

POLI 7964 Experiments

POLI 7964: Experiments
Class Time: Thursday 900 - 1150 am
Class Location: 210 Stubbs Hall
Instructor: Dr. Nichole Bauer

Office: Stubbs Hall 208B
Office Hours: by appointment
Contact: nbauer4@lsu.edu

Course Description

Experiments are a central methodology in political science. Experiments are essential for measuring underlying psychological processes that motivate political behaviors, identifying causal processes, and understanding the cognitive processes that affect how people think about and engage with politics. Scholars from every subfield regularly turn to experiments. Practitioners rely on experimental evidence in evaluating social programs, policies, institutions, and information provision. The design, implementation, and analysis of experiments raise a variety of distinct epistemological and methodological challenges. This is particularly true in political science due to the breadth of the discipline, the varying contexts in which experiments are implemented (e.g., laboratory, survey, field), and the distinct methods employed (e.g., psychological or economic approaches to experimentation). This class will review the challenges to experimentation, discuss how to implement experiments, and survey prominent applications. The class also will touch on recent methodological advances in experiments and ongoing debates about the reliability of experimental studies.

Attendance & Participation

This class is a graduate level seminar. Much of the class is based on discussions of the readings for each class session. As such the success of this class depends on your active and engaged participation in class discussions. This requires that you come to class prepared by having read that day's readings. As you work through the readings, be sure to make notes of questions and broader themes you would like to bring to the class discussion.

The larger academic setting and this course, in particular, requires an open, inclusive, and engaging learning environment in which students feel comfortable expressing their own opinions as well as being exposed to opinions, cultures, viewpoints, and personal experiences different from their own. With this in mind, students are expected to engage one another with respect, courtesy, and sensitivity both inside and outside of this classroom.

Course Objectives & Goals

By the conclusion of this course, each student will be able to:

- Differentiate between different types of experimental methods including but not limited to lab experiments, survey experiments, field experiments, and natural experiments.
- Understand how experiments trace causal mechanisms in ways that other empirical methods do not.
- Design an original experiment that you can realistically and practically implement to test a unique theoretical and empirical puzzle in political science.
- Identify and implement the appropriate method for analyzing experimental data including but not limited to t-tests, ANOVA analyses, and techniques for mediation and moderation tests.

Course Policies:

- Participation grades are based on not only regular attendance, but on participation in class discussions. There will be many opportunities for us to discuss the core themes of this class, and I do expect all students to contribute.
- Class sessions will be a combination of lectures, discussions, and other in-class activities. Regular attendance and keeping up with the course readings are necessary to do well in this class. Moreover, the class is structured to encourage discussion of key concepts, and these discussions are essential to student learning.
- Lectures will not repeat the readings. The lectures will expand on the concepts introduced in the readings, and will often introduce new concepts that may not be included in the readings.
- If you do need to miss class be sure to check with a classmate about getting the notes.
- Please be sure to silence your cell phone during class. You are welcome to use a laptop for taking notes or accessing the online readings. If it is clear you are using the laptop for another purpose, I will ask you to put it away. Do note that students who do best in my classes are those who DO NOT use laptops as they are unnecessarily distracting.
- I do not discuss grades with students over email. If you would like to discuss a grade you must set up a time to do so in person. This policy applies to mid-semester grade calculations. You will all receive mid-term grades in accordance with LSU policy. However, if you want to know your grade at another point in the semester it is up to you to do that calculation. I will return all assignments in a timely manner, and this syllabus has details about the grade distribution.
- If you require an accommodation, I am happy to work with you to make the appropriate arrangements; however, you do need to let me know right away.

- Any case of academic misconduct, including plagiarism or cheater, will be considered a violation of the University's honor code and these violations will be referred to the Dean's office.

A Note on Communication

Outside of my office hours, email is almost always the best way to get in touch with me. To ensure a timely response to your email I ask that students follow professional email etiquette. Each email subject line should line which course you are enrolled in and a brief description of the content of the email. For example, you might have a question about an upcoming due date so the subject should read "Poli 7903 Assignment Due Date." You should always start your email with a greeting. For example, Dear Professor Bauer or Hello Dr. Bauer, are completely appropriate email greetings. Be sure to include some kind of sign off that identifies who you are. I may not always be able to tell who the email is from, especially if you send from a non-university account. I will not respond to emails that do not follow these basic guidelines. These may seem a bit nit picky, but emails without a subject line often get automatically sorted into a Spam or Junk folder before I ever see them.

As long as these rules are followed, I'll generally respond to emails within 1 business day. If you send me an email on Friday I might not get to it until Monday. If you do not hear from me within 2 business days, you should follow-up with a second email or say something to me before class or during office hours.

Grading

Below is the breakdown for how I will calculate your grades. More specific instructions for each assignment will be provided on the course website closer to the due dates. I will keep track of your grades on assignments through the class website, and you will have access to this information so that you can calculate your projected grade at any point in the semester. Note that your participation grade will not be calculated until the end of the semester.

100-97 = A+	87-89 = B+	79-77 = C+	69-67 = D+	59 or below = F
96-93 = A	86-83 = B	76-73 = C	66-63 = D	
92-90 = A-	82-80 = B-	72-70 = C-	62-60 = D-	

A - Achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.

B - Achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements.

C - Achievement that meets course requirements in every respect.

D - Achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements.

F - Reflects failure (or no credit) and signifies that the work was either (1) completed

but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit of (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the professor and the student that the student would be awarded an I.

Assignments

Final Research Design Paper: 35%
Weekly Participation in Class Discussions: 20%
Experimental Paper Analyses: 20%
Attendance and Memos from Four Research Seminars: 10%
Peer Review Memo: 10%
Human Subjects Certification: 5%

Experimental Paper Analyses

On two class sessions, you will sign up to critical analyzing a published experiment that uses one of the methods we are studying. For each class day, I have provided a set of articles for the experimental critiques. You will choose just one of these articles to analyze. You will start by undertaking a rigorous and exhaustive reading of the article, and any online supplemental materials relevant to the article necessary to evaluating the experimental design. You will then evaluate how well the author(s) design and analyzing their experiment(s). You will pay attention to how well the experiments fit the theoretical expectations and hypotheses set up by the authors, how well the authors manipulate what they intend, do the materials convey the appropriate message or are their confounds, do the comparisons and empirical tests use the appropriate comparisons, are there untested assumptions the authors make. You will write a short analytical memo (2-3 pages, double-spaced) assessing how well the authors conduct their analyses, and you will present the design of the experiment to the class via an 8-10 minute PowerPoint presentation. Remember, your analytical memos should not summarize the article but should critically assess the use of experiments. Do not think of these memos as an opportunity to hate on the experiments others conducted, experiments are hard, but think of this assignment as an opportunity to think about how other scholars approach the challenges of experimental design. A link to the sign up form will be posted to Moodle. Everyone must sign up for all their discussion days by Monday January 14, 2019.

Weekly participation in class discussions

In-class discussion will be the primary mode of instruction for this course, and therefore it is vital that everyone participates. Participating means being an active conversation partner and engaging with other students. Participation does not mean dominating the conversation, trying to impress the professor or one's fellow students with how much you know, or even criticizing the readings or ideas that come up in conversation. Asking questions is a more desirable mode of participation rather than answering them. Asking good questions that open up lines of inquiry will contribute more to the conversation

than providing good answers or merely dissecting a reading's faults and limitations. Criticizing a reading is useful but easy. The more productive but difficult work is intellectually engaging with a reading. Being completely confused about a reading is fine (and candor about such matters is encouraged) so long as you own up to it so that others in the seminar can benefit from the opportunity to test their own understanding of what a reading is about.

Final Experimental Design Paper

Students will write a final paper that will be 20 to 30 double-spaced pages in length. This paper should lay out the design for an experimental study. The topic you choose to design an experiment around is 100% up to you. I'd encourage each of you to design an experiment that fits into your dissertation project, and that you can reasonably carry out once this class finishes. The idea here is to provide you with an opportunity to apply what you have read in the course, either to a substantive research problem, or to step back and crystallize your own perspectives about the theories, research designs, and topics covered in class. You are encouraged to integrate this research design into your dissertation research. All students will present an overview of their research topic on the final class session. Your experimental design project will include several components in addition to the paper you will also design and program all the materials for your experiment and secure human subjects approval for your experiment. The idea is that once the class ends you should be able to run the study, theoretically, the very next day. If you do not meet with me and have an approved topic by January 31 you will not be able to turn in the final paper, and you will not be able to pass the class.

Peer Review Memo

Each student will exchange a draft of their experimental design with another student in the class, and you will review each other's project. The peer review memo is an opportunity for you to get feedback on your project, and to practice conducting peer reviews that are constructive. The peer review process is a pivotal part of being an academic so we will work on it in this class. All students are required to have a draft of their paper ready to exchange for peer review by April 4. The peer review memos will be graded and shared with classmate whose work you are reviewing. We will do the entire process anonymously. The peer review memos are due to me by April 11.

Attendance and Memos from Four Research Seminars

Every student is required to attend and participate in four research seminars. Attending the brown bag presentations on Fridays at 1 p.m. in the political science department is the easiest way to accomplish this requirement. But, if there are other research seminars on campus, such as the Pizza & Papers series at the Manship school on Wed. at noon you can also attend those. You must not only attend the seminar but submit a short memo,

no more than 1 page, that assess the research design of the work presented. I'd also encourage all of you to ask helpful and constructive questions of the research presented at these seminars.

Course Schedule

January 10, 2019: Why Experiments?

- Druckman, James, Donald Green, James Kuklinski and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review*.p 100(4) 627-635.
- 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.
- McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methodology in Political Science." *Political Analysis*. 10 (4): 325-342.
- Druckman, James N., et al. 2018. "Graduate Advising in Experimental Research Groups." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 620-624.

January 17, 2019: Sampling, Causation, Validity, Ethics

- Holland, Paul W. 1986. "Statistics and Causal Inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81: 945-960.
- King, Gary, and Melissa Sands. 2015. "How Human Subjects Research Rules Mislead You and Your University, and What to Do About It.? Institute for Quantitative Social Science, Harvard University.
- Clifford, Scott and Jennifer Jerit. 2014. "Is There a Cost to Convenience? An Experimental Comparison of Data Quality in Laboratory and Online Studies." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1(2): 120-131.
- Yanna Krupnikov and Adam Seth Levine (2014) "Cross-Sample Comparisons and External Validity." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1(1) 59-80.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Nicholson, Stephen P., Coe, Chelsea M., Emory, Jason, and Anna V. Song. 2016. "The Politics of Beauty: The Effects of Partisan Bias on Physical Attractiveness." *Political Behavior* 38(4): 883-898.
- Berinsky, A. J., M. F. Margolis, and M. W. Sances. 2014. "Separating the Shirkers from the Workers? Making Sure Respondents Pay Attention on Self-Administered Surveys." *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (3):739-53.

- Hayes, D., J. L. Lawless, and G. Baitinger. 2014. "Who Cares What They Wear? Media, Gender, and the Influence of Candidate Appearance." *Social Science Quarterly* 95 (5):1194-212.
- Kalla, Joshua, et. al. 2018. "The Ties that Double Bind: Social Roles and Women's Under Representation in Politics." *American Political Science Review* 112(3): 525-541.

January 24, 2019: Lab Experiments

- Smith, Vernon L. 1976. "Experimental Economics: Induced Value Theory." *American Economic Review* 66: 687-704.
- Dickson, Eric S. Ch. 5, Economics vs. Psychology Experiments: Stylization, Incentives, and Deception. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*
- Iyengar, Shanto. Ch. 6, Laboratory Experiments in Political Science *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*
- Ostrom, Elinor. 2009. "Why Do We Need Laboratory Experiments in Political Science." IU, SPEA Research Paper.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Dunaway, Johanna, Kathleen Searles, Mingxiao Sui, and Newly Paul. 2018. "Left to Our Own Devices: Political News Attention and Engagement in a Mobile Era." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 23 (2): 107-124.
- Arceneaux, K., M. Johnson, and C. Murphy. 2012. "Polarized Political Communication, Oppositional Media Hostility, and Selective Exposure." *Journal of Politics* 74 (1):174-86.
- Kanthak, K., and J. Woon. 2015. "Women Don't Run: Election Aversion and Candidate Entry." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3):595-612.
- Klar, S. 2014. "Partisanship in a Social Setting." *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (3):687-704.

January 31, 2019: Survey Experiments

Deadline for completing and submitting human subjects certification

- Mutz, Diana C. 2011. *Population Based Survey Experiments*. This book is an ebook at the library so you do not need to buy it.
- Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. "Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?" *American Political Science Review* 104: 226-242.
- Mummolo, Jonathan and Erik Peterson. forthcoming. "Demand Effects in Survey Experiments: An Empirical Assessment." *American Political Science Review*.

- Hainmueller, Jens, Dominik Hangartner, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2015. "Validating Vignette and Conjoint Survey Experiments against Real-World Behavior." *PNAS* 112: 2395-2400.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Cassese, Erin C. and Mirya R. Holman. 2018. "Party and Gender Stereotypes in Campaign Attacks." *Political Behavior* 40(3): 785-807.
- Jerit, Jennifer and Scott Clifford. 2018. "Disgust, Anxiety, and Political Learning in the Face of Threat." *American Journal of Political Science* 62(2): 266-279.
- Bauer, Nichole M. forthcoming. "The Effects of Partisan Trespassing Strategies across Candidate Sex." *Political Behavior* doi.org/10.1007/s11109-018-9475-3.
- Kalmoe, Nathan P. and Kimberly Gross. 2015. "Cueing Patriotism, Prejudice, and Partisanship in the Age of Obama: Experimental Tests of U.S. Flag Imagery Effects in Presidential Elections." *Political Psychology*.

February 7, 2019: Field Experiments

- Gerber, Alan. "Field Experiments in Political Science." *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*
- Grose, Christian R. 2014. "Field Experimental Work on Political Institutions." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17(1): 355-70.
- Baldassari, Delia and Maria Abascal. 2017. "Field Experiments across the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 43(1): 41-73.
- Broockman, David E., et al. 2017. "The Design of Field Experiments with Survey Outcomes: A Framework for Selecting More Efficient, Robust, and Ethical Designs." *Political Analysis* 25: 435-464.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Butler, Daniel M. and David E. Broockman. 2011 "Do Politicians Racially Discriminate Against Constituents? A Field Experiment on State Legislators." *American Journal of Political Science* 55: 463-77.
- Gerber, A. S., and D. P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94 (3):653-63.
- Jerit, J., J. Barabas, and S. Clifford. 2013. "Comparing Contemporaneous Laboratory and Field Experiments on Media Effects." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77 (1):256-82.
- Karpowitz, C., Q. Monson, and J. Preece. 2017. "How to Elect More Women: Gender and Candidate Success in a Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (4):927-43.

February 14, 2019: Natural Experiments

- Dunning, Thad. Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach. Part I. (three chapters)
- Sekhon, Jasjeet S. and Rocio Titiunik. 2012. "When Natural Experiments are Neither Natural Nor Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 105: 221-237.
- Crasnow, Sharon. 2015. "Natural Experiments and Pluralism in Political Science." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 25: 424-441.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Hyde, Susan D. 2007. "The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *World Politics* 60: 37-63.
- Kim, Jeong. forthcoming. "Direct Democracy and Women's Political Engagement." *American Journal of Political Science*
- Erikson, Robert S. and Laura Stoker. 2011. "Caught in the Draft: The Effects of Vietnam Draft Lottery Status on Political Attitudes." *American Political Science Review* 105: 221-237.
- Doherty, David, Alan S. Gerber, and Donald P. Green. 2006. "Personal Income and Attitudes toward Redistribution: A Survey of Lottery Winners." *Political Psychology* 27: 441-458.

February 21, 2019: Experiments on Public Opinion, Emotions

- Holbrook, Allyson. "Attitude Change Experiments in Political Science." *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Bourdreau, Cheryl and Arthur Lupia. "Political Knowledge." *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Druckman, James N. and Thomas J. Leeper. 2012. "Learning More from Political Communication Experiments: Pretreatment and Its Effects." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(4): 875-896.
- Searles, Kathleen and Kyle Mattes. 2015. "It's a Mad, Mad World: Using Emotion Inductions in a Survey." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2(2).

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2010. "Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects over Time." *American Political Science Review* 104(4): 663-681.
- Boudreau, Cheryl and Scott A. MacKenzie. 2018. "Wanting What is Fair: How Party Cues and Information about Income Inequality Affect Public Support for Taxes." *Journal of Politics* 80(2): 367-81.

- D.J. Flynn and Yanna Krupnikov. 2018. "Motivations and Misinformation: Why People Retain Some Errors by Quickly Dismiss Others." *Journal of Experimental Political Science*
- Valentino, Nicholas, Carly Wayne, and Marzia Oceno. 2018. "Mobilizing Sexism: The Interaction of Emotion and Gender Attitudes in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82: 213-235.

February 28, 2019: Experiments on Race, Ethnicity, and Social Desirability

- Davis, Darren. Ch. 21, Racial Identity and Experimental Methodology. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Hutchings, Vincent L. and Spencer Piston. Ch. 22, The Determinants and Political Consequences of Prejudice. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Chong, Dennis and Jane Junn. Ch. 23, Politics from the Perspective of Minority Populations. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Krupnikov, Yanna, et al. 2016. "Saving Face: Identifying Voter Responses to Black and Female Candidates." *Political Psychology* 37(2): 253-273.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Ismail K. White, Chryl Laird and Troy Allen. 2014. "Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts Between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." *American Political Science Review*.
- Stephens-Dougan, LaFleur. 2016. "Priming Racial Resentment without Stereotypic Cues." *Journal of Politics* 78(3).
- Philpot, Tasha S. and Hanes Walton, Jr. 2007. "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 49-62.
- Burden, Barry, Yoshikuni Ono, and Yamada, Masahiro. 2017. "Reassessing Public Support for a Female President." *Journal of Politics* 79(3): 1-7.

March 7, 2019: Campaign Effects, Candidate Choice Experiments

- Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2017. "Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments." *Political Analysis* 22(1): 1-30.
- McGraw, Kathleen M. Ch. 13, Candidate Impressions and Evaluations. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.
- Gadarian, Shana Kushner and Richard R. Lau 15. Candidate Advertisements. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.

- Nelson, Thomas E., Bryner, Sarah M., and Carnahan, Dustin M. Ch. 14, Media and Politics. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Bauer, N. M. forthcoming. "Shifting Standards: How Voters Evaluate the Qualifications of Female and Male Candidates." *Journal of Politics*.
- Kirkland, Patricia and Alexander Coppock. 2018. "Candidate Choice without Party Labels: New Insights from U.S. Mayoral Elections 1945-2007 and Conjoint Survey Experiments." *Political Behavior*. 40(3):571-591.
- Piston, Spencer, Yanna Krupnikov, John Barry Ryan, and Kerri Milita. 2018. "Clear as Black and White: The Effects of Ambiguous Rhetoric Depend on Candidate Race." *Journal of Politics* 80: 662-674
- Bernhard, Rachel and Freeder, Sean. forthcoming. "The More You Know: Voter Heuristics and the Information Search." *Political Behavior*

March 14, 2019: Mediation, Moderation, and Analytical Methods

- Keele, L., McConnaughy, C., and White, I. 2012. "Strengthening the Experimenter's Toolbox: Statistical Estimation of Internal Validity." *American Journal of Political Science*. 56:2, 484-499.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., and Yamamoto, T. 2011. "Unpacking the Black Box of Causality: Learning about Causal Mechanisms from Experimental and Observational Studies." *American Political Science Review*. 105:4, 765-789.
- Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic and Statistical Considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 1173-1182.
- Sinclair, Betsy, Margaret McConnell, Donald P. Green. 2012. "Detecting Spillover Effects: Design and Analysis of Multilevel Experiments." *American Journal of Political Science* 56: 1055-1069.

Applied Readings for Article Analysis:

- Krupnikov, Yanna and Nichole Bauer. 2014. "The Relationship between Campaign Negativity, Gender and Campaign Context." *Political Behavior* 36(1): 167-188.
- Conrad, Courtenay, et al. 2018. "Threat Perception and American Support for Torture." *Political Behavior* 40(4): 989-1009.
- Banks, Antoine J., et al. 2018. "Black Politics: How Anger Influences the Political Actions Blacks Pursue to Reduce Racial Inequality." *Political Behavior* 1-27.
- Falco-Gimeno, Albert. and Jordi Munoz. 2017. "Show Me Your Friends: A Survey Experiment on the Effect of Coalition Signals." *Journal of Politics* 79(4): 1454-1459.

March 21, 2019: Best Practices in Planning, Programming, and Carrying Out Your Experiment Everyone's study must be pre-registered

- Gerber, Alan S., Kevin Arceneaux, Cheryl Boudreau, Conor Dowling, and D. Sunshine Hillygus. 2015. "Reporting Balance Tables, Response Rates and Manipulation Checks in Experimental Research: A Reply from the Committee that Prepared the Reporting Guidelines." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2(2): 216-229.
- Kane, John V., and Jason Barabas. Forthcoming. "No Harm in Checking: Using Factual Manipulation Checks to Assess Attentiveness in Experiments." *American Journal of Political Science*
- Monogan, James E. 2015. "Research Preregistration in Political Science: The Case, Counterarguments, and a Response to Critiques." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48(3): 425-429.
- Kam, Cindy D. and Marc J. Trussler. 2017. "At the Nexus of Observational and Experimental Research: Theory, Specification, and Analysis of Experiments with Heterogenous Treatment Effects." *Political Behavior* 39: 789-815.

March 28, 2019: Publishing your Experiment, Creating Replicable Data Files

- Ioannidis, John P. A. 2005. "Why Most Published Research Findings are False." *PLoS Medicine* 2(8).
- Franco, A., et al. 2014. "Publication Bias in the Social Sciences: Unlocking the File Drawer." *Science* 3456203: 1502-5.
- Mutz, Diana C. and Robin Pemantle. 2015. "Standards for Experimental Research: Encouraging a Better Understanding of Experimental Methods." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 2(2): 192-215.
- Gerber, Alan, et al. 2014. "Reporting Guidelines for Experimental Research: A Report from the Experimental Research Section Standards Committee." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1(1): 81-98.

April 4, 2019: no class, MPSA!

April 11, 2019: Peer Reviews Due

Workshop on how to program experiments and how to analyze experimental data

April 18, 2019: no class! Spring Break! Finally!

April 25, 2019: paper presentations

Finals Week: Work on papers. All papers are due by May 2 at noon.

Additional Readings

- Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. 2010. "The Weirdest People in the World?" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33 (April): 61-83.
- Ryan, J. B. 2011. "Social Networks as a Shortcut to Correct Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4):753-66.
- Carl I. Hovland. 1959. "Reconciling Conflicting Results Derived from Experimental and Survey Studies." *The American Psychologist* 14: 8-17.
- Coppock, Alexander and Donald P. Green. 2015. "Assessing the Correspondence between Experimental Results Obtained in the Lab and Field: A Review of Recent Social Science Research." *Political Science Research Methods* 3: 113-131.
- Rooij, Eline A. de., Donald P. Green, and Alan S. Gerber. 2009. "Field Experiments on Political Behavior and Collective Action." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12(1): 389-95.
- Kalla, J., F. Rosenbluth, and D. L. Teele. 2017. "Are You My Mentor? A Field Experiment on Gender, Ethnicity, and Political Self-Starters." *Journal of Politics* 80 (1).