

GV915-7-SU Research Design 2024-2025

Lecturer and Module Supervisor

Nelson A. Ruiz

Email: nelson.ruiz@essex.ac.uk

Module Administrator

govpgquery@essex.ac.uk

Academic Support Hours

Date/Time: Friday 2-4pm, during

Summer term. Week 30-35

Room: 5.420

Module available for Study Abroad students: Yes ☐ No ☒

ASSESSMENT: This module is assessed by 100% coursework.

LISTEN AGAIN: NO

INSTANT DEADLINE CHECKER – COURSEWORK

SU variant

Assignment Title	Due Date	Coursework Weighting	Feedback Due
Replication proposal composing of:	Week 31:	20% broken into	
-Memo	-Memo and presentation slides: Thursday 01 May (*)	Memo: 15%	Beginning of Week 32
-Presentation	-Presentation: Friday 02 May during class	Presentation: 5%	Presentation feedback in class
“Show me the data”: Data preparation and checks (Data, codebook, and do files/scripts	Week 32: Data, codebook, and do files/scripts uploaded. Thursday 08 May (*)	Formative part of the course	Feedback in class

uploaded the day prior to session)			
<p>Replication Intermediate Report composing of:</p> <p>-Report 1 (part 1)</p> <p>-Presentation and discussion</p> <p>-Extension report (part 2)</p> <p>-Presentation and discussion</p>	<p>Week 33:</p> <p>-Report 1 and presentation slides: Thursday 15 May (*)</p> <p>-Presentation and discussion: Friday 16 May during class</p> <p>Week 34:</p> <p>-Extension report and presentation slides: Thursday 22nd of May (*)</p> <p>-Presentation and discussion: Friday 23rd of May during class</p>	<p>36%</p> <p>Broken into:</p> <p>Report 1: 15%</p> <p>Presentation: 3%</p> <p>Extension report: 15%</p> <p>Presentation: 3%</p>	<p>Report feedback beginning of Week 34</p> <p>Presentation feedback in class</p> <p>Report feedback beginning of Week 35</p> <p>Feedback in class</p>
Replication Paper	<p>Week 35:</p> <p>-Replication paper and presentation slides: Thursday 29th of May (*)</p> <p>Replication paper includes empirical results, the implementation of the extension when doable, and upload <i>both</i> the final paper, the data used, and the code used.</p>	<p>39%</p> <p>Broken into:</p> <p>Replication paper: 36%</p>	End of week 39

	-Presentation and discussion: Friday 30 th of May during class	-Presentation: 3%	-Feedback during class
Comments on peer's replication projects	In class performance	5%	Week 30-35 during class. Please provide comments on others work

(*) Please not all submission are via FASER before 9.45 am

ASSESSMENT

This module is assessed by 100% coursework mark. Coursework includes a replication proposal (20%), a replication report (36%) which includes extension exercises proposed, and a final replication report (39%) which includes the implementation of the extension exercises. These are all intermediate instances of a single replication and extension exercise designed to provide timely formative feedback. Full description of the assignments in page 4..

Replication proposal (20%):

After carefully reading the materials assigned for Week 30, students will select a paper to replicate, following directions given in class (a paper from a list posted on Moodle, or ask for authorisation to work on another paper published in a major political science journal in the past 5 years). Please, make sure that all the data and codes for these papers are available from the authors and/or journal before proposing the article.

This assignment consists of two parts:

1. **Memo (15%):** Students should distribute:

1.a. A short memo including the following information:

1. Article's bibliographical information and abstract.
2. Link to the data and supplementary materials for the article.
3. Link to codes/do files/script employed in the article. Make sure that you have the statistical skills to reproduce the analyses described in the codes.
4. A brief justification of the choice of this article.
5. A brief explanation of potential extensions for this article (i.e., hypothesis). Focus on the potential theoretical implications or importance of the proposed extensions.

2.a. PDF of the article.

Both documents should be **uploaded to FASER** the working day before the session. The lecturer will email these materials to the rest of the class. The rest of the class is required to read the memo associated with the presentation before class.

2. **Presentation (5%)**: Students should prepare a 5-minute presentation highlighting:

- The theoretical background of the paper they are analysing (to what debates, line/s of research, bigger question/s this article is speaking to). Notice that your peers/audience may not be familiar with this area of research.
- A **brief** explanation of the article's theory and empirical test.
- Their ideas about potential extensions for this article. Focus on the (potential) theoretical implications or importance of the proposed extensions.
- **Practice your presentation before the session.** Selecting key pieces of information and timing your work and are important skills for academic presentations.

The presentation should happen during class. Students should have their presentations on the classroom computer **before** the beginning of the session. The objective of this presentation is to give the students the opportunity of stress their goals with the replication and receive more targeted feedback. The class will provide feedback to each project.

The purpose of this assignment is two-fold: First, it gives students the opportunity to defend the selected article and its potential for replication and extension, and to receive (and provide) advice from (to) the rest of the class. Second, it socializes students in the norms of professional presentations and contribution to the work of peers.

Replication intermediate report (36%)

This report should describe all the replication procedures conducted and the findings. The main elements of this report include (1) the **full reproduction** of the article's models (main tables, not in appendices), and (2) **comments on how successful** this replication was, or issues found regarding the robustness of results.

Additionally, the report should include (3) at least one crosscheck of the paper's data with original sources, and (4) one of the following issues: discuss data missingness, discuss alternative operationalisation or measurement for some of the main variables, discuss alternative coding decisions for some of the main variables, discuss alternative modelling choices.

This assignment consists of four parts:

1. Report 1 (15%):

Students should distribute a paper briefly describing the paper to be replicated (one or two paragraphs) and including the elements described above:

1. Full reproduction of main tables (run the scripts or do files on the original data and present the tables).
2. Describe how successful the reproduction of results was.
3. Data sources check (for at least one variable).
4. Innovation: describe your analysis and present results (if appropriate) for one of the following issues
 - a. Eventual data missingness: do you observe issues regarding data missingness? How can this affect the results? How do the authors deal with this issue?
 - b. Alternative operationalisation or measurement for some of the main independent or dependent variables
 - c. Alternative coding decisions for some of the variables (what happens if you use fewer categories, or dichotomise some variables? Would you treat "no answer" differently?
 - d. Alternative modelling choices: Would MLE or OLS estimations be more appropriate? Maybe duration or selection models would match the argument better? Do these choices produce different results?

Although these sections may closely follow the original paper, students are required to write them – **DO NOT COPY AND PASTE. Plagiarism standards also apply to this assignment.** If in doubt, follow the examples listed in Week 30.

2. Presentation and discussion 3%:

Students should prepare a 5 to 7-minute presentation including:

- The research question, and article's hypotheses.
- A brief explanation of the replication exercise, robustness of results.
- The empirical innovation.
- Preliminary remarks (bullet points are acceptable).

The presentation should happen during class. Students should have their presentations on the classroom computer before the beginning of the session. Students must be present to answer questions, and receive and give feedback.

The memo and the power point presentation should be **uploaded to FASER** a working day before the session. The lecturer will email these materials to the rest of the class. The rest of the class is required to read the memo associated with the presentation before class.

3. Extension report (15%):

This report should present and test an additional hypothesis that extends the work being replicated. Based on the article the student has been working with, the student needs to introduce a new (alternative or additional) hypothesis and test it. The empirical test may imply gathering data on a new variable.

The main elements of this report include (1) the theory justification for the new hypothesis

(**“proto-theory”**), (2) a **hypothesis**, (3) a description of the test performed (including

descriptive statistics and sources if a new variable is used), (4) the documentation of the analysis (do file or script), and (5) tables/figures reporting the results of the test.

Students should distribute a paper briefly describing the theoretical extension of the paper in the form of a new hypothesis, including its theoretical justification and an empirical test:

1. (Brief) theoretical justification/argument.
2. Hypothesis. The hypothesis could propose a conditional effect (an interaction), a differential effect for larger or different samples or subsamples, the test for selection effects, or the inclusion of third variables that could be affecting the relationship of interest, among other innovations.
3. Description of new data description (if necessary) and methods.
4. Replication materials.

5. Results

4. Power point presentation and discussion (3%):

Students should prepare a 5 to 7-minute presentation including:

- Hypothesis.
- Statistical work.
- Results.
- Preliminary conclusions.

The presentation should happen during class. Students should have their presentations on the classroom computer before the beginning of the session. Students must be present to answer questions, and receive and give feedback.

The memo and the power point presentation should be **uploaded to FASER** a working day before the session. The lecturer will email these materials to the rest of the class. The rest of the class is required to read the memo associated with the presentation before class.

Replication paper (39%)

Based on the feedback obtained through the class of the replication proposal and replication intermediate report. Students should present a final replication paper with all the empirical results, the implementation of the extensions when doable, and upload *both* the final paper, the data used, and the code used. The replication paper should be able to be replicated itself.

TOP READS

- Online resources: articles and replication materials. See reading list.
- Peers' replication proposals and replication reports.

MODULE DESCRIPTION

This module prepares students to replicate and extend published research. For this module, replication includes, but is not limited to the re-estimation of models using the data and codes provided by the authors. Additionally, students are expected to analyse the data accuracy and appropriateness of the modelling choices; i.e., consulting original sources of the data, and/or using alternative operationalization for key variables, and/or using alternative estimation techniques to assess the robustness of the findings.

For the extension component of this module, students should introduce a theory-informed modification that would allow them to build upon that study, and test it. The hypothesis could propose a separate estimation technique, a conditional effect (an interaction), a differential effect for larger or different samples or subsamples, a different effect after the removal of outliers, the test for selection effects, or the inclusion of third variables that could be affecting the relationship of interest, among other innovations.

This component is not a mechanical data-mining exercise or canned package application approach. Students should theoretically justify the inclusion of this hypothesis or of any empirical innovations or applications of new estimation methods.

Objectives and transferable skills

The aims of this module are:

- To orient and support students' replication and extension of a recent research article. The article must have been published in the past five years in a major political science journal.
- To provide students with the opportunity to consult original sources of the data, and/or use alternative operationalization for key variables, and/or use alternative estimation techniques to assess the robustness of the findings to other operationalization and/or measurement and/or modelling choices.
- To enable students to analyse the robustness and/or limits of generalization of the replicated findings.
- To provide students with the opportunity to propose an additional hypothesis grounded on the theory, and test it. The hypothesis could propose a new methodological approach, a conditional effect (an interaction), a differential effect for larger or different samples or subsamples, a different effect after the removal of outliers, the test for selection effects, or the inclusion of third variables that could be affecting the relationship of interest, among other innovations. This component is not a mechanical data-mining exercise or canned package application. Students should theoretically justify the inclusion of this hypothesis or of any empirical innovations.

By the end of this module, students will be expected to be able to:

1. understand the purpose and importance of replication in social sciences;
2. replicate and extend a recent research article;
3. evaluate critically, provide constructive feedback, and propose avenues for further research to peers and to extant research.

Key Skills:

1. Learn to read core political science texts quickly and extract key points of information from them.
2. Learn to concisely summarize and write about key concepts in political science
3. Learn to develop questions of interest to modern political science
4. Learn to structure a political science research paper
5. Matching appropriate designs to research questions
6. Develop a coherent research project in Political Science

MODULE STRUCTURE AND TEACHING

The module consists of five meetings to support students in the process of replicating one already published paper, and implementing at least one change to that paper to assess the robustness of its findings or to test a new hypothesis.

Sequential, formative assessments are designed to discuss and provide feedback on each of the stages of the process of replicating and extending published empirical research. This allows students to reinforce concepts of research design and to practice different forms of communicating research.

Students must work individually. Each student should present their own Replication proposal, Replication Intermediate Proposal, and Final Replication Report.

What we expect of you during lecture and classes:

- To attend all lectures and classes after having done the required reading
- To pay attention and take notes as necessary.
- To think about the readings and lectures notes before the class and be ready to discuss them: try to identify the key assumptions in the texts; map the structure of the argument; underline the conclusions. Highlight to yourself points you don't understand. (If you don't understand it, there's great likelihood others have not understood it either, so don't be shy to ask.) Ask yourself whether you agree with the text, whether you can identify weaknesses or gaps in the argument, and what could someone who disagrees with it argue against it.
- To offer your participation as required (answering questions, asking questions etc.). Learning about and discussing these texts is a communal endeavour and it is a matter of good citizenship to contribute. Further, part of what we want you to achieve, and what we mark you for, is clear and confident oral presentation. You are expected to answer questions, raise new points, and contribute to the progression of discussion in class.

Classroom courtesy:

Treat your classmates and professors with respect by avoiding distractions.

Be on time. Arriving late for class or leaving early is bad for you and for other students. Not only you may miss important materials, but you also interrupt the class dynamics.

Turn off your cell phone. Unless medical or family reasons makes it necessary for you to keep your phone visible, the instructor requests to keep phones off and out of sight.

Bring the readings to class. It is very helpful for class dynamics if students have access to the class materials and/or their notes.

How to submit your essay using FASER

You will be able to access the online submission system via your myEssex portal or via <https://FASER.essex.ac.uk>. FASER allows you to store your work-in-progress. This facility provides you with an ideal place to keep partially completed copies of your work and ensures

that no work, even drafts, is lost. If you have problems uploading your coursework, you should contact ltt@essex.ac.uk. You may find it helpful to look at the FASER guide <https://faser.essex.ac.uk/Student/Help>. If you have any questions about FASER, please contact your administrator or refer to the handbook.

Under NO circumstances is your coursework to be emailed to the administrators or the lecturer. This will NOT be counted as a submission.

Coursework deadline policy for undergraduates

There is a single policy at the University of Essex for the late submission of coursework in undergraduate courses. Essays must be uploaded before 09.45 on the day of the deadline.

All coursework submitted after the deadline will receive a mark of zero. The mark of zero shall stand unless the student submits satisfactory evidence of extenuating circumstances that indicate that the student was unable to submit the work prior to the deadline. For further information on late submission of coursework and extenuating circumstances procedures please refer to <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/ext-circ.aspx>.

Essay feedback will be given via FASER.

ALL submissions should be provided with a coversheet (Available from Moodle).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a very serious academic offence and whether done wittingly or unwittingly it is your responsibility. **Ignorance is no excuse!** The result of plagiarism could mean receiving a mark of zero for the piece of coursework. In some cases, the rules of assessment are such that a mark of zero for a single piece of coursework could mean that you will fail your degree. If it is a very serious case, you could be required to withdraw from the University. It is important that you understand right from the start of your studies what good academic practice is and adhere to it throughout your studies.

All work submitted to the Department will be run through plagiarism detection software and lecturers are very good at spotting work that is not your own. **Plagiarism gets you nowhere: DON'T DO IT!**

Following the guidance on referencing correctly will help you avoid plagiarism.

Please familiarise yourself with the University's policy on academic offences:

<https://www.essex.ac.uk/student/exams-and-coursework/about-academic-offences>

Extenuating circumstances for late submission of coursework

The university has guidelines on what is acceptable as extenuating circumstances for later submission of coursework. If you need to make a claim, you should upload your coursework to FASER and submit a late submission of coursework form which can be found here: <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/late-submission.aspx>. This must be done within seven days of the deadline. FASER closes for all deadlines after seven days. The Late Submissions committee will decide whether your work should be marked, and you will be notified of the outcome.

If you experience significant longer-term extenuating circumstances that prevent you from submitting your work either by the deadline or within seven days of the deadline, you should submit an Extenuating Circumstances Form for the Board of Examiners to consider at the end of the year <http://www.essex.ac.uk/students/exams-and-coursework/ext-circ.aspx>.

SCHEDULE OF TOPICS AND READINGS

READINGS

Required readings:

The role of replication in graduate training:

- King, Gary. 1995. Replication, Replication. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28: 444–452. <http://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/replication.pdf>
- Janz, Nicole. 2016. "Bringing the Gold Standard into the Classroom: Replication in University Teaching." *International Studies Perspectives* 17 (4): 392-407. <https://academic.oup.com/isp/article/17/4/392/2528285>

The importance of replication for research:

- Replication Forum. 2016. *International Studies Perspectives* 17(4). **Read pages 361 – 391, 439-44.**
- Symposium on data access and research transparency. 2014. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(1).

Some high-profile examples:

- Misunderstandings About the Regression Discontinuity Design in the Study of Close Elections. Brandon de la Cuesta, and Kosuke Imai. ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL SCIENCE Volume 19, 2016
- Response: On the Validity of the Regression Discontinuity Design for Estimating Electoral Effects: New Evidence from Over 40,000 Close Races. Andrew C. Eggers, Anthony Fowler, Jens Hainmueller, Andrew B. Hall, James M. Snyder Jr. *American Journal of Political Science*
- Broockman, David, Joshua Kalla, and Peter Aronow. 2015. Irregularities in Lacour (2014). http://stanford.edu/~dbroock/broockman_kalla_aronow_lq_irregularities.pdf
- Janz, Nicole. 2014. Replication scandal: We might not need austerity measures after all <https://politicalsciencereplication.wordpress.com/2013/04/17/replication-scandal-we-might-not-need-austerity-measures-after-all/>

Recommended readings:

Examples:

- Bell, Mark and Nicholas Miller. 2015. "Questioning the Effect of Nuclear Weapons on Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(1):74-92.

- Chapman, Terrence L., and Stephen Chaudoin. 2013. "Ratification Patterns and the International Criminal Court." *International Studies Quarterly* 57: 400-09.
- Chen, Frederick R. 2021. "Extended Dependence: Trade, Alliances, and Peace." *The Journal of Politics* 83:1, 246-259
- Haber, Stephen, and Victor Menaldo. 2011. "Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism? A Reappraisal of the Resource Curse." *American Political Science Review* 105: 1-26.
- Tomz, Michael, Judith L. Goldstein, and Douglas Rivers. 2007. "Do We Really Know That the WTO Increases Trade? Comment." *American Economic Review* 97: 2005-18.

On replication

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Nils Petter Gleditsch, Patrick James, Gary King, Claire Metelits, James Lee Ray, Bruce Russett, Håvard Strand, and Brandon Valeriano. 2003. "Symposium on Replication in International Studies Research." *International Studies Perspectives* 4: 72-107.
- Baker, Monya. 2016. "Is There a Reproducibility Crisis? A Nature survey lifts the lid on how researchers view the 'crisis rocking science and what they think will help" *Nature* 533 (7604):452– 54.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Ragnhild Nordås, and Henrik Urdal. 2017. "Peer Review and Replication Data: Best Practice from Journal of Peace Research." *College & Research Libraries* 78.
- King, Gary. 2006. "Publication, Publication." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39: 119–25.
- Camerer, Colin F., Anna Dreber, Eskil Forsell, Teck-Hua Ho, Jürgen Huber, Magnus Johannesson, and Michael Kirchler, et al. 2016. "Evaluating Replicability of Laboratory Experiments in Economics." *Science* 351: 1433–1436.
- Coppock, Alexander. 2018. "Generalizing from Survey Experiments Conducted on Mechanical Turk: A Replication Approach." *Political Science Research and Methods*: 1-16.

Replication beyond quantitative social sciences:

- Flake, Jessica Kay, Ian J. Davidson, Octavia Wong, and Jolynn Pek. 2022. "Construct validity and the validity of replication studies: A systematic review." *American Psychologist* 77.4: 576. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001006>
- Freese, Jeremy, and David Peterson. 2017. "Replication in Social Science." *Annual Review of Sociology* 43: 147-165. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053450>
- Jensen, Theis Ingerslev, Bryan Kelly, and Lasse Heje Pedersen. 2023. "Is there a replication crisis in finance?." *The Journal of Finance* 78.5: 2465-2518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13249>.
- Nosek, Brian A., and Timothy M. Errington. 2020. "What is Replication?." *PLoS biology* 18.3: e3000691. <https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000691>
- Schmidt, Stefan. 2009. "Shall We Really Do It Again? The Powerful Concept of Replication is Neglected in the Social Sciences." *Review of general psychology* 13.2:90-100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015108>
- Tuval-Mashiach, Rivka. 2021. "Is replication relevant for qualitative research?." *Qualitative Psychology* 8.3: 365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000217>

Required readings:

- Peers' replication proposal memos

RECOMMENDED PAPERS FOR REPLICATION (*) (**) (***)

(*) These are papers that address current debates, or use interesting/new data, or that have potential for publishable replication or extension.

(**) Students can propose a different article, but need to get approval from the lecturer before proceeding. The proposed article needs to have been published **in the past five years in a major political science journal**, and the authors made available data and codes for replication.

(***) Even for recommended papers, **it is the student's responsibility** to make sure that all the data and codes for these papers are available from the authors and/or journal before proposing the article. Chek the Harvard Dataverse: <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/>

- Aklin, Michael and Kern, Andreas. 2021. "The Side Effects of Central Bank Independence." *American Journal of Political Science*, 65: 971-987.
- Arana Araya, Ignacio, Melanie M. Hughes, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán. 2021. "Judicial Reshuffles and Women Justices in Latin America." *American Journal of Political Science*, 65: 373-388.
- Arrington, Nancy, Bass, Leeann, Glynn, Adam, Staton, Jeffrey. K., Delgado, Brian and Lindberg, Staffan I. 2021. "Constitutional Reform and the Gender Diversification of Peak Courts," *American Political Science Review*, 115(3), pp. 851–868
- Carcelli, Shannon P. 2024. "Bureaucratic Structure and Compliance with International Agreements." *American Journal of Political Science*, 68: 177-192.
- Carey Sabine C. and Anita R. Gohdes. 2021. "Understanding Journalist Killings." *The Journal of Politics* 83:4, 1216-1228
- Chen, Frederick R. 2021. "Extended Dependence: Trade, Alliances, and Peace." *The Journal of Politics* 83:1, 246-259
- Cormier, Ben, and Natalya Naqvi. 2023. "Delegating discipline: how indexes restructured the political economy of sovereign bond markets." *The Journal of Politics* 85.4: 1501-1515.
- Dolan Lindsay R, Milner Helen V. 2023. "Low-Skilled Liberalizers: Support for Free Trade in Africa." *International Organization* 77(4):848-870.
- Escobar-Lemmon, Maria C., Valerie J. Hoekstra, Alice J. Kang, and Miki Caul Kittilson. 2021. "Breaking the Judicial Glass Ceiling: The Appointment of Women to High Courts Worldwide." *The Journal of Politics* 83:2, 662-674
- Fourniaies, Alexander. 2021. "How Do Campaign Spending Limits Affect Elections? Evidence from the United Kingdom 1885–2019." *American Political Science Review*, 115(2), pp. 395–411. New dataset.
- Håkansson, Sandra. 2021. "Do Women Pay a Higher Price for Power? Gender Bias in Political Violence in Sweden." *The Journal of Politics* 83:2, 515-531

- Hegre, Håvard, Lisa Hultman, and Håvard Mokleiv Nygård. 2019. "Evaluating the conflict-reducing effect of UN peacekeeping operations." *The Journal of Politics* 81.1: 215-232.
- Jung, Yoo Sun, Erica Owen, and Gyu Sang Shim. 2021. "Heterogeneity in How Investors Respond to Disputes: Greenfield Foreign Direct Investment and Coindustrial Disputes." *The Journal of Politics* 83:4, 1260-1274
- Karpowitz, Christopher F., Tyson King-Meadows, J. Quin Monson, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2021. "What Leads Racially Resentful Voters to Choose Black Candidates?." *The Journal of Politics* 83:1, 103-121
- Malis, Matt and Smith, Alastair. 2021. "State Visits and Leader Survival." *American Journal of Political Science*, 65: 241-256.
- Orr, Lilla V., Anthony Fowler, and Gregory A. Huber. 2023. "Is Affective Polarization Driven by Identity, Loyalty, or Substance?." *American Journal of Political Science* 67.4: 948-962.
- Prorok, Alyssa K, and Deniz Cil. 2022. "Cheap Talk or Costly Commitment? Leader Statements and the Implementation of Civil War Peace Agreements." *Journal of Peace Research* 59(3): 409– 24.
- Quinn Dennis P, Sattler Thomas, Weymouth Stephen. 2023. "Do Exchange Rates Influence Voting? Evidence from Elections and Survey Experiments in Democracies.' *International Organization* 77(4):789-823. doi:10.1017/S002081832300022X
- Shoub, Kelsey, Katelyn E. Stauffer, Miyeon Song. 2021. "Do Female Officers Police Differently? Evidence from Traffic Stops." *American Journal of Political Science*, 65: 755-769.