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In 2011, we coedited, along with Jim Kuklinski and Skip Lupia, the Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science. The broad scope of that volume helped convince a skeptical discipline that experiments had arrived in political science. A decade later, experiments have quickly evolved from being an accepted method to being a primary method. The substantive, methodological, and epistemological advances are apparent in every subfield. This volume covers those advances.
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Our hope is this volume spurs another decade, if not more, of important advances in experimental political science.
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