
Experimental Methods

Fall 2019
(Poli Sci 919)

Professor Jonathan Renshon

✉: renshon@wisc.edu

Office location: North Hall 410

Office hours: Tuesday (3:30-5:00pm, via Calendly)

Tuesday

1:20-3:15

Ogg Room, North Hall

📧: Canvas website

1 Course Description and Objectives

This course is a 3-credit graduate seminar (class # 47808). It introduces graduate students to experimental methods in the social sciences, with specific application to political science. We will discuss the logic of experimentation, its strengths and weaknesses compared to other methodologies, and how experiments can be used to investigate social phenomena. Students will learn how to interpret, design, execute and analyze experiments. Each session of the course will be a combination of discussion guided by students, some mini-lectures where appropriate and small group work.

The main project will be an experiment that you will design, get IRB approval for, pilot and analyze (funding is available to each student). This can be done by yourself or in a group of up to three students.

This course is a traditional course according to the Carnegie definition (i.e. at least 1 hour of classroom instruction and 2 hours of out-of-class student work each week).

Students who closely and carefully engage course readings, attend and participate in class discussion, and complete course assignments will be able to:

- Explain important concepts and arguments made by prominent scholars in causal inference and experimental methods
- Design, analyze and field experiments suited to your own particular research question
- Understand and explain the ethical debates that surround experimental research
- Assess varied types of experimental designs on several dimensions
- Apply course concepts to analysis of current research and contemporary social scientific debates

2 Guidelines and Grading

- Grading is A-F (i.e., not pass/fail), and is based on a combination of class participation, your presentations and your written work.
- “Further Readings” are not required, but are listed in case you would like to delve more deeply into a topic.

- The goal for this course is to produce something useful: a chapter of your dissertation, a draft of an article, etc. Feel free to meet with me as soon as you begin to have an idea of what you'd like to work on for your written project.
- If you have a question, or want to know if a reading is available, please check Canvas for any announcements and download the latest copy of the syllabus before emailing.
- If you ever have any questions, or are confused about something, please do not hesitate to come to office hours and meet with me or email me. Office hours are Tuesdays between 3:30-5:00pm, and you can make an appointment at the following website: *link to make an appointment*. If you are unavailable at that time, you can email me to schedule an appointment.

3 Policies

I expect you to complete the readings assigned for each week prior to our class meeting, to take notes on your readings and to actively participate in our seminar discussion. Active participation requires you bring the relevant readings to class each day (which may mean printing them beforehand) and that you respectfully engage with both the course content and your peers' contributions. I agree entirely with the University's institutional statement on inclusion and diversity, and value the contributions of each person and respect the ways their identity, culture, background, experience, status, abilities, and opinion enrich our intellectual community <https://diversity.wisc.edu>.

You will need to complete your assignments on time, as I will accept no late work without an approved accommodation prior to the due date. Accommodations will be made for those students who have documented proof of an emergency or those students who have documented evidence of learning disabilities. I am firmly committed to ensuring equal learning access for all and therefore encourage individuals with disabilities to participate in the McBurney Center's available programs and activities. If you need an accommodation, you must contact the center at (608) 263-2741 or email them at mcburney@studentlife.wisc.edu to obtain documentation for your specific needs. You must do so by the end of Week 2 and you must contact me in advance to make appropriate arrangements for papers, etc.

Finally, I strictly adhere to the UW Academic Misconduct Process and will report all incidents of academic misconduct to the Dean of Students Office, as it is a prerequisite for maintaining academic integrity in our course.

4 Assignments & Grading

- **20% – Attendance/Participation**

→ I expect you to attend all of the sessions of the course and contribute to discussion.

- **45% – Assignments**

- *20% – Review paper (10% × 2)*

→ You will write reviews of two “application papers” from two different weeks, due at the beginning of the session in which that paper is assigned. Weeks 3-14 (minus Week 8) all have application papers to choose from. These reviews should critically assess the

paper in terms of the experimental methodology being employed. Your review should be no longer than 5 pages, double-spaced.

– 10% – *Guiding class discussion* (5% × 2)

→ You will also be expected to lead the discussion of whatever paper you write about (see above) and help guide discussion for that class meeting more generally. That will require (in addition to writing the paper) coordinating with the other student(s) signed up for that week to think about how you'd like to focus class discussion.

→ You will need to email an outline/agenda for class discussion to me no later than the morning of class

→ Sign up *here*.

– 15% – *Misc. Assignments* (5% × 3)

1. Complete CITI human subjects training and submit proof to me via email. Due September 10th before class.
2. Sign up for a UW Qualtrics account and program a survey experiment copied from a published paper. Due October 1st before class (we will “test-drive” each of the experiments in class).
3. 2-page research proposal. Due October 8th anytime. Set up meeting with me for the following week to discuss.

• 45% – **Paper**

→ You will design, implement, and analyze an actual lab or survey experiment. This can be done either by yourself or in groups (of up to 3 people). In consultation with me, you will write a research proposal, design your experiment, get IRB approval, run the experiment (or a pilot version), analyze your data, and submit a written paper by the end of the semester. Ideally, this could lead to a publication! Options for this include a lab experiment at the UW BRITE laboratory, or a survey experiment, a field experiment proposal with a pilot of some kind, etc.

Projects will be funded at \$150 per student (this can be combined, so groups of three, for example, will have \$450 to spend). No matter which option you choose, you will present in front of the class twice: an initial experimental design mid-semester and a final presentation at the end of the semester.

Timeline for project:

- *October 8*: 2-page research proposal due (schedule meeting with me to discuss that week or the following week)
- *October 22*: Experimental Design Presentations
- *October 29*: Submit instrument to IRB (this will give you 5 weeks to get through IRB and 2 weeks to run experiment and finish paper).
- *December 10th*: Presentation of completed project
- *December 16th*: Paper due

5 Required Books

Required texts: Most weeks will include some theoretical readings and some applications of the concepts in political or another social science. Students are expected to keep up with each week's reading. Consider purchasing the following books, which we will use repeatedly throughout the semester (though I will do my best to get everything scanned and online if possible):

- Gerber, A. S. and Green, D. P. (2012). *Field experiments: Design, analysis, and interpretation*. W.W. Norton & Company Norton, New York, NY
- Morton, R. and Williams, K. (2010). *Experimental political science and the study of causality: From nature to the lab*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY
- Dunning, T. (2012). *Natural experiments in the social sciences: a design-based approach*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY

All the books should be available in the library, though of course, you may wish to purchase some (time to start thinking about building up your library). All of the journal articles should be available online through the UW library website. If not, I will send or post scanned copies.

6 Overview of Schedule

Week	Date	Thursday
1	3-Sep	no class
2	10-Sep	Why Experiments? /Validity <i>Assignment #1 (CITI training) due</i>
3	17-Sep	Lab Experiments
4	24-Sep	Field Experiments
5	1-Oct	Survey Experiments <i>Assignment #2 (Qualtrics replication) due</i>
6	8-Oct	Survey Experiments: Alternative Designs <i>Assignment #3 (2-page proposal) due</i>
7	15-Oct	Natural Experiments
8	22-Oct	Experimental Design Presentations
9	29-Oct	Causal Mechanisms and Heterogenous Treatment effects
10	5-Nov	Elite Experiments
11	12-Nov	Confounding and Other Barriers to Inference
12	19-Nov	Pre-commitment and Replication
13	26-Nov	No Class
14	3-Dec	Ethics and Research Transparency
15	10-Dec	Final Presentations
<i>Final Paper due: December 16th anytime</i>		

Schedule

1. Introduction/Why Experiments?/Validity
[September 10]

⇒ **Assignment #1 Due: Complete CITI human subjects training**

Why Experiments?

- Gerber and Green, Chapter 1.
→ *link*
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P., and Kaplan, E. H. (2014). The illusion of learning from observational research. In Shapiro, I., Smith, R. M., and Masoud, T. E., editors, *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, pages 251–273. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT
→ *link*
- Rogowski, R. (2016). The rise of experimentation in political science. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*, pages 1–11
- McDermott, R. (2002). Experimental methodology in political science. *Political Analysis*, 10(4):325–342
- Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A. (2011). An introduction to core concepts. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *The Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, pages 15–26. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY
→ *link*

Validity:

- Morton and Williams, Chapters 7 and 8.
→ *link*
- Dunning, Chapter 10.
→ *link*
- Jimenez-Buedo, M. and Miller, L. M. (2010). Why a trade-off? the relationship between the external and internal validity of experiments. *Theoria. Revista de Teoría, Historia y Fundamentos de la Ciencia*, 25(3):301–321
- McDermott, R. (2011). Internal and external validity. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, pages 27–41. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY
- Aronow, P. M. and Samii, C. (2016). Does regression produce representative estimates of causal effects? *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(1):250–267
- Barabas, J. and Jerit, J. (2010). Are survey experiments externally valid? *American Political Science Review*, 104(2):226–242

- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(1):155

FURTHER READING:

- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., and Brewer, M. B. (1998). Experimentation in social psychology. In D.T. Gilbert, S. F. and Lindzey, G., editors, *The Handbook of Social Psychology, 4th edition*, pages 99–107. McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA
 - Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A. (2006). The growth and development of experimental research in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100(4):627–635
 - Campbell, D. T. (1957). Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings. *Psychological bulletin*, 54(4):297
 - 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
-

2. Lab Experiments
[September 17]

- Morton and Williams, Chapters 9 and 10.
→ [link](#)
- Ostrom, E. (2012). Why do we need laboratory experiments in political science? Working Paper
→ [link](#)
- Levitt, S. and List, J. (2007). What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world? *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2):153–174

Applications:

- Renshon, J., Lee, J. J., and Tingley, D. (2017). Emotions and the micro-foundations of commitment problems. *International Organization*, 71(S1):189–218
- Habyarimana, J., Humphreys, M., Posner, D. N., and Weinstein, J. M. (2007). Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision? *American Political Science Review*, 101(4):709–725
- Oxley, D. R., Smith, K. B., Alford, J. R., Hibbing, M. V., Miller, J. L., Scalora, M., Hatemi, P. K., and Hibbing, J. R. (2008). Political attitudes vary with physiological traits. *science*, 321(5896):1667–1670
- Enos, R. D. and Gidron, N. (2018). Exclusion and cooperation in diverse societies: Experimental evidence from israel. *American Political Science Review*, 112(4):742–757

FURTHER READING:

- Falk, A. and Heckman, J. J. (2009). Lab experiments are a major source of knowledge in the social sciences. *science*, 326(5952):535–538
 - Mutz, D. C. (2007). Effects of “in-your-face” television discourse on perceptions of a legitimate opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 101(4):621–635
 - Renshon, J. (2015). Losing face and sinking costs: Experimental evidence on the judgment of political and military leaders. *International Organization*, 69(3):659–695
 - Levine, D. K. and Palfrey, T. R. (2007). The paradox of voter participation? a laboratory study. *American political science Review*, 101(1):143–158
-

3. Field Experiments

[September 24]

- John, P. (2017). *Field Experiments in Political Science and Public Policy: Practical Lessons in Design and Delivery*. Routledge Press, New York, NY (Chapter 4: A Brief History of Field Experiments)
 ↪ *link*
- Gerber, A. S. (2011). Field experiments in political science. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, pages 114–140. Cambridge University Press
 ↪ *link*
- Coppock, A. and Green, D. P. (2015). Assessing the correspondence between experimental results obtained in the lab and field: A review of recent social science research. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 3(1):113–131
- List, J. A. (2011). Why economists should conduct field experiments and 14 tips for pulling one off. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(3):3–15

Applications:

- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., and McElreath, R. (2001). In search of homo economicus: behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *The American Economic Review*, 91(2):73–78
- Butler, D. M. and Broockman, D. E. (2011). Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? a field experiment on state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3):463–477
- Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., and Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: A social network experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):566–571
- Blair, G., Littman, R., and Paluck, E. L. (2019). Motivating the adoption of new community-minded behaviors: An empirical test in nigeria. *Science advances*, 5(3):eaau5175

FURTHER READING:

- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., and Washington, E. (2010). Party affiliation, partisanship, and political beliefs: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 104(4):720–744
- Wantchekon, L. (2003). Clientelism and voting behavior: Evidence from a field experiment in benin. *World politics*, 55(3):399–422
- Broockman, D. E., Kalla, J. L., and Sekhon, J. S. (2017). The design of field experiments with survey outcomes: A framework for selecting more efficient, robust, and ethical designs. *Political Analysis*, 25(4):435–464
- Grose, C. R. (2014). Field experimental work on political institutions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17:355–370
- Humphreys, M. and Weinstein, J. M. (2009). Field experiments and the political economy of development. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12:367–378
- Baldassarri, D. and Abascal, M. (2017). Field experiments across the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43(1):41–73
- Alvarez, R. M., Hopkins, A., and Sinclair, B. (2010). Mobilizing pasadena democrats: Measuring the effects of partisan campaign contacts. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(1):31–44

4. Survey Experiments I

[October 1]

⇒ **Assignment #2 Due: Qualtrics Replication of Survey Experiment**

- Sniderman, P. M. (2011). The logic and design of the survey experiment. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science*, pages 102–114. Cambridge University Press New York, New York, NY
 ↪ *link*
- Gaines, B. J., Kuklinski, J. H., and Quirk, P. J. (2006). The logic of the survey experiment reexamined. *Political Analysis*, 15(1):1–20
- Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., and Freese, J. (2015). The generalizability of survey experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 2(2):109–138
- Mummolo, J. and Peterson, E. (2019). Demand effects in survey experiments: An empirical assessment. *American Political Science Review*, 113(2):517–529

Applications

- Chong, D. and Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 101(4):637–655
- Tomz, M. (2007). Domestic audience costs in international relations. *International Organization*, 61(4):821–840
- Press, D. G., Sagan, S. D., and Valentino, B. A. (2013). Atomic aversion: Experimental evidence on taboos, traditions, and the non-use of nuclear weapons. *American Political Science Review*, 107(1):188–206

- Adida, C. L., Lo, A., and Platas, M. R. (2018). Perspective taking can promote short-term inclusionary behavior toward syrian refugees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(38):9521–9526

FURTHER READING:

- Nock, S. L. and Guterbock, T. M. (2010). Survey experiments. In Marsden, P. V. and Wright, J. D., editors, *Handbook of survey research*, pages 837–865. Emerald Group Publishing Bingley, United Kingdom
- Prior, M. and Lupia, A. (2008). Money, time, and political knowledge: Distinguishing quick recall and political learning skills. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1):169–183
- Tomz, M. and Van Houweling, R. P. (2009). The electoral implications of candidate ambiguity. *American Political Science Review*, 103(1):83–98

5. Survey Experiments II: Alternative Designs

[October 8]

⇒ **Assignment #3 Due: 2 Page Research Proposal**

- Blair, G. and Imai, K. (2012). Statistical analysis of list experiments. *Political Analysis*, 20(1):47–77
- Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., and Yamamoto, T. (2013). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis*, 22(1):1–30
- Bansak, K., Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., and Yamamoto, T. (2017). Beyond the breaking point? survey satisficing in conjoint experiments. Working Paper
 ↪ *link*
- Glynn, A. N. (2013). What can we learn with statistical truth serum? design and analysis of the list experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(S1):159–172

Applications

- Kertzer, J. D., Renshon, J., and Yarhi-Milo, K. (2019). How do observers assess resolve? *British Journal of Political Science*
- Sen, M. (2017). How political signals affect public support for judicial nominations: Evidence from a conjoint experiment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70(2):374–393
- Blair, G., Imai, K., and Lyall, J. (2014). Comparing and combining list and endorsement experiments: Evidence from afghanistan. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(4):1043–1063

FURTHER READING:

- Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D., and Yamamoto, T. (2015). Validating vignette and conjoint survey experiments against real-world behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(8):2395–2400
 - Hainmueller, J. and Hopkins, D. J. (2015). The hidden american immigration consensus: A conjoint analysis of attitudes toward immigrants. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(3):529–548
 - Gonzalez-Ocantos, E., De Jonge, C. K., Meléndez, C., Osorio, J., and Nickerson, D. W. (2012). Vote buying and social desirability bias: Experimental evidence from nicaragua. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1):202–217
-

6. Natural Experiments: “True” and “As-If” Randomization [October 15]

- Dunning, Chapter 2-4.
→ *link*
- Robinson, G., McNulty, J. E., and Krasno, J. S. (2009). Observing the counterfactual? the search for political experiments in nature. *Political Analysis*, 17(4):341–357
- Sekhon, J. S. and Titiunik, R. (2012). When natural experiments are neither natural nor experiments. *American Political Science Review*, 106(1):35–57
- Baldwin, K. and Bhavnani, R. R. (2015). Ancillary studies of experiments: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Globalization and Development*, 6(1):113–146

Applications:

- Hyde, S. D. (2007). The observer effect in international politics: Evidence from a natural experiment. *World Politics*, 60(1):37–63
- Doherty, D., Gerber, A. S., and Green, D. P. (2006). Personal income and attitudes toward redistribution: A study of lottery winners. *Political Psychology*, 27(3):441–458
- Healy, A. J., Malhotra, N., and Mo, C. H. (2010). Irrelevant events affect voters’ evaluations of government performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(29):12804–12809
- Dinas, E., Matakos, K., Xefteris, D., and Hangartner, D. (2019). Waking up the golden dawn: does exposure to the refugee crisis increase support for extreme-right parties? *Political Analysis*, 27(2):244–254
- Nellis, G. and Siddiqui, N. (2018). Secular party rule and religious violence in pakistan. *American political science review*, 112(1):49–67

FURTHER READING:

- Grossman, G., Manekin, D., and Miodownik, D. (2015). The political legacies of combat: Attitudes toward war and peace among israeli ex-combatants. *International Organization*, 69(4):981–1009

- Samii, C. (2013). Perils or promise of ethnic integration? evidence from a hard case in burundi. *American Political Science Review*, 107(3):558–573
 - Fowler, A. and Montagnes, B. P. (2015). College football, elections, and false-positive results in observational research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(45):13800–13804 (PLUS EXCHANGE)
 - Dunning, T. (2008). Improving causal inference: Strengths and limitations of natural experiments. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2):282–293
 - Ho, D. E. and Imai, K. (2006). Randomization inference with natural experiments: An analysis of ballot effects in the 2003 california recall election. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):888–900
 - Erikson, R. S. and Stoker, L. (2011). Caught in the draft: The effects of vietnam draft lottery status on political attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2):221–237
 - Eggers, A. C. and Hainmueller, J. (2009). Mps for sale? returns to office in postwar british politics. *American Political Science Review*, 103(4):513–533
 - Hangartner, D., Dinas, E., Marbach, M., Matakos, K., and Xefteris, D. (2019). Does exposure to the refugee crisis make natives more hostile? *American Political Science Review*, 113(2):442–455
-

7. Experimental Design Presentations

[October 22]

8. Causal Mechanisms and Heterogenous Treatment Effects

[October 29]

- 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
- Bullock, J. G., Green, D. P., and Ha, S. E. (2010). Yes, but what’s the mechanism?(don’t expect an easy answer). *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(4):550
- Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6):1173
- Kam, C. D. and Trussler, M. J. (2017). At the nexus of observational and experimental research: Theory, specification, and analysis of experiments with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Political Behavior*, 39(4):789–815
- “10 Things To Know About Heterogenous Treatments Effects”
- Acharya, A., Blackwell, M., and Sen, M. (2018). Analyzing causal mechanisms in survey experiments. *Political Analysis*, 26(4):357–378

- Coppock, A., Leeper, T. J., and Mullinix, K. J. (2018). Generalizability of heterogeneous treatment effect estimates across samples. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(49):12441–12446

Applications

- Tomz, M. and Weeks, J. (2013). Public opinion and the democratic peace. *American Political Science Review*, 107(3):849–865
- Renshon, J., Lee, J. J., and Tingley, D. (2015). Physiological arousal and political beliefs. *Political Psychology*, 36(5):569–585
- Kertzer, J. D. and Brutger, R. (2016). Decomposing audience costs: Bringing the audience back into audience cost theory. *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(1):234–249

FURTHER READING:

→ *link*

- Grimmer, J., Messing, S., and Westwood, S. J. (2017). Estimating heterogeneous treatment effects and the effects of heterogeneous treatments with ensemble methods. *Political Analysis*, 25(4):413–434
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Yamamoto, T. (2010b). Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science*, 25(1):51–71
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Tingley, D. (2010a). A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 15(4):309–334
- Imai, K., Tingley, D., and Yamamoto, T. (2013). Experimental designs for identifying causal mechanisms. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 176(1):5–51

9. Elite Experiments (and other issues related to samples)

[November 5]

- Druckman, J. N. and Kam, C. D. (2011). Students as experimental participants. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, pages 41–57. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3):515–530
- “Re-Assessing Elite-Public Gaps in Political Behavior” (2019), Working paper, Josh Kertzer.
- Machery, E. (2010). Explaining why experimental behavior varies across cultures: a missing step in “the weirdest people in the world?”. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3):101–102
- Chiao, J. Y. and Cheon, B. K. (2010). The weirdest brains in the world. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3):88–90

Applications:

- Sheffer, L. and Loewen, P. (2019). Electoral confidence, overconfidence, and risky behavior: Evidence from a study with elected politicians. *Political Behavior*, 41(1):31–51
- Nyhan, B. and Reifler, J. (2015). The effect of fact-checking on elites: A field experiment on us state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(3):628–640
- Yarhi-Milo, K., Kertzer, J. D., and Renshon, J. (2019). Tying hands, sinking costs, and leader attributes tying hands, sinking costs, and leader attributes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*

→ *link*

FURTHER READING:

- Henry, P. J. (2008). College sophomores in the laboratory redux: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology’s view of the nature of prejudice. *Psychological Inquiry*, 19(2):49–71
- McClendon, Gwyneth. 2012. “Ethics of Using Public officials as field experiment subjects.” Newsletter of the APSA Experimental Section 3 (1): 13-20.

→ *link*

- Renshon, J., Yarhi-Milo, K., and Kertzer, J. D. (2016). Democratic leaders, crises and war paired experiments on the israeli knesset and public. *Unpublished manuscript*

10. Confounding and other barriers to inferences

[November 12]

- Gerber & Green, Chapters 5 and 6 (on noncompliance) and 8 (on interference).
→ *link*
- Dafoe, A., Zhang, B., and Caughey, D. (2018). Information equivalence in survey experiments. *Political Analysis*
- Sinclair, B., McConnell, M., and Green, D. P. (2012). Detecting spillover effects: Design and analysis of multilevel experiments. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4):1055–1069
- Druckman, J. N. and Leeper, T. J. (2012). Learning more from political communication experiments: Pretreatment and its effects. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4):875–896

Applications

- Renshon, J., Dafoe, A., and Huth, P. (2018). Leader influence and reputation formation in world politics. *American Journal of Political Science*, 62(2):325–339
- Weiss, J. C. and Dafoe, A. (2017). Authoritarian audiences and government rhetoric in international crises: Evidence from china. Working Paper

11. Pre-commitment and Replication

[November 19]

- Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS medicine*, 2(8):e124
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., and Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological science*, 22(11):1359–1366
- “10 Things to know about pre-analysis plans”
- Humphreys, M., Sanchez de la Sierra, R., and Van der Windt, P. (2013). Fishing, commitment, and communication: A proposal for comprehensive nonbinding research registration. *Political Analysis*, 21(1):1–20
- Olken, B. A. (2015). Promises and perils of pre-analysis plans. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3):61–80
- Monogan, J. E. (2015). Research preregistration in political science: The case, counterarguments, and a response to critiques. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(3):425–429

Applications

- Findley, M. G., Jensen, N. M., Malesky, E. J., and Pepinsky, T. B. (2016). Can results-free review reduce publication bias? the results and implications of a pilot study. *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(13):1667–1703
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P., and Nickerson, D. (2001). Testing for publication bias in political science. *Political Analysis*, 9(4):385–392
- Dunning, T., Grossman, G., Humphreys, M., Hyde, S. D., McIntosh, C., Nellis, G., Adida, C. L., Arias, E., Bicalho, C., Boas, T. C., et al. (2019). Voter information campaigns and political accountability: Cumulative findings from a preregistered meta-analysis of coordinated trials. *Science advances*, 5(7):eaaw2612

FURTHER READING:

- Lin, W. and Green, D. P. (2016). Standard operating procedures: A safety net for pre-analysis plans. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 49(3):495–500
- Franco, A., Malhotra, N., and Simonovits, G. (2014). Publication bias in the social sciences: Unlocking the file drawer. *Science*, 345(6203):1502–1505
- Brown, Andrew W., T. S. M. and Allison, D. B. (2017). Publication bias in science. In Jamieson, K. H., Kahan, D. M., and Scheufele, D. A., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Science Communication*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY
- Lupia, A. and Elman, C. (2014). Openness in political science: Data access and research transparency. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1):19–42

- Coppock, A. (2016). Generalizing from survey experiments conducted on mechanical turk: A replication approach. In *annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association*
 ↪ *link*
 - Baker, M. (2016). Is there a reproducibility crisis? a nature survey lifts the lid on how researchers view the crisis rocking science and what they think will help. *Nature*, 533(7604):452–455
 - Dunning, T. (2016). Transparency, replication, and cumulative learning: What experiments alone cannot achieve. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19:541–563
 - Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Forsell, E., Ho, T.-H., Huber, J., Johannesson, M., Kirchler, M., Almenberg, J., Altmeld, A., Chan, T., et al. (2016). Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Science*, 351(6280):1433–1436
 - Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S., Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., et al. (2015). Promoting an open research culture. *Science*, 348(6242):1422–1425
 - Fanelli, D., Costas, R., and Ioannidis, J. P. (2017). Meta-assessment of bias in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, page 201618569
 - Collaboration, O. S. et al. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251):aac4716
 - Gilbert, D. T., King, G., Pettigrew, S., and Wilson, T. D. (2016). Comment on “estimating the reproducibility of psychological science”. *Science*, 351(6277):1037–1037
 - Chandler, J. (2016). Response to comment on “estimating the reproducibility of psychological science”. Technical report, Mathematica Policy Research
-

12. No class (Thanksgiving)

November 26

13. Ethics and Research Transparency

[December 3]

- Morton & Williams Chapters 12 (Ethics) and 13 (Deception)
 ↪ *link*
- Hertwig, R. and Ortmann, A. (2008). Deception in experiments: Revisiting the arguments in its defense. *Ethics & Behavior*, 18(1):59–92
- King, G. and Sands, M. (2015). How human subjects research rules mislead you and your university, and what to do about it. Technical report, Working Paper
 ↪ *link*

- Dickson, E. S. (2011). Economics versus psychology experiments. stylization, incentives, and deception. In Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., and Lupia, A., editors, *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pages 58–72. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY

Applications

- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *The Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 67(4):371
- Enos, R. D., Fowler, A., and Vavreck, L. (2013). Increasing inequality: The effect of gotv mobilization on the composition of the electorate. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(1):273–288

FURTHER READING:

- Selections from: Desposato, S., editor (2015). *Ethics and Experiments: Problems and Solutions for Social Scientists and Policy Professionals*. Routledge, New York, NY:
 - Chapter 1: Introduction
 - Chapter 2: The Ethics of Exclusion: When Experimenting in Impoverished Settings
 - Chapter 3: Considering the Political Consequences of Comparative Politics Experiments
 - Chapter 17: The Responsibilities of the Researcher and the Profession
 - Chapter 18: Journal Editors as Ethical Sheriffs
 - Chapter 19: Conclusion and Recommendations
- Nickerson, D. W. (2011). When the client owns the data. *The experimental political scientist: Newsletter of the APSA experimental section*, 2(2):5–6
 ↪ *link*
- Elms, A. C. (1994). Keeping deception honest: Justifying conditions for social scientific research stratagems. In Elms, A., Erwin, E., Gendin, S., and Kleiman, L., editors, *Ethical issues in scientific research: An anthology*, pages 121–140. Garland, New York, NY
- Baumrind, D. (1985). Research using intentional deception: ethical issues revisited. *American psychologist*, 40(2):165–174
- Humphreys, M. (2011). Ethical challenges of embedded experimentation. *Comparative Democratization (APSA Newsletter)*, 9(3):10–29

14. Presentations [December 10]