

Session II

Survey Experiments in

Context

Thomas J. Leeper

Government Department
London School of Economics and Political Science

31 January 2017

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Form groups of 3 and share the survey-experiment examples you found on TESS.

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Beyond One-shot Designs

- Surveys can be used as a measurement instrument for a field treatment or a manipulation applied in a different survey panel wave
 - 1 Measure effect duration in two-wave panel
 - 2 Solicit pre-treatment outcome measures in a two-wave panel
 - 3 Measure effects of field treatment in post-test only design
 - 4 Randomly encourage field treatment in pre-test and measure effects in post-test

Beyond One-shot Designs

- Surveys can be used as a measurement instrument for a field treatment or a manipulation applied in a different survey panel wave
 - 1 Measure effect duration in two-wave panel
 - 2 Solicit pre-treatment outcome measures in a two-wave panel
 - 3 Measure effects of field treatment in post-test only design
 - 4 Randomly encourage field treatment in pre-test and measure effects in post-test
- Problems? Compliance & nonresponse

I. Effect Duration

- Use a two- (or more-) wave panel to measure duration of effects
 - T1: Treatment and outcome measurement
 - T2+: Outcome measurement
- Two main concerns
 - Attrition
 - Panel conditioning

II. Within-Subjects Designs

- Estimate treatment effects as a difference-in-differences
- Instead of using the post-treatment mean-difference in Y to estimate the causal effect, use the difference in pre-post differences for the two groups:


$$(\hat{Y}_{0,t+1} - \hat{Y}_{0,t}) - (\hat{Y}_{j,t+1} - \hat{Y}_{j,t})$$


II. Within-Subjects Designs


- Estimate treatment effects as a difference-in-differences
- Instead of using the post-treatment mean-difference in Y to estimate the causal effect, use the difference in pre-post differences for the two groups:


$$(\hat{Y}_{0,t+1} - \hat{Y}_{0,t}) - (\hat{Y}_{j,t+1} - \hat{Y}_{j,t})$$


- Advantageous because variance for paired samples decreases as correlation between t_0 and t_1 observations increases

















Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)
- 2 Maturation (time trends)

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)
- 2 Maturation (time trends)
- 3 Testing (observation changes respondents)

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)
- 2 Maturation (time trends)
- 3 Testing (observation changes respondents)
- 4 Instrumentation (changing operationalization)

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)
- 2 Maturation (time trends)
- 3 Testing (observation changes respondents)
- 4 Instrumentation (changing operationalization)
- 5 Instability (measurement error)

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

Threats to Validity

As soon as time comes into play, we have to worry about threats to validity.¹

- 1 History (simultaneous cause)
- 2 Maturation (time trends)
- 3 Testing (observation changes respondents)
- 4 Instrumentation (changing operationalization)
- 5 Instability (measurement error)
- 6 Attrition

¹Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002)

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:
 - 1 Citizens randomly sent a letter by post encouraging them to reduce water usage

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:
 - 1 Citizens randomly sent a letter by post encouraging them to reduce water usage
 - 2 Different local media markets randomly assigned to receive different advertising

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:
 - 1 Citizens randomly sent a letter by post encouraging them to reduce water usage
 - 2 Different local media markets randomly assigned to receive different advertising
- Survey is used to measure outcomes, when treatment assignment is already known

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:
 - 1 Citizens randomly sent a letter by post encouraging them to reduce water usage
 - 2 Different local media markets randomly assigned to receive different advertising
- Survey is used to measure outcomes, when treatment assignment is already known
- Issues

III. Randomized Field Treatment

- Examples:
 - 1 Citizens randomly sent a letter by post encouraging them to reduce water usage
 - 2 Different local media markets randomly assigned to receive different advertising
- Survey is used to measure outcomes, when treatment assignment is already known
- Issues
 - Nonresponse
 - Noncompliance

Noncompliance

- Compliance is when individuals receive and accept the treatment to which they are assigned
- Noncompliance:
“when subjects who were assigned to receive the treatment go untreated or when subjects assigned to the control group are treated”²
- This causes problems for our analysis because factors other than randomization explain why individuals receive their treatment
- Lots of methods for dealing with this, but the consequence is generally reduced power

²Gerber & Green. 2012. *Field Experiments*, p.132.

Asymmetric Noncompliance

- Noncompliance *asymmetric* if only in one group
- We can ignore non-compliance and analyze the “intention to treat” effect, which will underestimate our effects because some people were not treated as assigned
$$ITT = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$$
- We can use “instrumental variables” to estimate the “local average treatment effect” (LATE) for those that complied with treatment:
$$LATE = \frac{ITT}{PercentCompliant}$$
- We can ignore randomization and analyze data “as-treated”, but this makes our study no longer an experiment

Local Average Treatment Effect

- IV estimate is *local* to the variation in X that is due to variation in D
- LATE is effect for those who *comply*
- Four subpopulations:
 - Compliers: $X = 1$ only if $D = 1$
 - Always-takers: $X = 1$ regardless of D
 - Never-takers: $X = 0$ regardless of D
 - Defiers: $X = 1$ only if $D = 0$
- Exclusion restriction! Monotonicity!

Two-Sided Noncompliance

- Two-sided noncompliance is more complex analytically
- Stronger assumptions are required to analyze it and we won't discuss them here
- Best to try to develop a better design to avoid this rather than try to deal with the complexities of analyzing a broken design

IV. Treatment Encouragement

- Design:
 - T1: Encourage treatment
 - T2: Measure effects
- Examples:
 - 1 Albertson and Lawrence³

³Albertson & Lawrence. 2009. "After the Credits Roll." *American Politics Research* 37(2): 275–300.
10.1177/1532673X08328600.

IV. Treatment Encouragement

- Design:
 - T1: Encourage treatment
 - T2: Measure effects
- Examples:
 - 1 Albertson and Lawrence³
- Issues

³Albertson & Lawrence. 2009. "After the Credits Roll." *American Politics Research* 37(2): 275–300.
10.1177/1532673X08328600.

IV. Treatment Encouragement

- Design:
 - T1: Encourage treatment
 - T2: Measure effects
- Examples:
 - 1 Albertson and Lawrence³
- Issues
 - Nonresponse
 - Noncompliance

³Albertson & Lawrence. 2009. "After the Credits Roll." *American Politics Research* 37(2): 275–300.
10.1177/1532673X08328600.

Treatment Noncompliance

Treatment Noncompliance

- Several strategies
 - “As treated” analysis
 - “Intention to treat” analysis
 - Estimate a LATE

Questions?

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Unrepresentative Samples

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants

Unrepresentative Samples

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants
- But do those characteristics actually matter?

Unrepresentative Samples

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants
- But do those characteristics actually matter?
- Shadish, Cook, and Campbell tell us to think about:
 - Surface similarities
 - Ruling out irrelevancies
 - Making discriminations
 - Interpolation/extrapolation

Reweighting

- It may be possible to *reweight* convenience sample data to match a population
- Any method for this is “model-based” (rather than “design-based”)
- Not widely used or evaluated (yet)
- All techniques build on the idea of stratification

Overview of Stratification

- 1 Define population
- 2 Construct a sampling frame
- 3 Identify variables we already know about units in the sampling frame
- 4 Stratify sampling frame based on these characteristics
- 5 Collect an SRS (of some size) within each stratum
- 6 Aggregate our results

Estimates from a stratified sample

- Within-strata estimates are calculated just like an SRS
- Within-strata variances are calculated just like an SRS
- Sample-level estimates are weighted averages of stratum-specific estimates
- Sample-level variances are weighted averages of strataum-specific variances

Post-Stratification

- Used to correct for nonresponse, coverage errors, and sampling errors

Post-Stratification

- Used to correct for nonresponse, coverage errors, and sampling errors
- Reweight sample data to match population distributions
 - Divide sample and population into strata
 - Weight units in each stratum so that the weighted sample stratum contains the same proportion of units as the population stratum does

Post-Stratification

- Used to correct for nonresponse, coverage errors, and sampling errors
- Reweight sample data to match population distributions
 - Divide sample and population into strata
 - Weight units in each stratum so that the weighted sample stratum contains the same proportion of units as the population stratum does
- There are numerous other related techniques

Post-Stratification: Example

- Imagine our sample ends up skewed on immigration status and gender relative to the population

Group	Pop.	Sample	Rep.	Weight
Native-born, Female	.45	.5		
Native-born, Male	.45	.4		
Immigrant, Female	.05	.07		
Immigrant, Male	.05	.03		

- PS weight is just $w_{ps} = N_I/n_I$

Post-Stratification: Example

- Imagine our sample ends up skewed on immigration status and gender relative to the population

Group	Pop.	Sample	Rep.	Weight
Native-born, Female	.45	.5	Over	
Native-born, Male	.45	.4	Under	
Immigrant, Female	.05	.07	Over	
Immigrant, Male	.05	.03	Under	

- PS weight is just $w_{ps} = N_I/n_I$

Post-Stratification: Example

- Imagine our sample ends up skewed on immigration status and gender relative to the population

Group	Pop.	Sample	Rep.	Weight
Native-born, Female	.45	.5	Over	0.900
Native-born, Male	.45	.4	Under	
Immigrant, Female	.05	.07	Over	
Immigrant, Male	.05	.03	Under	

- PS weight is just $w_{ps} = N_I/n_I$

Post-Stratification: Example

- Imagine our sample ends up skewed on immigration status and gender relative to the population



Group	Pop.	Sample	Rep.	Weight
Native-born, Female	.45	.5	Over	0.900
Native-born, Male	.45	.4	Under	1.125
Immigrant, Female	.05	.07	Over	0.714
Immigrant, Male	.05	.03	Under	1.667

- PS weight is just $w_{ps} = N_I/n_I$

Post-Stratification


- This is the basis for inference in non-probability samples
 - *Demographic* representativeness
- Online panels will reweight sample based on age, sex, education, etc.
- Purely design-based surveys are increasingly rare

The Xbox Study





Wang et al. 2015. "Forecasting elections with non-representative polls." *International Journal of Forecasting*.

The Xbox Study



Wang et al. 2015. "Forecasting elections with non-representative polls."
International Journal of Forecasting





So does reweighting solve everything forever?

So does reweighting solve everything forever?

- Need well-defined target population
 - and detailed covariate data
 - and large stratum sizes

So does reweighting solve everything forever?

- Need well-defined target population
 - and detailed covariate data
 - and large stratum sizes
- Purely model-based, so only as good as the model
 - What unobservables might be hiding bias?
 - What reweighting might worse bias?

So does reweighting solve everything forever?

- Need well-defined target population
 - and detailed covariate data
 - and large stratum sizes
- Purely model-based, so only as good as the model
 - What unobservables might be hiding bias?
 - What reweighting might worse bias?
- Non-coverage is a potentially huge problem

So does reweighting solve everything forever?

- Need well-defined target population
 - and detailed covariate data
 - and large stratum sizes
- Purely model-based, so only as good as the model
 - What unobservables might be hiding bias?
 - What reweighting might worse bias?
- Non-coverage is a potentially huge problem
- Not well-tested on experimental data

Effect Mediation

- Sometimes we care about *why* an effect comes about (i.e., what is the mechanism, or mediator?)
- If we suspect this happens and we care about the mediation process, we should try to manipulate the treatment and the suspected mediator
- If we cannot manipulate the mediator, there is basically no credible way of estimating the “mediation effect” of the treatment group a given mediator
 - Have to assume exclusion restriction

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

SUTO Framework

- Cronbach (1986) talks about generalizability in terms of UTO
- Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2001) speak similarly of:
 - **Settings**
 - **Units**
 - **Treatments**
 - **Outcomes**
- External validity depends on all of these

Population

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

Your Study

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

Population

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

Your Study

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

In your study, how do these correspond?

Population

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

Your Study

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

In your study, how do these correspond?
how do these differ?

Population

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

Your Study

- Setting
- Units
- Treatments
- Outcomes

In your study, how do these correspond?
how do these differ?
do these differences matter?

Common Differences

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants

Common Differences

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants
- But do those characteristics actually matter?

Common Differences

- Most common thing to focus on is demographic representativeness
 - Sears (1986): “students aren’t real people”
 - Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic (WEIRD) psychology participants
- But do those characteristics actually matter?
- Shadish, Cook, and Campbell tell us to think about:
 - Surface similarities
 - Ruling out irrelevancies
 - Making discriminations
 - Interpolation/extrapolation

Heterogeneity due to Settings

- We should expect heterogeneity related to settings!
- How do we use/explore this?

Heterogeneity due to Settings

- We should expect heterogeneity related to settings!
- How do we use/explore this?
 - Comparative research designs where experiments provide measures for each case

Heterogeneity due to Settings

- We should expect heterogeneity related to settings!
- How do we use/explore this?
 - Comparative research designs where experiments provide measures for each case
 - Over-time replications of the same design

Heterogeneity due to Settings

- We should expect heterogeneity related to settings!
- How do we use/explore this?
 - Comparative research designs where experiments provide measures for each case
 - Over-time replications of the same design
 - Replication of a design across contexts with unknown sources of variability?

Heterogeneity due to Settings

- We should expect heterogeneity related to settings!
- How do we use/explore this?
 - Comparative research designs where experiments provide measures for each case
 - Over-time replications of the same design
 - Replication of a design across contexts with unknown sources of variability?
- Can we control for context?

Pretreatment Dynamics

“If the experiment explores a communication that regularly occurs in ‘reality,’ then reactions in the experiment might be contaminated by those ‘regular’ occurrences prior to the experiment.”⁴

⁴p.875 from Druckman & Leeper. 2012. “Learning More from Political Communication Experiments: Pretreatment and Its Effects.” *American Journal of Political Science* 56(4): 875–896.

Pretreatment Dynamics

- Pretreatment is a feature of an experimental setting, treatment, and sample, wherein the effect of the treatment has already occurred⁵

⁵Or, units having already been treated are otherwise affected differently.

Pretreatment Dynamics

- Pretreatment is a feature of an experimental setting, treatment, and sample, wherein the effect of the treatment has already occurred⁵
- Consequences:
 - Biased effect estimates

⁵Or, units having already been treated are otherwise affected differently.

Pretreatment Dynamics

- Pretreatment is a feature of an experimental setting, treatment, and sample, wherein the effect of the treatment has already occurred⁵
- Consequences:
 - Biased effect estimates
- Mitigation:
 - Measure pretreatment
 - Avoid “pretreated” treatments or contexts
 - Study units not already treated
 - Theorize repeated effects

⁵Or, units having already been treated are otherwise affected differently.

Questions?

Heterogeneity due to Units

Most commonly studied source of heterogeneity is covariate-related (i.e., characteristics of units).

If we think there might be covariate-related effect heterogeneity, what can we do?

- Best solution: manipulate the moderator
- Next best: block on the moderator
- Least best: post-hoc exploratory approaches

Block Randomization

Block Randomization

- Basic idea: randomization occurs within strata defined before treatment assignment

Block Randomization

- Basic idea: randomization occurs within strata defined before treatment assignment
- CATE is estimate for each stratum; aggregated to SATE

Block Randomization

- Basic idea: randomization occurs within strata defined before treatment assignment
- CATE is estimate for each stratum; aggregated to SATE
- But...
 - Blocked randomization only works in exactly the same situations where stratified sampling works
 - Need to observe covariates pre-treatment in order to block on them, so works in panels but not cross-sectional designs
 - More precise SATE estimate

Questions?

Three Post-hoc Approaches

- Suggestive evidence
- Regression using treatment-by-covariate interactions
- Automated approaches

Three Post-hoc Approaches

- Suggestive evidence
- Regression using treatment-by-covariate interactions
- Automated approaches
- (Replication and meta-analysis)

Suggestive Evidence

We can never know $\text{Var}(TE_i)$!

Suggestive Evidence

We can never know $\text{Var}(TE_i)$! But...

- Quantile-quantile plots

- Equality of variance tests

Suggestive Evidence

We can never know $\text{Var}(TE_i)$! But...

- Quantile-quantile plots
 - Compare the distribution of Y_0 's to distribution of Y_1 's
 - If homogeneity, a vertical shift in Y_1 's
 - If heterogeneity, a slope $\neq 1$
- Equality of variance tests

Suggestive Evidence

We can never know $\text{Var}(TE_i)$! But...


- Quantile-quantile plots
 - Compare the distribution of Y_0 's to distribution of Y_1 's
 - If homogeneity, a vertical shift in Y_1 's
 - If heterogeneity, a slope $\neq 1$
- Equality of variance tests
 - If homogeneity, variance should be equal
 - If heterogeneity, variances should differ


QQ Plots

```
# y_0 data
set.seed(1)
n <- 200
y0 <- rnorm(n) + rnorm(n, 0.2)

# y_1 data (homogeneous effects)
y1a <- y0 + 2 + rnorm(n, 0.2)
# y_1 data (heterogeneous effects)
y1b <- y0 + rep(0:1, each = n/2) + rnorm(n, 0.2)

qqplot(y0, y1a, pch=19, xlim=c(-3,5), ylim=c(-3,5), asp=1)
curve((x), add = TRUE)
qqplot(y0, y1b, pch=19, xlim=c(-3,5), ylim=c(-3,5), asp=1)
curve((x), add = TRUE)
```





Equality of Variance tests

```
> var.test(y0, y1a)
```

F test to compare two variances

data: y0 and y1a

F = 0.60121, num df = 199, denom df = 199,

p-value = 0.0003635

alternative hypothesis:

true ratio of variances is not equal to 1

95 percent confidence interval:

0.4549900 0.7944289

sample estimates:

ratio of variances

0.6012131

Equality of Variance tests

```
> var.test(y0, y1b)
```

F test to compare two variances

data: y0 and y1b

F = 0.53483, num df = 199, denom df = 199,

p-value = 1.224e-05

alternative hypothesis:

true ratio of variances is not equal to 1

95 percent confidence interval:

0.4047531 0.7067133

sample estimates:

ratio of variances

0.5348312

Questions?

Regression Estimation

Aside: Regression Adjustment in Experiments, Generally

- Recall the general advice that we do not need covariates in the regression to “control” for omitted variables (because there are none)
- Including covariates can reduce variance of our SATE by explaining more of the variation in Y

Scenario

Imagine two regression models. Which is correct?

- 1 Mean-difference estimate of SATE is “not significant”
- 2 Regression estimate of SATE, controlling for sex, age, and education, is “significant”

Scenario

Imagine two regression models. Which is correct?

- 1 Mean-difference estimate of SATE is “not significant”
- 2 Regression estimate of SATE, controlling for sex, age, and education, is “significant”

This is a small-sample dynamic, so make these decisions pre-analysis!

Treatment-Covariate Interactions

- The regression paradigm allows us to estimate CATEs using interaction terms
 - X is an indicator for treatment
 - M is an indicator for possible moderator

Treatment-Covariate Interactions

- The regression paradigm allows us to estimate CATEs using interaction terms
 - X is an indicator for treatment
 - M is an indicator for possible moderator
- SATE: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + e$

Treatment-Covariate Interactions

- The regression paradigm allows us to estimate CATEs using interaction terms
 - X is an indicator for treatment
 - M is an indicator for possible moderator
- SATE: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + e$
- CATEs:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 M + \beta_3 X * M + e$$

Treatment-Covariate Interactions

- The regression paradigm allows us to estimate CATEs using interaction terms
 - X is an indicator for treatment
 - M is an indicator for possible moderator
- SATE: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + e$
- CATEs:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 M + \beta_3 X * M + e$$

- Homogeneity: $\beta_3 = 0$
- Heterogeneity: $\beta_3 \neq 0$

Let's work in Stata!

(Covariate-related effect
heterogeneity)

BART


- Estimate CATEs in a fully automated fashion

BART





- Estimate CATEs in a fully automated fashion
- “Bayesian Additive Regression Trees”
 - Essentially an ensemble machine learning method

BART

- Estimate CATEs in a fully automated fashion
- “Bayesian Additive Regression Trees”
 - Essentially an ensemble machine learning method
- Iteratively split a sample into more and more homogeneous groups until some threshold is reached using binary (cutpoint) decisions
- Repeat this a bunch of times, aggregating across results



Green & Kern. 2012. "Modeling Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Survey Experiments with Bayesian Additive Regression Trees." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(3): 491–511.



Considerations

- BART is totally automated, conditional on the set of covariates used
- Only really works with dichotomous covariates
- Not widely used or tested
- Totally post-hoc and atheoretical

Considerations

Considerations

- Coefficients on moderators have no causal interpretation without further conditioning on observables

Considerations

- Coefficients on moderators have no causal interpretation without further conditioning on observables
- Nearly unlimited potential moderators
 - First-order interactions with every covariate in dataset
 - Second-, third-order, etc. interactions
- Thus, multiple comparisons problem!

Considerations


- Coefficients on moderators have no causal interpretation without further conditioning on observables
- Nearly unlimited potential moderators
 - First-order interactions with every covariate in dataset
 - Second-, third-order, etc. interactions
- Thus, multiple comparisons problem!
- Power (esp. if M is continuous)


Simply: Manipulating the moderator variable is the best way to estimate a heterogeneous effect!

Why is this true?

Complex Designs

- An experiment can have any number of conditions
 - Up to the limits of sample size
 - More than 8–10 conditions is typically unwieldy
- Typically analyze complex designs using ANOVA or regression, but we are still ultimately interested in pairwise comparisons to estimate SATEs
 - Treatment–treatment, or treatment-control
 - Without control group, we don't know which treatment(s) affected the outcome





Ex. Question-as-treatment⁶

- How close do you feel to your ethnic or racial group?
- Some people have said that taxes need to be raised to take care of pressing national needs. How willing would you be to have your taxes raised to improve education in public schools?

⁶Transue. 2007. "Identity Salience, Identity Acceptance, and Racial Policy Attitudes: American National Identity as a Uniting Force." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 78–91.

Ex. Question-as-treatment⁶

- How close do you feel to other Americans?
- Some people have said that taxes need to be raised to take care of pressing national needs. How willing would you be to have your taxes raised to improve education in public schools?

⁶Transue. 2007. "Identity Salience, Identity Acceptance, and Racial Policy Attitudes: American National Identity as a Uniting Force." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 78–91.

Ex. Question-as-treatment⁶

- How close do you feel to your ethnic or racial group?
- Some people have said that taxes need to be raised to take care of pressing national needs. How willing would you be to have your taxes raised to improve educational opportunities for minorities?

⁶Transue. 2007. "Identity Salience, Identity Acceptance, and Racial Policy Attitudes: American National Identity as a Uniting Force." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 78–91.

Ex. Question-as-treatment⁶

- How close do you feel to other Americans?
- Some people have said that taxes need to be raised to take care of pressing national needs. How willing would you be to have your taxes raised to improve educational opportunities for minorities?

⁶Transue. 2007. "Identity Salience, Identity Acceptance, and Racial Policy Attitudes: American National Identity as a Uniting Force." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 78–91.

2x2 Factorial Design

Condition

Educ. for Minorities	Y_1
Schools	Y_0

2x2 Factorial Design

Condition	Americans	Own Race
Educ. for Minorities	$Y_{1,0}$	$Y_{1,1}$
Schools	$Y_{0,0}$	$Y_{0,1}$

Two ways to *parameterize* this

Dummy variable regression (i.e., treatment–control CATEs):

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{0,1} + \beta_2 X_{1,0} + \beta_3 X_{1,1} + \epsilon$$

Interaction effects (i.e., treatment–treatment CATEs):

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1,1} + \beta_2 X_{2,1} + \beta_3 X_{1,1} * X_{2,1} + \epsilon$$

Use margins to extract marginal effects

Considerations

- Need to have hypotheses about heterogeneity a priori
- Factorial designs can quickly become unwieldy and expensive

Probably obvious, but . . .

Factors	Conditions per factor	Total Conditions	<i>n</i>
1	2	2	400
1	3	3	600
1	4	4	800
2	2	4	800
2	3	6	1200
2	4	8	1600
3	3	9	1800
3	4	12	2400
4	4	16	3200

Assumes power to detect a relatively small effect, but no consideration of multiple comparisons.

Considerations

- Need to have hypotheses about heterogeneity a priori
- Factorial designs can quickly become unwieldy and expensive

Considerations

- Need to have hypotheses about heterogeneity a priori
- Factorial designs can quickly become unwieldy and expensive
- Need to consider what CATEs are of theoretical interest
 - Treatment-control
 - Treatment-treatment
 - Marginal effects, averaging across other factors

Questions?

Treatment Preferences/Self-Selection

Bennett and Iyengar:⁷

manipulational control actually weakens the ability to generalize to the real world where exposure to stimuli is typically voluntary. Accordingly, it is important that experimental researchers use designs that combine manipulation with self-selection of exposure.

⁷p.724 from Bennett & Iyengar. 2008. "A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication." *Journal of Communication* 58(4): 707-31.

Hovland:⁸

It should be possible to assess what demographic and personality factors predispose one to expose oneself to particular communications and then to utilize experimental and control groups having these characteristics. Under some circumstances the evaluation could be made on only those who select themselves, with both experimental and control groups coming from the self-selected audience.

⁸p.16 from Hovland. 1959. "Reconciling conflicting results derived from experimental and survey studies of attitude change." *American Psychologist* 14(1): 8-17.

Treatment Preferences I

- Experiments are about inferring effect of X on Y
- Respondents may have preferences over whether they are treated or untreated⁹
- Origins of this discussion are in the medical literature¹⁰
- Closely related to the notion of placebo effects

⁹Rucker. 1989. "A Two-Stage Trial Design for Testing Treatment, Self-Selection, and Treatment Preference Effects." *Statistics in Medicine* 8: 477–485.

¹⁰Swift & Callahan. 2009. "The Impact of Client Treatment Preferences on Outcome: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 65(4): 368–381.

Treatment Preferences I

- Treatment preferences may be an important factor in:
 - Compliance
 - Effect heterogeneity

Treatment Preferences I


- Treatment preferences may be an important factor in:
 - Compliance
 - Effect heterogeneity
- Depending on your treatments, you may want to measure preferences

Treatment Preferences I

- Treatment preferences may be an important factor in:
 - Compliance
 - Effect heterogeneity
- Depending on your treatments, you may want to measure preferences
 - 1 Stated preference measures

Treatment Preferences I

- Treatment preferences may be an important factor in:
 - Compliance
 - Effect heterogeneity
- Depending on your treatments, you may want to measure preferences
 - 1 Stated preference measures
 - 2 Designs that reveal preferences



Analyzing 3-Group Preference Trials¹¹

1 SATE: $\bar{Y}_T - \bar{Y}_C$

2 CATE (Prefer T): $\frac{\bar{Y}_{Choice} - \bar{Y}_C}{\hat{\alpha}}$

3 CATE (Prefer C): $\frac{\bar{Y}_T - \bar{Y}_{Choice}}{1 - \hat{\alpha}}$

Note: $\alpha = Pr(T|Choice)$

¹¹GK2011 Package for R. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=GK2011>

Questions?

Attention and Satisficing

One final issue with unit-related sources of heterogeneity is how we handle or analyze survey-experimental data where we think participants “misbehaved”.

Attention and Satisficing

One final issue with unit-related sources of heterogeneity is how we handle or analyze survey-experimental data where we think participants “misbehaved”.

This falls into a couple of broad categories:

- 1 Noncompliance (discussed earlier)
- 2 Survey Satisficing
- 3 Apparent Inattention

Substantive Manipulation Check

- Two common approaches:
 - Information recall or understanding
 - Measure level of manipulated treatment variable
- Risky to remove cases based on this because it is a form of conditioning on post-treatment variables
- May be useful to consider either a mediator of effects

Attention Checking

- Online mode invites satisficing
- Attention checking can help, but is imperfect

Apparent Satisficing

- Filter out respondents based on response behavior
- Some common measures:
 - “Straightlining”
 - Non-differentiation
 - Acquiescence
 - Nonresponse
 - DK responding
 - Speeding
- Difficult to detect
- Difficult to distinguish from “real” responses

Metadata/Paradata

■ Timing

- Some survey tools will allow you to time page
- Make a prior rules about dropping participants for speeding

Metadata/Paradata

- Timing
 - Some survey tools will allow you to time page
 - Make a prior rules about dropping participants for speeding
- Mousetracking or eyetracking
 - Mousetracking is unobtrusive
 - Eyetracking requires participants opt-in

Metadata/Paradata

- Timing
 - Some survey tools will allow you to time page
 - Make a prior rules about dropping participants for speeding
- Mousetracking or eyetracking
 - Mousetracking is unobtrusive
 - Eyetracking requires participants opt-in
- Record focus/blur browser events

Direct Measures

- How closely have you been paying attention to what the questions on this survey actually mean?

Direct Measures

- How closely have you been paying attention to what the questions on this survey actually mean?
- While taking this survey, did you engage in any of the following behaviors? Please check all that apply.
 - Use your mobile phone
 - Browse the internet
 - ...

Instructional Manipulation Check

We would like to know if you are reading the questions on this survey. If you are reading carefully, please ignore this question, do not select any answer below, and click “next” to proceed with the survey.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Instructional Manipulation Check

Do you agree or disagree with the decision to send British forces to fight ISIL in Syria? We would like to know if you are reading the questions on this survey. If you are reading carefully, please ignore this question, do not select any answer below, and click “next” to proceed with the survey.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Attention Checking

In summary...

- Attention checking can be useful
- Lots of options
- No obvious best metric
- Can be analytically consequential

How should we deal with respondents that appear to not be paying attention, not “taking” the treatment, or not responding to outcome measures?

- 1 Keep them
- 2 Throw them away

Best Practice: Protocol

- Excluding respondents based on survey behavior is one of the easiest ways to “p-hack” an experimental dataset
 - Inattention, satisficing, etc. will tend to reduce the size of the SATE
- So regardless of how you handle these respondents, these should be decisions that are made *pre-analysis*

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

Post-Treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors

Post-Treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention

Post-Treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention
- Covariate-based selection

Post-Treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention
- Covariate-based selection
- Pretreated

Post-Treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention
- Covariate-based selection
- Pretreated

Post-Treatment

- Speeding on treatment

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention
- Covariate-based selection
- Pretreated

Post-Treatment

- Speeding on treatment
- “Failing” a manipulation check

When are you excluding participants?

Pre-Treatment

- Satisficing behaviors
- Inattention
- Covariate-based selection
- Pretreated

Post-Treatment

- Speeding on treatment
- “Failing” a manipulation check
- Drop-off

Pre-Treatment Exclusion

- This is totally fine from a causal inference perspective

Pre-Treatment Exclusion


- This is totally fine from a causal inference perspective
- Advantages:
 - Focused on engaged respondents
 - Likely increase impact of treatment


Pre-Treatment Exclusion

- This is totally fine from a causal inference perspective
- Advantages:
 - Focused on engaged respondents
 - Likely increase impact of treatment
- Disadvantages:
 - Changing definition of sample (and thus population)


Post-Treatment Exclusion

This is much more problematic because it involves controlling for a *post-treatment* variable





Risk that estimate of β_1 is diminished because effect is being carried through the manipulation check.



Introduction of “collider bias” wherein values of the manipulation check are affected by other factors.

Post-Treatment Exclusion


- Any post-treatment exclusion is problematic and should be avoided

Post-Treatment Exclusion


- Any post-treatment exclusion is problematic and should be avoided
- Can estimate a LATE
 - Interpretation: Effect of manipulation check among those whose value of the check can be changed by the treatment manipulation

Post-Treatment Exclusion

- Any post-treatment exclusion is problematic and should be avoided
- Can estimate a LATE
 - Interpretation: Effect of manipulation check among those whose value of the check can be changed by the treatment manipulation
- Non-response or attrition is the same as researcher-imposed exclusion
 - Not problematic if MCAR
 - Nothing really to be done if caused by treatment



Introduction of “collider bias” wherein values of the manipulation check are affected by other factors.



Post-Treatment Exclusion

- Any post-treatment exclusion is problematic and should be avoided
- Can estimate a LATE
 - Interpretation: Effect of manipulation check among those whose value of the check can be changed by the treatment manipulation

Post-Treatment Exclusion

- Any post-treatment exclusion is problematic and should be avoided
- Can estimate a LATE
 - Interpretation: Effect of manipulation check among those whose value of the check can be changed by the treatment manipulation
- Non-response or attrition is the same as researcher-imposed exclusion
 - Not problematic if MCAR
 - Nothing really to be done if caused by treatment

Questions?

Heterogeneity due to Treatments

- We should expect this! Why?

Heterogeneity due to Treatments

- We should expect this! Why?
- What can we do?
 - Pilot testing
 - Replication
 - More complex design
 - Conjoint experiments

Conjoint Designs I

- “Classic vignettes” taken to an extreme
 - Address heterogeneity w/r/t SUTO
- Example: Judge whether to admit an immigrant to your country

Conjoint Designs I

- “Classic vignettes” taken to an extreme
 - Address heterogeneity w/r/t SUTO
- Example: Judge whether to admit an immigrant to your country
- Respondents see a series of vignettes that are fully randomized along any number of dimensions
 - Sex, Education, Language proficiency, etc.

Conjoint Designs I

- “Classic vignettes” taken to an extreme
 - Address heterogeneity w/r/t SUTO
- Example: Judge whether to admit an immigrant to your country
- Respondents see a series of vignettes that are fully randomized along any number of dimensions
 - Sex, Education, Language proficiency, etc.
- Outcome is judgment (binary or rating scale)

Conjoint Designs II

Why is this useful?


- Understand complex decision-making
- Within-subjects comparisons
- Heterogeneous effects across versions of treatment
- Pilot testing: Sensitivity of design to specification of *compound* vignette

Please read the descriptions of the potential immigrants carefully. Then, please indicate which of the two immigrants you would personally prefer to see admitted to the United States.

	Immigrant 1	Immigrant 2
Prior Trips to the U.S.	Entered the U.S. once before on a tourist visa	Entered the U.S. once before on a tourist visa
Reason for Application	Reunite with family members already in U.S.	Reunite with family members already in U.S.
Country of Origin	Mexico	Iraq
Language Skills	During admission interview, this applicant spoke fluent English	During admission interview, this applicant spoke fluent English
Profession	Child care provider	Teacher
Job Experience	One to two years of job training and experience	Three to five years of job training and experience
Employment Plans	Does not have a contract with a U.S. employer but has done job interviews	Will look for work after arriving in the U.S.
Education Level	Equivalent to completing two years of college in the U.S.	Equivalent to completing a college degree in the U.S.
Gender	Female	Male

Immigrant 1 Immigrant 2

If you had to choose between them, which of these two immigrants should be given priority to come to the United States to live?



Conjoint Designs III

Conjoint Designs III

- As long as profiles are randomized, this is just a complex factorial design where we can estimate *marginal effect* of each attribute
 - Treatment-control SATE, conditional on all other randomized factors

Conjoint Designs III

- As long as profiles are randomized, this is just a complex factorial design where we can estimate *marginal effect* of each attribute
 - Treatment-control SATE, conditional on all other randomized factors
- Assumptions:
 - Fully randomized profiles
 - No “carry-over” effects
 - No profile order effects

Replication

- Conjoint solve one problem: they identify the relative size of sources of heterogeneity within a given treatment

Replication

- Conjoint solve one problem: they identify the relative size of sources of heterogeneity within a given treatment
- But how should we consider experiments testing the same theory using different treatments?
 - “Triangulation”
 - Consistent directionality
 - Consistent (standardized) effect sizes

Replication

- Conjoint solve one problem: they identify the relative size of sources of heterogeneity within a given treatment
- But how should we consider experiments testing the same theory using different treatments?
 - “Triangulation”
 - Consistent directionality
 - Consistent (standardized) effect sizes
- Big conclusion: replication is important and there's not enough of it.

Questions?

Heterogeneity due to *Outcomes*

- This is expected!
 - E.g., non-equivalent outcomes
- Reasonable to explore multiple outcomes
 - Multiple comparisons
 - Power considerations
 - Construct validity

Heterogeneity due to *Outcomes*

- This is expected!
 - E.g., non-equivalent outcomes
- Reasonable to explore multiple outcomes
 - Multiple comparisons
 - Power considerations
 - Construct validity
- What outcomes you measure depend on your theory

Heterogeneity due to *Outcomes*

- This is expected!
 - E.g., non-equivalent outcomes
- Reasonable to explore multiple outcomes
 - Multiple comparisons
 - Power considerations
 - Construct validity
- What outcomes you measure depend on your theory
- Lots of potential for behavioral measures!

Behavioural measures

Some behaviours that can be directly measured through survey questionnaires.

Behavioural measures

Some behaviours that can be directly measured through survey questionnaires.

Three broad categories:

Behavioural measures

Some behaviours that can be directly measured through survey questionnaires.

Three broad categories:

- 1 Behavioural measures that provide survey paradata

Behavioural measures

Some behaviours that can be directly measured through survey questionnaires.

Three broad categories:

- 1 Behavioural measures that provide survey paradata
- 2 Behavioural measures that operationalize attitudes

Behavioural measures

Some behaviours that can be directly measured through survey questionnaires.

Three broad categories:

- 1 Behavioural measures that provide survey paradata
- 2 Behavioural measures that operationalize attitudes
- 3 Behavioural measures that operationalize behaviours

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies
- Reading times

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies
- Reading times
- Answer switching

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies
- Reading times
- Answer switching
- Eye tracking

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies
- Reading times
- Answer switching
- Eye tracking
- Mouse tracking

Behavioural Measures for Paradata

Why?

- Respondents use of the survey tells us something meaningful about their behaviour

What?

- Nonresponse
- Response latencies
- Reading times
- Answer switching
- Eye tracking
- Mouse tracking
- Smartphone metadata

Behavioural Measures for Attitudes

Why?

- Attitudinal self-reports might be “cheap talk”

Behavioural Measures for Attitudes

Why?

- Attitudinal self-reports might be “cheap talk”

What?

Behavioural Measures for Attitudes

Why?

- Attitudinal self-reports might be “cheap talk”

What?

- Implicit Association Test

Behavioural Measures for Attitudes

Why?

- Attitudinal self-reports might be “cheap talk”

What?

- Implicit Association Test
- Incentivized Survey questions

Behavioural Measures for Behaviour

Why?

- We want to observe or affect behaviour (e.g., in an experiment)

Behavioural Measures for Behaviour

Why?

- We want to observe or affect behaviour (e.g., in an experiment)

What?

- Directly measure or initiate a direct measure of a behaviour
- May be measured by something that occurs within the confines of the survey or something outside of the survey

Example 1: Active Information Choice

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. "Measure for Measure." *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. "The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Remember, please check **ALL** rows containing any links shown in **PURPLE**. Leave all other rows unchecked.

- [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#) [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#)
- [LINK](#) [LINK](#)

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²
- Information boards¹³

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Reports From the Hive,
Where the Swarm
Concurs

Pay for Performance
Improves Quality of
Health Care Through
Collaborative Medicine

Why are 3-D Movies so
Bad?

Physicians Group Says
Quality Will Improve
Under Outcome-based
Payments

Council Is Set to
Consider Increases in
Hotel and Property Taxes

Doctors Can Work
Together to Improve
Patient Health, But Need
Appropriate Incentives

Patients Better Served
When Providers Paid for
Health Outcomes

Improving America's
Health Requires Provider
Incentives, Not 'Fee-for-
Service'

When Paid for Outcomes,
Doctors Have Little
Reason to Treat Highest
Risk Patients

A Bowl of Chili with
Bragging Rights

SEC Vote Requires
Business Filings to Add
Environmental Risks to
Bottom Line

Anatomy of a Tear-
Jerker

Spammers Use the
Human Touch to Avoid
CAPTCHA

USDA Raises Corn
Export Outlook

Will a Standardized
System for Verifying
Web Identity Ever
Catch On?

Wellness, Rather
Than Illness, Is Focus
Under Outcome-
Accountable Care

Gender Differences in
Education Need
Innovative Solution

Heart Attack While
Dining at Heart Attack
Grill in Las Vegas

Out of the O.R., T.R.
Knight Back Onto the
Stage

Paying Doctors Based
on Outcomes Will
Lead to Rationing

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²
- Information boards¹³

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²
- Information boards¹³
- Video choice¹⁴

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Example 1: Active Information Choice

- “Followed link” identification¹²
- Information boards¹³
- Video choice¹⁴
- Dynamic Process Tracing Environment¹⁵

¹²Guess, AM. 2015. “Measure for Measure.” *Political Analysis* 23: 59–75. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu010

¹³Leeper, TJ. 2014. “The Informational Basis for Mass Polarization.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(1): 27–46. doi:10.1093/poq/nft045

¹⁴Arceneaux, K & Johnson, M. 2012. *Changing Minds or Changign Channels*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

¹⁵<https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/>

Stage: Primary Election

Sub-stage: Early Primary

Time Remaining: 21:26

6:46

Andy Fischer's Political Experience

DELEGATE COUNT, END OF FEBRUARY

Republican Primary

Sam Green's Mother provides a Childhood Anecdote

Dana Turner's Picture

Terry Davis's Current Job Performance

Taylor Harris's Age

Iowa General Election

January, 2008

Time remaining: 5:23

Hillary Clinton wins in South Dakota!



◀ ▶ ⟲ ⟳ 0:05 / 0:06

Stage: Pre-Election

Sub-stage: PE-2

Time Remaining: 0:00

0:00

Question 1 of 1

Primary elections require voters to choose the party they want to vote in. Before we begin the Iowa primary, please choose either the the Republican or Democrat Primary. You will see candidates for both parties but will be only able to vote in the party you choose.

- Republican
- Democrat

Select an answer, then click the End button to end the questionnaire.

End

Example 2: Sign-up/Enrolment

An extension of information choice behaviour would be explicit engagement in other kinds of (small) behaviours, such as:

- Entering an email address to receive information or join a mailing list^{16 17}
- Signing up for an appointment or further interaction

¹⁶Leeper, T.J. 2017. "How Does Treatment Self-Selection Affect Inferences About Political Communication?" *Journal of Experimental Political Science*: In press.

¹⁷Bolsen, Druckman, & Cook. 2014. "Communication and Collective Actions." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1(1): 24–38. doi:10.1017/xps.2014.2

Example 3: Incentivised Survey Questions

Definitions:

- A survey question is just a self-report
- An *incentivized* survey question attached financial gains or losses to the answer options

Mark your gamble selection with an **X** in the last column across from your preferred gamble.

Gamble	Event	Payoff	Probabilities	Your Selection
1	A	\$10	50%	
	B	\$10	50%	
2	A	\$18	50%	
	B	\$6	50%	
3	A	\$26	50%	
	B	\$2	50%	
4	A	\$34	50%	
	B	-\$2	50%	
5	A	\$42	50%	
	B	-\$6	50%	

Example 3: Incentivised Survey Questions

Definitions:

- A survey question is just a self-report
- An *incentivized* survey question attached financial gains or losses to the answer options

Example 3: Incentivised Survey Questions

Definitions:

- A survey question is just a self-report
- An *incentivized* survey question attached financial gains or losses to the answer options

Paradigm could be applied to any measure of behavioural intentions to avoid cheap talk.

Example 4: Purchasing Decisions

Common ways to study purchasing behaviour include:

Example 4: Purchasing Decisions

Common ways to study purchasing behaviour include:

- Direct attitudinal questions

Example 4: Purchasing Decisions

Common ways to study purchasing behaviour include:

- Direct attitudinal questions
- Retrospective and prospective self-reports

Example 4: Purchasing Decisions

Common ways to study purchasing behaviour include:

- Direct attitudinal questions
- Retrospective and prospective self-reports
- Conjoint experiments

Example 4: Purchasing Decisions

Common ways to study purchasing behaviour include:

- Direct attitudinal questions
- Retrospective and prospective self-reports
- Conjoint experiments

Another way is embedding a purchase in a survey.¹⁸

¹⁸Bolsen, T. 2011. "A Lightbulb Goes On." *Political Behavior* 35(1): 1–20. 10.1007/s11109-011-9186-5



Example 5: Donations

- Miller and Krosnick¹⁹ asked for charitable donations via cheque directly as part of a paper-and-pencil survey

¹⁹Miller, Krosnick, & Lowe. N.d. "The Impact of Policy Change Threat on Financial Contributions to Interest Groups." Working paper.

²⁰Klar & Piston. 2015. "The influence of competing organisational appeals on individual donations." *Journal of Public Policy* 35(2): 171–91. doi:10.1017/S0143814X15000203

Example 5: Donations

- Miller and Krosnick¹⁹ asked for charitable donations via cheque directly as part of a paper-and-pencil survey
- Klar and Piston²⁰ offered respondents a survey incentive up-front for participation and then later offered them a chance to donate (a portion of payment) to a charity

¹⁹Miller, Krosnick, & Lowe. N.d. "The Impact of Policy Change Threat on Financial Contributions to Interest Groups." Working paper.

²⁰Klar & Piston. 2015. "The influence of competing organisational appeals on individual donations." *Journal of Public Policy* 35(2): 171–91. doi:10.1017/S0143814X15000203

Example 6: Web Tracking Data

- 1 Active installation of a tracking app, such as YouGov Pulse^{21 22}
- 2 Post-hoc collection of web history files using something like Web Historian²³

²¹<https://yougov.co.uk/find-solutions/profiles/pulse/>

²²Guess, AM. N.d. "Media Choice and Moderation." Working paper, <https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/663930/GuessJMP.pdf>.

²³<http://www.webhistorian.org/>

Other Possibilities

²⁴Mao, Mason, Suri, Watts. 2016. "An Experimental Study of Team Size and Performance on a Complex Task." *PLoS ONE* 11(4): e0153048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153048

Other Possibilities

- Coordination tasks
 - Synchronous group tasks²⁴
 - Game play
 - Simulations

²⁴Mao, Mason, Suri, Watts. 2016. "An Experimental Study of Team Size and Performance on a Complex Task." *PLoS ONE* 11(4): e0153048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153048

Event Records **Map** **Documents**

Notifications - Help **Turkmenistan** **Strikes** **McDonalds** **Flight** **Argentina** **Superhero**

111 #Tifón #Bopha afejó #4 amuentes den #Apáñas. # http://it.co/2y7m7g para mas videos # Origin - <http://it.co/5qApDm>

112 Ito ang preaka nakaatakot n' nangyan do sa CDO kahapon #Patikis # <http://it.co/2y7m7g>

113

114 #batub1# #pasukan #sakata#Typhoon #Bopha #Pibolo. Hindi babata sa 56 nakupeima (80 hindu nakupeima) patay 20 <http://it.co/USUf00>

115

116 #cicma_jacon via @ipromo: El centro del Tifón #Pibolo en #Iloilo a 180km al Este de #Cebu, #Philippines. Ver <http://it.co/16QKph>

117

118 Magandang villaga submerged <http://it.co/MSVwz1> #Pibolo # <http://it.co/2y7m7g>

119 Damage in Ever Mall Dumaguete after #PiboloPH @youtracksofMA <http://it.co/2y7m7g>

120

121 (C) NCRMC expands disparity, between its death count vs. numbers from the ground <http://it.co/EEqjzgm> #PiboloPH

122

123 #111: Uploaded area as Bataan Blvd Dumaguete City after #PatikisPH via Youtracksof (@heymanly) <http://it.co/CSPWV03>

124

125 Dahil sa Typhoon #PatikisPH_X @gmanees ditto po sa Cagayan Cdo. 9000 <http://it.co/16VHg0>

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079</b

Other Possibilities

- Coordination tasks
 - Synchronous group tasks²⁴
 - Game play
 - Simulations

²⁴Mao, Mason, Suri, Watts. 2016. "An Experimental Study of Team Size and Performance on a Complex Task." *PLoS ONE* 11(4): e0153048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153048

Other Possibilities

- Coordination tasks
 - Synchronous group tasks²⁴
 - Game play
 - Simulations
- Offering incentives to perform future behaviour
(tracked elsewhere)

²⁴Mao, Mason, Suri, Watts. 2016. "An Experimental Study of Team Size and Performance on a Complex Task." *PLoS ONE* 11(4): e0153048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153048

Other Possibilities

- Coordination tasks
 - Synchronous group tasks²⁴
 - Game play
 - Simulations
- Offering incentives to perform future behaviour (tracked elsewhere)
- OAuth/API integrations w/ other platforms
 - Merging website usage data w/ survey data
 - Treating website sign-up or usage as behavioural outcomes
 - Linking with smartphone metadata

²⁴Mao, Mason, Suri, Watts. 2016. "An Experimental Study of Team Size and Performance on a Complex Task." *PLoS ONE* 11(4): e0153048. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153048

Some principles for survey measures of behaviour

Some principles for survey measures of behaviour

- 1 Know why you are collecting a behavioural measure!

Some principles for survey measures of behaviour

- 1 Know why you are collecting a behavioural measure!
- 2 Know whether you are studying a past, present, or future behaviour.

Some principles for survey measures of behaviour

- 1 Know why you are collecting a behavioural measure!
- 2 Know whether you are studying a past, present, or future behaviour.
- 3 Be creative! Recognise possibilities and limitations of any given survey mode.

Some principles for survey measures of behaviour

- 1 Know why you are collecting a behavioural measure!
- 2 Know whether you are studying a past, present, or future behaviour.
- 3 Be creative! Recognise possibilities and limitations of any given survey mode.
- 4 Validate, validate, validate!

Activity!

With a partner, brainstorm how one or more these behavioural measures might be applied to a survey experiment (either as outcome, treatment, covariate, or behavioural check) relevant to your own work or your organisation.

SUTO Punchline 1: Replication!

- If we think effects are homogeneous (across SUTO), then replications in other SUTO conditions should provide us the same SATE (within sampling error)
- If we think effects are heterogeneous, then replications should give *systematically* different SATE (or CATE) estimates

SUTO Punchline 1: Replication!

- If we think effects are homogeneous (across SUTO), then replications in other SUTO conditions should provide us the same SATE (within sampling error)
- If we think effects are heterogeneous, then replications should give *systematically* different SATE (or CATE) estimates
 - Identify those patterns of heterogeneity using meta-analysis

SUTO Punchline 1: Replication!

- If we think effects are homogeneous (across SUTO), then replications in other SUTO conditions should provide us the same SATE (within sampling error)
- If we think effects are heterogeneous, then replications should give *systematically* different SATE (or CATE) estimates
 - Identify those patterns of heterogeneity using meta-analysis
 - Regress effect estimates from multiple studies on SUTO features of each study

***SUTO* Punchline 2: What do you want to know?**

- Do we want to know SATE, CATE(s), or both?

SUTO Punchline 2: What do you want to know?

- Do we want to know SATE, CATE(s), or both?
- Decide in advance
 - Include in protocol
 - Design study to estimate CATE(s)

SUTO Punchline 2: What do you want to know?

- Do we want to know SATE, CATE(s), or both?
- Decide in advance
 - Include in protocol
 - Design study to estimate CATE(s)
- Estimation of unit-related CATEs
 - Block randomization
 - Post-hoc procedures

Questions?

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Recruitment Considerations

- Recruitment
 - Sampling
 - Opt-in
 - A mix of each
- Incentives
- Frequency of participation
 - MTurk panelists do 100+ studies per month
 - YouGov panelists do nearly as many
- “Profile” variables
- Quotas, post-stratification, weighting
- Respondent “quality”

Professional Panels

- Big players: SSI, YouGov, GfK, TNS/Gallup
- Online panels of respondents
- Respondents participate for incentives
- Study costs are negotiated
 - Sample size
 - Study length (number of survey items)
 - Targeting
 - Timing

KnowledgeNetworks versus YouGov

- Big debate in early 2000s about online panels
 - KN used ABS to build a representative panel
 - YouGov created an opt-in panel; used “sample matching”

Knowledge Networks versus YouGov

- Big debate in early 2000s about online panels
 - KN used ABS to build a representative panel
 - YouGov created an opt-in panel; used “sample matching”
- YouGov’s process:
 - Randomly sample from a list
 - Match each sampled individual to someone in their opt-in panel
 - Survey the matched individuals

Knowledge Networks versus YouGov

- Big debate in early 2000s about online panels
 - KN used ABS to build a representative panel
 - YouGov created an opt-in panel; used “sample matching”
- YouGov’s process:
 - Randomly sample from a list
 - Match each sampled individual to someone in their opt-in panel
 - Survey the matched individuals
- Evidence inconclusive but many think KN approach is better

Opt-in (Crowdsourcing) Sites

- Not exactly a panel (fully opt-in)
- Incentivized participation

Opt-in (Crowdsourcing) Sites

- Not exactly a panel (fully opt-in)
- Incentivized participation
- Prominent examples
 - MTurk
 - Crowdflower
 - Microworkers
 - Prolific Academic
 - Google Surveys

“River Sampling”

- Not using an existing subject pool
 - Link sharing or posting on websites
 - Using email list
 - Online advertising (Google, Facebook)

“River Sampling”

- Not using an existing subject pool
 - Link sharing or posting on websites
 - Using email list
 - Online advertising (Google, Facebook)
- My advice: don't do this unless you have no other choice!

Custom Panels

- Creating your own panel is great
 - Carefully sample on specific characteristics
 - Organize repeated interviewing or interaction
- Lots of additional issues
 - Attrition
 - Compensation
 - Panel Conditioning
- See Callegaro et al. 2014. *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective*. Wiley.

My Advice, Elaborated

- Only work with populations where each unit is uniquely identifiable

My Advice, Elaborated

- Only work with populations where each unit is uniquely identifiable
- Without this, you risk many things:
 - Ambiguous eligibility
 - Retakes, treatment crossover
 - No way to evaluate response rates/bias

My Advice, Elaborated


- Only work with populations where each unit is uniquely identifiable
- Without this, you risk many things:
 - Ambiguous eligibility
 - Retakes, treatment crossover
 - No way to evaluate response rates/bias
- Know something about your sample
 - How does it differ from your target of inference?
 - What theories or evidence would suggest those differences should matter?
 - What can you do to adjust or control for those *consequential* differences?

Measure, Measure, Measure

The only way to evaluate a sample is to know something about it.

The best way to convince reviewers is to rule out irrelevancies.

Don't forget statistical power. . .



And don't forget costs, either!

From one of my studies:

Sample	Cost	n	Cost/participant
National	\$13200	593	\$22.26
Exit Poll	\$3000	741	\$4.05
Students	\$0	299	\$0
Staff	\$1280	128	\$10.00
MTurk	\$550	1024	\$0.54
Ads	\$636	80	\$7.95

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Quiz time!

Compliance

1 What is compliance?

Compliance

- 1 What is compliance?
- 2 How can we analyze experimental data
when there is noncompliance?

Balance testing

- 1 What does randomization ensure about the composition of treatment groups?

Balance testing

- 1 What does randomization ensure about the composition of treatment groups?
- 2 What can we do if we find a covariate imbalance between groups?

Balance testing

- 1 What does randomization ensure about the composition of treatment groups?
- 2 What can we do if we find a covariate imbalance between groups?
- 3 How can we avoid this problem entirely?

Nonresponse and Attrition

- 1 Do we care about outcome nonresponse in experiments?

Nonresponse and Attrition

- 1 Do we care about outcome nonresponse in experiments?
- 2 How can we analyze experimental data when there is outcome nonresponse or post-treatment attrition?

Manipulation checks

- 1 What is a manipulation check? What can we do with it?

Manipulation checks

- 1 What is a manipulation check? What can we do with it?
- 2 What do we do if some respondents “fail” a manipulation check?

Null effects

- 1 What should we do if we find our estimated $\widehat{SATE} = 0$?

Null effects

- 1 What should we do if we find our estimated $\widehat{SATE} = 0$?
- 2 What does it mean for an experiment to be *underpowered*?

Null effects

- 1 What should we do if we find our estimated $\widehat{SATE} = 0$?
- 2 What does it mean for an experiment to be *underpowered*?
- 3 What can we do to reduce the probability of obtaining an (unwanted) “null effect”?

Effect heterogeneity

- 1 What should we do if, post-hoc, we find evidence of effect heterogeneity?

Effect heterogeneity

- 1 What should we do if, post-hoc, we find evidence of effect heterogeneity?
- 2 What can we do pre-implementation to address possible heterogeneity?

Representativeness

- 1 Under what conditions is a design-based, probability sample necessary for experimental inference?

Representativeness

- 1 Under what conditions is a design-based, probability sample necessary for experimental inference?
- 2 What kind of causal inferences can we draw from an experiment on a descriptively unrepresentative sample?

Peer Review

- 1 What should we do if a peer reviewer asks us to “control” for covariates in the analysis?

Peer Review

- 1 What should we do if a peer reviewer asks us to “control” for covariates in the analysis?
- 2 What should we do if a peer reviewer asks us to include or exclude particular respondents from the analysis?

Questions?

1 Beyond One-Shot Designs

2 More Statistical Issues

- Representativeness
- Mediation

3 Sources of Heterogeneity

- Settings
- Unit
- Treatments
- Outcomes

4 Participant Recruitment

5 Presentations/Conclusion

Presentations!

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the day, you should be able to...

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the day, you should be able to...

- 1 Explain how to analyze experiments quantitatively.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the day, you should be able to...

- 1 Explain how to analyze experiments quantitatively.
- 2 Explain how to design experiments that speak to relevant research questions and theories.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the day, you should be able to...

- 1 Explain how to analyze experiments quantitatively.
- 2 Explain how to design experiments that speak to relevant research questions and theories.
- 3 Evaluate the uses and limitations of several common survey experimental paradigms.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the day, you should be able to...

- 1 Explain how to analyze experiments quantitatively.
- 2 Explain how to design experiments that speak to relevant research questions and theories.
- 3 Evaluate the uses and limitations of several common survey experimental paradigms.
- 4 Identify practical issues that arise in the implementation of experiments and evaluate how to anticipate and respond to them.

Wrap-up

- Thanks to all of you!
- Stay in touch (t.leeper@lse.ac.uk)
- Good luck with your research!

Experimental Methods

- Druckman et al. 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge.
- Gerber and Green. 2011. *Field Experiments*. W.W. Norton.
- Mutz. 2011. *Population-Based Survey Experiments*. Princeton.
- Shadish et al. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Houghton Mifflin.

Survey Methods

- Groves et al. 2008. *Survey Methodology*. 2nd Edition. Wiley.
- Lohr. 2010. *Sampling: Design and Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Cengage.

Online Surveys

- Callegaro et al. 2015. *Web Survey Methodology*. Sage.
- Callegaro et al. 2015. *Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective*. Wiley.

References