social Media**

Barbera, Pablo et al. 2015. “Tweeting from Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber?” *Psychological Science*, 2015, 26 (10), 1531-1542.

Settle, Jaime E. Chapter 4 of *Newspaper to News Feed: How the Social Communication of Politics Affectively Polarizes the American Public*

Situating the Individual in Political Behavior Research

Tu April 4th
The Two Systems

Thinking Fast and Slow, Part I (pp. 20-105)

Th April 6th
Case Studies – Heuristics and Biases

Selected chapter from *Thinking Fast and Slow*, Part II

THINKING FAST AND SLOW ASSIGNMENT DUE

F April 7th
FIRST DRAFT DUE

Tu April 11th
Counteracting our Biases

Thinking Fast and Slow, Chapter 18 and Part III

Th April 13th
Survey Response and Public Opinion

Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions Versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579–616.

Friedman, Jeffrey. 2012. "Beyond Cues and Political Elites: the Forgotten Zaller." *Critical Review* 24(4): 417–461.

Tu April 18th
Emotion: Affective Intelligence vs. Hot Cognition

Lodge, Milton, and Charles Taber. 2005. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Candidates, Parties, and Issues: Experimental Tests of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis." *Political Psychology* 26(3): 455–482.

Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., & MacKuen, M. (2000). *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. University of Chicago Press. Chapters 4 and 5.

Redlawsk, David P, Andrew J W Civettini, and Karen M Emmerson. 2010. “The Affective Tipping Point: Do Motivated Reasoners Ever ‘Get It’?.” *Political Psychology* 31(4): 563–593.

**Th April 20th
Implicit vs. Explicit Attitudes**

Dovidio, J, K Kawakami, C Johnson, and B Johnson. 1997. “On the Nature of Prejudice: Automatic and Controlled Processes.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 33: 510–540

Kam, Cindy D. 2007. “Implicit Attitudes, Explicit Choices: When Subliminal Priming Predicts Candidate Preference.” *Political Behavior* 29(3): 343–367.

Kurzban, R, J Tooby, and L Cosmides. 2001. “Can Race Be Erased? Coalitional Computation and Social Categorization.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98(26): 15387-15392

**F April 21st
PORTFOLIO, SYNTHESIS, AND SELF-REFLECTION ASSIGNMENTS DUE**

**Tu April 25th
Irrelevant and Incidental Influences**

Enos, Ryan D. 2014. “Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(10): 3699-3704

Healy, Andrew J, Neil Malhotra, and Cecilia Hyunjung Mo. 2010. “Irrelevant Events Affect Voters' Evaluations of Government Performance.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107(29): 12804–12809.

Gomez, B T, T G Hansford, and G A Krause. 2007. “The Republicans Should Pray for Rain: Weather, Turnout, and Voting in US Presidential Elections.” *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 649–663.

**Th April 27th
Conclusions**

F May 5th

FINAL DRAFT DUE