

## Surveys and Experiments

PSC 722- Spring 2022  
Department of Political Science,  
Syracuse University  
Wednesday 9:30-12:15 pm, Eggers 100A

Professor Shana Kushner Gadarian

### *Contact Information*

Office: 100 Eggers

Phone: 315-443-3718

Email: [sgadaria@syr.edu](mailto:sgadaria@syr.edu)

Course website: [blackboard.syr.edu](http://blackboard.syr.edu)

### *Office Hours*

Tuesday 10 am- 12 pm (or by appointment)

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

### Learning Outcomes:

1. Presentational Skills: Students will present original research at the end of the course
2. Writing Skills: Develop an original research project in the form of a journal article.
3. Research skills: Practice and hone quantitative skills and research design in designing and conducting original research.

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

1. In your view, what are some of the major *theoretical* perspectives that structure research in a given area, what are their major strengths and weaknesses, and how do they compare with other perspectives you're familiar with (encountered in the course or elsewhere)?
2. In your view, what do you see as some of the major strengths and weaknesses of the *methods* used to investigate the subject? What methodologies, broadly conceived (e.g., basic issues of design, measurement, etc.) do you feel are most appropriate, given the subject of inquiry, and to what degree do you think the substantive conclusions drawn are dependent on the particular methods employed?
3. Do the authors engage with each other? Is this engagement fruitful for furthering the field? Would we learn more as political scientists by more study in this area? What do we still not know?
4. What are the major *implications* of the findings for research methodology as well as substantive questions of political science?
5. How can this research be *improved*, in your view? What theories, methods and substantive foci deserve more attention in future research?

6. What are the major advantages of using either survey research or experimental research for the particular theoretical question being studied? What are the potential or actual disadvantages?

### **COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS:**

**Course modality:** You are expected to read and analyze the readings prior to each week and come to class prepared to offer your insights. You are also expected to attend class each week and will need to inform me ahead of time if you will be absent. For at least the first few weeks, we will have a Zoom option for reasons of public health. Being physically in class will be better for discussion and for meeting other students. BUT, if you are ill or a loved one in your home is ill or quarantined, please do not come to class. Hop on Zoom if you are able and we will include you in the conversation.

We will be following all public health guidelines on campus. If you have particular concerns about health and safety that you'd like to share with me, let me know.

Shana Gadarian is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join [Zoom](#) Meeting (Click on link)

Meeting ID: 948 9319 8616

Passcode: 236278

**Names:** If you go by a different name or pronoun that is listed on the roster, please let me know so that your colleagues and I can refer to you by your preferred name. You are colleagues in the making so you are welcome to call me by my first name (Shana, rhymes with Dana) but Professor Gadarian or Dr. Gadarian are fine as well.

**Short assignments (30%):** You are expected to read and analyze the readings prior to each week and come to class prepared to offer your insights. You are also expected to attend class each week and will need to inform me ahead of time if you will be absent. Multiple unexcused absences will lead to a lower grade. Your participation grade will be made up of these components: completing IRB training through the Office of Institutional Research, assignments and active, engaged participation in class, which includes workshopping your paper ideas each week.

1. *IRB training through CITI (5%):* The Institutional Research Board oversees all projects using human subjects at Syracuse. In order to collect data through an intervention such as survey or an experiment, you will need to go through the online training provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) by. Email your CITI certificate to me. If you already have CITI Basic training, take one of the more advanced offerings. <http://orip.syr.edu/human-research/training-list/Education%20and%20Training.html>
2. *Bringing in survey questions (5%)* – see assignments at the end of each week's reading

3. *Active engagement (10%)*: Active student participation is essential to a successful seminar. Your participation should be intelligent, informed and frequent. Optimally, all three. Tradeoffs among them should not be necessary.
4. *Research paper presentation (10%)* : During the last week of class, you will present the findings of your research in a 10 minute conference style presentation.

**Discussion leading (20%)**: Two times over the course of the semester, you will help to lead discussion. The first time, you will lead on a paper on the required reading list and the second time, you will cover a recommended reading. If there is no recommended reading on the day that you want to discuss, I can make a recommendation. Your job is to provide an outline of each reading and start a discussion of thinking through the critical issues in the articles, the methodological issues or problems they raise, and what researchers should take away from the article.

### **Research paper (50%):**

Pick a question or a theory from the course or one of your other courses and apply it to a problem of interest to you. You have several choices for research papers. Each type of paper will require a theory, hypotheses, and analysis. Each option can be coauthored with another student in the class.

1. **Secondary data analysis** – use already collected survey or experimental data to test a theory (ideally one that is related to a dissertation chapter or paper).
2. **Original data collection** – Design and implement a survey or survey experiment.  
I will fund an omnibus survey on Amazon Mechanical Turk, Lucid or other survey platform of up to \$1000. You will be responsible for coding the survey in Qualtrics and coordinating with other students in the class for question wording and question ordering. Students will also have to fill out an IRB application for the project by midway through the semester.
3. **COVID behaviors and attitudes** – Work with me on a project on the pandemic and American politics (up to 2 students). I have a survey of 3,000 Americans interviewed six times from March 2020 to March 2021. Come up with a question that can be answered with my survey data and/or other pandemic related survey data. You will take the lead on writing and data analysis but will have support from me as well as the other project PIs.

### **Paper format:**

**A 15-20** page double-spaced research paper in the model of an article in the *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. (The page limit is for the text; figures and references can take up additional pages.) The paper should focus briefly on the research question and previous literature and focus more heavily on how you tested the theoretically derived hypotheses, what the benefits as well as the drawbacks of the method are that you chose, and what these findings add to our knowledge about your topic. Papers should also pose alternative hypotheses and outline how your research design can help eliminate alternative explanations or what additional data you would need to do so. Papers are **due on Wed, May 11 by 5 pm.**

There are multiple phases of this project. Please note the dates below:

1. **Feb 9**, Research Question (5%) (due in class): Submit a one-page typed description of your research question, and explain how it fits into the general topical themes for the course. Provide an initial bibliography of at least 10 sources.
2. **March 2**, Research Design (10%) (Bring to class and be prepared to discuss): PREREGISTRATION PLAN Submit five to seven typed pages (with a bibliography) that identify your research question, review the literature relevant to your question, discuss the method of analysis you intend to employ, and describe the data you will use to evaluate your hypotheses.
3. **March 23**, Rough draft (15%): Submit the initial draft of your paper, with all key parts of the paper included (introduction, theory, research design, pre-analysis (i.e., operationalization, what models), references. **Please bring 2 copies to class.** Each draft will be read by the instructor and another student in the class. The instructor will assign the student discussants for each paper.
4. **March 30**, Review (20%): Each student will write a typed review commenting on one other students' paper in the class. Please bring 2 copies of review to class. The reviews should take the form of a journal review, where you make specific recommendations about how to improve the paper. More detailed instructions (including examples) will be distributed later.
5. **May 11**, Final Draft by 5 PM, Final Draft (50%): Submit your final paper by email along with a memo responding to the reviewers' comments in the previous round. I will take into consideration how well you responded to others' criticisms when assigning a final grade. The final paper grade is based on the weighted component grades for each portion of the paper (research question, research design, first draft, reviews, and final draft).

At the end of the semester, your grade will be assigned based on the following scale: A (93-100), A- (90-92), B+ (87-89), B (83-86), B- (80-82), C+ (77-79), C (73-76), C- (70-72). F (69 and below). There are no D grades in graduate courses.

### **Readings:**

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

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

### **January 26 - Class overview: Causality, correlation, and social research**

Readings:

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

**Assignment: None**

### **Feb 2 - Surveys: The Survey Interview and Nature of Survey Response, Sampling**

Readings

- a. Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*. (1992): 579-61
- b. Berinsky, Adam. 2017. Measuring Public Opinion with Survey Data. *Annual Review Political Science* 20:309–2
- c. Converse, Philip. 1964 "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In David Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*. (Blackboard)
- d. Connors, E. The Social Dimension of Political Values. *Polit Behavior* 42, 961–982 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09530-3>

- a. Silver, Laura. Pew Research Center. [Using cognitive interviewing to design survey questions about democracy.](#)

Recommended readings:

- e. Asher, Herbert. 2007. *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know*, 7th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- a. Bartels, Larry M. "Democracy with attitudes." *Electoral democracy* (2003): 48-82
- b. Berinsky, Adam J. "Silent voices: Social welfare policy opinions and political equality in America." (2002): *American Journal of Political Science* : 276-287.
- f. Bassili, John N. 1995. "Response Latency and the Accessibility of Voting Intentions: What Contributes to Accessibility and How It Affects Vote Choice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(July): 686-695.
- g. Bassili, John N., and B. Stacey Scott. 1996. "Response Latency as a Signal to Question
- a. Berinsky, Adam J. "Can we talk? Self-presentation and the survey response." *Political Psychology* 25, no. 4 (2004): 643-659.
- b. Converse, Jean and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- Problems in Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(Fall): 390-399.
- h. Berinsky, Adam J. 2004. "Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s: The Analysis of Quota Controlled Sample Survey Data."
- i. Brady, Henry E. 2000. "Contributions of Survey Research to Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33(1): 47-57.
- j. MacInnis, Bo, Jon Krosnick Annabell Ho, Mu-Jung Cho. 2018. "The Accuracy of Measurements with Probability and Non-Probability Survey Samples: Replication and Extension" *Public Opinion Quarterly*. nfy038,
- k. Sanders, Lynn M. 1999. "Democratic Politics and Survey Research." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 29:248-80. (<http://faculty.virginia.edu/lsanders/P29s2s5.pdf>)

**Assignments:** IRB Certification Due

**Feb 9 - Surveys – Measurement issues; question wording and ordering effects**

Readings:

- a. Smith, Tom W. "That which we call welfare by any other name would smell sweeter: An analysis of the impact of question wording on response patterns." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51.1 (1987): 75-83.
- b. Wolter, Felix, and Peter Preisendörfer. "Asking Sensitive Questions: An Evaluation of the Randomized Response Technique Versus Direct Questioning Using Individual Validation Data." *Sociological Methods & Research* 42.3 (2013): 321-353.
- c. Blair, Graeme, Alexander Coppock, and Margaret Moor. "When to worry about sensitivity bias: A social reference theory and evidence from 30 years of list experiments." *American Political Science Review* 114, no. 4 (2020): 1297-1315.

- d. Daoust, J., Nadeau, R., Dassonneville, R., Lachapelle, E., Bélanger, É, Savoie, J., & Van der Linden, C. (2021). How to Survey Citizens' Compliance with COVID-19 Public Health Measures: Evidence from Three Survey Experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 8(3), 310-317.
- e. Stroud, Natalie Jomini and Kate Kenski; From Agenda Setting to Refusal Setting: Survey Nonresponse as a Function of Media Coverage Across the 2004 Election Cycle, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 71, Issue 4, 1 January 2007, Pages 539–559, <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfm042>

Recommended readings:

- a. Bernstein, Robert, Anita Chadha and Robert Montjoy. 2001. Overreporting Voting: Why it Happens and Why it Matters. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65: 22-44.
- b. Brutger, Ryan, Joshua D. Kertzer, Jonathan Renshon, Dustin Tingley and Chagai M. Weiss. "Abstraction and Detail in Experimental Design." *The American Journal of Political Science*.
- c. S.M. Zdep, Isabelle Rhodes, R.M. Schwarz, and Mary Kilkenny. 1979. The Validity of the Randomized Response Technique. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 43 (4), 544-549.
- d. Hanmer, Michael J., Antoine J. Banks, and Ismail K. White. "Experiments to Reduce the Over-reporting of Voting: A Pipeline to the Truth." *Political Analysis* 22.1 (2014): 130-141.
- e. Krosnick, Jon A., and Duane F. Alwin. "An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response-order effects in survey measurement." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51.2 (1987): 201-219.
- f. Petty, Richard E. Greg A. Rennie, and John T. Cacioppo. 1987. Assertion Versus Interrogation Format in Opinion Surveys: Questions Enhance Thoughtful Responding. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51(4), 481-494.

**Assignments:** 1. Using Roper iPoll

(<https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/>) or the American National Election Studies ([electionstudies.org](http://electionstudies.org)), bring in an example of *alternative question wordings* for the same topic. Think about the consequences of the question wording choices. Bring short write up of this into class to discuss.

- 2. Bring your research question (see part 1 of the paper assignment)

**Feb 16- Survey Design. – Response options, ordering, anchoring vignettes**

- a. King, Gary, et al. "Enhancing the validity and cross-cultural comparability of measurement in survey research." *American Political Science Review*. 98.01 (2004): 191-207.
- b. Wamble, Julian, Chryl Laird, Corrine McConaughy, and Ismail White. We are One: Understanding the Maintenance of Black Democratic Party Loyalty. *The Journal of Politics* 0 0:ja <https://doi.org/10.1086/716300>
- a. Huddy, L., Billig, J., Bracciodieta, J. et al. 1997. The Effect of Interviewer Gender on the Survey Response *Political Behavior* (1997) 19: 197.
- a. Leeper, Thomas J. "Where have the respondents gone? Perhaps we ate them all." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83, no. S1 (2019): 280-288.

- b. Lee, Taeku, and Efrén O. Pérez. "The persistent connection between language-of-interview and Latino political opinion." *Political Behavior* 36, no. 2 (2014): 401-425.

#### Recommended reading

- a. Bishop, George F. 1987. Experiments with the Middle Response Alternative in Survey Questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51(2), 220-232.
- b. Davis, Darren W. "Nonrandom measurement error and race of interviewer effects among African Americans." *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1997): 183-207.
- c. Geer, John G. 1991. Do Open-Ended Questions Measure "Salient" Issues. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 55(3), 360-370.
- d. Holbrook, Allyson, Jon A. Krosnick, David Moore, Roger Tourangeau; Response Order Effects in Dichotomous Categorical Questions Presented Orally: The Impact of Question and Respondent Attributes, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 71, Issue 3, 1 January 2007, Pages 325-
- e. Krosnick et. al. 2002. The Impact of "No Opinion" Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(3) 371-403.
- f. Sanchez, Gabriel R. 2008. "Latino Group Consciousness and Perceptions of Commonality with African Americans" *Social Science Quarterly* 89.2: 428-444.
- g. McDermott, Monika L., and Kathleen A. Frankovic. "Review: Horserace Polling and Survey Method Effects: An Analysis of the 2000 Campaign." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 67, no. 2 (2003): 244-64.
- h. Viruell-Fuentes, Edna A., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, David R. Williams, and James S. House. "Language of interview, self-rated health, and the other Latino health puzzle." *American journal of public health* 101, no. 7 (2011): 1306-1313.

**Assignment:** Using Roper iPoll (<https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/>) or the American National Election Studies ([electionstudies.org](http://electionstudies.org)), bring in an example of how *question ordering* may influence the answers given on a topic of interest to you.

#### **Feb 23 – No class, Shana out of town**

**Assignment:** Start work on your research design, due next week

#### **March 2 - The future of survey research & introduction to experiments**

- a. Shapiro, Robert. 2011. Public Opinion and American Democracy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 75(5); 982-1017.
- b. Schaffner, Brian F., and Samantha Luks. "Misinformation or expressive responding? What an inauguration crowd can tell us about the source of political misinformation in surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82, no. 1 (2018): 135-147.
- c. Groves, Robert. 2011. Three Eras of Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75: 861-871.
- d. Sinclair, Betsy. "Design and analysis of experiments in multilevel populations" in *Cambridge Handbook*.



- e. Sondheim, Rachel Milstein. “Analyzing the downstream effects of randomized experiments” *Cambridge Handbook*.

#### Recommended readings

##### *Future of survey research*

- a. Ansolabehere, S., & Schaffner, B. F. 2014. Does survey mode still matter? Findings from a 2010 multi-mode comparison. *Political Analysis*, 22(3): 285-303.
- b. Brick, J. Michael. 2011. The Future of Survey Sampling. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 75 (5): 872-888. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfr045
- c. Sampling and inferences: Discussion about the use of CCES to study non-citizens
  - i. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/10/31/are-non-citizens-following-american-election-laws/>
  - ii. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/10/28/what-can-we-learn-about-the-electoral-behavior-of-non-citizens-from-a-survey-designed-to-learn-about-citizens/>
  - iii. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/11/02/do-non-citizens-vote-in-u-s-elections-a-reply-to-our-critics/>
- d. Lonna Atkeson Q&A in *Political Analysis* <http://blog.oup.com/2014/08/improving-survey-methodology-q-a-with-lonna-atkeson/>

##### *Methods to get closer to causality:*

- a. Matching: Jas Sekhon. “The Neyman-Rubin Model of Causal Inference and Estimation via Matching Methods” *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady, and David Collier, eds. <http://sekhon.berkeley.edu/papers/SekhonOxfordHandbook.pdf>
- b. Regression discontinuity designs: Eggers, Andrew C., Anthony Fowler, Jens Hainmueller, Andrew B. Hall, James M. Snyder, Jr. Forthcoming. On the Validity of the Regression Discontinuity Design for Estimating Electoral Effects: New Evidence from Over 40,000 Close Races. *American Journal of Political Science*
- c. Mediation: Imai, Kosuke, Luke Keele, and Dustin Tingley. "A general approach to causal mediation analysis." *Psychological methods* 15.4 (2010): 309.
- d. Johnston, Richard and Henry Brady. 2002. The Rolling Cross Section Design. *Electoral Studies*. 21(2): 283-295.
- e. Couper, Mick P. 2000. “Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64:464-494
- f. Witte, James and Philip E. N. Howard. 2002. “The Future of Polling: Relational Inference and the Development of Internet Survey Instruments.” In Jeff Maza et al (ed). *Navigating Public Opinion Polls, Policy, and the Future of American Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- g. Gelman, Andrew and David Rothschild. 2014. Modern polling needs innovation, not traditionalism. *The Monkey Cage. Washington Post*. August 4.

## Experiments

- h. Gerber, Alan and Donald Green. 2012 *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, Interpretation*. Jas Sekhon and Danny Hidalgo. "Causality"  
<http://sekhon.berkeley.edu/papers/causality.pdf>
- i. 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.
- j. Post-treatment bias and how to avoid:
  - i. Jacob Montgomery, Brendan Nyhan, Michelle Torres. How conditioning on post-treatment variables can ruin your experiment and what you can do about it. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12357>
  - ii. Aronow, Peter Michael and Baron, Jonathon and Pinson, Lauren, A Note on Dropping Experimental Subjects Who Fail a Manipulation Check (October 14, 2015). Available SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2683588> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2683588>
- k. An update to the Common Rule and what it means:  
<http://researchintegrity.syr.edu/human-research/common-rule/>

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

### March 9 – Experimental design – Subjects and ethics

- a. Barrera, Davide, and Brent Simpson. "Much ado about deception: Consequences of deceiving research participants in the social sciences." *Sociological Methods & Research* 41, no. 3 (2012): 383-413.
- b. Berinsky, Adam J., Gregory A. Huber, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2012. "Evaluating Online Labor Markets for Experimental Research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk." *Political Analysis* 20 (Summer): 351-368.
- c. Druckman, James and Cindy Kam. "Students as Experimental Participants: A Defense of the 'Narrow Data Base'" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, p 41-58.
- d. Sears, David O. "College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 51.3 (1986): 515.
- e. Smith, Stevens S., and Deborah Richardson. 1983. Amelioration of deception and harm in psychological research: The important role of debriefing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44(5): 1075.

## Recommended readings:

- a. Burger, Jerry M. 2009. Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today? *American Psychologist*.
- b. Gordon, M. E., Slade, L. A., & Schmitt, N. 1987. Student guinea pigs: Porcine predictors and particularistic phenomena. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 160-163.
- c. Greenberg, Jerald. 1987. The College Sophomore as Guinea Pig: Setting the Record Straight. *The Academy of Management Review*. 12(1): 157-159.
- d. Kam, Cindy, Jennifer R. Wilking, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2007. "Beyond the 'Narrow Data Base': Another Convenience Sample for Experimental Research." *Political Behavior* 29(4):415-440.
- e. Milgram, Stanley. 1963. "Behavioral Study of Obedience" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67(4): 371-378.
- f. Orne, M. T. 1962. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, 17(11), 776.
- g. Schrag, Zachary. 2011. How Talking Became Human Subjects Research: The Federal Regulation of the Social Sciences, 1965–1991 [https://zacharyschrag.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/schrag\\_howtalking\\_final.pdf](https://zacharyschrag.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/schrag_howtalking_final.pdf)
- h. Whitbourne, Susan Krauss. 2013. The Rarely Told True Story of Zimbardo's Prison Experiment. *Psychology Today*. July 20. (<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/fulfillmentanyage/201307/therarelytoldtruestoryzimbardosprisonexperiment>)
- i. Zimbardo, Philip G. 1973. Pirandellian Prison. *New York Times Magazine*. April 8.

## Ethics and experiments

- a. Blustein, Jan. 2005. "Toward a More Public Discussion of the Ethics of Federal Social Program Evaluation," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. Vol. 24, No. 4, 824-846.
- b. Frazer, Michael L. "Respect for Subjects in the Ethics of Causal and Interpretive Social Explanation." *American Political Science Review* 114, no. 4 (2020): 1001-1012.
- c. M Humphreys. 2011. "Ethical Challenges of Embedded Experimentation." *Comparative Democratization*. 9(3).
- d. Morton, Rebecca B., and Kenneth C. Williams. *Experimental political science and the study of causality: From nature to the lab*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- e. Tom Pepinsky 2014. "Surveys, Experiments, and the Landscape of International Political Economy." *International Interactions*.
- f. Teele, Dawn Langan, ed. *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. Yale University Press, 2014.
- g. Some reflections on the Montana field experiment:
  - i. Goel, Vinu. 2014. As Data Overflows Online, Researchers Grapple with Ethics. *New York Times* (12 August 2014) <http://www.nytimes.com/.../the-boon-of-online-data-puts-socia...>

- ii. Scott, Dylan. 2014. Profs Bumble Into Big Legal Trouble After Election Experiment Goes Way Wrong. TPM Online. (27 October 2014) <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/.../montana-election-mailer-stat...>
- iii. Humphreys, Macartan. 2014. How to make field experiments more ethical. The Washington Post Monkey Cage (2 November 2014) <http://www.washingtonpost.com/.../how-to-make-field-experime.../>
- iv. Leeper, Thomas. 2014. In Defense of the Montana Experiment. (25 October 2014) <http://thomasleeper.com/2014/10/montana-experiment/>
- v. American Political Science Association. 2014. Statement on Field Experiments and Research Integrity in Political Science. <http://www.apsanet.org/.../Hero.Hochschild%20Statement%20on%2>

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

**March 16** – SU Spring Break, No class

### **March 23 - Survey based experiments**

- a. Sniderman, Paul. “The Logic and Design of the Survey Experiment: An Autobiography of a Methodological Innovation” in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. *Cambridge Handbook*, p 102-114.
- b. Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, and Paul J. Quirk. 2007. “The Logic of the Survey Experiment Revisited.” *Political Analysis* 15 (Winter): 1-20.
- c. Barabas, Jason, and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. Are survey experiments externally valid? *American Political Science Review* 104.02: 226-242.
- d. Berinsky, Adam J., Michele F. Margolis, and Michael W. Sances. "Separating the shirkers from the workers? Making sure respondents pay attention on self-administered surveys." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 3 (2014): 739-753.
- e. Klar, Samara, and Alexandra McCoy. "Partisan-Motivated Evaluations of Sexual Misconduct and the Mitigating Role of the# MeToo Movement." *American Journal of Political Science* 65, no. 4 (2021): 777-789.
- f. Thorson, E., 2016. Belief echoes: The persistent effects of corrected misinformation. *Political Communication*, 33(3), pp.460-480.

Recommended reading:

- a. Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2016. “Explaining Causal Findings Without Bias: Detecting and Assessing Direct Effects.” *American Political Science Review* 110 (3): 512-529. Copy at <http://j.mp/2ox96sU>
- b. Druckman, James N. Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (Ir) relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98.04 (2004): 671-686.
- c. Frimer, Jeremy and Linda Skita. 2018. “The Montagu Principle: Incivility Decreases Politicians’ Public Approval, Even with their Political Base” *Journal of Personality*

- and Social Psychology: Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes.*  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000140>
- d. Hutchings, Vincent L., and Spencer Piston. 2011. "The Determinants and Political Consequences of Prejudice." In Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge University Press. p 306-320.
  - e. Kinder, Donald and Lynn Sanders. 1990. Mimicking Political Debate with Survey Questions. *Social Cognition*. 8(1): 73-103.
  - f. Kinder, Donald R., and Thomas R. Palfrey, eds. *Experimental foundations of political science*. University of Michigan Press, 1993.
  - g. Kuklinski, James H., et al. "Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action." *American Journal of Political Science* (1997): 402-419.
  - h. Miratrix, L., Sekhon, J., Theodoridis, A., & Campos, L. (2018). Worth Weighting? How to Think About and Use Weights in Survey Experiments. *Political Analysis*, 26(3), 275-291. doi:10.1017/pan.2018.1
  - i. Mutz, Diana C. *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton University Press, 2011.
  - j. Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance." *American Political Science Review* (1997): 567-583.

**Assignment:** Rough draft of paper due. Please bring in 2 hard copies to class. I will distribute one to a discussant.

### March 30 – Laboratory experiments

- a. Iyengar, Shanto. "Laboratory Experiments in Political Science" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. *Cambridge Handbook*, p 73-89.
- b. Morton, Rebecca and Kenneth C. Williams. "Electoral systems and strategic voting (laboratory election experiments)" in *Cambridge Handbook*.
- c. Kanthak, Kristin and Jonathan Woon. 2016. Women Don't Run? Election Aversion and Candidate Entry. *American Journal of Political Science*.
- d. Mendelberg, Tali, Christopher F. Karpowitz, and Nicholas Goedert. "Does Descriptive Representation Facilitate Women's Distinctive Voice? How Gender Composition and Decision Rules Affect Deliberation." *American Journal of Political Science* 58.2 (2014): 291-306.
- e. Lieberman, E., & Zhou, Y. (2021). Self-Efficacy and Citizen Engagement in Development: Experimental Evidence from Tanzania. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1-18. doi:10.1017/XPS.2020.47

### Recommended readings:

- a. Albert, et al. (2007). "Are We Nice(R) to Nice(R) People? - an Experimental Analysis." *Experimental Economics* 10 (1): 53-69.
- b. Anderhub, et al. (2002). "An Experimental Study of the Repeated Trust Game with Incomplete Information." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 48 (2): 197-216.

- c. Anderson, et al. (2006). "Induced Heterogeneity in Trust Experiments." *Experimental Economics* 9 (3): 223-235.
- d. Ashraf, et al. (2006). "Decomposing Trust and Trustworthiness." *Experimental Economics* 9 (3): 193-208.
- e. Berg, et al. (1995). "Trust, Reciprocity, and Social History." *Games and Economic Behavior* 10 (1): 122-142.
- f. Bohnet, et al. (2001). "More Order with Less Law: On Contract Enforcement, Trust, and Crowding." *American Political Science Review* 95 (1): 131-144.
- g. Carlin and Love. (2013). "The Politics of Interpersonal Trust and Reciprocity: An Experimental Approach." *Political Behavior* 35 (1): 43-63.
- h. Chaudhuri. (2011). "Sustaining Cooperation in Laboratory Public Goods Experiments: A Selective Survey of the Literature." *Experimental Economics* 14 (1): 47-83.
- i. Chong, Dennis and James Druckman Framing Theory, *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103-126, 2007
- j. Dickson, Eric. "Economics versus Psychology Experiments: Stylization, Incentives, and Deception" in Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. Cambridge Handbook, p 58-72.
- k. Falk, Armin and James J. Heckman, "Lab Experiments Are a Major Source of Knowledge in the Social Sciences" *Science* 23 October 2009: 326 (5952), 535-538.
- l. Habyarimana, et al. (2007). "Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision?" *American Political Science Review* 101 (4): 709-725.
- m. Fehr and Gächter. (2000). "Cooperation and Punishment in Public Goods Experiments." *American Economic Review* 90 (4): 980-994.
- n. Olken. (2010). "Direct Democracy and Local Public Goods: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 243-267.
- o. Ostrom, et al. (1992). "Covenants with and without a Sword: Self-Governance Is Possible." *American Political Science Review* 86 (2): 404-417.
- p. Wilson and Eckel chapter in Druckman, et al. (2011). "Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- q. Wilson and Eckel. (2006). "Judging a Book by Its Cover: Beauty and Expectations in the Trust Game." *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (2): 189-202.

**Assignment:** Peer review due.

#### **April 6.** – Field experiments

- a. Gerber, Alan. "Field experiments in political science" in Cambridge Handbook.
- b. Preece, Jessica and Olga Stoddard. 2015. "Why Women Don't Run: Experimental Evidence in Difference in Political Competition Aversion" *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 117: 296-308.
- c. Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, and Donald P. Green. "Deference, dissent, and dispute resolution: An experimental intervention using mass media to change norms and behavior in Rwanda." *American Political Science Review* 103.04 (2009): 622-644.



- d. Siegel, Alexandra A., and Vivienne Badaan. "Sectarianism: Experimental approaches to reducing sectarian hate speech online." *American Political Science Review* 114.3 (2020): 837-855.

Recommended readings:

- a. Arias, Eric, et al. "Information provision, voter coordination, and electoral accountability: Evidence from Mexican social networks." *American Political Science Review* 113.2, 2019: 475-498.
- b. Broockman, David E., and Donald P. Green. "Do online advertisements increase political candidates' name recognition or favorability? Evidence from randomized field experiments." *Political Behavior* 36.2, 2014: 263- 289.
- c. Coppock, Alexander, Andrew Guess, and John Ternovski. "When treatments are tweets: A network mobilization experiment over Twitter." *Political Behavior* 38.1, 2016: 105-128.
- d. Dunning, Thad, and Lauren Harrison. "Cross-cutting cleavages and ethnic voting: An experimental study of cousinage in Mali." *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 1 (2010): 21-39
- e. Fearon, James D., Macartan Humphreys, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. "Can development aid contribute to social cohesion after civil war? Evidence from a field experiment in post-conflict Liberia." *The American Economic Review* (2009): 287-291.
- e. Foos, Florian, Peter John and Asli Unan. 2021. Progressive campaigns, social media ads and young voters: Null effects from the 2019 UK General Election. Working paper.
- f. Foos, Florian and Alexander Wuttke. 2021. Democratic Persuasion: Strengthening Citizen Commitment to Democracy. Working paper. Hager, Anselm. "Do online ads influence vote choice?." *Political Communication* 36.3, 2019: 376-393.
- g. Foos, Florian, et al. "Does social media promote civic activism? A field experiment with a civic campaign." *Political Science Research and Methods*, 2015: 1-19.
- h. Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. "The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment." *American Political Science Review* (2000): 653-663
- i. Gilligan, Michael J; Benjamin Pasquale, & Cyrus Samii. 2014. "Civil War and Social Cohesion: Lab-in-the-Field Evidence from Nepal." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3):604-619.
- j. Gosnell, Harold F. "An experiment in the stimulation of voting." *The American Political Science Review* 20.4 (1926): 869-874.
- k. Guess, Andrew M., et al. "The consequences of online partisan media." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118.14, 2021.
- l. Hyde, Susan D. "Experimenting in democracy promotion: international observers and the 2004 presidential elections in Indonesia." *Perspectives on Politics* 8, no. 2 (2010): 511-527.
- m. McClendon, Gwenyth. Social Esteem and Participation in Contentious Politics: a Field Experiment at an LGBT Rights Rally. 2014. *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2).
- n. Munger, Kevin. "Tweetment effects on the tweeted: Experimentally reducing racist harassment." *Political Behavior* 39.3, 2017: 629-649.

**Assignment:** Visit Evidence in Governance and Politics (<http://egap.org/>), read a brief about an RCT and bring into class to share.

## April 13– Field experiments II

- a. Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. *Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination*. No. w9873. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003.
- b. Pager, Devah. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108.5 (2003): 937-975.
- c. Adida, Claire. David Latin and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2016. "One Muslim is Enough! Evidence from a Field Experiment in France." *Annals of Economics and Statistics* 121-122
- d. Broockman, David E., and Daniel M. Butler. "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication." *American Journal of Political Science* 61, no. 1 (2017): 208-221.
- e. Peisakhin, Leonid, Arturas Rozenas, and Sergey Sanovich. "Mobilizing opposition voters under electoral authoritarianism: A field experiment in Russia." *Research & Politics* 7, no. 4 (2020): 2053168020970746.

## Topical applications of surveys and experiments -

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

## April 20 – Emotion

- a. Mason, Lilliana. 2016. A Cross-Cutting Calm: How Social Sorting Drives Affective Polarization, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1): 351–377.
- b. Brader, Ted, Nicholas A. Valentino, and Elizabeth Suhay. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat." *American Journal of Political Science*. 52:(4).
- c. Gadarian, Shana Kushner, and Eric Van der Vort. "The gag reflex: Disgust rhetoric and gay rights in American politics." *Political Behavior* 40, no. 2 (2018): 521-543.
- d. Zeitzoff, Thomas. 2014. "Anger, Exposure to Violence, and Intragroup Conflict: A "Lab in the Field" Experiment in Southern Israel." *Political Psychology* 35.3 (2014): 309-335.
- e. Phoenix, Davin L. "Black Hope Floats: Racial Emotion Regulation and the Uniquely Motivating Effects of Hope on Black Political Participation." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 8, no. 2 (2020): 662-685.

Recommended.

- a. Groenendyk, E. W., & Banks, A. J. (2014). Emotional rescue: How affect helps partisans overcome collective action problems. *Political Psychology*, 35(3), 359-378.
- b. Gadarian, Shana and Bethany Albertson 2014. Anxiety, Immigration, and the Search for Information. *Political Psychology*. 35(4):133-164.



## April 27 - Intergroup relations

- a. Enos, Ryan. 2014. Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes. *Proceedings of the National Academy* 111(10): 3699-3704.
- c. Kuklinski, James, Michael Cobb, Martin Gilens. 1997. "Racial Attitudes and the New South" *Journal of Politics*. Vol. 59, No. 2, p. 323-349
- d. MARBLE, W., MOUSA, S. and SIEGEL, A.A., 2021. Can Exposure to Celebrities Reduce Prejudice? The Effect of Mohamed Salah on Islamophobic Behaviors and Attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, pp.1-18.
- e. Choi, Donghyun Danny, Mathias Poertner, and Nicholas Sambanis. "The Hijab Penalty: Feminist Backlash to Muslim Immigrants." *American Journal of Political Science* (2021).

## Recommended

- a. Bracic, Ana. "Reaching the individual: EU Accession, NGOs, and human rights." *American Political Science Review* 110, no. 3 (2016): 530-546.
- b. Klar, Samara. 2018. When Common Identities Decrease Trust: An Experimental Study of Partisan Women. *American Journal of Political Science*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12366>
- c. Klar, Samara, and Alexandra McCoy. "Partisan-Motivated Evaluations of Sexual Misconduct and the Mitigating Role of the# MeToo Movement." *American Journal of Political Science* 65, no. 4 (2021): 777-789.
- d. Hopkins, Daniel, Van Tran, and Abigail Fisher Williamson. 2014. See No Spanish: Language, Local Context, and Attitudes toward Immigration. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. 2(1): 35-51.

## May 4 – Research presentations

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

Some guides for giving excellent conference presentations:

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

**Wednesday, May 11 by 5 pm. Final paper due.**

### *Advanced methods that we won't cover*

- a. Conjoint analysis: Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. "Causal inference in conjoint analysis: understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments." *Political Analysis* 22.1 (2014): 1-30.
- b. Process tracing: Lau, Richard R. "Information search during an election campaign: Introducing a processing-tracing methodology for political scientists." *Political Judgment: Structure and process* (1995): 179-206.
- c. Matching: Sekhon, Jasjeet S. "Opiates for the matches: Matching methods for causal inference." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12 (2009): 487-508.
- d. Matching: Arceneaux, Kevin, Alan S. Gerber, and Donald P. Green. "Comparing experimental and matching methods using a large-scale voter mobilization experiment." *Political Analysis* 14.1 (2006): 37-62.
- e. Field experiments methods: Imai, Kosuke. "Do get-out-the-vote calls reduce turnout? The importance of statistical methods for field experiments." *American Political Science Review* 99.02 (2005): 283-300.
- f. List experiment methods: Blair, Graeme, and Kosuke Imai. "Statistical analysis of list experiments." *Political Analysis* 20.1 (2012): 47-77.
- g. Endorsement experiments: Bullock, Will, Kosuke Imai, and Jacob N. Shapiro. "Statistical analysis of endorsement experiments: Measuring support for militant groups in Pakistan." *Political Analysis* 19.4 (2011): 363-384.

### *Natural experiments*

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

## **COURSE POLICIES**

### **SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

There are many ways to succeed in this class. Cheating and plagiarism are not among them and will not be tolerated. The Syracuse University Academic Integrity Policy holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Students should be familiar with the policy and know that it is their responsibility to learn about instructor and general academic expectations with regard to proper citation of sources in written work. Serious sanctions can result from academic dishonesty of any sort. For more information and the complete policy, see <http://academicintegrity.syr.edu>. Please see me if you have any questions about what constitutes original work. Plagiarism on research papers or the analytical papers will lead to an F for the course.

### **A CADEMIC FREEDOM**

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

## **ACCOMMODATIONS**

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

## **RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES**

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

## **CAMPUS RESOURCES**

There may be times during the semester that you need assistance, academically or otherwise. There are a wide variety of campus resources that may be able to help. Please consider using help when you need it. If you don't know what type of help you need, you can ask me or other faculty.

- **Counseling Center:** <https://ese.syr.edu/bewell/help-a-student/>
- **Writing Center:** <https://thecollege.syr.edu/writing-center/>
- **Tutoring Services:** Center for Learning and Student Success: <http://class.syr.edu/>
- **Financial Counseling:** <http://financialaid.syr.edu/financialliteracy/>
- **Sexual Harassment/Title IX Concerns:** Sheila Johnson-Willis, compliance officer [sjohnson@syr.edu](mailto:sjohnson@syr.edu) (315) 443-0211

- **Palmer Career Center (Maxwell graduate students)**  
<https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/career/>
- **Other personal health resources:** <https://ese.syr.edu/bewell/find-services/>

## **HARRASMENT**

Federal and state law, and University policy prohibit discrimination and harassment based on sex or gender (including sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic/dating violence, stalking, sexual exploitation, and retaliation). If a student has been harassed or assaulted, they can obtain confidential counseling support, 24-hours a day, 7 days a week, from the [Sexual and Relationship Violence Response Team](#) at the Counseling Center (315-443-4715). Incidents of sexual violence or harassment can be reported non-confidentially to the University's Title IX Officer (Sheila Johnson Willis, 315-443-0211, [titleix@syr.edu](mailto:titleix@syr.edu), 005 Steele Hall). Reports to law enforcement can be made to the University's Department of Public Safety (315-443-2224, 005 Sims Hall), the Syracuse Police Department (511 South State Street, Syracuse, New York, 911 in case of emergency or 315-435-3016 to speak with the Abused Persons Unit), or the State Police (844-845-7269). I will seek to keep information you share with me private to the greatest extent possible, but as a professor I have mandatory reporting responsibilities to share with the Title IX office to create a safe campus for all.