Changelog – Hireability and Educational Prestige Questionnaire

1. 12/2/2020 – Provided initial draft to committee
2. 12/9/2020 – Implemented change requests per meeting with Dr. Robin Hanson:
   1. Reword Question 14 so that ‘True’ is a greater than or equal to condition rather than a response of strict preference.
   2. Ask directly about prestige rather than composing prestige of name recognition and quality. Affects Questions 2-10 in Section 2. Wording was later recommended by Bryan.
   3. Support cross-industry comparison through variable credential interrogation. Ie, “thinking about a prestigious credential in your industry…” This is used in Section 3 with vignettes.
   4. Contrast IT with health or law. Both offer alternative learning paths but one is less remote friendly, more demanding of traditional credentials, and engaged in more political entanglement. No special questions are added for this, but additional analysis is provided.
   5. Compare [inward vs outward facing roles](https://blogs.aca-it.be/product-manager-inward-outward/). Solved using Question 15.
   6. Compare direct prestige vs stakeholder prestige. This is also solved using vignettes.
   7. Vignettes also solve the issue where a respondent may not have any name recognition for bootcamps.
      1. In a vignette, we can and do stipulate familiarity. What about the case lacking familiarity? That’s handled in section 2.
3. 12/22/2020 – Implemented change requests per meeting with Dr. Bryan Caplan:
   1. Survey will be 3-part including controls, concrete reference survey, vignette survey. Vignette design papers:
      1. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christiane_Atzmueller/publication/240483121_Experimental_Vignette_Studies_in_Survey_Research/links/58aabf8fa6fdcc0e0798415a/Experimental-Vignette-Studies-in-Survey-Research.pdf>
      2. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0038038587021001008>
      3. Mechanical-Turk embedded JS will randomly send to 1 of 2 surveys; 1 survey has the extended section 1 priming and the other doesn’t
   2. Suggested wording for direct measure of prestige: “How impressed would you be if you heard that someone went to \_\_\_?”
      1. I used “studied at \_\_\_?” so as to distinguish learning at Google from working at Google. I slightly worry that the question doesn’t distinguish partial study from graduation, where sheepskin effects and dropout stigma are things – however the penalty is at least held constant across all providers.
      2. Respond on a scale of 1 to 10. This affects section 2 questions 2-10.

TODO: discuss institutional prestige; amazon, google, facebook are industry leaders with high corporate valuation in addition to name recognition; if they role out a certification then consumers will assume the curriculum is of high quality because these are high quality companies. Prestige can be established in other product categories and transferred into education. This technique will allow normalization of alternative credentials and it is also already happening.

TODO: discuss how to obtain higher prestige; emulate the prestigious or innovate by providing something valued by consumers…this topic is somewhat out-of-scope but partially also in; name recognition moves positively with prestige as does user-rated program quality, but beware survivorship bias in each factor. Notice that user-rated quality is not the same as prestige, but in designing a prestigious program one can gain some advantage by comparing and contrasting highly rated programs and selecting features which correlate to quality.

A Convo w Bryan - Agenda and Notes

12/22/20

Outputs:

1. Reach out to Dr. Klein
2. Update questions
3. Reconfirm Dr. Hanson w Bryan’s approval
4. Officially register for Spring
5. Submit to IRB
6. IRB Permission to go ahead: Robin says gtg pending approval from Bryan
   1. The Privacy and Confidentiality of Prospective Data section in the application says that the dissertation committee will have access to data, so they would need to be added as study staff to this project and have up to date CITI training. If they will NOT have access to the data, please remove mention of that from the application.
      1. Can I tell IRB that only Robin will have access to the raw data?
   2. No permission needed for second change request but FYI.
      1. Please attach the consent form that will be used for this study. Be sure to use the IRB consent template to create your consent form (this can be found under the Designer tab and under the Forms and Templates (Documents for Researchers drop-down menu) on IRBNet and you will edit the last two pages of the document to create your consent form).
7. Discuss Questions
   1. COVID Question(s) – hopefully straightforward
   2. Prestige Questions – see below section
      1. Overall hypothesis: Prestige matters more than accreditation. Therefore, alternative education can normalize through establishment of prestige.
      2. Major concern: Getting an exa
8. Discuss 3rd Committee fulfilment
   1. Recommended in-department faculty
   2. Someone I find – strong preference to within department?
   3. Dr. Klein?

Prestige Questions

Recommended:

1. Cross-industry with a focus on IT and healthcare.
   1. Secondary interest in finance, business, management, and law.
   2. Tertiary interest in all other industries.
   3. Motivated by alignment to Lauren Rivera, author of “Pedigree”

Notes and Considerations:

1. Question 14 is restrictive so use a softer version
2. Should we assume the conceptualization of prestige? Arguably not, so ask directly about prestige too.
   1. For Lauren Rivera, author of Pedigree, prestigious universities are those with elite hiring preference, to boil it down.
   2. I worry that the layperson taking my survey will have another conceptualization.
   3. This motivates asking about “name recognition plus quality.”
   4. I think name recognition plus quality substantively are the functional things we care about when we talk about prestige.
   5. Robin aptly points out that there could be an imperfect relation here.
3. Vignettes or real data? Why not both?
   1. If vignettes, do we ask a respondent to select between candidate vignettes or do we ask a respondent to evaluate traits of interest for one or more candidate vignettes. These could be generated using a template like a Mad Lib.
   2. Optional or out-of-scope: If we exploit both opportunities in 3.a then we can evaluate respondent self-consistency to some degree.
4. Industry and job-level variation
   1. Varied political entanglement
   2. Prestige value. We can include a question on indirect prestige value. Interesting cases of indirect prestige value:
      1. Some firms, industries, or roles may rely intensively on prestige to impress clients.
      2. Some job families lend themselves to performance reviewer familiarity and some don’t. Consider three scenarios:
         1. A Business Analyst hired by a Project Manager. The Project Manager reports to a Senior Project Manager. This job family is entirely familiar with what constitutes a good business or management school or alternative credential.
         2. A Software Engineer hired by a non-technical Project Manager. The Project Manager reports to a non-technical Senior Project Manager.
      3. Some firms or individuals may vary in prestige weighting due to company culture, as a form of slack, or for any other reason.
      4. "Maybe when generalities matter then prestige matters." This would seem to indicate non-technical roles or roles which require switching hats. Management consulting and some business roles might fall in here. Medicine and IT would be largely excluded; maybe less so in law. In line with “general thinking skills / flexible thinking” theory.
5. Whether to specify one industry or take a cross-industry look.
   1. Varied industrial political entanglement
   2. Optional approach: Varied job-level political entanglement (eg attorney > lawyer > paralegal; MD > RN > alternative health / receptionist)

Alternatives:

Meeting w robin

robin

11/11 outline

---

1. Hanson down to IRB. he said hold gift basket until after graduation. Presented Paper topics:

i. skill gap (currently before IRB)

ii. COVID effect

iii. personality and grit effect

2. hanson suggested another topic: studying prestige effects in education.

i. the research question can be framed this way: "Employers hire for prestige [over accreditation or skill]"

ii. prestige is the means by which that catch-22 on alternative education can be overcome; it's not weird if it's prestigious (or, it is good-weird)

...read and reviewed book Pedigree; most prestigious employers; law firms, mgmt, investmnet; ethnographyt; "prestige is everything"

-- prestige..."probe for impression vs whether they can do the job"

- Hanson...perestige in US today

"customer / peer / boss";...marketing, management/executive; b2b people; "outward facing in the organization"...roles where prestige is important.

-which school / which alternative educated thing...strong observer effect.

- inward/vs outward facing roles.

-ordinary college never heard of; is it all about name

"name recognition" - Google curricula.

Justification for US News and CourseReport? "Out of Scope" is my main answer...i can come up w one if needed

\*\*\*

https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/search?\_sort=rank&\_sortDirection=asc

prestigous universities - "best" per us news: https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities

1. princeton

2. harvard

3. columbia

4. [TIE] MIT

4. [TIE] Yale-

prestigious bootcamps - "best" per CourseReport: https://www.coursereport.com/best-coding-bootcamps

\*\*\* BEST REVIEWED (some threshold for statistical integrity; over 200 reviews)

alternative -

known - \*\*\* MOST REVIEWED

\*\*\* appendix with stats on these bootcamps...

\*\*\*

1. use external lists for pop-lvl metrics like prestige

2. but also individual-level measures

3. diff from avg is also an individual-level metric

\*\*\*

high / low

[test telling them high / low?]

2\*2\*2; 8-16

reduction / deflationary analysis / decompositional analysis

---

prestige networks and elite theory may relate to o-ring analysis;

- the idea of irreducible complexity where certain thresholds of productivity and efficiency cannot be arrived at by smooth combination or aggregation of lesser inputs

https://youtu.be/\_70KfdHV7Nk

1. She notes important gender, ethnicity, industry effects

2. Hanson notes job family effects and job supergroup (internal vs external facing). Imo this is related to personality too

3. Mitigation strategy: using structured interviews, scored rubrics, coding or task performance interviews, behavioral, unstructured or conversational, require 2 or more references...derive two metrics there...one is “hoop count” and the other is hard/soft interview style; hard interview style associated with meritocracy and prestige offset; basically prestige hiring is a form of labor market slack. <~THEORY

--- replace williams?

1. john earle from policy school

2. austrian education independent study guy

3. stratmann (caplan has previously urged no though)

4. garret jones?