

# Domestic Politics and International Relations Survey Experiments

## Basics

**Instructor:** Tobias Heinrich ([heinricht@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:heinricht@mailbox.sc.edu) – [www.theinrich.net](http://www.theinrich.net))

**Time and place:** POLI 391, University of South Carolina, Spring 2016.

**Class:** Mondays and Wednesdays, 3.55–5.10pm, Humanities Classroom 314.

**Office hour:** Wednesdays, 2.30–3.30pm in Gambrell 333. I will usually be available for a bit right before and after class as well. You can also schedule alternative times with me through email.

## Outline

First, contrary to what one might encounter on CNN on a regular basis, domestic politics are central, fundamental in today's understanding of international relations. Scholars very often focus on political institutions, public opinion, interest groups, and elections in order to explain onset of armed conflict, the imposition of economic sanctions, the restrictions of migration, the delivery of foreign aid, etc. That justifies the importance and appropriateness of the first, substantive part of this class' title.

Second, undergraduate political science courses often diverge quite a bit from political science research, even within the same instructor. Survey experiments are an excellent vehicle to narrow the gap. They first let student conduct their own research so that they not only read about existing reseach. Second, the research steps can actually carried out by students without years of graduate training. This justifies the second part of the title of the course.

This course revolves around a small number of student groups pitching, designing, carrying out, and analyzing their own survey experiments. Actual survey-takers from across the United States will be recruited so that actual, valid data can be analyzed at the end. As the topics and research questions of the groups can be anything that connects domestic politics and international relations, students' chosen topics will determine the substantive questions discussed in class.

If you actively and meticulously participate in this course, you will learn

- how to coherently think in a structured way through political issues;
- about a broad range of how domestic politics affect international relations;
- how to design, carry out, and analyze a survey experiment;
- to think more like a (social) scientist and much less like a journalist or talking head.

---

Date of this syllabus: January 11, 2016.

## Required Materials

Everything needed in class will either be freely available online, be posted on Blackboard, or accessible via USC's subscriptions of academic journals.

## Grades and Grading

Your grade will be comprised of several contributions which follow the process of research. **First**, each student writes out a crude research idea (including pitch, question, survey design, randomization). (Due January 25; weight of 1.) **Second**, each student's crude research idea will be constructively criticized by two other students. (Due January 27; weight of 1.) **Third**, after reviewing all research ideas and their respective critiques, a small number of groups should form to refine (and to ultimately conduct) the research idea. That is, the initial idea should be rewritten, extended, and subsequently presented in class. (Due February 15; weight of 2.) **Fourth**, taking in the comments from the presentation, a first draft of the research proposal has to be written and presented. (Due March 21; weight of 3.) **Fifth**, the final draft of the research proposal lays out the exact experimental design which will then be implemented. It has to address suggestions from the earlier presentation. (Due March 28; weight of 3.) **Sixth**, the final paper augments the final research proposal with the analysis of the data and conclusion. (Due April 18; weight of 3.) **Seventh**, survey involves human subjects and for such research, the researcher has to obey laws and university policies. Therefore, you have to pass online tests about research ethics and the treatment of human subjects. (Due March 16; weight of 1.)

**Also**, throughout the semester, class will start off with one or two short presentations of some published survey experiment articles. The exact format (solo? in groups?) is up for discussion. Each student should expect to do this 3–4 times over the course of the semester. (Weight of 1 for the average grade.)

**Optionally**, there is a final test that students can take which will primarily be short answers and various multiple choice questions. (Due May 6; weight of 3.)

Everything in this class will be graded on a scale of 0–100. Your final grade will simply be the weighted average (note the weights mentioned above) of all these contributions.

I will use the following grading scale to map the final grade-points to letter grades. A 92-100, B+ 87-91, B 80-86, C+ 77-79, C 70-76, D+ 67-69, D 60-66, and F 0-59. Standard rounding rules apply. If you choose to turn in your work late, then you will lose five points every 12 hours. Unexcused no-shows for presentations get a zero.

Assignments and examination work are expected to be the sole effort of the student or student group submitting the work. Students are expected to follow the University of South Carolina Honor Code and should expect that every instance of a suspected violation will be reported. Students found responsible for violations of the Code will be subject to academic penalties under the Code in addition to whatever disciplinary sanctions are applied. Cheating on a test or copying someone else's work, will result in a zero for the work, possibly a grade of F in the course, and, in accordance with University policy, be referred to the University Committee for Academic Responsibility and may result in expulsion from the University.

You are expected to be in class on time and be there every time as attending class is an integral part in learning the material. Further, missing class when your classmates carry out their presentations is simply rude. That said, no attendance will be taken so that there is no formal

disadvantage from not showing up. I firmly believe that missing classes will adversely affect your learning and thereby your grade. However, if you fail to show up when you are supposed to present something, you will receive a zero even if your fellow group members present well.

Reading the assigned material and attending class are crucial and not substitutable for each other. Some material in the readings are starting points for the content of the lectures; others will be dissected meticulously in lectures. There will also be lectures without any previous grounding in readings. Your learning and thereby your grade will require close attention to lectures and readings.

Politics is inherently a social phenomenon, and thereby discussions about it are as well. I encourage every student to voice objections, questions, critique, and dissatisfaction with the presented material as well as with the instructor's and other students' views on the material. There are only three prerequisites: the comments have to be thought-out before voiced, be respectful, and must not aim to disrupt the course for disruption's sake.

Last, in light of debates around "micro-aggression", let me clear: I cannot rule out that class discussions will challenge students' pre-existing beliefs. Consider this syllabus an omnibus trigger warning for the entire semester.

Reasonable accommodations are available for students with a documented disability. If you have a disability and may need accommodations to fully participate in this class, contact the Office of Student Disability Services: 777-6142, TDD 777-6744, email [sads@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:sads@mailbox.sc.edu), or stop by LeConte College Room 112A. All accommodations must be approved through the Office of Student Disability Services.

## A note on data

Once the survey experiments are fielded, students will obtain actual data from respondents. I encourage students to make the data available for everyone to use eventually. Data should not be proprietary in any sense. This is roughly the norm in social science.

## Course Schedule

The syllabus is very likely to be changed by the instructor. If you are unclear about anything, just ask. Talk to the instructor early about concerns.

**January 11:** Howdy.

**January 13:** Surveys, IR, research, experiments.

- Alex Mintz, Yi Yang, and Rose Mc Dermott. Experimental approaches to international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2):493–501, 2011
- Susan D Hyde. Experiments in international relations: Lab, survey, and field. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18:403–424, 2015
- Dustin Tingley. Survey research in international political economy: motivations, designs, methods. *International Interactions*, 40(3):443–451, 2014

**January 18:** No class as it's MLK Day.

**January 20:** Surveying the wide world of survey experiments in IR. *Read 5+ articles from those*

listed at the end of the syllabus and write a quick summary for each for yourself. What is the research question? Why does the answer to the question matter? Why are the authors using survey experiments? Who is being surveyed? Describe the survey and the experiment.

**January 25:** Approaching the idea of experiments, Day I. *Crude research idea is due. Start a new thread in the “Crude research idea” thread on Blackboard.*

**January 27:** Approaching the idea of experiments, Day II. *Critiques of two crude research ideas are due. Leave critiques as replies in threads on Blackboard. Which idea, maybe not your own, interests you the most?*

**February 1:** Approaching the idea of experiments, Day III. *Form groups in class.*

**February 3:** What do politicians do?

- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Alastair Smith, *The Dictator’s Handbook*. Chapters 1–3. On Blackboard.

**February 8:** Mass public opinion and politics.

- Brandice Canes-Wrone. From mass preferences to policy. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18:147–165, 2015

**February 10:** Mass public opinion and foreign policy.

- John H Aldrich, Christopher Gelpi, Peter Feaver, Jason Reifler, and Kristin Thompson Sharp. Foreign policy and the electoral connection. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:477–502, 2006
- Matthew A Baum and Philip BK Potter. The relationships between mass media, public opinion, and foreign policy: Toward a theoretical synthesis. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11:39–65, 2008

**February 15:** Present refined research ideas, Day I. *Upload document to Blackboard (“Refined research idea”) by class time.*

**February 17:** Present refined research ideas, Day II.

**February 22:** Reading and discussing (macro) research on the chosen topics, Day I.

**February 24:** Reading and discussing (macro) research on the chosen topics, Day II.

**February 29** (yes): Reading and discussing (macro) research on the chosen topics, Day III.

**March 2:** Field experiments.

- Michael G Findley, Daniel L Nielson, and Jason Campbell Sharman. Using field experiments in international relations: A randomized study of anonymous incorporation. *International Organization*, 67(4):657–693, 2013

**March 7:** No class as it’s Spring Break.

**March 9:** No class as it’s Spring Break.

**March 14:** Lab experiments.

**March 16:** No class as it’s ISA. *Take CITI online certification.*

**March 21:** Present research proposals in class, Day I. *Upload document to “Research proposals” on Blackboard by class time.*

**March 23:** Present research proposals in class, Day II.

**March 28:** Using the internet for surveys. *Final research proposals are due; upload to Blackboard under “Research proposals (final version)”.*

- Read up on what Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) is.
- Winter Mason and Siddharth Suri. Conducting behavioral research on amazons mechanical turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(1):1–23, 2012
- Adam J Berinsky, Gregory A Huber, and Gabriel S Lenz. Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com’s mechanical turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3):351–368, 2012

**March 30:** Analyzing surveys, Day I.

**April 4:** Analyzing surveys, Day II.

**April 6:** Analyzing surveys, Day III.

**April 11:** Analyzing surveys, Day IV.

**April 13:** Buffer class.

**April 18:** Presenting projects and analyses, Day I. *Upload final paper to Blackboard under the eponymous folder.*

**April 20:** Presenting projects and analyses, Day II.

**April 25:** ... and it’s a wrap! *Optional final is posted on Blackboard.*

**May 6:** *Last day to complete optional final on Blackboard.*

## Some sample literature

### Economic policies and survey experiments

- Martin Ardanaz, M Murillo, and Pablo M Pinto. Sensitivity to issue framing on trade policy preferences: Evidence from a survey experiment. *International Organization*, 67(2):411–437, 2013
- Timothy T Hellwig, Eve M Ringsmuth, and John R Freeman. The american public and the room to maneuver: Responsibility attributions and policy efficacy in an era of globalization. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(4):855–880, 2008
- David H Bearce and Kim-Lee Tuxhorn. When are monetary policy preferences egocentric? evidence from american surveys and an experiment. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2015
- Nathan M Jensen, Edmund Malesky, Mariana Medina, and Ugur Ozdemir. Pass the bucks: credit, blame, and the global competition for investment. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(3):433–447, 2014
- Sean D Ehrlich and Eddie Hearn. Does compensating the losers increase support for trade? an experimental test of the embedded liberalism thesis. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 10(2):149–164, 2014
- Timothy W Taylor. The electoral salience of trade policy: Experimental evidence on the effects of welfare and complexity. *International Interactions*, 41(1):84–109, 2015
- Xiaobo Lü, Kenneth Scheve, and Matthew J Slaughter. Inequity aversion and the international distribution of trade protection. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3):638–654, 2012
- Michael M Bechtel, Jens Hainmueller, and Yotam Margalit. Preferences for international redistribution: The divide over the eurozone bailouts. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(4):835–856, 2014
- Jens Hainmueller, Michael J Hiscox, and Sandra Sequeira. Consumer demand for fair trade: Evidence from a multistore field experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(2):242–256, 2015
- Stephen Chaudoin. Promises or policies? an experimental analysis of international agreements and audience reactions. *International Organization*, 68(1):235–256, 2014
- Michael J Hiscox. Through a glass and darkly: Framing effects and individuals attitudes towards international trade. *International Organization*, 60(3):755–780, 2006
- Megumi Naoi and Ikuo Kume. Explaining mass support for agricultural protectionism: Evidence from a survey experiment during the global recession. *International Organization*, 65(4):771–795, 2011
- Raymond Hicks, Helen V Milner, and Dustin Tingley. Trade policy, economic interests, and party politics in a developing country: The political economy of cafta-dr. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(1):106–117, 2014

## Migration and survey experiments

- Jens Hainmueller and Michael J Hiscox. Attitudes toward highly skilled and low-skilled immigration: Evidence from a survey experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1):61–84, 2010
- Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J Hopkins. The hidden american immigration consensus: A conjoint analysis of attitudes toward immigrants. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2014
- Ted Brader, Nicholas A Valentino, and Elizabeth Suhay. What triggers public opposition to immigration? anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4):959–978, 2008
- Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J Hopkins. Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17, 2014

## Foreign aid and survey experiments

- Andy Baker. Race, paternalism, and foreign aid: Evidence from us public opinion. *American Political Science Review*, 109(1):93–109, 2015
- Lauren Prather. Values at the water’s edge: Social welfare values and foreign aid. 2014. On Blackboard. On Blackboard.
- Lauren Prather. Transnational ties and support for international redistribution. 2014. On Blackboard
- Simone Dietrich and Matthew S Winters. Foreign aid and government legitimacy. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, pages 1–8, 2015 On Blackboard.
- Tobias Heinrich and Yoshiharu Kobayashi. How do people evaluate aid to nasty regimes? 2015. On Blackboard.

## Armed conflict and survey experiments

- Geoffrey PR Wallace. International law and public attitudes toward torture: An experimental study. *International Organization*, 67(1):105–140, 2013
- Geoffrey PR Wallace. Martial law? military experience, international law, and support for torture. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(3):501–514, 2014
- Douglas L Kriner and Francis X Shen. Reassessing american casualty sensitivity the mediating influence of inequality. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2013
- Stephen Chaudoin. Promises or policies? an experimental analysis of international agreements and audience reactions. *International Organization*, 68(1):235–256, 2014
- Seiki Tanaka. The microfoundations of territorial disputes: Evidence from a survey experiment in japan. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 2015

- Jason Lyall, Graeme Blair, and Kosuke Imai. Explaining support for combatants during wartime: A survey experiment in afghanistan. *American Political Science Review*, 107(4):679–705, 2013
- C Christine Fair, Neil Malhotra, and Jacob N Shapiro. Democratic values and support for militant politics evidence from a national survey of pakistan. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2013
- James D Fearon, 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*, pages 287–291, 2009
- Andrew W Bausch. Democracy and war effort: An experiment. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2015
- Atsushi Tago and Maki Ikeda. An ‘a’ for effort: experimental evidence on un security council engagement and support for us military action in japan. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(2):391–410, 2015
- Robert F Trager and Lynn Vavreck. The political costs of crisis bargaining: Presidential rhetoric and the role of party. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3):526–545, 2011
- Daryl G Press, Scott D Sagan, and Benjamin A Valentino. Atomic aversion: experimental evidence on taboos, traditions, and the non-use of nuclear weapons. *American Political Science Review*, 107(1):188–206, 2013
- William A Boettcher and Michael D Cobb. Echoes of vietnam? casualty framing and public perceptions of success and failure in iraq. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50(6):831–854, 2006
- William A Boettcher and Michael D Cobb. “dont let them die in vain casualty frames and public tolerance for escalating commitment in iraq. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53(5):677–697, 2009
- Joseph M Grieco, Christopher Gelpi, Jason Reifler, and Peter D Feaver. Lets get a second opinion: International institutions and american public support for war. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2):563–583, 2011
- Graeme AM Davies and Robert Johns. Audience costs among the british public: the impact of escalation, crisis type, and prime ministerial rhetoric. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(4):725–737, 2013
- Michael Tomz. Domestic audience costs in international relations: An experimental approach. *International Organization*, 61(4):821–840, 2007
- Michael Tomz and Jessica Weeks. Public opinion and the democratic peace. *American Political Science Review*, 107(4):849–865, 2013
- Daniel Corstange and Nikolay Marinov. Taking sides in other peoples elections: the polarizing effect of foreign intervention. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3):655–670, 2012

## Terrorism, counterterrorism, and survey experiments

- Andrew W Bausch, Joao R Faria, and Thomas Zeitzoff. Warnings, terrorist threats and resilience: A laboratory experiment. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 30(5):433–451, 2013
- Daniel G Arce, Rachel TA Croson, and Catherine C Eckel. Terrorism experiments. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48(3):373–382, 2011
- Blake E Garcia and Nehemia Geva. Security versus liberty in the context of counterterrorism: An experimental approach. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 2014
- Leonie Huddy, Stanley Feldman, Charles Taber, and Gallya Lahav. Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American journal of political science*, 49(3):593–608, 2005
- Cindy D Kam and Donald R Kinder. Terror and ethnocentrism: Foundations of american support for the war on terrorism. *Journal of Politics*, 69(2):320–338, 2007
- Marc Hetherington and Elizabeth Suhay. Authoritarianism, threat, and americans support for the war on terror. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3):546–560, 2011
- Shana Kushner Gadarian. The politics of threat: How terrorism news shapes foreign policy attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(02):469–483, 2010
- Andrew W Bausch and Thomas Zeitzoff. Citizen information, electoral incentives, and provision of counter-terrorism: An experimental approach. *Political Behavior*, pages 1–26, 2014
- Deborah A Small, Jennifer S Lerner, and Baruch Fischhoff. Emotion priming and attributions for terrorism: Americans’ reactions in a national field experiment. *Political Psychology*, 27(2):289–298, 2006

## Environmental policy and survey experiments

- Thomas Bernauer, Robert Gampfer, and Aya Kachi. European unilateralism and involuntary burden-sharing in global climate politics: A public opinion perspective from the other side. *European Union Politics*, 15(1):132–151, 2014
- Dustin Tingley and Michael Tomz. Conditional cooperation and climate change. *Comparative Political Studies*, 2013
- Michael M Bechtel and Kenneth F Scheve. Mass support for global climate agreements depends on institutional design. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(34):13763–13768, 2013
- Robert Gampfer, Thomas Bernauer, and Aya Kachi. Obtaining public support for north-south climate funding: Evidence from conjoint experiments in donor countries. *Global Environmental Change*, 29:118–126, 2014
- Robert Gampfer. Do individuals care about fairness in burden sharing for climate change mitigation? evidence from a lab experiment. *Climatic change*, 124(1-2):65–77, 2014

## Various other topics and survey experiments

- Tobias Heinrich, Yoshiharu Kobayashi, and Timothy M. Peterson. Sanction consequences and citizen support: A survey experiment. On Blackboard
- Michael G Findley, Daniel L Nielson, and Jason Campbell Sharman. Using field experiments in international relations: A randomized study of anonymous incorporation. *International Organization*, 67(4):657–693, 2013
- Dawn Brancati. The determinants of us public opinion towards democracy promotion. *Political Behavior*, 36(4):705–730, 2014
- Michael G Findley, Daniel L Nielson, and JC Sharman. Causes of noncompliance with international law: A field experiment on anonymous incorporation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1):146–161, 2015
- Susan D Hyde. Experimenting in democracy promotion: international observers and the 2004 presidential elections in indonesia. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2):511–527, 2010
- Sarah Sunn Bush and Amaney A Jamal. Anti-americanism, authoritarian politics, and attitudes about women’s representation: Evidence from a survey experiment in jordan. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(1):34–45, 2015
- Daniel Corstange. Anti-american behavior in the middle east: Evidence from a field experiment in lebanon. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1), 2016
- Yotam Margalit. Lost in globalization: International economic integration and the sources of popular discontent1. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(3):484–500, 2012