

Spring 2018 – Voting and American Politics

Tuesday/Thursday, 10:10 - 11:25 – Hamilton Hall, Room 304

Dr. Audrey Neville

Pronouns: she/her/hers

aneville@barnard.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday, 11:30 – 1

This course explores the causes and effects of voting in American politics. My goal is to introduce you to the most interesting and current debates related to this line of inquiry, with some attention given to the classics as well. Though I have broken up the debates week-by-week, you will find that many of these debates are interconnected, and that all of these debates inform the most fundamental questions about American democracy and its citizens.

I. Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

- read academic articles in the behavioral sciences, and explain the main points of the article
- compare and contrast different research designs, explaining the respective strengths and weaknesses
- write essays that connect topics of voting in American politics, and comment on broader themes in the scholarship

II. E-Mail Policy

If you have any questions or concerns about class, e-mail is absolutely the best way to get in touch with me. I will always respond within 24 hours, unless I have told you in advance that I will be away from e-mail. E-mails sent after the end of the business day will usually be answered the following morning. I expect that you will check your Barnard / Columbia e-mail regularly, and once a day at least. I expect for you to read any communications carefully. If you want to use a different e-mail address, you should set up forwarding from your Barnard / Columbia e-mail address.

E-mails must demonstrate university-level communication skills. Please include a salutation (“Good afternoon, Dr. Neville”), a clear explanation of your question or comment, and a signature (“Best, Teresa”). Make sure that your tone is professional. Because Barnard College is a place that develops professional communication skills, I will let you know if the style and tone of your e-mails do not reflect university-level communication skills.¹

III. Availability

My office hours are in 237 LeFrak on Tuesdays from 11:30am to 1pm. I am happy to set up a meeting with you – either in person or over Skype – if your schedule prevents you from being able to attend my regular office hours.

IV. ADA Policy Statement:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. This legislation requires that all students with disabilities be provided with a learning environment that has reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you are a student with a documented disability and require academic accommodations, you must visit the Office of Disability Services (ODS) for assistance. Students requesting eligible accommodations in their courses

¹ I have stories.

will need to first meet with an ODS staff member for an intake meeting. Once registered, students are required to visit ODS each semester to set up new accommodations and learn how to notify faculty.

Accommodations are not retroactive, so it is best to register with ODS early each semester to access your accommodations. If you are registered with ODS, please see me to schedule a meeting outside of class in which you can bring me your faculty notification letter and we can discuss your accommodations for this course. Students are not eligible to use their accommodations in this course until they have met with me. ODS is located in Milbank Hall, Room 008.

V. Student Needs

Students can and do face challenges that interfere with their academic performance. Such challenges include, but are not limited to, accessing enough food to eat every day, or having a safe place to live. If you are facing such challenges with meeting your needs, I urge you to contact the Dean of Studies immediately at (212) 854 - 2024. You are under no obligation to tell me about these challenges; however, you may do so if you wish, and I will put you in contact with any additional resources that I may know about.

It is important for undergraduates to recognize and identify the different pressures, burdens, and stressors you may be facing, whether personal, emotional, physical, financial, mental, or academic. We as a community urge you to make yourself--your own health, sanity, and wellness--your priority throughout this term and your career here. Sleep, exercise, and eating well can all be a part of a healthy regimen to cope with stress. Resources exist to support you in several sectors of your life, and we encourage you to make use of them. Should you have any questions about navigating these resources, please visit these sites:

<http://barnard.edu/primarycare>

<http://barnard.edu/counseling>

<http://barnard.edu/wellwoman/about>
[Stressbusters Support Network](#)

VI. Rules for Classroom

My classroom is a place of mutual respect. I show that I respect you by assigning readings that will maximize your learning experience, by returning grades in the promised amount of time, by being punctual, by leading a thoughtful, civil discussion of the topics, and by thoughtfully creating assignments that are valid tests of your knowledge and understanding. I ask that you respect me by communicating with me promptly about any issues that come up, by doing the readings, by being engaged in class, and by participating consistently and thoughtfully. I ask that we all respect one another by conducting ourselves in a professional manner. I will let you know if you are doing something unprofessional.²

Use of Electronics

I do not allow electronics in class, unless you have a well-documented need for an electronic device. If you have this need, then it is your responsibility to let me know over e-mail or in office hours; moreover, it is your responsibility to use the electronic device for class-related tasks. Using technology inappropriately will negatively impact your participation grade.

² Again, I have stories.

Food Allergies

I understand if you need a snack to get you through to lunch. Make good choices about the type of food you bring in to the classroom. If you have a severe allergy that prevents you from being in close quarters with a particular type of food, please let me know, and I can make a general announcement.

Readings

I expect that you will complete the week's readings, in advance of class, that you will bring the readings with you to class, and that you will be ready to talk about them. You can access all of the readings through Google Scholar and through Oxford Handbooks Online (this requires that you sign in using your Columbia username and password).

I expect that some of you may struggle to understand the methods sections of the papers, particularly if you have never taken a research design course, or if you have never taken statistics. You may struggle even if you have taken these classes before. I recommend that you focus on the written portion of the paper first, then circle back around and try to make sense of the statistical portion of the paper. Feel free to e-mail me if you ever have any questions about the readings.

Academic Honesty

Academic dishonesty has no place at Barnard College, as evidenced by our honor code. Approved by the student body in 1912 and updated in 2016, the Code states:

We, the students of Barnard College, resolve to uphold the honor of the College by engaging with integrity in all of our academic pursuits. We affirm that academic integrity is the honorable creation and presentation of our own work. We acknowledge that it is our responsibility to seek clarification of proper forms of collaboration and use of academic resources in all assignments or exams. We consider academic integrity to include the proper use and care for all print, electronic, or other academic resources. We will respect the rights of others to engage in pursuit of learning in order to uphold our commitment to honor. We pledge to do all that is in our power to create a spirit of honesty and honor for its own sake.

If after reading the code you are left with questions about what constitutes academic honesty, please let me know and I will clarify. But it is your responsibility for understanding what constitutes academic dishonesty. Even if you did not realize that what you were doing was academically dishonest, you will still face the consequences of your actions.

If I find that you have violated the Honor Code on an assignment, you will receive a zero on the assignment. And, depending on the nature and gravity of the violation, you may face more serious punishment from the administration, such as being suspended or expelled. This is to say nothing of how this violation will influence my willingness to write you a letter of recommendation, or recommend you for any awards.

In my experience, students are most likely to cheat when they are feeling overwhelmed, or feel painted into a corner. They mistakenly feel like they have no other options, and make a bad choice. I want to make it clear to you that you do have other options. If you are feeling stuck or overwhelmed, let me know, and we will work together to find a solution.

VII. Grades

Your final grade in my course will be determined by the grades on your reaction papers, your attendance grades, and your participation. There are no tests or quizzes.³

Reaction Papers

You will write four reaction papers over the course of the semester. Each reaction paper needs to be 2 pages long, single-spaced (~1000 words). These papers will be submitted to me, over CourseWorks. Submitted files must include the student's first and last name, both in the document title and in the document itself. You will use a standard 12-point font, single-spaced, with 1" margins. Use whatever citation style you like, but you must be consistent.

You will critique one or more of the readings for the week. I expect for these responses to be a thoughtful, thorough critique. Thoughtful critiques include questions about things the scholar did not thoroughly explain or account for, or critiques of the data, methodology, conclusions, or implications. Thoughtful critiques may also include a discussion of how the readings speak to, or even past, one another. They may also speak to readings from previous weeks.

A thoughtful critique extends beyond, "The subject pool had only Anglo men," and explains why we should expect different outcomes, had the scholars used a more nationally-representatives subject pool. You may write a single, long question / comment, or you may write several questions / comments. Successful reaction papers do not summarize, nor are they merely a reflection of how a reading made you feel.

Paper Grades and Grade Appeals

A papers will provide a strongly argued, very interesting, and highly sophisticated critiques, and will make non-summary arguments. A papers will be overwhelmingly free from grammatical errors, with A+ and A papers being completely free from such errors, and A- papers making very few small errors. The writing will be polished and refined.

B papers are sound papers that are not written as well as A papers. They may lack strongly argued, very interesting, or highly sophisticated critiques, though they may not lack all three. They may offer more summary than is absolutely necessary to make a critique. They may also be somewhat lacking in content, with B+ papers providing a more thorough exploration than B papers and B- papers (in that order). B papers may have some grammatical errors, but nothing grievous. The writing, while not as polished as the writing found in A papers, will still meet university standards of good writing.

C papers will exhibit flaws that call into question whether the student understood the course material. They may suffer from some of the same faults of B papers, but to a stronger or more severe degree. C papers are often lacking in content, or are somewhat faulty attempts at summary. The paper may exhibit structural or grammatical flaws that may interfere with my ability to understand you. The paper may contain incorrect facts. The writing will probably not meet university standards of good writing.

D papers will exhibit major flaws that call into question the understanding of course materials, and perhaps of behavioral science more broadly. They may also suffer from the same faults of C papers, but to an even stronger or more severe degree. Their attempts at critique will be very shallow. Such papers may contain incorrect facts; these incorrect facts are often numerous or grievous in nature. The writing may fall far below university standards of good writing, making it difficult for me to understand you.

³ If you want to hear my anti-test rant, just let me know.

F papers will exhibit many major flaws that demonstrate a lack of understanding of course materials and of behavioral science. They may contain many incorrect facts; these incorrect facts may be numerous or grievous in nature. They may not follow instructions, and may be plagued by numerous grammatical, structural, or spelling errors that make it very difficult for me to understand you.

If you think that you should have earned more points than you did on an assignment, you must submit a written appeal, explaining why the grading standard was misapplied to you. “I put a lot of effort into this” is not enough. You must wait 48 hours after I hand back a grade to submit your grade appeal. You must submit this written appeal within a week of receiving your grade. You may not be present when I read your written appeal. I will re-grade your work, and whatever grade you receive – *higher or lower* – will be your final grade on the assignment.

If you think that I have made a mathematical error in adding up your grade, let me know over e-mail and we can adjudicate the error in office hours.

Class Groups

To break up the monotony of grading, I have sorted you into groups, based on your last name. If you have a double-barreled last name (e.g. Huntington-Whiteley), then sort based on the first of the two names (in this instance, Huntington). Read the schedule for the deadlines specific to your particular group.

Group 1: Last name A - I

Group 2: Last name J - Q

Group 3: Last name R - Z

Attendance

I take attendance every day at the beginning of class, and will determine your final attendance grade as a simple percentage of how many days you were registered for the class, and how many days you attended. I will give excused absences for well-documented medical / personal events.

Participation / Hot Seat

This course requires that you participate actively in the class. I expect that you will read the materials, come to class prepared to discuss them, stay off your phone, offer up insightful comments during class sessions, and be a respectful, engaged listener. Participating well does not mean “talking a lot” or dominating the conversation.

Recall that you have been sorted into groups, based on your last name. These groups will also determine when you are in the “hot seat” for that particular week. If you are in the “hot seat,” I reserve the right to call on you at any time during class. Given that there will probably only be about 10 of you per group, and that we have two 75-minute lectures a week, there is a very good chance that you will be called on if you are in the hot seat that week, so prepare accordingly.

You can of course participate if you are not in the hot seat that week, and I encourage you to participate every week. But your “hot seat” weeks are weighted more heavily in terms of how it will affect your final participation grade.

Note that if you miss class, you cannot get any participation points for that day. This will have an especially big impact on your participation grade if your group is in the “hot seat” that week.

Final Grade Breakdown

Reaction Paper #1	15% of final grade
Reaction Paper #2	15% of final grade
Reaction Paper #3	15% of final grade
Reaction Paper #4	15% of final grade
Attendance	10% of final grade
Participation	30% of final grade
Mysterious Extra Credit Opportunity	potential for +1% added to your final grade

Late Work

I do not accept late work. If you are having a medical or personal crisis that makes it impossible for you to meet a deadline, I will need to see evidence of this event before the deadline, after which I will decide if I am willing to grant you an extension.⁴ If I receive the evidence and decide to grant you an extension, I will give you an appropriate extension. If you miss the agreed-upon extension, I will no longer accept your work, and you will receive a zero for the assignment.

Curving, “Rounding Up,” and Extra Credit

I do not grade on a curve (e.g. 10% will get A’s, 30% will get Bs, etc.). If everybody in the class earns an A, then everybody gets an A. If everybody gets an F, then everybody gets an F.

I do not “round up.” Grade inflation cheapens the value – monetary or otherwise – of a Barnard College education. Thus, the thresholds for final letter grades are concrete. A final grade of 89.99999999% is a very, very good B+, but a B+ nonetheless.⁵ I strongly encourage you to monitor the status of your final grade throughout the semester, to avoid unpleasant surprises at the end.

I will administer one point of extra credit, added on to your final grade, to students who read the syllabus carefully, in its entirety, within the first two weeks of class.⁶ I do not offer any additional extra credit beyond this one mysterious opportunity.

⁴ Falsifying documents to get an extension is a violation of the Barnard Honor Code. Yes, I have caught students doing this. Yes, the consequences were dire.

⁵ I know, I know; this makes me the cruelest, most unfeeling woman to have ever lived. I am at peace with this.

⁶ “But how will Dr. Neville know if I have read the syllabus carefully?”, you may be asking yourself. Oh, I’ll know.

Letter Grade Scale

<u>Letter Grade</u>	<u>Numeric Range</u>
A+	96.6 - 100
A	93.3 - 96.59
A-	90 - 93.29
B+	86.6 - 89.9
B	83.3 - 86.59
B-	80 - 83.29
C+	76.6 - 79.9
C	73.3 - 76.59
C-	70 - 73.29
D+	66.6 - 69.9
D	63.3 - 66.59
D-	60 - 63.29
F	0 - 59.9

VIII. Schedule

Syllabus Changes

I may make changes to adjust the schedule, correct errors, or to account for other issues. Changes will be announced in class, and I will update the official syllabus on CourseWorks. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that they are using the most current copy of the syllabus

Week 1: Introduction, The Role of Voting in American Democracy, Voting as a Form of Political Participation

Tuesday, January 16th

Required Reading: none. Frolic while you may.

Thursday, January 18th

1. Best, Samuel J., and Brian S. Krueger. 2005. "Analyzing the Representativeness of Internet Political Participation." *Political Behavior* 27:183-216.
2. Mondak, Jeffery J., et al. 2010. "Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior." *APSR* 104:85-110.

Week 2: Voter Turnout

Tuesday, January 23rd

1. Fowler, James H., Laura A. Baker, and Christopher T. Dawes. 2008. "Genetic Variation in Political Participation." *APSR* 102:233-48.
2. Gruszczyński, Michael W., et al. 2013. "The Physiology of Political Participation." *Political Behavior* 35:135-52.

Thursday, January 25th

1. Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment." *APSR* 102:33-48.
2. Stoker, Laura, and M. Kent Jennings. 1995. "Life-Cycle Transitions and Political Participation: The Case

of Marriage." APSR 89:421-33.

Note: Wait lists closed at 9:30 pm.

Week 3: The Role of Emotion in Political Participation

Group 1: Response Paper #1 due Monday, January 29th at 8am.

Group 3: Hot Seat

Tuesday, January 30th

1. Valentino, Nicholas A., et al. 2011. "Election Night's Alright for Fighting: The Role of Emotions in Political Participation." JOP 73:156-70.
2. Marcus, George E., and Michael B. MacKuen. 1993. "Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns." APSR 87:672-85

Thursday, February 1st

1. Healy, Andrew J., Neil Malhotra, and Cecilia Hyunjung Mo. 2010. "Irrelevant Events Affects Voters' Evaluations of Government Performance." PNAS 107:12804-9.
 2. Smith, Kevin B., et al. 2011. "Disgust Sensitivity and the Neurophysiology of Left-Right Political Orientations." PLoS One 6.
-

Week 4: Party Identification

Group 2: Response Paper #1 due Monday, February 5th, at 8am.

Group 1: Hot Seat

Tuesday, February 6th

1. Bafumi, Joseph, and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2009. "A New Partisan Voter." JOP 71:1-24.
2. Bartels, Larry M. 2000. "Partisanship and Voting Behavior, 1952-1996." AJPS 44:35-50.

Thursday, February 8th

1. Dinas, Elias. 2014. "Does Choice Bring Loyalty? Electoral Participation and the Development of Party Identification." AJPS 58:449-65.
 2. Klar, Samara. 2014. "Partisanship in a Social Setting." AJPS 58:687-704
-

Week 5: The Basic Vote Choice

Group 3: Response Paper #1 due Monday, February 12th at 8am.

Group 2: Hot Seat

Tuesday, February 13th

1. Downs, A. (1957). An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *Journal of Political Economy*, 65(2), 135-150.
2. Alvarez, R. Michael, Thad E. Hall and Morgan H. Llewellyn. 2008. "Are Americans Confident Their Ballots Are Counted?" JOP 70:754-6.

Thursday, February 15th - CLASS CANCELLED

Required Readings: none.

Week 6: Party Polarization

Group 1: Response Paper #2 due Monday, February 19th, at 8 am.

Group 3: Hot Seat

Tuesday, February 20th

1. Stoker, Laura, and M. Kent Jennings. 2008. "Of Time and the Development of Partisan Polarization." *AJPS* 52:619-635.
2. Layman, Geoffrey C., and Thomas M. Carsey. 2002. "Party Polarization and 'Conflict Extension' in the American Electorate." *AJPS* 46:786-802.

Note: This is the last day you can drop a course without incurring a W.

Thursday February 22nd

1. Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *POQ* 76:405-31.
2. Ahler, Douglas J. 2014. "Self-Fulfilling Misperceptions of Public Polarization." *JOP* 76:607-20

Week 7: Group Interests and Electoral Choices

Group 2: Response Paper #2 due Monday, February 26th, at 8 am.

Group 1: Hot Seat

Tuesday, February 27th

1. Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice." *AJPS* 46:20-34.
2. Kaufmann, Karen M., and John R. Petrocik. 1999. "The Changing Politics of American Men: Understanding the Sources of the Gender Gap." *AJPS* 43:864-87.

Thursday, March 1st

1. Hersh, Eitan, and Clayton Nall. 2016. "The Primacy of Race in the Geography of Income-Based Voting: New Evidence from Public Voting Records." *AJPS* 60:289-303.
2. Barreto, Matt A., Gary M. Segura, and Nathan D. Woods. 2004. "The Mobilizing Effects of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout." *APSR* 98:65-75

Week 8: Economic Voting

Group 3: Response Paper #2 due Monday, March 5th, at 8am.

Group 2: Hot Seat

Tuesday, March 6th

1. Hetherington, Marc J. 1996. "The Media's Role in Forming Voters' National Economic Evaluations in 1992." *AJPS* 40:372-95
2. Rudolph, Thomas J. 2003. "Who's Responsible for the Economy? The Formation and Consequences of Responsibility Attributions." *AJPS* 47:698-713.

Thursday, March 8th

1. Malhotra, Neil, and Yotam Margalit. 2014. "Expectation Setting and Retrospective Voting." *JOP* 76:1000-16.
2. Healy, Andrew, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2014. "Substituting the End for the Whole: Why Voters Respond

Primarily to the Election-Year Economy.” AJPS 58:31-47.

SPRING BREAK – MAKE GOOD CHOICES

Week 9: Political Knowledge

Group 1: Response Paper #3 due Monday, March 19th, at 8am.

Group 3: Hot Seat

Tuesday, March 20th

1. Lodge, Milton, and Marco R. Steenbergen. 1995. “The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation.” APSR 89:309-26.

2. Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas, and Toby Bolsen. 2006. “Citizens, Knowledge, and the Information Environment.” AJPS 50:266-82.

By January 30th, send me an e-mail with a picture of your favorite animal. Tell no one.

Thursday March 22nd

1. Lau, Richard P., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. “Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making.” AJPS 45:951-71.

2. Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. “Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis.” AJPS 53:821-37.

Week 10: Social Networks

Group 2: Response Paper #3 due Monday, March 26th, at 8am.

Group 1: Hot Seat

Tuesday, March 27th

1. Mutz, Diana C. 2002. “The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation.” AJPS 46:838-55.

2. Oliver, J. Eric. 2000. “City Size and Civic Involvement in Metropolitan America.” APSR 94:361- 73.

Thursday, March 29th

1. Nickerson, David. 2008. “Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments.” APSR 102:49-57.

2. Sokhey, Anand Edward, and Scott D. McClurg. 2012. “Social Networks and Correct Voting.” JOP 74:751-64.

Week 11: Campaign Effects on Voter Decision-Making

Group 3: Response Paper #3 due Monday, April 2nd, at 8am.

Group 2: Hot Seat

Tuesday, April 3rd

1. Gelman, Andrew, and Gary King. 1993. “Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes are So Predictable?” BJPS 23:409-51.

2. Wlezien, Christopher, and Robert S. Erikson. 2002. "The Timeline of Presidential Election Campaigns." JOP 64:969-93.

Thursday, April 5th

1. Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." AJPS 49:388-405
2. Darr, Joshua P., and Matthew S. Levendusky. 2014. "Relying on the Ground Game: The Placement and Effect of Campaign Field Offices." APR 42:529-48.

Week 12: Media Influence on Vote Choice

Group 1: Response Paper #4 due Monday, April 9th, at 8am.

Group 3: Hot Seat

Tuesday, April 10th

1. Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." APSR 87:267-85.
2. Mutz, Diana C., and Paul S. Martin. 2001. "Facilitating Communication across Lines of Political Difference: The Role of Mass Media." APSR 95:97-114.

Thursday, April 12th

1. Druckman, James N., and Michael Parkin. 2005. "The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters." JOP 67:1030-49.
2. Chiang, Chun-Fang, and Brian Knight. 2011. "Media Bias and Influence: Evidence from Newspaper Endorsements." Review of Economic Studies 78:795-820.

Week 13: Congressional Elections

Group 2: Response Paper #4 due Monday, April 16th, at 8 am.

Group 1: Hot Seat

Tuesday, April 17th

1. Erikson, Robert S. 1988. "The Puzzle of Midterm Loss." JOP 50:1011-29.
2. Jacobson, Gary C. 1989. "Strategic Politicians and the Dynamics of U.S. House Elections, 1946- 86." APSR 83:773-93.

Thursday, April 19th

1. Cox, Gary W., and Jonathan N. Katz. 1996. "Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?" AJPS 40:478-97.
2. Prior, Markus. 2006. "The Incumbent in the Living Room: The Rise of Television and the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections." JOP 68:657-73

Week 14: The Effects of Election Administration on Voting, Conclusions

Group 3: Response Paper #4 due Monday, April 23rd at 8am.

Group 2: Hot Seat

Tuesday, April 24th

1. Wand, Jonathan N., et al. 2001. "The Butterfly Did It: The Aberrant Vote for Buchanan in Palm Beach

County, Florida." APSR 95:793-810.

2. Brady, Henry E., and John E. McNulty. 2011. "Turnout Out to Vote: The Costs of Finding and Getting to the Polling Place." APSR 105:115-34.

Thursday, April 26th

1. Hajnal, Z., Lajevardi, N., & Nielson, L. (2017). Voter Identification laws and the suppression of minority votes. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(2), 363-379.

2. Burden, Barry C., et al. 2014. "Election Laws, Mobilization, and Turnout: The Unanticipated Consequences of Election Reform." *AJPS* 58:95-109.

NO FINAL EXAM

"School's out for summer." – Alice Cooper