

The Graduate School of Political Management

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

M.P.S. in Political Management

Summer 2017 (10 weeks)

May 22, 2017 – July 29, 2017

Course Name

6474.10

3 Credits

Tuesdays from 7:10 p.m. – 9:40 p.m.

Elliot School of International Affairs

Building

1957 E. Street, Room 214

Office Hours

Tuesdays from 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

BASIC INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

Instructor

A former government affairs specialist, public health campaign operative and lobbyist turned certified executive coach and organizational strategist, Frieda K. Edgette is the founder and principal of Novos Consulting, a global consultancy that helps civic leaders and institutions through strategic changes (literally ‘novos’) using political intelligence, innovation and neuroscience. For close to 15 years, Frieda has facilitated the development and implementation of more than 150 cross sector change initiatives in five continents and 25 states, and advised more than 1,000 emergent to veteran civic leaders at the highest levels of government. Past projects range from: major community culture changes, cross-sector partnerships that expand access to government services, multinational mergers, public policy creation through implementation, strategic planning with federal leaders and agencies, coaching national campaign operatives, facilitating community outreach for land use projects, team building for governance bodies, leading meditations on Capitol Hill, training aspiring local electeds to Ministers of Parliament and U.S. Presidential cabinet members, instructional design and delivery, and one-on-one leadership coaching to increase performance whilst cultivating well-being.

Frieda is published in the *Harvard Business Review*, *GOVERNING*, *Campaigns & Elections*, *US News & World Report*, *Mindful* and *European Heart Journal* on leadership, resiliency for campaign life and mindful strategy, and her work building resiliency with campaign operatives has been featured on C-SPAN. Frieda is also a former county commissioner and founder of Courage to Run, a leadership initiative that cultivates the inner game of civic leadership.

She has a Master of Science in Organizational and Social Psychology from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and a Bachelors of Arts in Political Science and minors in History and Women, Culture and Development from the University of California, Santa Barbara. She is a certified executive coach with the International Coach Federation, holds development awards in group facilitation from the Institute of Leadership and Management and “The Science of Happiness” from the University of California, Berkeley’s Greater Good Science Center. Frieda trained in Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction at the University of California, San Francisco Osher Center of Integrative Medicine and Compassion Cultivation at Stanford University.

Frieda lives in Silicon Valley with her husband, Chris. In addition to all things political, she loves dancing, traveling, dabbling in extreme sports, crossword puzzles and avocados.

Contact Information

Phone Number: 415-939-6169 (mobile)

Email Address: edgette@novosconsulting.com

Communication

Please contact me by email unless it is an emergency, in which case please connect via my cell phone. I will respond within 24 hours to all student emails. If you would like to arrange an appointment to discuss your work, I will be available the hour prior to class each week.

Blackboard Site & Dropbox

A Blackboard course site has been set up for this course; however, assignments and select readings will be saved in a course Dropbox. Each student is expected to check the Dropbox folder throughout the semester, as additional readings, in-class assignments and presentations may be uploaded.

Academic Integrity

All members of the university community are expected to exhibit honesty and competence in their academic work. Students have a special responsibility to acquaint themselves with, and make use of, all proper procedures for doing research, writing papers, and taking exams. Members of the community will be presumed to be familiar with the proper academic procedures and will be held responsible for applying them. Deliberate failure to act in accordance with such procedures will be considered academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is defined as “cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one’s own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.” Acts of academic dishonesty are a legal, moral, and intellectual offense against the community and will be prosecuted through the proper university channels. The University Code of Academic Integrity can be found at <http://studentconduct.gwu.edu/code-academic-integrity>.

Support for Students with Disabilities

GW’s Disability Support Services (DSS) provides and coordinates accommodations and other services for students with a wide variety of disabilities, as well as those temporarily disabled by injury or illness. Accommodations are available through DSS to facilitate academic access for students with disabilities. Please notify your instructor if you require accommodations. Additional information is available at www.gwu.edu/~dss.

In the Event of an Emergency or Crisis during Class

If we experience some an emergency during class time, we will try to stay at this location until we hear that we can move about safely. If we have to leave here, we will meet at **[fill in proximate location]** in order to account for everyone and to make certain that everyone is safe. Please refer to Campus Advisories for the latest information on the University’s operating status: <http://www.campusadvisories.gwu.edu/>.

Attendance Policy

Attending class is required and contributes to part of your overall grade. If you find yourself with a scheduling conflict, please contact me as soon as you are aware of the issue to determine whether excusable; otherwise, your absence will be considered unexcused and will negatively impact your participation grade.

Course Evaluation

At the end of the semester, students will be given the opportunity to evaluate the course through GW's online course evaluation system. It is very important that you take the time to complete an evaluation. Students are also encouraged to provide feedback throughout the course of the semester by contacting any/all of the following:

Dr. Lara Brown
Interim Director, Graduate School of Political Management
larambrown@gwu.edu | 202-994-4545

Dr. Jack Prostko
Associate Dean for Learning and Faculty Development
College of Professional Studies
jackp@gwu.edu | 202-994-3592

Suzanne Farrand
Director of Academic Administration, GSPM
sfarrand@gwu.edu | 202-994-9309

THE COURSE

Political Management Program Objectives

A Political Management degree prepares students to win campaigns for elective office and policy positions, and to do so in a manner that benefits democracy and society as well as their organization and clients.

In completing the degree, students will be able to:

1. Assess a political environment, develop a strategy to achieve specified goals, and execute that strategy;
2. Draw upon a repertoire of effective campaign communication skills;
3. Collect, evaluate, and incorporate empirical evidence to shape and optimize the strategy;
4. Find, engage, and motivate the right leaders, professionals, and citizens;
5. Recognize and work through recurring political dilemmas in a manner that upholds ethical standards and professional conduct.

Graduate School Expectations

Students enrolled in a graduate program should take their academic responsibilities seriously and be prepared to meet the following expectations:

1. Utilize effective time management skills so as to complete and submit their assignments on their required due dates and times.
2. Have attained a mastery of written communication skills including proper sentence structure, grammar, spelling, and word usage.
3. Understand how to properly format in-text citations and references for resources and information integrated into their written assignments.

GSPM prepares students for careers in the professional political world. In politics, words and deadlines matter. Excellent written communication skills are essential for success. Every word used, whether it is in a television or radio ad, direct mail piece, social media, or a press release, will be scrutinized. Similarly, deadlines are important. Election Day does not get postponed because a candidate and their campaign are not prepared.

There are no “do-overs” because a direct mail piece did not arrive to its intended recipients until after the election was concluded. Students will be best positioned for success in the practical political world if they have developed and exercise excellent written communication and time management skills.

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OVERVIEW

Stereotypes: What are they and what are their impacts? Stereotypes are “fast thinking” mental shortcuts that enable people to make split-second judgments. As the University of Virginia’s Timothy Wilson has argued, our brains are not equipped to handle the 11-plus million bits of information arriving at any given moment. For the sake of efficiency, we tend to make these split-second decisions based upon old frames, memories or associations, causing us to consciously and unconsciously jump to conclusions (Kahneman, 2013). Over the next ten weeks, we will cultivate a strategic understanding of the neurology and behavioral science underpinning stereotypes, unpack different stereotypes confronted within politics and explore their implications on practitioner, candidate and elected officials’ effectiveness.

The goal of this course is to mindfully assess, adapt to and challenge stereotypes by teaching students how to perform campaign research anchored in neuro and behavioral science. By the end of the course, students will:

- **Understand psychological, behavioral and neurological aspects of stereotypes and develop strategies to challenge:** Evolutionary biology to emerging research on the brain report how we are predisposed to simplify thinking and feeling with stereotypes. With personal connections to candidates a rarity, social constructions of political party strong, and the media, campaigns and our own echo chambers regularly conveying political information through a specific “frame”, the political landscape can easily enable stereotyping. We will review psychological, neurological and biological factors that enable stereotypes and develop mental and physical strategies to objectively assess stereotypes as they emerge.
- **Unpack multiple stereotypes and their implications:** Categorically, we will assess different stereotypes that emerge in the media and on the campaign trail.
- **Mindfully engage stereotypes for effective political strategy:** Students will identify, evaluate and challenge stereotypes strategically through intensive in-class interactive application and two deliverable assignments.
- **Cultivate self-awareness and self-management:** As practitioners and political leaders, clients and communities look to us for balanced decisions, strategic focus and counsel. Students will increase their own understanding of themselves and begin developing personal strategies to diffuse personal biases and bolster effectiveness.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

In addition to written deliverables, students are required to prepared for and actively participate in class discussions and in-class exercises that translate theory into practice. Please see Course Calendar for preparatory assignment details.

EVALUATION AND GRADING

Assignment	Description	Due Date	Weight
Deliverable 1: Self-evaluation and strategy	Campaigns can be defined by the qualities, narratives and self-management strategies of its	Week 3	15%

	<p>practitioners and candidates. This reflective memo will (1) describe 3-4 stereotypes that describe your perceived identity, (2) assess your behavior patterns, and 3) develop 2-3 personal self-management strategies with the intent of cultivating self-regulation and balanced decision making.</p>		
<p>Deliverable 3: Develop a candidate image strategic plan memo</p>	<p>Create an implementable media strategy that enhances a U.S. Senate candidate’s image by leveraging two positive stereotypes, diffusing one stereotype blind spot, and distinguishing your candidate from the competition. This assignment will require you to compile and describe a list of events, core messages, target audience(s), media avenues for gaining coverage and the desired outcome. Lastly, you will create an accompanying media piece with the intention of going viral on social media.</p> <p>The memo will be separated into three parts: Part I is “high skim value” (sub-headers and bullet points); Part II is an information processing matrix; and Part III provides the theoretical and scientific evaluation of the proposed strategy using the APA style.</p> <p>An ungraded formative draft is due in Week 5 with the purpose of receiving early feedback.</p> <p>Additional information will be shared in class of Week 3.</p>	<p>Week 9</p>	<p>40%</p>
<p>Attendance and Participation</p>	<p>This is an action learning course. As such, attendance and active participation are expected (up to 5% each week). Classes are designed to follow a 45-45-45 instructional methodology: 45 minutes of direct</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>45%</p>

	instruction, 45 minutes of in-class application, and 45 minutes of reporting out and debriefs. The course's heavy "workshop" format seeks to translate academic theory into real-time application. You will have weekly assignments to demonstrate your understanding of the science and its effect in practice. There will be a 10-minute break.		
Total			100%
Extra Credit	There will be an optional extra credit assignment introduced in Week 5.	Week 10	5%

IN-CLASS EVALUATION

During each week of the course, there will be in-class exercises and discussion, in which we translate the week's theoretic readings into interactive practice. Explicit instructions on how to complete weekly discussion workshops will be included in each discussion assignment. Up to 5% of total grade may be earned each week.

Points	Unsatisfactory – 0 points	Satisfactory – 10 points	Exemplary – 20 points
Criterion	You do not attend the session and have an unexcused absence.	<p>You participate in discussions, address key issues and questions or problems, but indirectly or vaguely.</p> <p>You offer some analysis, insight and observation, but still lack a full understanding of concepts and ideas being studied.</p> <p>Statements are generally supported with evidence.</p>	<p>You actively participate, directly address key issues, questions or problems related to the week's topic.</p> <p>You offer original and thoughtful analysis, insights and observation that demonstrate a strong grasp of concepts and ideas being studied.</p> <p>Statements are supported with rational arguments and evidence.</p>

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT EVALUATION

You have written assignments due weeks 3, 5 and 9. Written assignments should be submitted in the memo format that is required for the course, which will be distributed in Week 1. The length of each assignment is based on actual written content. Reference pages, exhibits and any other attachments do not count toward the required content length of a written assignment. Please use Times New Roman, font size 11 and 1 inch margins for your assignments. Assignments should be 1.5 spaced.

Assignment Content (70%)
<p>The content element will be judged on the following as pertinent to the assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively material is organized • How clearly it is written • How accurate writing is (i.e., ensuring all information is accurate and properly attributed/cited to reliable sources) • Quality of substance, as opposed to simple opinion (unless explicitly requested) • Presentation of conflicting views in a way that provides representation of each side of an issue (if appropriate to the assignment) • Research and reliance on course materials, including weekly readings and outside research that is from reliable and accurate sources.
Grammar (20%)
<p>The grammar element will be judged on several key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct punctuation and spelling • Subject/verb agreement • Sentence construction • Complete sentences/thoughts
Formatting/Length (10%)
<p>Assignments will be evaluated with respect to proper formatting using the memo template requirements and the required minimum length element of each assignment. Excess or superfluous content is not an effective communication technique and can degrade the quality of an assignment. Make sure presented information is clear, concise and precise. Any references and citations that are included in the assignment will be reviewed for proper APA formatting.</p>

FOLLOWING IS THE GRADE SCALE FOR ALL GSPM CLASSES:

Grade*	Grading Standard
A 94-100	Your work is outstanding and ready for submission in a professional environment. Your material, effort, research, and writing demonstrate superior work.
A- 90-93	Represents solid work with minor errors. Overall, excellent work.
B+ 87-89	Very good. Represents well-written material, research, and presentation, but needs some minor work.
B 83-86	Satisfactory work, but needs reworking and more effort. Note that although not a failing grade, at the graduate level, anything below a “B” is viewed as unacceptable.
B- 80-82	You’ve completed the assignment, but you are not meeting all of the requirements.
C+ 77-79	Needs improvement in content and in effort. Shows some motivation and concern.
C 73-76	Needs reworking, improved effort, and additional research. Shows minimal

		motivation and concern.
C-	70-72 (lowest grade to pass)	Poor performance. Major errors, too many misspellings, problems with accuracy, etc.
F	Below 70	Unacceptable performance, or inability to submit the assignment.

*Please note that you may be penalized for late submission of assignment(s).

REQUIRED TEXT AND LEARNING MATERIALS

This is a complex topic with many facets. As such, in most instances, you will read approximately 40 – 60 pages per week. Additional readings and interactive exercises may be assigned. Required readings are listed under each respective week. Readings are available in Dropbox or within the links offered below with the exception of the following text:

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York.

TENTATIVE COURSE CALENDAR*

*The Instructor reserves the right to alter course content and/or adjust the pace to accommodate class progress. Students are responsible for keeping up with all adjustments to the course calendar.

WEEK 1 - MAY 23, 2017

Topic: Introduction & Overview: What are stereotypes and their implications?

Learning objectives:

- Define “stereotype”, its functions and impacts on our behavior
- Explore biological, psychological and neurological factors that enable stereotype thinking
- Build awareness of personal identities and narratives

Reading:

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979), “Chapter 1: Social Identity Theory for Intergroup Behavior,” in [n.s.]: 7-24. Access at:

http://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Intergroup_Conflict/Tajfel_%26_Turner_Psych_of_Intergroup_Relations_CH1_Social_Identity_Theory.pdf

[n.a.] (2015). Beyond Distrust: How Americans View their Government, *Pew Research Center*, pgs. 4-27, 106-115. Published on November 23, 2015.

Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2015/11/23/1-trust-in-government-1958-2015/>

WEEK 2 – MAY 30, 2017

Topic: What are stereotypes and their implications? (Continued) & Present State of Play

Learning objectives:

- Deepen neuroscientific and biological foundation for practical application

- Expand awareness of role personal identities and narratives play in decision making and practice mindful strategies for balanced mental processing
- Discuss neuro-politics ethics

Readings:

Congleton, C., Holzel, B.K. and Lazar, S.W. (2015). Mindfulness Can Literally Change Your Brain, *Harvard Business Review*. Published on January 8, 2015. Access at: <https://hbr.org/2015/01/mindfulness-can-literally-change-your-brain>

Cuddy, A., Fiske, S. and Glick, P. (2008). "Warmth and Competence as Universal Dimensions of Social Perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS Map", *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 40, pgs. 62-78, 119-130.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux: 19-30.

Karelaia, N. and Reb, J. (2014). "Improving Decision Making through Mindfulness" in (eds.) Reb, J. and Atkins, P., *Mindfulness in Organizations*, Cambridge University Press, pgs. 1-37. Access at: <http://faculty.insead.edu/natalia-karelaia/documents/Karelaia%20Reb%202014%20Mindful%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). "The Big Idea" in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York, pgs. 1-24.

Redlawsk, D. and Lau, R. (2012). "Chapter 3: Behavioral Decision-Making" in (eds.) Huddy, L., Sears, D. and Levy, J. *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (Second Edition)*, Oxford University Press, pgs. 13-18, 132-137, 139-141.

Optional reading:

Jazaieri, H. (2014). Can Mindfulness Improve Decision Making? *University of California, Berkeley, Greater Good Science Center*. Published on May 12, 2014. Access at: http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/can_mindfulness_improve_decision_making

Lakoff, G. (2008). "Exploring the Political Mind" in *The Political Mind*, Viking: New York, New York, pgs. 195-200.

Talbot-Zorn, J. and Edgette, F. (2016). Mindfulness Improves Strategy, Too, *Harvard Business Review*. Published on May 2, 2016. Access at: <https://hbr.org/2016/05/mindfulness-can-improve-strategy-too>

Weston, D. (2007). "The Evolution of the Passionate Brain" in *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation*, BBS Public Affairs: New York, New York, pgs. 45-68.

Learning Objectives for Weeks 3 – 7

- Explore different stereotype archetypes
- Evaluate through psychological and neurological theory
- Unpack through real time practice, discussion and expert panels

WEEK 3 – JUNE 6, 2017

Topic: Political Identity Stereotypes

Readings:

[n.a.] (2016). “Partisanship and Political Animosity,” *Pew Research Center*. Published on June 22, 2016. Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2016/06/22/partisanship-and-political-animosity-in-2016/>

[n.a.] (2017) “On Eve of Inauguration, Americans Expect Nation’s Deep Political Divisions to Persist,” *Pew Research Center*. Published on January 19, 2017. Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2017/01/19/on-eve-of-inauguration-americans-expect-nations-deep-political-divisions-to-persist/>

Carney, D., Jost, J., Gosling, S.D. and Potter, J. (2008). The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles and the Things They Leave Behind, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 29(6), pgs. 814-836.

Crawford, J., Modri, S. and Motyl, M. (2013). Bleeding Heart Liberals and Hard-Hearted Conservatives: Subtle Political Dehumanization Through Differential Attributes of Human Nature and Human Uniqueness Traits, *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, North America*, Vol. 1 (Oct), pgs. 86-104.

Jost, J. and Amodio, D.M. (2012). Political ideology as motivated social cognition: Behavior and neuroscience evidence, *Motivation Emotion*, Vol. 36, pgs. 55-64.

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “In Politics” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York, pgs. 222-225.

Take the Pew Typology Quiz and come prepared to discuss your results:

<http://www.people-press.org/quiz/political-typology>

Deliverable #1 self-evaluation and strategy due by 7:00 p.m. on June 6, 2017. Submit via email to edgette@novosconsulting.com.

WEEK 4 – JUNE 13, 2017

Topic: Gender & Sexual Orientation Stereotypes

Readings:

[n.a.] (2016). “Women and Leadership,” *Pew Research Center*, pgs. 1-23. Published on January 14, 2015. Access at: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/01/14/women-and-leadership/>

[n.a.] (2013). “Chapter 2: Social Acceptance” and “Chapter 7: Political in *LGBT in Changing Times: A Survey of LGBT Americans*, *Pew Research Center*, pgs. 30-43, 104-112. Published on June 13, 2013. Access at: http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2013/06/SDT_LGBT-Americans_06-2013.pdf

Hayes, D. (2011). When Gender and Party Collide: Stereotyping in Candidate Trait Attribution, *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 7, pgs. 133-141, 155-161.

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “Gender” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York, pgs. 28-42.

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “Sexual Orientation and Identity” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*. New York: Hudson Street Press: 68-70.

WEEK 5 – JUNE 20, 2017

Topic: Race and Ethnicity Stereotypes

Readings:

[n.a.] (2016). “On immigration policy, partisan differences but also some common ground,” *Pew Research Center*. Published on August 25, 2016. Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2016/08/25/on-immigration-policy-partisan-differences-but-also-some-common-ground/>

Al Ramiah, A. and Hewstone, M. (2013). “Discrimination: Conditions, Consequences and Cures” in (eds.) Huddy, L., Sears, D. and Levy, J. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (Second Edition)*: Oxford University Press, pgs. 897-903.

Jones, B. (2016). Americans’ views of immigrants marked by widening partisan, generational divides, *Pew Research Center*. Published on April 15, 2016. Access at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/15/americans-views-of-immigrants-marked-by-widening-partisan-generational-divides/>

Kinder, D. (2013). “Prejudice and Politics” in (eds.) Huddy, L., Sears, D. and Levy, J.’s *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (Second Edition)*: Oxford University Press, pgs. 826-839.

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “Ethnicity” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York, pgs. 43-52.

Torres, N. (2014). Mindfulness May Reduce Biases You May Not Know You Have, *Harvard Business Review*. Published on: December 24, 2014. Access at: <https://hbr.org/2014/12/mindfulness-mitigates-biases-you-may-not-know-you-have>

Weaver, V.M. (2012). “The Electoral Consequences of Skin Color: The ‘Hidden’ Side of Race in Politics”, *Political Behavior*, Vol. 34(1), pgs. 159-192.

Formative draft of candidate strategy due by 7:00 p.m. on June 14, 2017. Students will receive Instructor feedback responses on June 20, 2017.

Optional reading:

Haidt, J. (2012). *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*: Vintage Books, pgs. 150-179.

WEEK 6 – JUNE 27, 2017

Topic: Generational Stereotypes

Readings:

[n.a.] (2014). “Millennials in Adulthood,” *Pew Research Center*, pgs. 4-39. Published on March 7, 2014. Access at: http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2014/03/2014-03-07_generations-report-version-for-web.pdf

[n.a.] (2015). “A Different Look at Generations and Partisanship,” *Pew Research Center*, pgs. 1-7. Published April 30, 2015. Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2015/04/30/a-different-look-at-generations-and-partisanship>

[n.a.] (2016). “Millennials Overtake Baby Boomers,” *Pew Research Center*. Published on April 25, 2016. Access at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/25/millennials-overtake-baby-boomers/>

[n.a.][n.d.] Generational Differences in the Workplace, pgs. 37-430.
(To be distributed in class in Week 5.)

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “Age” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York, pgs. 52-54.

WEEK 7 - JULY 4, 2017

National holiday observed. No class.

WEEK 8 – JULY 11, 2017

Topic: Candidate Image and Public Impressions

- Understand visual imagery’s neurological impacts
- Explore the role of appearance in politics
- Match candidate image with identity/stereotype narrative(s)

Readings:

Cuddy, A., Kohut, M. and Neffinger, J. (2013). Connect then Lead, *Harvard Business Review*, May/June (2013). Access at: <https://hbr.org/2013/07/connect-then-lead>

Hayes, D., Lawless, J. and Baitinger, G. (2014). Who Cares What They Wear? Media, Gender, and the Influence of Candidate Appearance, *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 95 (5), pgs. 1194-1212.

Lawson, C., Lenz, G.S., Baker, A., and Myers, M. (2010). Looking Like a Winner: Candidate Appearance and Electoral Success in New Democracies, *World Politics*, Vol. 62(4), pgs. 561-593.

Mattes et al. (2010). Predicting Candidate Outcomes Predicting Election Outcomes from Positive and Negative Trait Assessments of Candidate Images, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 31(1), pgs. 41-58.

McGraw, K. et al. (2011) “Chapter 13: Candidate Impressions and Evaluations” in (eds.) Druckman, J.N., Green, D.P., Kuklinski, J.K. and Lupia, A. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, Cambridge.

Neffinger, J. and Kohut, M. (2013). “Style” in *Compelling People: The Hidden Qualities That Make Us Influential*, Hudson Street Press: New York.

Shephard, M. and Johns, R. (2008). Candidate Image and Electoral Preference in Britain, *British Politics*, Vol. 3, pgs. 324-339.

Stroud, L., Glaser, J., and Salovey, P. (2005). The Effects of Partisanship and Candidate Emotionality on Voter Preference, *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, Vol. 25(1), pgs. 25-44, 2005-2006.

Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A.N., Goren, A. and Hall, C.C. (2005). Inference of competence from faces predict electoral outcomes, *Science*, Vol. 208 (June), pgs. 1623-1626.

WEEK 9 – JULY 18, 2017

No new readings.

Deliverable 2 campaign strategy and evaluation due at 7:00 p.m. on July 18, 2017.

Viral “heads and hearts” media piece presentations.

WEEK 10 – JULY 25, 2017

Topic: Ethics, Stereotypes of the Political System and Next Steps

Learning objectives:

- Discuss ethnics of behavioral sciences in politics
- Address political system stereotypes and their implications on the practice of political management
- Explore the future state of political campaigns and institutions

Reading:

[n.a.]. [n.d.] AAPC Code of Ethics, *American Association of Political Consultants*. Access at: <http://theaacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AAPC-Code-of-Ethics.pdf>

[n.a.] (2017). “Partisan Conflict and Congressional Outreach,” *Pew Research Center*. Published on February 23, 2017. Access at: <http://www.people-press.org/2017/02/23/partisan-conflict-and-congressional-outreach/>

ten Brinke, L. Liu, C.C., Keltner, D. and Srivastava, S.B. (2016). Virtues, Vices, and Political Influence in the U.S. Senate, *Psychological Science* 2016, Vol. 27(1), pgs. 85–93. Access at: http://rady.ucsd.edu/docs/Virtues_ten%20Brinke%20Liu%20Keltner%20and%20Srivastava%202015.pdf

*** LATE POLICY**

Students should be prepared to engage effective time management skills so as to meet submission deadlines for written assignments. From time to time, mitigating circumstances arise that may preclude a student from submitting their assignment by its due date. In such instances, it is expected that the student will contact the Instructor in a timely and expeditious fashion, and discuss their particular situation prior to the assignment due date.

It is at the discretion of the Instructor as to the appropriateness of granting an extension to complete a written assignment. If a student contacts the Instructor prior to the due date and time of the written assignment to request an extension and the Instructor grants the extension, the assignment will be reduced to the next letter grade on the grading scale for each day for which the extension is granted. For example, if the assignment would have earned an A- grade if submitted on or before the due date and the Instructor granted a one-day extension, the assignment grade will then be reduced to a B+. If a two-day extension, the A- will be reduced to a B. Additionally, the grade will be the lowest end of the grading scale associated with the letter grade. For example, if a B, and the assignment is 100 points, the written assignment will earn 83 points.

In no instance will more than a two (2) day extension be granted. A day is defined as that period of twenty-four hours after the due date/time.

If a student should submit a written assignment after the due date and time without first requesting an extension from the Instructor, then the following penalties will be assessed:

1. If the written assignment is submitted within 24 hours of the due date and time a two (2) letter grade penalty will be assessed. For example, if the written assignment is valued at 100 points and the Instructor assigns a grade of 85 points, which corresponds to a letter grade of B, then a letter grade of C+ will be assessed. The numerical grade recorded in the grade book will correspond to the number of points at the lowest end of the grading scale for the letter. (For example, C+ will be recorded as 77 points.)
2. If the written assignment is submitted over 24 hours after the due date and time but within 48 hours of the due date and time, a four (4) letter grade penalty will be assessed. For example, if the written assignment is valued at 100 points and the Instructor assigns a grade of 85 points, which corresponds to a letter grade of B, then a letter grade of C- will be assessed. The numerical grade recorded in the grade book will correspond to the number of points at the lowest end of the grading scale for the grade. (For example, assignments out of 100 points then earning a C- will be recorded as 70 points.)

Copyright Statement

Unless explicitly allowed by the instructor, course materials, class discussions, and examinations are created for and expected to be used by class participants only. The recording and rebroadcasting of such material, by any means, is forbidden.