

Surveys and Experiments

PSC 700- Spring 2015
Department of Political Science,
Syracuse University
Monday 9:30-12:15 pm, Maxwell Hall 315

Professor Shana Kushner Gadarian

Contact Information

Office: 315 Eggers

Phone: 315-443-3718

Email: sgadaria@maxwell.syr.edu

Course website: blackboard.syr.edu

Office Hours

Monday 2-4 pm or by appointment

Course Overview: The goal of this class is to introduce you to the use and analysis of two methodologies increasingly used in political science – surveys and experiments. We will explore both technical aspects of surveys and experiments – what they can measure, how they can measure it, and what types of questions they allow political scientists to answer – as well as read substantive social science that utilizes these methods. You will also all become practitioners this semester by completing a research project that uses either survey or experimental data and writing it up in the style of an article in the *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. Given my own area of study, we will mainly focus on the US, but please feel free to offer perspectives from comparative politics as well.

For each week's readings, you should be prepared to discuss the following questions:

1. In your view, what are some of the major *theoretical* perspectives that structure research in a given area, what are their major strengths and weaknesses, and how do they compare with other perspectives you're familiar with (encountered in the course or elsewhere)?
2. In your view, what do you see as some of the major strengths and weaknesses of the *methods* used to investigate the subject? What methodologies, broadly conceived (e.g., basic issues of design, measurement, etc.) do you feel are most appropriate, given the subject of inquiry, and to what degree do you think the substantive conclusions drawn are dependent on the particular methods employed?
3. Do the authors engage with each other? Is this engagement fruitful for furthering the field? Would we learn more as political scientists by more study in this area? What do we still not know?
4. What are the major *implications* of the findings for democratic theory and public policy? What relevance do the studies have for *your interests*? What does the study say about the way in which the American political system operates in practice – does the system live up to its billing as a democracy? According to what expectations and what definition of democracy?
5. How can this research be *improved*, in your view? What theories, methods and substantive foci deserve more attention in future research?
6. What are the major advantages of using either survey research or experimental research for the particular theoretical question being studied? What are the potential or actual disadvantages?

COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS:

Participation (40%): You are expected to read and analyze the readings prior to each week and come to class prepared to offer your insights. You are also expected to attend class each week and will need to inform me ahead of time if you will be absent. Multiple unexcused absences will lead to a lower grade. Your participation grade will be made up of these components: 4 response papers, completing IRB training through the Office of Institutional Research, and active, engaged participation in class, which includes workshopping your paper ideas each week.

1. *IRB training through CITI:* The Institutional Research Board oversees all projects using human subjects at Syracuse. In order to collect data through an intervention such as survey or an experiment, you will need to go through the online training provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) by **Monday, January 19 at 9:30 am**. You can email your CITI certificate to me.
<http://orip.syr.edu/human-research/training-list/Education%20and%20Training.html>
2. *Analysis papers:* As part of your participation grade, you are required to turn in 4 (2-3 page) papers in the vein of a column in The Monkey Cage, Vox.com, or Upshot. The papers should tell us what the point of one or several reading(s). What should an informed consumer take away from the readers? What do the data tell us, and what do we still not know based on these readings? You can select 4 weeks of your choice but at least 2 must be before spring break. These are not graded for content but are designed to help you think about the readings in preparation for discussion. The papers are due to me by **email by 5 pm** on the **Sunday** before class.
3. *Active engagement:* Active student participation is essential to a successful seminar. Your participation should be intelligent, informed and frequent. Optimally, all three. Tradeoffs among them should not be necessary.
4. *Research paper workshopping:* Each week we will workshop our projects, starting in the second week of class. This means that you need to find a research question quickly. Each week you should provide the class with an update about your progress with research design, data collection, and hypothesis testing. We will spend the last hour of class helping each other to improve the projects, so you should bring a handout for each member of the class, such as survey question wordings or experimental manipulation materials.

Discussion leading (20%): Two times over the course of the semester, you will help to lead discussion. You will lead the week's discussion starting with a 5 minute introduction to the week's readings that provides a concise summary of key findings and questions and *raises questions for discussion*. Do not feel obliged to address each article from the week. Rather, you may want to focus on the key issues or debate and follow those through several pieces. As an early preparation for your comprehensive exams, please prepare a handout for the class of your presentation. We will coordinate discussion leading during the first week of class.

Graded papers (40%):

A 15-20 page double-spaced research paper in the model of an article in the *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. (The page limit is for the text; figures and references can take up additional pages.)

The paper should focus briefly on the research question and previous literature, and focus more heavily on how you tested the theoretically derived hypotheses, what the benefits as well as the drawbacks of the method are that you chose, and what these findings add to our knowledge about your topic. Papers should also pose alternative hypotheses and outline how your research design can help eliminate alternative explanations or what additional data you would need to do so. Pick a question or a theory from the course and apply it to a problem of interest to you. These papers will use either secondary or newly collected survey or experimental data to test a theoretically derived hypothesis. For students interested in collecting experimental data, you will have access to the behavioral lab at the Whitman School of Management. We will need to discuss your design and I will put you in touch with the faculty members who run the lab. Papers are **due on Friday, May 1 by 5 pm**. A detailed paper outline is due in class by **March 2**. Late papers will be penalized 1/3 of a grade for each 24 hours they are late.

At the end of the semester, your grade will be assigned based on the following scale:

A (93-100), A- (90-92), B+ (87-89), B (83-86), B- (80-82), C+ (77-79), C (73-76), C- (70-72), F (69 and below). There are no D grades in graduate courses.

COURSE POLICIES

SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

There are many ways to succeed in this class. Cheating and plagiarism are not among them and will not be tolerated. The Syracuse University Academic Integrity Policy holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Students should be familiar with the policy and know that it is their responsibility to learn about instructor and general academic expectations with regard to proper citation of sources in written work. The policy also governs the integrity of work submitted in exams and assignments as well as the veracity of signatures on attendance sheets and other verifications of participation in class activities. Serious sanctions can result from academic dishonesty of any sort.

For more information and the complete policy, see <http://academicintegrity.syr.edu>. Please see me if you have any questions about what constitutes original work. Plagiarism on research papers or the analytical papers will lead to an F for the course.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

I encourage and value student participation. Keep in mind that since this is a class on politics, you will no doubt encounter point of views that differ from your own. Students in this class come from a variety of personal and academic backgrounds and these backgrounds may lead to a variety of perspectives on the political world. I believe that having a variety of viewpoints will make our discussions more interesting and will allow us to learn from each other. We will maintain a respectful dialogue even when we disagree and no student's grade will be affected by his or her personal views.

ACCOMMODATIONS

If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS), <http://disabilityservices.syr.edu>, located in Room 309 of 804 University Avenue, or call (315) 443-4498 for an appointment to discuss your needs and the process for requesting accommodations. ODS is responsible for coordinating disability-related accommodations and will issue students with documented disabilities Accommodation Authorization Letters, as appropriate. Since accommodations may require early planning and generally are not provided retroactively, please contact ODS as soon as possible. You are also welcome to contact me privately to discuss your academic needs, although I cannot arrange for disability-related accommodations.

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES

It is the policy of Syracuse University that no student should be refused admission or be expelled because he or she is unable to participate in any examination, study, or work requirement because of his or her religious holy day requirements. An opportunity will be provided to make up any examination, study, or work requirements that may have been missed because of an absence due to a religious observance providing that I have been notified in writing one week before the absence. No fees will be charged to the student for the costs incurred by the University for such makeup work. In effecting this policy, the University agrees that no adverse or prejudicial effect should result to any student who avails herself or himself of its provisions.

Readings:

Most of our readings will be from journal articles in political science, communication, economics or psychology. I've intentionally made the reading load lighter in this course compared to other graduate courses to accommodate for the fact that you will also be working on your projects throughout the semester. However, that means that we will not cover all the possible topics on each subject. If you are interested in additional reading, please see me and I can make recommendations for further reading. They are all easily accessed using JStor (www.jstor.org) or going directly to the journals website through the library. When we are assigned a book chapter, I will make it available to you via Blackboard unless we are reading multiple chapters that create a copyright problem. We will read many chapters from the Druckman, et al Handbook of Experimental Political Science. I recommend that you purchase this book through an online retailer. I have also made it available through Course Reserves at Bird Library.

Druckman, James, Donald Green, James Kuklinski, Arthur Lupia. 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

January 12 - Class overview: Causality, correlation, and social research**Readings:**

- a. Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, Chapter 1: Introduction: Experimentation in Political Science and Chapter 2: An Introduction to Core Concepts.
- b. Hillygus, D. Sunshine. "The Practice of Survey Research." New Directions in Public Opinion. Berinsky, Adam J., ed. New York: Routledge. Chapter 2.

Assignment: None**Jan 19 - NO CLASS, MLK DAY**

Assignment: IRB Certification Due

Jan 26 - Surveys: The Survey Interview and Nature of Survey Response**Readings**

- a. Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*. (1992): 579-616.
- b. Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge University Press, (2000). Chapter 1
- c. Berinsky, Adam J. "Silent voices: Social welfare policy opinions and political equality in America." (2002): *American Journal of Political Science* : 276-287.
- d. Converse, Philip. 1964 "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In David Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*.

Recommended readings:

- a. Asher, Herbert. 2007. *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know*, 7th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- b. Bartels, Larry M. "Democracy with attitudes." *Electoral democracy* (2003): 48-82
- c. Brady, Henry E. 2000. "Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33(1): 47-57.
- d. Bassili, John N. 1995. "Response Latency and the Accessibility of Voting Intentions: What Contributes to Accessibility and How It Affects Vote Choice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(July): 686-695.
- e. Bassili, John N., and B. Stacey Scott. 1996. "Response Latency as a Signal to Question Problems in Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(Fall): 390-399.
- f. Berinsky, Adam J. 2004. "Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s: The Analysis of Quota Controlled Sample Survey Data."
- g. Converse, Jean and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- h. Sanders, Lynn M. 1999. "Democratic Politics and Survey Research." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 29:248-80. (available at <http://faculty.virginia.edu/lsanders/P29s2s5.pdf>)

Assignment: Come to class with paper idea and be ready to discuss

Feb 2 - Surveys – Measurement issues; question wording and ordering effects - Seth Jolly visits

Readings:

- a. Smith, Tom W. "That which we call welfare by any other name would smell sweeter an analysis of the impact of question wording on response patterns." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51.1 (1987): 75-83.
- b. Wolter, Felix, and Peter Preisendörfer. "Asking Sensitive Questions An Evaluation of the Randomized Response Technique Versus Direct Questioning Using Individual Validation Data." *Sociological Methods & Research* 42.3 (2013): 321-353.
- c. Hanmer, Michael J., Antoine J. Banks, and Ismail K. White. "Experiments to Reduce the Over-reporting of Voting: A Pipeline to the Truth." *Political Analysis* 22.1 (2014): 130-141.
- d. Krosnick, Jon A., and Duane F. Alwin. "An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response-order effects in survey measurement." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51.2 (1987): 201-219.

Recommended readings:

- a. Bernstein, Robert, Anita Chadha and Robert Montjoy. 2001. Overreporting Voting: Why it Happens and Why it Matters. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65: 22-44.
- b. Petty, Richard E. Greg A. Rennie, and John T. Cacioppo. 1987. Assertion Versus Interrogation Format in Opinion Surveys: Questions Enhance Thoughtful Responding. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51(4), 481-494.
- c. Zdep, S.M., Isabelle Rhodes, R.M. Schwarz, and Mary Kilkenny. 1979. The Validity of the Randomized Response Technique. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 43 (4), 544-549.

Assignment: Using Roper iPoll

(http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html) or the American National Election Studies (electionstudies.org), bring in an example of alternative question wordings for the same topic. Think about the consequences of the question wording choices.

Feb 9 - Survey Design. – Response options, ordering, anchoring vignettes

- a. King, Gary, et al. "Enhancing the validity and cross-cultural comparability of measurement in survey research." *American Political Science Review*. 98.01 (2004): 191-207.
- b. Davis, Darren W. "Nonrandom measurement error and race of interviewer effects among African Americans." *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1997): 183-207.
- c. Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge University Press, (2000). Chapter 7
- d. Geer, John G. 1991. Do Open-Ended Questions Measure "Salient" Issues. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 55(3), 360-370.

Recommended reading

- a. Bishop, George F. 1987. Experiments with the Middle Response Alternative in Survey Questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51(2), 220-232.
- b. Krosnick et. al. 2002. The Impact of "No Opinion" Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(3) 371-403.
- c. Sanchez, Gabriel R. 2008. "Latino Group Consciousness and Perceptions of Commonality with African Americans" *Social Science Quarterly* 89.2: 428-444.

Assignment: Using Roper iPoll

(http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html) or the American National Election Studies (electionstudies.org), bring in an example of how question ordering may influence the answers given on a topic of interest to you.

Feb 16 – The future of survey research

- a. Shapiro, Robert. 2011. Public Opinion and American Democracy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 75(5); 982-1017.
- b. Ansolabehere, S., & Schaffner, B. F. 2014. Does survey mode still matter? Findings from a 2010 multi-mode comparison. *Political Analysis*, 22(3): 285-303.
- c. Brick, J. Michael. 2011. The Future of Survey Sampling. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 75 (5): 872-888. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfr045
- d. Groves, Robert. 2011. Three Eras of Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75: 861-871.
- e. Gelman, Andrew and David Rothschild. 2014. Modern polling needs innovation, not traditionalism. *The Monkey Cage. Washington Post*. August 4.

Recommended Readings:

- a. Couper, Mick P. 2000. "Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64:464-494
- b. Johnston, Richard and Henry Brady. 2002. The Rolling Cross Section Design. *Electoral Studies*. 21(2): 283-295.
- c. Witte, James and Philip E. N. Howard.. 2002. "The Future of Polling: Relational Inference and the Development of Internet Survey Instruments." In Jeff Maza et al (ed). *Navigating Public Opinion Polls, Policy, and the Future of American Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Assignment: Fill out an IRB application for your research. Find the forms here (<http://orip.syr.edu/human-research/human-research-irb.html>) (Even if you are doing analysis of secondary data, this is an exercise to go through how you would fill this out in the future.)

Feb 23 - Survey based experiments - Spencer Piston visits

- a. Sniderman, Paul. "The Logic and Design of the Survey Experiment: An Autobiography of a Methodological Innovation" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. *Cambridge Handbook*, p 102-114.
- b. Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Revisited." *Political Analysis* 15 (Winter): 1-20.
- c. Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. Are survey experiments externally valid? *American Political Science Review* 104.02: 226-242.
- d. Hutchings, Vincent L., and Spencer Piston. 2011. "The Determinants and Political Consequences of Prejudice." In Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge University Press. p 306-320.

Recommended reading:

- a. Druckman, James N. Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (Ir) relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98.04 (2004): 671-686.
- b. Kinder, Donald and Lynn Sanders. 1990. Mimicking Political Debate with Survey Questions. *Social Cognition*. 8(1): 73-103.
- c. Kinder, Donald R., and Thomas R. Palfrey, eds. *Experimental foundations of political science*. University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- d. Kuklinski, James H., et al. "Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action." *American Journal of Political Science* (1997): 402-419.
- e. Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance." *American Political Science Review* (1997): 567-583.
- f. Mutz, Diana C. *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton University Press, 2011.

Assignment: None (This would be a good time to write a short paper!)

March 2 – Laboratory experiments – Matt Cleary visits

- a. Iyengar, Shanto. "Laboratory Experiments in Political Science" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, p 73-89.
- b. Kanthak, Kristin and Jonathan Woon. Forthcoming. Women Don't Run? Election Aversion and Candidate Entry. *American Journal of Political Science*.
(<http://www.pitt.edu/~woon/papers/kw-ajps-final.pdf>)
- c. Zeitzoff, Thomas. 2014. "Anger, Exposure to Violence, and Intragroup Conflict: A "Lab in the Field" Experiment in Southern Israel." *Political Psychology* 35.3 (2014): 309-335.
(http://www.zeitsoff.com/uploads/2/2/4/1/22413724/zeitsoff_rockets_polpsych.pdf)
- d. Mendelberg, Tali, Christopher F. Karpowitz, and Nicholas Goedert. "Does Descriptive Representation Facilitate Women's Distinctive Voice? How Gender Composition and Decision Rules Affect Deliberation." *American Journal of Political Science* 58.2 (2014): 291-306.

Recommended readings:

- a. Albert, et al. (2007). "Are We Nice(R) to Nice(R) People? - an Experimental Analysis." *Experimental Economics* 10 (1): 53-69.
- b. Anderhub, et al. (2002). "An Experimental Study of the Repeated Trust Game with Incomplete Information." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 48 (2): 197-216.
- c. Anderson, et al. (2006). "Induced Heterogeneity in Trust Experiments." *Experimental Economics* 9 (3): 223-235.
- d. Ashraf, et al. (2006). "Decomposing Trust and Trustworthiness." *Experimental Economics* 9 (3): 193-208.
- e. Berg, et al. (1995). "Trust, Reciprocity, and Social History." *Games and Economic Behavior* 10 (1): 122-142.
- f. Bohnet, et al. (2001). "More Order with Less Law: On Contract Enforcement, Trust, and Crowding." *American Political Science Review* 95 (1): 131-144.
- g. Carlin and Love. (2013). "The Politics of Interpersonal Trust and Reciprocity: An Experimental Approach." *Political Behavior* 35 (1): 43-63.
- h. Chaudhuri. (2011). "Sustaining Cooperation in Laboratory Public Goods Experiments: A Selective Survey of the Literature." *Experimental Economics* 14 (1): 47-83.
- i. Chong, Dennis and James Druckman Framing Theory, *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103-126, 2007
- j. Dickson, Eric. "Economics versus Psychology Experiments: Stylization, Incentives, and Deception" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, p 58-72.

- k. Falk, Armin and James J. Heckman, "Lab Experiments Are a Major Source of Knowledge in the Social Sciences". *Science* 23 October 2009: 326 (5952), 535-538.
- l. Fehr and Gächter. (2000). "Cooperation and Punishment in Public Goods Experiments." *American Economic Review* 90 (4): 980-994.
- m. Habyarimana, et al. (2007). "Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision?" *American Political Science Review* 101 (4): 709-725.
- n. Olken. (2010). "Direct Democracy and Local Public Goods: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *American Political Science Review* **104** (2): 243-267.
- o. Ostrom, et al. (1992). "Covenants with and without a Sword: Self-Governance Is Possible." *American Political Science Review* 86 (2): 404-417.
- p. Wilson and Eckel. (2006). "Judging a Book by Its Cover: Beauty and Expectations in the Trust Game." *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (2): 189-202.
- q. Druckman, et al. (2011). "Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Wilson and Eckel chapter

Assignment: Detailed outline of your research project. Please use the format of a pre-registration document. See examples at www.egap.org. These don't need to be extensive , but do need to contain all of the information from the EGAP online form (<http://egap.org/design-registration/standards-project-registration/>) as well as your research design and expected tests. Please bring to class.

March 9 – No class, SU Spring Break

March 16 – Experimental design – Subjects and ethics

- a. Sears, David O. "College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 51.3 (1986): 515.
- b. Druckman, James and Cindy Kam. "Students as Experimental Participants: A Defense of the 'Narrow Data Base'" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, p 41-58.
- c. Berinsky, Adam J., Gregory A. Huber, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2012. "Evaluating Online Labor Markets for Experimental Research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk." *Political Analysis* 20 (Summer): 351-368.
- d. Milgram, Stanley. 1963. "Behavioral Study of Obedience" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67(4): 371-378.
- e. Smith, Stevens S., and Deborah Richardson. 1983. Amelioration of deception and harm in psychological research: The important role of debriefing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44(5): 1075.

Recommended readings:

- a. Burger, Jerry M. 2009. Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today? *American Psychologist*.
- b. Gordon, M. E., Slade, L. A., & Schmitt, N. 1987. Student guinea pigs: Porcine predictors and particularistic phenomena. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 160-163.
- c. Greenberg, Jerald. 1987. The College Sophomore as Guinea Pig: Setting the Record Straight. *The Academy of Management Review*. 12(1): 157-159.
- d. Kam, Cindy, Jennifer R. Wilking, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2007. "Beyond the 'Narrow Data Base': Another Convenience Sample for Experimental Research." *Political Behavior* 29(4):415-440.
- e. Orne, M. T. 1962. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American psychologist*, 17(11), 776.
- f. Whitbourne, Susan Krauss. 2013. The Rarely Told True Story of Zimbardo's Prison Experiment. *Psychology Today*. July 20.
(<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/fulfillmentanyage/201307/therarelytoldtruestoryzimbardosprisonexperiment>)
- g. Zimbardo, Philip G. 1973. Pirandellian Prison. *New York Times Magazine*. April 8.

Ethics and experiments

- a. Blustein, Jan. 2005. Toward a More Public Discussion of the Ethics of Federal Social Program Evaluation," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. Vol. 24, No. 4, 824-846.
- b. Humphreys, Maccartan. 2011. "Ethical Challenges of Embedded Experimentation." *Comparative Democratization*. 9(3).
- c. Morton, Rebecca B., and Kenneth C. Williams. *Experimental political science and the study of causality: From nature to the lab*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- d. Pepinsky, Tom. 2014. "Surveys, Experiments, and the Landscape of International Political Economy." *International Interactions*.
- e. Teele, Dawn Langan, ed. *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. Yale University Press, 2014.
- f. Some reflections on the Montana field experiment:
 - i. Goel, Vindu. 2014. As Data Overflows Online, Researchers Grapple with Ethics. *New York Times* (12 August 2014)
<http://www.nytimes.com/.../the-boon-of-online-data-puts-socia...>
 - ii. Scott, Dylan. 2014. Profs Bumble Into Big Legal Trouble After Election Experiment Goes Way Wrong. *TPM Online*. (27 October 2014)
<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/.../montana-election-mailer-stat...>
 - iii. Humphreys, Macartan. 2014. How to make field experiments more ethical. *The Washington Post Monkey Cage* (2 November 2014)
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/.../how-to-make-field-experime.../>

- iv. Leeper, Thomas. 2014. In Defense of the Montana Experiment. (25 October 2014) <http://thomasleeper.com/2014/10/montana-experiment/>
- v. American Political Science Association. 2014. Statement on Field Experiments and Research Integrity in Political Science. <http://www.apsanet.org/.../Hero.Hochschild%20Statement%20on%2>

Assignment: Find a study where you think the results may change depending on the sample being used.

March 23 - Field experiments – Dimitar Gueorguiev visits

- a. Gosnell, Harold F. "An experiment in the stimulation of voting." *The American Political Science Review* 20.4 (1926): 869-874.
- b. Pager, Devah. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108.5 (2003): 937-975.
- c. Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. "The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment." *American Political Science Review* (2000): 653-663.
- d. Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, and Donald P. Green. "Deference, dissent, and dispute resolution: An experimental intervention using mass media to change norms and behavior in Rwanda." *American Political Science Review* 103.04 (2009): 622-644.

Recommended readings:

- a. Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. *Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination*. No. w9873. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003.
- b. Fearon, James D., Macartan Humphreys, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. "Can development aid contribute to social cohesion after civil war? Evidence from a field experiment in post-conflict Liberia." *The American Economic Review* (2009): 287-291.
- c. Gerber, Alan. "Field Experiments in Political Science" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. *Cambridge Handbook*, 115-140.
- d. Gilligan, Michael J; Benjamin Pasquale, & Cyrus Samii. 2014. "Civil War and Social Cohesion: Lab-in-the-Field Evidence from Nepal." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3):604-619.
- e. LaCour, Michael J., and Donald P. Green. "Messages, Messengers, and Diffusion of Support for Gay Equality: Results from Two Longitudinal Field Experiments." *Under Review* (2014).
- f. McClendon, Gwenyth. Social Esteem and Participation in Contentious Politics: a Field Experiment at an LGBT Rights Rally. 2014. *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2).

Assignment: Bring in table or graph of main results in project so far

Topical applications of surveys and experiments -

As you read, think about the advantages and disadvantages of studying the same question with various methodologies. What more do we know by utilizing multiple methods? What do we still not know?

March 30 – Emotion

- a. MacKuen, Michael and George Marcus. 1993. Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns. *American Political Science Review* 87: 672-685.
- b. Ladd, Jonathan McDonald, and Gabriel S. Lenz. "Reassessing the role of anxiety in vote choice." *Political Psychology* 29.2 (2008): 275-296.
- c. Gadarian, Shana and Bethany Albertson 2014. Anxiety, Immigration, and the Search for Information. *Political Psychology*. 35(4):133-164.
- d. Banks, Antoine and Nicholas Valentino. 2012. Emotional Substrates of White Racial Attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*. 56(2): 286-297.

April 6 - Intergroup relations

- a. Hopkins, Daniel, Van Tran, and Abigail Fisher Williamson. 2014. See No Spanish: Language, Local Context, and Attitudes toward Immigration. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. 2(1): 35-51.
- b. Enos, Ryan. 2014. Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes. *Proceedings of the National Academy* 111(10): 3699-3704.
- c. Kuklinski, James, Michael Cobb, Martin Gilens. 1997. "Racial Attitudes and the New South" *Journal of Politics*. Vol. 59, No. 2, p. 323-349
- d. Bobo, L., & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. *American Sociological Review*, 951-972.

April 13 - Media effects

- a. Green, D. P., Calfano, B. R., & Aronow, P. M. (2014). Field experimental designs for the study of media effects. *Political Communication*, 31(1), 168-180.
- b. King, Gary, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E Roberts. 2014. Reverse-engineering censorship in China: Randomized experimentation and participant observation, *Science* 345, no. 6199: 1-10. Copy at <http://j.mp/16Nvzge>
- c. Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. "Experimental demonstrations of the "not so-minimal" consequences of television news programs." *The American Political Science Review* (1982): 848-858
- d. Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas, and Scott Clifford. 2013. Comparing Contemporaneous Laboratory and Field Experiments on Media Effects. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 77.1 (2013): 256-282.

April 20 – Political Responsiveness

- a. Gilens, Martin and Benjamin Page. 2014. Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. *Perspectives on Politics*. 12(3)
- b. Broockman, David. "Black Politicians Are More Intrinsically Motivated To Advance Blacks' Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 no. 3. (2013)
- c. Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. "Constituency influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57.01 (1963): 45-56.
- d. Harbridge, Laurel, and Neil Malhotra. "Electoral incentives and partisan conflict in congress: Evidence from survey experiments." *American Journal of Political Science* 55.3 (2011): 494-510.
- e. Bartels, Larry M. "Constituency opinion and congressional policy making: The Reagan defense build up." *The American Political Science Review* (1991): 457-474.

April 27 – Research presentations

Assignment: Prepare a 10 minute conference style presentation of final research project. The presentation should give limited background and focus on the findings and implications of the findings for the broader literature and the study of democracy.

Some guides for giving excellent conference presentations:

- a. Columbia Graduate School: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/tat/pdfs/presentations1.pdf>
- b. Get a Life, PhD: <http://getalifeph.d.blogspot.com/2011/04/how-to-give-fabulous-academic.html>
- c. The American Psychological Association:
<http://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2010/04/presentation.aspx>
- d. Nick Hopwood: <https://nickhop.wordpress.com/2013/09/12/a-guide-to-making-academic-conference-presentations-more-effective/>

Here is a small taste of topics that we won't be able to cover this semester. I'd encourage you to consider attending IQMR

(http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Institute_for_Qualitative_and_Multi-Method_Research/) , ICPSR (<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp>), or EITM (<http://www.citminstitute.org/>) for advanced training in these topics.

Advanced methods

- a. Conjoint analysis: Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. "Causal inference in conjoint analysis: understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments." *Political Analysis* 22.1 (2014): 1-30.
- b. Process tracing: Lau, Richard R. "Information search during an election campaign: Introducing a processing-tracing methodology for political scientists." *Political judgment: Structure and process* (1995): 179-206.

- c. Regression discontinuity designs: Eggers, Andrew C., Anthony Fowler, Jens Hainmueller, Andrew B. Hall, James M. Snyder, Jr. Forthcoming. On the Validity of the Regression Discontinuity Design for Estimating Electoral Effects: New Evidence from Over 40,000 Close Races. *American Journal of Political Science*
- d. Mediation: Imai, Kosuke, Luke Keele, and Dustin Tingley. "A general approach to causal mediation analysis." *Psychological methods* 15.4 (2010): 309. Glynn, A.N. (2013). What Can We Learn with Statistical Truth Serum? Design and Analysis of the List Experiment" *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 77: 159-172.
- e. Matching: Sekhon, Jasjeet S. "Opiates for the matches: Matching methods for causal inference." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12 (2009): 487-508.
- f. Matching: Arceneaux, Kevin, Alan S. Gerber, and Donald P. Green. "Comparing experimental and matching methods using a large-scale voter mobilization experiment." *Political Analysis* 14.1 (2006): 37-62.
- g. Field experiments methods: Imai, Kosuke. "Do get-out-the-vote calls reduce turnout? The importance of statistical methods for field experiments." *American Political Science Review* 99.02 (2005): 283-300.
- h. List experiment methods: Blair, Graeme, and Kosuke Imai. "Statistical analysis of list experiments." *Political Analysis* 20.1 (2012): 47-77.
- i. Endorsement experiments: Bullock, Will, Kosuke Imai, and Jacob N. Shapiro. "Statistical analysis of endorsement experiments: Measuring support for militant groups in Pakistan." *Political Analysis* 19.4 (2011): 363-384.

Natural experiments

- a. Enos, Ryan D. "What tearing down public housing projects teaches us about the effect of racial threat on political participation". Working paper.
- b. Dunning, Thad. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Cambridge University Press
- c. Sekhon, Jasjeet S., and Rocio Titunik. "When natural experiments are neither natural nor experiments." *American Political Science Review* 106.01 (2012): 35-57.
- j. Posner, Daniel N. "The political salience of cultural difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are allies in Zambia and adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98.4 (2004): 529-545.

Behavioral game theory

- a. Isaac, et al. (1984). "Divergent Evidence on Free Riding: An Experimental Examination of Possible Explanations." *Public Choice* 43 (4): 113-149.
- b. Grossman and Baldassarri. (2012). "The Impact of Elections on Cooperation: Evidence from a Lab-in-the-Field Experiment in Uganda." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (4): 964-985.
- c. Andreoni. (1988). "Why Free Ride? Strategies and Learning in Public Goods Experiments." *Journal of Public Economics* 37: 291-304.
- d. Alencar, et al. (2008). "Does Group Size Matter? Cheating and Cooperation in Brazilian School Children." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 29 (1): 42-48.

- e. Andreoni and Petrie. (2008). "Beauty, Gender and Stereotypes: Evidence from Laboratory Experiments." *Journal of Economic Psychology* **29** (1): 73-93.
- f. Au and Chung. (2006). "Effect of Order of Contribution in a Sequential Public Goods Dilemma." *Group Decision and Negotiation* **16** (5): 437-449.
- g. Barclay. (2006). "Reputational Benefits for Altruistic Punishment." *Evolution and Human Behavior* **27** (5): 325-344.
- h. Bochet, et al. (2006). "Communication and Punishment in Voluntary Contribution Experiments." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **60** (1): 11-26.
- i. Brewer and Kramer. (1986). "Choice Behavior in Social Dilemmas: Effect of Social Identity, Group Size, and Decision Framing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **50**: 543-549.
- j. Brucks and Van Lange. (2007). "When Prosocials Act Like Proselfs in a Commons Dilemma." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* **33** (5): 750-758.
- k. Butts and Rode. (2007). "Rational and Empirical Play in the Simple Hot Potato Game." *Social Forces* **85** (4): 1787-1806.
- l. Cadsby, et al. (2007). "Cross-National Gender Differences in Behavior in a Threshold Public Goods Game: Japan Versus Canada." *Journal of Economic Psychology* **28** (2): 242-260.
- m. Cardenas and Ostrom. (2004). "What Do People Bring into the Game? Experiments in the Field About Cooperation in the Commons." *Agricultural Systems* **82** (3): 307-326.