

Survey Experiments
Graduate Methods Seminar
Lauren Sukin
lsukin@stanford.edu



Course Description:

This class is intended for advanced graduate students in the social sciences who are seeking to design and implement survey experiments as part of their research agenda. This course is fast-paced and may be best suited for students who already have a research project in mind.

The course includes readings on survey design and a number of assignments intended to help students design and field a survey. Students should finish the semester with a completed draft of a research paper. Students will work collaboratively, providing feedback every week to their classmates on their survey designs and other components of their survey projects.

While we will discuss survey design in a comparative perspective, all surveys occurring in this course will be fielded in the United States, unless explicit permission is received from the instructor to field a survey abroad.

Course Goals:

This course teaches students to:

- Understand the features, methods, and design of surveys;
- Design their own observational surveys and survey experiments;
- Analyze and understand survey experiments and survey data;
- Apply these skills by fielding a survey and preparing a paper showcasing survey results.

Requirements:

This course is designed for graduate students in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. Students must have completed the quantitative methods core in the Department of Political Science or an equivalent sequence before taking this course. All students must have completed the IRB training sequence before enrolling in this course.

Availability:

Office hours are **Tuesdays, 11:30-1:30** in **Encina Central Room 434**. Sign up for office hours here: <https://www.wejoinin.com/lsukin@stanford.edu>. Sign-ups help reduce wait times and allow the instructor to prepare for each meeting. If you cannot make any of these times, please email me and we can schedule an alternative time.

I encourage you to utilize office hours for longer conversations, but you should also feel free to email me (particularly with any brief questions.) I will get back to you within 24 hours during the week and within 48 hours on weekends and holidays. Give yourself enough time to receive a reply.

Accommodations:

Please contact me if you have approved accommodations. Please include a copy of your accommodations letter. I will help facilitate these accommodations. Requested accommodations that are not approved by the Office of Accessible Education or a dean are unlikely to be granted. No extensions will be granted on assignments without clear, extenuating circumstances.

Assignments:

Readings, Attendance, and Course Participation (10%):

You are expected to complete all readings **before the class to which they are assigned**. Keep up to date with Canvas announcements throughout the course.

Survey Memos (40%) and Feedback Memos (10%)

Students will turn in several drafts of their survey, literature review, and results throughout the quarter. For each draft, students will be assigned to read and provide comments on two of their classmates' memos. Both the memos and the feedback will be graded.

Final Paper (50%):

A final paper analyzing the results of your survey will be due during finals week. The paper should be 8,000-12,000 words, excluding the appendix. Details on the design of the paper are available on Canvas.

Attendance and Participation:

Do I have to come to class?

Readings, attendance, and participation make up 10% of your grade. Attendance and participation are expected, unless you have an excused absence. If you will be unable to attend a class, be sure to notify your instructor in advance. Students with excused absences may make up participation points by submitting a 2-page response memo on the course material for the missed class.

How is my participation evaluated?

To receive full credit for attendance, you must attend all classes, arrive on time, and participate in activities and discussions. Participation grades will be based on the quality, not on the quantity, of participation. Students who make an effort to prepare ahead of time, make thoughtful contributions, ask questions that further the conversation, and listen and respond to their classmates will do well.

There is one exception to this policy. Some students are naturally talkative. Other students struggle to find their voice. Both types of students are welcome in this course. If you are of the latter type, I highly encourage being prepared for class by identifying elements of the course material that you find interesting, curious, problematic, etc. and preparing some discussion points. However, if, for any reason, you are not comfortable talking in class, you may choose to refrain from participation and instead send in a 2-page response paper with your thoughts on that

day's class. Doing this will allow the instructor to understand what you know, what you are interested in, and what can be clarified or improved upon.

Will you cold-call students?

There may be situations in which I cold-call students. The purpose of cold calling is not to embarrass you! It is to encourage everyone to actively participate and to create an environment where everyone feels comfortable engaging. You should not be afraid of being wrong. Being wrong is an important part of academic inquiry.

What should I do to prepare for class?

You will need to have read the material ahead of time. I recommend that, as you go through the readings, you take notes. Whenever possible, we will try to tie the theoretical principles under study to current events and ongoing political debates. Stay tied into the most recent developments in American and international politics so that you can contribute substantively to classroom discussions.

Can I use a computer during class?

Yes. However, the purpose of class is to engage with the material and with each other. Computers, phones, and tablets can distract from that goal. If you seem distracted by any technology, it is more likely that I will cold-call you! I will also ask you to put away anything that appears to be distracting.

On Politics & Controversy:

This is a politics class and some political issues will be inherently controversial. Our goal is to approach politics objectively, utilizing and analyzing the available resources. This is an environment for learning and debate, and I want all students to be able to express their thoughts as well as interact with and learn from their peers. Please be aware of and respectful of the fact that your peers may have different views from you. That being said, it is important to take care of yourself. While there will not usually be formal trigger warnings for readings or discussions, if any conversation becomes too difficult for you, you can take steps (like leaving the room) to alleviate any pressure without being penalized.

Re-Grade Policy:

Should you wish to have an assignment re-graded, you must submit a 1-page memo explaining why you are requesting a re-grade. Point to specific elements that you believe were graded incorrectly. Please note that re-grades can make your grade higher or lower. The new grade that you are assigned is permanent and cannot be changed.

Academic Integrity:

We take the honor code very seriously at Stanford and expect you to abide by it at all times. This means that you agree not to receive or give unpermitted aid on assignments or exams. You also agree not to plagiarize, either from outside sources or other students. The penalty for honor code violations is harsh and can include suspension.

The Honor Code is the University's statement on academic integrity written by students in 1921. It articulates University expectations of students and faculty in establishing and maintaining the highest standards in academic work.

In recent years, most student disciplinary cases have involved Honor Code violations; of these, the most frequent arise when a student submits another's work as their own or gives or receives unpermitted aid. The standard penalty for a first offense includes a one-quarter suspension from the University and 40 hours of community service. In addition, most faculty members issue a "No Pass" or "No Credit" for the course in which the violation occurred. The standard penalty for multiple violations (e.g. cheating more than once in the same course) is a three-quarter suspension and 40 or more hours of community service.

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated in any form. Please refer to and uphold the Stanford Honor Code, noting especially the rules on plagiarism. You can find the Code here: <https://studentaffairs.stanford.edu/communitystandards/policy/honor-code>.

Additional Resources:

Hume Writing Center

You are encouraged to make use of the writing tutoring offered through the Hume Center, especially as you begin work on your term papers. <https://undergrad.stanford.edu/tutoring-support/hume-center/see-tutor>.

Library Research Support

These resources can help with research and papers: <https://library.stanford.edu/students>.

Diversity/First-Gen Resources

Stanford has many resources available for its students; you can find more information about resources for diverse and first-generation students here:

<https://undergrad.stanford.edu/advising/student-guides/diversity-and-first-gen-office>.

Tutoring and Academic Support

If you are falling behind in class, reach out to me! We can work through any issues you are having with the material. Moreover, there are a number of additional tutoring and support resources that you might find helpful: <https://undergrad.stanford.edu/tutoring-support/tutoring>.

Mental Health Resources

Counseling & Psychological Services at Vaden is available to assist with a wide range of mental health concerns. Learn more here: <https://vaden.stanford.edu/caps>.

Class Schedule:

Week 1: Introduction to Survey Methods

- Assignment: Write a brief memo detailing two or more ideas for a survey experiment. For each idea, the memo should include your puzzle, research question, and hypotheses. Identify the population under study and specify your sample. Draft questions for demographic control variables.
- Readings:
 - 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: 627-635.
 - Druckman, J. N. and Leeper, T. J. 2012. "Learning More from Political Communication Experiments: Pretreatment and Its Effects." *American Journal of Political Science* 56: 875-896.
 - Sniderman, P.M. 2011. "The Logic and Design of the Survey Experiment: An Autobiography of a Methodological Innovation." In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, eds. Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, and Lupia, 102–14. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
 - Gaines, B. J., Kuklinski, J.H. and Quirk, P.J. 2007. "The Logic of the Survey Experiment Reexamined." *Political Analysis* 15: 1–20.
 - Anderson, A.B., and Wright, J.D. *Handbook of Survey Research*. United Kingdom, Elsevier Science, 2013. Chapters 1, 2, & 5.

Week 2: Measuring Respondent Attitudes

- Assignment: Begin a literature review for the survey experiment idea that you have chosen. Draft a version of your survey using an observational study. Draft a question for a sensitive item using any of the techniques we've discussed in class.
- Readings:
 - Malhotra, N., Margalit, Y., and Mo, C.M. 2013. "Economic Explanations for Opposition to Immigration: Distinguishing between Prevalence and Conditional Impact." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(2):391-410.
 - Hainmueller, J., and Hopkins, D. 2014. "Public Attitudes Toward Immigration." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 225-249.
 - Gilens, M., Sniderman, P., and Kuklinski, J.H. 1998. "Affirmative Action and the Politics of Realignment." *British Journal of Political Science* 28: 159–83.
 - Krysan, M., and Couper, M.P. 2003. "Race in the Live and Virtual Interview: Racial Deference, Social Desirability, and Activation Effects in Attitude Surveys." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66: 364–83.
 - Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. 1955. "Construct Validation in Psychological Tests." *Psychological Bulletin* 52: 281–302.
 - Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J.A., Marx, D.M., Judd, C.M., and Park, B. 2012. "Complete Anonymity Compromises the Accuracy of Self-Reports." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48(6): 1291–99.
 - *Handbook of Survey Research*. Chapters 3, 6, & 8.
 - Alrababah, A., Marble W., Mousa S., and Siegel, A. 2019. "Can Exposure to Celebrities Reduce Prejudice? The effect of Mohamed Salah on Islamophobic behaviors and attitudes." Working Paper.

- Bechtel, M.M., Jensen, A.S. and Scheve, K., 2019. “Measuring Time Preferences in Large Surveys.” Working Paper Available at SSRN 3422697.

Week 3: Causal Inference & Survey Experiments

- Assignment: Literature review memos are due today. Draft two versions of your survey experiment using both a short and a long vignette-style survey experiment. Conduct a power analysis to determine the sample size that you would need for each experiment.
- Readings:
 - Schuldt, J. P., Konrath, S. H., and Schwarz, N. 2011. “‘Global Warming’ or ‘Climate Change’: Whether the Planet is Warming Depends on Question Wording.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75: 115-124.
 - Banerjee, A., Green, D. P., McManus, J., and Pande, R. (2014). “Are Poor Voters Indifferent to Whether Elected Leaders are Criminal or Corrupt? A vignette experiment in rural India.” *Political Communication*, 31(3), 391-407.
 - Atzmüller, C., and Steiner, P.M. 2010. "Experimental Vignette Studies in Survey Research." *Methodology* 6(3):128–138.
 - Chaudoin, S., Milner, H.V., and Tingley, D.H. 2010. “The Center Still Holds: Liberal Internationalism Survives,” *International Security*, 35(1), 75-94.
 - *Handbook of Survey Research*. Chapters 7 & 9.
 - Gaines, B.J., and Kuklinski, J.H. 2011. “Treatment Effects.” In *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. eds. Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, and Lupia, 445–58. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
 - 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): 765–89.

Week 4: Survey Experiment Design

- Assignment: Draft two versions of your survey experiment using a conjoint experiment and a list experiment. Draft questions for mediators and moderators.
- Readings:
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - Rosenbaum, P.R., 2010. *Design of Observational Studies*. New York: Springer. Chapter 3.
 - Blair, G. and Imai, K. 2012. “Statistical Analysis of List Experiments.” *Political Analysis* 20(1): 47–77.
 - 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.
 - Sniderman, P.M., 2018. “Some Advances in the Design of Survey Experiments.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21: 259-275.
 - Auspurg, K. and Hinz, T., 2014. *Factorial Survey Experiments* (Vol. 175). Sage Publications. Chapters 1-5.

- Bansak, K., Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D.J. and Yamamoto, T., 2018. "The Number of Choice Tasks and Survey Satisficing in Conjoint Experiments." *Political Analysis*, 26(1):112-119.

Week 5: Public Opinion and Public Policy

- Assignment: Complete your IRB application. Edit your literature review memo. Write a memo on the policy implications of your experiment.
- Readings:
 - Christensen, G. and Miguel, E., 2018. "Transparency, Reproducibility, and the Credibility of Economics Research." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 56(3): 920-80.
 - Zaller, J.R., 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-4.
 - Durr, R.H., 1993. "What Moves Policy Sentiment?" *American Political Science Review* 87(1): 158-170.
 - Ansolabehere, S., Rodden, J. and Snyder Jr., J.M., 2008. "The Strength of Issues: Using multiple measures to gauge preference stability, ideological constraint, and issue voting." *American Political Science Review* 102(2): 215-232.
 - Parvizi, J., Tarity, T.D., Conner, K. and Smith, J.B., 2007. "Institutional Review Board Approval: Why it matters." *JBJS*, 89(2): 418-426.
 - Shapiro, R.Y. and Page, B.I., 1988. "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 32(2): 211-247.
 - Monroe, A.D., 1998. "Public Opinion and Public Policy, 1980-1993." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 62(1): 6-28.
 - Foyle, D.C., 1999. *Counting the Public in: Presidents, public opinion, and foreign policy*. Columbia University Press. Chapters 1, 4, 7, & 10.
 - Lian, B. and Oneal, J.R., 1993. "Presidents, the Use of Military Force, and Public Opinion." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 37(2): 277-300.
 - Kertzer, J.D., 2020. "Re-Assessing Elite-Public Gaps in Political Behavior." *American Journal of Political Science*. Forthcoming.

Week 6: Bias & Validity

- Assignment: Experimental design memo are due today! Continue to edit your literature review memo. Begin to identify possible sources of bias and discuss your survey's internal and external validity.
- Readings:
 - Clifford, S. and Jerit, J. 2015. "Do Attempts to Improve Respondent Attention Increase Social Desirability Bias?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79: 790-802.
 - Hertwig, R. and Ortmann, A. 2008. "Deception in Experiments: Revisiting the Arguments in Its Defense." *Ethics & Behavior* 18: 59-92.
 - 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.

- Auspurg, K. and Hinz, T., 2014. *Factorial Survey Experiments* (Vol. 175). Sage Publications. Chapter 6.
- Barabas, J. and Jerit, J., 2010. “Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?” *American Political Science Review* 104(2): 226-242.
- Davis, D.W. and Silver, B.D., 2003. “Stereotype Threat and Race of Interviewer Effects in a Survey on Political Knowledge.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(1): 33-45.

Week 7: Pre-Analysis, Moderators, & Mediators

- Assignment: Begin your pre-analysis plan memo, taking into account questions of bias and validity and focusing on mediation and moderation. Program your survey design into Qualtrics. Continue to edit your literature review memo.
- Readings:
 - Preacher, K.J., 2015. “Advances in Mediation Analysis: A survey and synthesis of new developments.” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66: 825–52
 - MacKinnon, D. P., Cheong, J., & Pirlott, A. G. 2012. “Statistical Mediation Analysis.” In *APA handbooks in psychology®. APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological.* eds. H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher. 313–331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-018>.
 - Huddleston, R.J. and Weller, N., 2017. “Unintended Causal Pathways: Probing Experimental Mechanisms Through Mediation Analysis.” Working Paper Available at SSRN 2964336.
 - Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L. and Imai, K., 2014. “Mediation: R package for causal mediation analysis.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 59(5): 1-38.
 - Imai, K., Keele, L. and Tingley, D., 2010. “A General Approach to Causal Mediation Analysis.” *Psychological Methods*, 15(4): 309-334.
 - Complete the Qualtrics tutorials: <http://www.qualtrics.com/university/researchsuite/>.

Week 8: International and Comparative Survey Research

- Assignment: Update your survey in response to any IRB feedback you may have received. Your complete pre-analysis plan memo is due today! Continue to edit your literature review memo. Begin Qualtrics testing and time your survey.
- Readings:
 - O’Rourke, K.H., and Sinnott, R. 2001. “The Determinants of Individual Trade-Policy Preferences: International Survey Evidence.” *Brookings Trade Forum*. 157–196.
 - Sukin, L. 2020. “Credible Nuclear Security Commitments Can Backfire: Explaining Domestic Support for Nuclear Weapons Acquisition in South Korea.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 64(6): 1011–1042.
 - Allison, D.M., Herzog, S., Ko, J. “Under the Umbrella: Nuclear Crises, Extended Deterrence, and Public Opinion.” Working Paper.

- Malesky, E.J., Gueorguiev, D.D. and Jensen, N.M., 2015. “Monopoly Money: Foreign investment and bribery in Vietnam, a survey experiment.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(2): 419-439.
- Bechtel, M.M., Scheve, K. and van Lieshout, E., 2019. “What Determines Climate Policy Preferences if Reducing Greenhouse-Gas Emissions is a Global Public Good?” Working Paper Available at SSRN.

Week 9: Survey Modes

- Assignment: Field your survey! Your complete literature review is also due today. Write a brief memo on questions that you would add to your design if you were conducting an in-person or phone survey, rather than an online survey. Discuss the advantages and drawbacks of online surveys in your memo.
- Readings:
 - *Handbook of Survey Research*. Chapters 11-12.
 - Berinsky, A., Huber, G., and Lenz, G. 2012. “Evaluating Online Labor Markets for Experimental Research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk.” *Political Analysis* 20(3): 351–68.
 - Ansolabehere, S., and Schaffner, B.F. 2014. “Does Survey Mode Still Matter? Findings from a 2010 Multi-Mode Comparison” *Political Analysis* 22(3): 285–303.
 - Rivers, D. 2007. “Sampling for Web Surveys.” Working Paper, Stanford University. Prepared for the 2007 Joint Statistical Meetings, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 - Leech, B.L., 2002. “Asking Questions: Techniques for semistructured interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35(4): 665-668.
 - Coppock, A., 2019. “Generalizing from Survey Experiments Conducted on Mechanical Turk: A replication approach.” *Political Science Research and Methods*, 7(3): 613-628.
 - Coppock, A. and McClellan, O.A., 2019. “Validating the Demographic, Political, Psychological, and Experimental Results Obtained from a New Source of Online Survey Respondents.” *Research & Politics*, 6(1), 1-14.

Week 10: Processing Survey Data

- Assignment: Clean your data! Write a memo with key summary statistics from your results. Balance or weight your data, then reproduce the summary statistics. Analyze your results.
- Readings:
 - *Handbook of Survey Research*. Chapters 13-14.
 - Hainmueller, J. 2012. “Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies.” *Political Analysis*, 20(1): 25–46.
 - Diamond, A. and Sekhon, J.S., 2013. “Genetic Matching for Estimating Causal Effects: A general multivariate matching method for achieving balance in observational studies.” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(3): 932-945.
 - Miratrix, L.W., Sekhon, J.S., Theodoridis, A.G. and Campos, L.F., 2018. “Worth Weighting? How to think about and use weights in survey experiments.” *Political Analysis*, 26(3): 275-291.

- Kohler, U., Kreuter, F. and Stuart, E.A., 2019. “Nonprobability Sampling and Causal Analysis.” *Annual Review of Statistics and its Application*, 6: 149-172.

Week 11: Analyzing Survey Data

- Assignment: Analyze your survey! Write a memo with your results and analysis. Include at least three distinct methods of data visualization in your memo.
- Readings:
 - *Handbook of Survey Research*. Chapters 15-16.
 - Acharya, A., Blackwell, M. and Sen, M., 2018. “Analyzing Causal Mechanisms in Survey Experiments.” *Political Analysis*, 26(4): 357-378.
 - Green, D.P. and Kern, H.L., 2012. “Modeling Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Survey Experiments with Bayesian Additive Regression Trees.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3): 491-511.
 - Muñoz, J., Falcó-Gimeno, A. and Hernández, E., 2020. “Unexpected Event During Survey Design: Promise and pitfalls for causal inference.” *Political Analysis*, 28(2): 186-206.
 - Druckman, J.N., Green, D.P., Kuklinski, J.H. and Lupia, A. eds., 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge University Press. Parts III & IX.
 - Chen, C.H., Härdle, W.K. and Unwin, A. eds., 2007. *Handbook of Data Visualization*. Springer Science & Business Media. Parts I-II.

Week 12: Data Visualization and Text Analysis

- Assignment: Incorporating feedback on your results, update your findings. Use Tableau, ArcGIS, or machine-assisted text analysis to provide a supplementary data visualization element to your memo.
- Readings:
 - Roberts, M.E., Stewart, B.M., Tingley, D., Lucas, C., Leder-Luis, J., Gadarian, S.K., Albertson, B. and Rand, D.G., 2014. “Structural Topic Models for Open-Ended Survey Responses.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(4): 1064-1082.
 - Laver, M. and Garry, J., 2000. “Estimating Policy Positions from Political Texts.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(3): 619-634.
 - Grimmer, J. and Stewart, B.M., 2013. “Text as Data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts.” *Political Analysis*, 21(3): 267-297.
 - Young, L. and Soroka, S., 2012. “Affective News: The automated coding of sentiment in political texts.” *Political Communication*, 29(2): 205-231.
 - Munzert, S., Rubba, C., Meißner, P. and Nyhuis, D., 2014. *Automated Data Collection with R: A practical guide to web scraping and text mining*. John Wiley & Sons. Part II.
 - Steinberg, S.J. and Steinberg, S.L., 2005. *Geographic Information Systems for the Social Sciences: Investigating Space and Place*. Sage Publications. Chapters 1-4, 7, & 9.
 - Complete the Tableau tutorial: <https://help.tableau.com/current/guides/get-started-tutorial/en-us/get-started-tutorial-home.htm>.

Week 13: Presenting Survey Research

- Assignment: Begin drafting your final paper, using the memos you have produced throughout the semester. Produce slides to present your results to the class. All students' presentations should be less than 10 minutes each; Q&A will follow each presentation.
- Readings:
 - O'Hair, D., Stewart, R. and Rubenstein, H., 2011. *A Speaker's Guidebook: Text and reference*. Macmillan.
 - 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.
 - Bechtel, M.M. and Scheve, K.F., 2013. "Mass Support for Global Climate Agreements Depends on Institutional Design." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(34): 13763-13768.
 - Tomz, M., 2007. "Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An experimental approach." *International Organization*, 61(4): 821-840.
 - Franco, A., Malhotra, N. and Simonovits, G., 2014. "Publication Bias in the Social Sciences: Unlocking the file drawer." *Science*, 345(6203): 502-1505.
 - Riccucci, N.M., Van Ryzin, G.G. and Jackson, K., 2018. "Representative Bureaucracy, Race, and Policing: A survey experiment." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 28(4): 506-518.
 - Campbell, R. and Cowley, P., 2014. "What Voters Want: Reactions to candidate characteristics in a survey experiment." *Political Studies*, 62(4): 745-765.

Week 14: Reading Period

- Assignment: Review the video of your presentation. For extra credit, present your work again and record your second performance. Write a one-page memo on improvements that you made to your presentation, focusing on public speaking style. Work on your final papers, including the appendices!

Week 15: Finals Period

- Assignment: Final papers are due! Congratulations!