

**RESEARCH SEMINAR IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS:
EXPERIMENTAL METHODS**

790:599

TH 8:40-11:30, 313 Hickman Hall

Professor David Redlawsk
Office Hours: T/TH 1:30-3:30
or by appointment

Department of Political Science
603 Hickman Hall
email: Redlawsk@rutgers.edu
web: www.rci.rutgers.edu/~redlawsk

Syllabus

Experiments are something *real* scientists do, right? We can all picture the white-lab-coated scientist examining test tubes and mixing various ingredients to test theories. Or, if you're of a psychological bent, you might think of mice running mazes in the basement of some psychology building. (Though one is also tempted to picture first-year psych students running those same mazes...) But historically one has rarely spoken about experiments and political science in the same breath. In fact experimentation is a rapidly developing methodology within our discipline. As a political psychologist, much of the work I do is based on experimentation, but experiments are not limited to those of us taking a psychological view of human nature and politics. Political economists, comparativists, institutionalists, and others have all found value in experiments.

The purpose of this course is to introduce you to the use of experiments in political science, to develop an understanding of where experimentation might work and where it might not, to develop an ability to critique experimental research, and to get some experience developing a proposal for an experiment of your own and carrying out a pilot of that proposal.

Course Web Site

I have a web site at <http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~redlawsk> that includes information about this course. Among other things, this syllabus will be posted there, as will any changes necessitated in the schedule due to unforeseen circumstances. In addition, you will find links to various resources elsewhere on the web.

Requirements

Participation

First and foremost, this class requires that you do the reading as assigned, completely, prior to class meetings. Since this is an advanced graduate course this should go without saying, but I think it worthwhile to say it anyway. By "doing the readings" I mean that you will read, make notes, and otherwise be prepared to engage the material in discussion and critique with your colleagues in the seminar. If you fail to do this we will spend nearly three hours each week staring at each other with very little to say!

Discussion Leader

To minimize the chances that no one will have anything to say, most weeks one member of the seminar will serve as discussion leader. This will begin with our second meeting. At our first meeting you will have the opportunity to choose your weeks – given the number of students each will probably lead during two weeks. When it is your turn you should be especially well prepared with that week's readings and should help direct our discussion through the use of thought-provoking questions and well-considered comments about the materials. Your intention should be to provoke additional analysis of the readings, NOT to summarize the readings themselves. We'll assume everyone has done the reading. In order that we will all be prepared you will post your comments, critiques, and questions online.

Short Papers/Critiques

During the course of the semester you will write three short papers, no fewer than 4 pages and no more than 6 (double-spaced, 12 point font, standard margins). For each paper you will pick one or more of the experimental studies we read and develop a critique. Generally you will want to focus extensively on one reading, but it may also be profitable to consider two readings together for what they say jointly to each other and about the topic. These papers are not to be summaries, but instead efforts to identify the strong and weak points of each reading and to consider how each advances our knowledge of its topic with special consideration given to the way in which the use of an experimental design is (or is not) a superior way to consider the topic at hand.

An initial draft of a short paper is due by NOON on the MONDAY BEFORE the class on which it focuses. Late papers will not be accepted, and a zero grade will be assigned. But since you choose when to do your papers, turning papers in on time should be no problem. You will turn in your paper online for all of us to read and consider (Details to be determined). We will include that draft in our discussion of the material in class. I do this because critique of our work by our peers is a critical part of how we advance knowledge. Following the class, you may revise the draft if you so choose. The printed hardcopy final version of the paper must be turned in to me no later than one week following the discussion. I will then grade and return the revised paper. You are expected to check online before class and read any papers your colleagues have written.

Experimental Research Design and Pilot

Instead of a final exam or a traditional research paper in this course, you will prepare and pilot a proposal for an experimental study. The initial proposal will develop the theory you want to test and an experimental design to test it. The proposal must be written to convince the reader (me) that the approach you want to take is the right one to test your theory and that you should be “funded” for your pilot. You will turn in your proposal on the date specified on the schedule. I will review and determine whether to approve it, at which point you will carry out data collection for a pilot of your proposal. Facilities are available for lab experiments may be available in our new lab facility. We can also carry out survey experiment pilots as well; we will talk about the logistics in class. Following data collection and analysis, you will revise your paper to consider the results of the pilot and the adjustments you might need to make in your experimental design. The final version of the proposal and pilot will be due the last day of class, ~~following that we will hold a poster session open to the public, for which you must prepare a poster.~~ [Note, we will not do the poster session this year.]

Grading

Participation/Discussion Leader	20%
Short Papers/Critiques	30%
Experimental Proposal & Pilot	50%

Required Books

I have NOT ordered books from any bookstore, however they are on reserve at Douglass Library. I have found that you can acquire the books needed more cheaply yourself through various sources such as Amazon. Our major textbook will be a draft of a text under development by Rebecca Morton and Kenneth Williams, which is available online. We will use all or most of the remaining books listed. The rest of our readings will come from journal articles and other sources, links (or the text) of which will be on the course website or on reserve.

Donald R. Kinder and Thomas R. Palfrey. 1993. *Experimental Foundations of Political Science*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ISBN: 0472081810

Richard R. Lau and David P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during a Political Campaign*. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 052161306X

Rebecca Morton and Kenneth Williams. Forthcoming. *From Nature to the Lab: Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality*. NOT YET PUBLISHED, AVAILBLE ONLINE AT <http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/2797/experiment.pdf>

Spring 2010 Schedule
All readings listed are required

January 21: INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS EXPERIMENTATION?

Morton and Williams, Chapters 1 & 2.

Bositis, David A. and Douglas Steinel. 1987. A Synoptic History and Typology of Experimental Research in Political Science. *Political Behavior* 9(3): 263-284.

Kinder and Palfrey, Preface, p. 1-42 and Coming to Grips with the Holy Ghost, p. 43-51.

Gerber, Alan and Donald Green. 2002. Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science. In Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (eds.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline* 3. New York: W.W. Norton. ON RESERVE

McDermott, Rose. 2002. Experimental Methodology in Political Science, *Political Analysis* 10(4), pp. 325-342.

January 28: HUMAN SUBJECTS & ETHICS/ THE IRB

NOTE: You must complete the Human Subjects Training if you have not already

Morton and Williams, Ch. 11-13.

Larry B. Christensen, *Experimental Methodology*, Ch 5. On Sakai (with Chapter 9).

Rutgers University Human Subjects Training online.

Milgram, Stanley. 1963. Behavioral Study of Obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67: 361-378.

Helm, Charles and Mario Morelli. 1979. Stanley Milgram and the Obedience Experiment: Authority, Legitimacy, and Human Action. *Political Theory*, 7(3): 321-345.

Stanford Prison Experiment materials online at <http://www.prisonexp.org/>. Focus in particular on the section on "Discussion Questions" after going through the slideshow (<http://www.prisonexp.org/slide-1.htm>) and looking at the materials used in the study (found at <http://www.prisonexp.org/links.htm>).

February 4: OVERVIEW OF EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Planned visit from Professor Caroline Tolbert, University of Iowa. Professor Tolbert will be meeting with our class and then giving a talk at noon.

Also, note that there is a meeting at NYU tomorrow and Saturday (Feb 5/6) on experimental methods in social sciences. You may want to attend. More information can be found at

NOTE: BEFORE this class you should examine the web site: www.experimentcentral.org which houses the TESS project. Then read the proposal that Jay McCann (Purdue) and I made to TESS [and was supported] and the reviews of that proposal. (This material will be provided.)

Morton and Williams, Ch 15.

Christensen, Ch 9, 10 & 12. On Sakai.

Lau and Redlawsk, Chapters 1-3, Appendices A, B, and C

February 18: CAUSALITY AND CONTROL

Morton and Williams, Chs. 3-5.

Lau & Redlawsk, Ch 3, App A-C: Consider the experimental design issues in the context of Causality and Control

Redlawsk, David P., Andrew Civettini, and Karen Emmerson. Forthcoming. The Affective Tipping Point: Do Motivated Reasoners ever “Get It”? *Political Psychology*.

Dickson, Eric, Catherine Hafer, and Dimitri Landa. 2008. Cognition and Strategy: A Deliberation Experiment. *Journal of Politics* 70(4): 974-989.

February 25: INTERNAL, EXTERNAL VALIDITY, AND SUBJECTS

Morton & Williams, Chs. 7-10.

Sears, David O. 1986. College Sophomores in the Laboratory - Influences Of A Narrow Database On Social-Psychology View Of Human Nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51(3): 515-530.

Greenberg, Jerald. 1987. The College Sophomore as Guinea Pig: Setting the Record Straight. *The Academy of Management Review* 12(1): 157-159.

Gordon, Michael E., L. Allen Slade, and Neal Schmitt. 1987. Student Guinea Pigs: Porcine Predictors and Particularistic Phenomena. *The Academy of Management Review* 12(1): 160-163.

Druckman, James N. and Cindy D. Kam. Manuscript. Students as Experimental Participants: A Defense of the “Narrow Data Base”. (On Sakai)

Orne, M. T. 1962. On the Social Psychology of the Psychological Experiment: with Particular Reference to Demand Characteristics and their Implications. *American Psychologist* 17:777-783.

MARCH 1 FIELD EXPERIMENTS

(10:30-12:45)

RESEARCH PROPOSALS DUE TODAY

Gosnell, Harold F. 1926. An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting. *American Political Science Review* 20: 869-874.

Adams, William C. and Dennis J. Smith. 1980. Effects of Telephone Canvassing on Turnout and Preferences: A Field Experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44(3): 389-395.

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2000. The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review* 94: 653-63.

- Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 33-48.
- Bositis, David A. 1985. Design Strategies for Theory Testing: The Efficient Use of Field Experimentation in Local Level Political Research. *Political Behavior* 7(4): 374-385.
- Bertrand, Marianne and Sendhil Mullanathan. 2004. Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamil? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination. *The American Economic Review* 94(4): 991-1013.

March 4: NATURAL EXPERIMENTS

- Grofman, Bernard, Robert Griffin and Gregory Berry. 1995. House Members Who Become Senators: Learning from a 'Natural Experiment' in Representation. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20(4): 513-529.
- Hibbing, John R. 1986. Ambition in the House: Behavioral Consequences of Higher Office Goals among U.S. Representatives. *American Journal of Political Science* 30(Aug): 651-665.
- Franklin, Charles H. and Liane C. Kosaki. 1989. Republican Schoolmaster: The U.S. Supreme Court, Public Opinion, and Abortion. *The American Political Science Review* 83(3). pp. 751-771.
- Wand, Jonathan N., Kenneth W. Shotts, Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Alter R. Mebane, Jr., Michael C. Herron, And Henry E. Brady. 2001. The Butterfly Did It: The Aberrant Vote for Buchanan in Palm Beach County, Florida. *The American Political Science Review* 95(4):793-810.
- Jacobsen, Joyce P., James Wishart Pearce III, and Joshua L. Rosenbloom. 1999. The Effects of Childbearing on Married Women's Labor Supply and Earnings: Using Twin Births as a Natural Experiment. *The Journal of Human Resources* 34(Summer): 449-474.
- Beckwith, Jon and Corey A. Morris. 2008. Twin Studies of Political Behavior: Untenable Assumptions? *Perspectives on Politics* 6 : 785-791.
- Alford , John R., Carolyn L. Funk and John R. Hibbing. 2008. Twin Studies, Molecular Genetics, Politics, and Tolerance: A Response to Beckwith and Morris. *Perspectives on Politics* 6 : 793-797.

March 11: FORMAL THEORY TESTING

- Morton and Williams, Ch. 6
- Palfrey, Agendas and Decisions in Government, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp 389-398.
- Fiorina and Plott, Committee Decisions under Majority Rule, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 399-434.
- Levine and Plott, Agenda Influence and its Implications, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 461-496.
- Lohmann, Susanne. 1998. Rational Choice in the Laboratory: A Survivor's Guide to Experimental Design. *The Political Methodologist* 8(2): 10-17.
- Cameron, Charles and Rebecca Morton. 2002. Formal Theory Meets Data. In Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (eds.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline* 3. New York: W.W. Norton. ON RESERVE

March 25: SURVEY EXPERIMENTS

Schuman and Bobo, Survey Based Experiments on White Racial Attitudes toward Residential Integration, in Kinder and Palfrey, p. 53-78.

Kinder, Donald & Lynn M. Sanders. 1990. Mimicking Political Debate with Survey Questions. *Social Cognition* 8(1): 73-103.

Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus, Ideological Constraint in the Mass Public, in Kinder & Palfrey, pp. 79-96.

Kuklinski, James H., Sniderman, Paul M., Knight, Kathleen, Piazza, Thomas, Tetlock, Philip E., Lawrence, Gordon R., Mellers, Barbara. 1997. Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2): 402.

Redlawsk, David, Caroline J. Tolbert, and William Franko. 2009. Voters, Emotions, and Race in 2008: Obama as the First Black President. Manuscript.

Druckman, James N. 2004. Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 671-686.

Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2008. Survey Experiments and the External Validity of Treatments. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology. Paris, France, July 9-12, 2008

April 1: POLITICAL INFORMATION EXPERIMENTS

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. Experimental Demonstrations of the "Not-So-Minimal" Consequences of Television News Programs. In Kinder & Palfrey, pp. 313-332.

Cover and Brumberg, Baby Books and Ballots, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 363-388.

Brader, Ted. 2005. Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 388-405

Lau and Redlawsk, Ch 5-7, Appendix D

Redlawsk, David P. 2007. When Model Fitting is not Understanding: The Case of Modeling Candidate Evaluation. Manuscript

April 8: POLITICAL DECISION MAKING EXPERIMENTS

Kinder, Rational and not so Rational Processes in Judgement and Choice, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 119-128.

Quattrone and Tversky, Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 159-184.

Herstein, Keeping the Voters Limits in Mind, in Kinder and Palfrey, pp. 129-158.

Lau and Redlawsk, Chapters 8-12

April 15: EVALUATING EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Special issue on experimental methods in *Political Analysis*, Vol 10, No. 4, Autumn 2002.
<http://www.pan.oupjournals.org/content/vol10/issue4/index.shtml>

April 22: Midwest PSA Meeting

April 29: EXPERIMENTS AND THE FUTURE

Morton and Williams, Ch 14.

Mahoney M.J. 1977. Publication Prejudices: An Experimental Study of Confirmatory Bias in the Peer Review System. *Cognitive Therapy Research*, 1:161-175.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and David Nickerson. 2001. Testing for Publication Bias in Political Science. *Political Analysis* 9: 385-92.

McDermott, Rose. 2004. "The Feeling of Rationality: The Meaning of Neuroscientific Advances for Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (December): 691– 707

Phelps, Elizabeth A. and Laura A. Thomas. 2003. Race, Behavior, and the Brain: The Role of Neuroimaging in Understanding Complex Social Behaviors. *Political Psychology* 24(4): 747-758.

TBD: POSTER SESSION