

Government 491

Fall Semester, 2013

M/W 3:30-4:50 Millington 23

http://jsettle.blogs.wm.edu/teaching/govt491_f13/

Blackboard Course Website

Professor Jaime Settle

Morton Hall 15

jsettle@wm.edu

Office Hours: Mondays 1:00-4:00, 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 491 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”)	25%
Critique-Response Thread Papers (4)	30%
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 two 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.

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

The students completing the Critique-Response Thread assignment(s) will lead 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: Wednesday, October 23rd

Thinking Fast and Slow Assignment: Wednesday, November 6th

Synthesis Assignment: Monday, December 2nd

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 participate in two other activities:

1. James Fowler will be on campus October 24th and 25th. You will have the opportunity to meet with him during his visit, and you are required to attend his public lecture on the evening of Thursday, October 24th (time and place TBA)
2. The Government Department is launching 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.

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, September 6th (5%)
- Paper Topic: Friday, September 20th (10%)
- Workshop Day: Wednesday, October 2nd (5%)
- Research Design Prospectus: Friday, October 11th (10%)
- First Draft: Friday, November 15th (30%)
- Final Draft: Tuesday, December 17th (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 12:00 p.m. on Friday, December 6th.

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-	A	89-87	B+	79-77	C+	
93	A-	86-83	B	76-73	C	
92-90		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.

Anyone requiring accommodations due to a disability should contact the Dean of Students Office as soon as possible so that arrangements can be made.

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.

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 two 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

**W August 28th
Logistics Day (Week 1)**

Find a newspaper or magazine article (i.e. NOT an academic article) that describes something intriguing about political behavior. I recommend using Swem’s “Summon Discovery” tool (<https://swem.wm.edu/research/summon-discovery>). Be prepared to talk about these three questions in class:

1. What event, phenomenon, or puzzle was the article discussing?
2. What was the explanation provided?
3. What was the journalist’s relative advantage in exploring this topic, as compared to an academic researcher?

**M September 2nd
Reading Carefully - Bring your laptop!**

King, Keohane, and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. 1994. Chapter 1

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.

**W September 4th
Analyzing Critically**

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

King, Keohane, and Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. 1994. Chapters 4-5

F September 6th

ARTICLE REVIEW ASSIGNMENT DUE

Biological Origins of Political Behavior

**M September 9th
Evolutionary Theory and Political Behavior (Week 2)**

Alford, John, and John Hibbing. 2004. “The Origin of Politics: an Evolutionary Theory of Political Behavior.” *Perspectives on Politics* 2(4): 707–723.

Hatemi, Peter and Rose McDermott. 2011. *Man is by Nature a Political Animal: Evolution, Biology, and Politics*. Chapters 1 and 2

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

W **September 11th**
Why study biology?

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 the following in order:

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

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

Hannagan, Rebecca J, and Peter K Hatemi. 2008. “The Threat of Genes: a Comment on Evan Charney's “Genes and Ideologies”.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6(02): 329-336

Charney, Evan. 2008. “Politics, Genetics, and ‘Greedy Reductionism’.” *Perspectives on Politics* 6(02): 337-343

Optional, additional resources:

Charney, Evan, and William English. 2012. “Candidate Genes and Political Behavior.” *American Political Science Review* 106(01): 1–34.

Fowler, James H, and Christopher T Dawes. 2013. “In Defense of Genopolitics.” *American Political Science Review* 107(02): 362–374.

M **September 16th**
Genetic, Neurological and Psychophysiological Bases of Participation (Week 3)

Fowler, James H, Laura A Baker, and Christopher T Dawes. 2008. “Genetic Variation in Political Participation.” *American Political Science Review* 102(02): 16.

Fowler, James H, and Christopher T Dawes. 2008. “Two Genes Predict Voter Turnout.” *The Journal of Politics* 70(3): 579-594

Stanton, Steven J, Jacinta C Beehner, Ekjyot K Saini, Cynthia M Kuhn, and Kevin S LaBar. 2009. “Dominance, Politics, and Physiology: Voters' Testosterone Changes on the Night of the 2008 United States Presidential Election.” Edited by Colin Allen. *PLoS ONE* 4(10): e7543

W September 18th
State vs. Trait Conceptions of Biological Influences

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, Kevin B Smith, Adam Guck, John R Alford, and John R Hibbing. 2011. “The Stress of Politics: Endocrinology and Voter Participation.” *Paper Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Istanbul, July 2011.* 1–35.

“A Role for Negative Affectivity in the Relationships between Competition, Emotion, and Voting.” pgs 6-24.

F September 20th

PAPER TOPIC DUE

M September 23rd
Genetic, Neurological and Psychophysiological Bases of Attitudes (Week 4)

Read one traditional take on political ideology:

Campbell et al. 1960. *The American Voter*, Chp. 9 and 10

OR

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

Then read both of these articles:

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.

W September 25th

Smith, Kevin B, Douglas Oxley, Matthew V Hibbing, John R Alford, and John R Hibbing. 2011. “Disgust Sensitivity and the Neurophysiology of Left-Right Political Orientations.” Edited by Andrea Serino. *PLoS ONE* 6(10): e25552.

Schreiber, Darren, Greg Fonzo, Alan N Simmons, Christopher T Dawes, Taru Flagan, James H Fowler, and Martin P Paulus. 2013. “Red Brain, Blue Brain: Evaluative Processes Differ in Democrats and Republicans.” Edited by Andrew H Kemp. *PLoS ONE* 8(2): e52970.

Settle, Jaime E, Christopher T Dawes, Nicholas A Christakis, and James H Fowler. 2010. “Friendships Moderate an Association Between a Dopamine Gene Variant and Political Ideology.” *The Journal of Politics* 72(04): 1189–1198.

**M September 30th
Personality and Survey Measures of Individual Difference (Week 5)**

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

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.

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.

W October 2nd

INDEPENDENT PROJECT WORKSHOP DAY

**M October 7th
Micro (Individual Level) Consequences of Biological Differences (Week 6)**

Gerber, Alan S, Gregory A Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M Dowling. 2012. “Disagreement and the Avoidance of Political Discussion: Aggregate Relationships and Differences Across Personality Traits.” *American Journal of Political Science* 56(4): 849–874.

Gerber, Alan S, Gregory A Huber, David Doherty, and Conor Dowling. 2010. “Personality and Persuasion: Big Five Personality Traits and Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in a Voter Mobilization Field Experiment.” *Prepared for Presentation at the 2010 Joint Sessions of Workshops of the European Consortium for Political Research, Münster, Germany, March 22-27.*

Bailey, Michael A., Daniel J. Hopkins, and Todd Rogers. 2013. “Unresponsive and Unpersuaded: The Unintended Consequences of Voter Persuasion Efforts.” *An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the 30th Annual Summer Meeting of the Society for Political Methodology at the University of Virginia, July 18th, 2013.*

W October 9th
Macro (Societal Level) Consequences of Biological Influences

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.

Anderson, Rindy C, and Casey A Klofstad. 2012. “Preference for Leaders with Masculine Voices Holds in the Case of Feminine Leadership Roles.” Edited by Cédric Sueur. *PLoS ONE* 7(12): e51216.

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

Little, Anthony C, Robert P Burriss, Benedict C Jones, and S Craig Roberts. 2007. “Facial Appearance Affects Voting Decisions.” *Evolution and Human Behavior* 28(1): 18–27.

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

F October 11th
RESEARCH DESIGN ASSIGNMENT DUE

M October 14th – NO CLASS – FALL BREAK

Social Origins of Political Behavior

W October 16th
Social Network Theory (Week 7)

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

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

M October 21st
Political Disagreement (Week 8)

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.

W October 23rd
Christakis and Fowler. 2009. *Connected*. Chapters 5-6 (pp. 135-209)

CONNECTED ASSIGNMENT DUE

Th October 24th
Public lecture by James Fowler, time and location TBA

M October 28th
Political Behavior on Social Media (Week 9)

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

Additional reading TBA

W October 30th
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)*.

Situating the Individual in Political Behavior Research

M November 4th
The Two Systems (Week 10)

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

W November 6th
Case Studies – Heuristics and Biases

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

THINKING FAST AND SLOW ASSIGNMENT DUE

M November 11th
Counteracting our Biases (Week 11)

Thinking Fast and Slow, Chapter 18 and Part III

W November 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.

F November 15th

FIRST DRAFT DUE

M November 18th
Emotion: Affective Intelligence vs. Hot Cognition (Week 12)

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.

**W November 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

**M November 25th
Irrelevant Influences (Week 13)**

Markey, Patrick M, and Charlotte N Markey. 2010. “Changes in Pornography-Seeking Behaviors Following Political Elections: an Examination of the Challenge Hypothesis.” *Evolution and Human Behavior* 31(6): 442–446.

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.

W November 27th – NO CLASS – Thanksgiving

M December 2nd – NO CLASS

SYNTHESIS ASSIGNMENT DUE

**W December 4th
Conclusions**

T December 17th

FINAL DRAFT DUE