



The Experimental Political Scientist



In this issue

- Morton in the desert
- Kam and Hands On Learning!
- Myers on Class Syllabi
- Shineman on Surveys and Behavior
- WCE Wrap-up
- Announcements

Welcome to the next issue of the Experimental Political Scientist. Leading off is a discussion by Rebecca Morton on her experimental experiences in Abu Dhabi. Next Cindy Kam and Dan Myers take up my call for submissions about the role of experiments in education, here, training the next generation of political experimentalists. Victoria Shineman provides a thoughtful discussion on behavioral measures in surveys. Kevin Esterling and Mike Tomz give us a nice summary of the recent WCE conference. We conclude with some important announcements. Submissions for the fall issue should be directed to the next editor, to be announced shortly by our leadership. In the meantime, happy experimentation!

Information on Joining or Contributing

The *Experimental Political Scientist* is the official newsletter of APSA Organized Experiments section 42.

To receive the newsletters register for the section (\$8/yr!) at <http://www.apsanet.org> and visit us at <http://ps-experiments.ucr.edu/group>. Previous issues available.

From the Editor

This is the last issue of the newsletter for me as editor. Editing the newsletter has been a lot of fun and fulfilling work. I have learned a lot from our colleagues throughout the discipline, as I hope you have as well. I very much would like to thank all of the contributors whose willingness to provide a public good, with marginal personal returns, is greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank my team of assistant editors, Kristen Michelitch, Dan Myers, and Jonathan Renshon, who have helped solicit some of the excellent contributions. All three of them are heading to great tenure track jobs.

These are undoubtedly exciting times for experimentalists. Political science is increasingly concerned with research design issues that we bring expertise to, and innovative designs and research questions are being put forward by our ranks. My hope is we will continue to resist seeing the world as a bunch of nails requiring our hammer, and be motivated by substantive questions that are also theoretically interesting. I also hope we continue to refine our methodological tools, understanding how, and whether, they help us. I suspect along the way that we will find older tools still help us a lot. For example, I'm increasingly interested in interview/open-ended data collection methods. I have much to learn!

Its been an honor to serve, but now its back to work!

Dustin Tingley, Editor

Government Department, Harvard University

Letter from the Desert

Rebecca Morton
New York University
rbm5@nyu.edu

As many of you may have heard, New York University has established a new campus in Abu Dhabi, New York University at Abu Dhabi. The campus is what NYU calls a “portal”– that is, it is not just a study abroad site for students from New York to have some interesting experiences, but a separate university within the university system that admits students and confers degrees, sort of like how the University of California system has campuses in Berkeley, San Diego, etc. There will be a third portal campus in Shanghai opening this fall. These developments have been controversial “on the square” as we colloquially call the New York campus on Washington Square, but exciting. I’ve never been at an institution as long as I have been at NYU and to be truthful it has been too long for me to just be in one place – I had a psychological evaluation as an undergrad and my preference for having change and variety was rated off the charts and I don’t think it has changed. So I have agreed to be a new “bridge” appointment, half in Abu Dhabi, and half back in the square, starting next year.

The most energizing aspect of these things to me, though, is not just the new location but the opportunities it has given me to explore new research agendas and to promote experimental work in the region, broadly defined. With other experimentalists and helpful staff, we have established a new Social Sciences Experimental Laboratory ([SSEL in Abu Dhabi](#)), and are beginning the process of building subject pools not just from the students at NYUAD but also students at local universities and the nonstudent population – which is almost as varied and certainly as interesting as New York City’s. Right now the lab is small, only 14 machines, but when we move to the new NYUAD campus on [Saadiyat Island](#), (the museum island where the Guggenheim and Louvre museum branches are being built as well), we will have a spacious area with two experimental laboratories of 46 machines and a large amount of portable equipment.

In January 2014 the NYUAD Institute, the Division of Social Sciences, and SSEL will host the Inaugural Winter Experimental Social Sciences Institute ([WESSI](#)). The Institute is designed to provide training for social science graduate students and junior faculty in experimental methods, broadly defined. The institute will provide training in lab, field, lab-in-the-field, and survey experimental methodology and cover a broad range of substantive topics in the social sciences drawn from economics, political science, and sociology. Practical training for lab-in-the-field experimentation will be provided. The Inaugural Institute will also include a special module on the issues and concerns of conducting experiments in the Middle East and surrounding region (In future years we will have focuses on Africa and Southwest Asia). Faculty providing instruction include: [Abigail Barr, University of Nottingham](#); [Fotini Christia, MIT](#); [Daniel Corstange, Columbia University](#); [Jacob Goeree, University of Zurich](#); [Amaney Jamal, Princeton University](#); [Dorothea Kuebler, WZB Berlin](#); [Andreas Lange, University of Hamburg](#); and myself.

Applications for the program can be submitted online [here](#). Applications are due by August 1, 2013

and decisions will be announced by September 1, 2013. Prospective applicants should submit their cv/resume, a writing/research sample, and if a current graduate student, a letter of support from their principal adviser. Enrollment is limited to 14 students; thus students will receive significant individual guidance and instruction.

The NYU Abu Dhabi Institute has graciously offered to provide full tuition scholarships for all participants attending the Inaugural workshop (in future years the Institute will charge a tuition of \$1,200). Participants will also be provided with housing as well as a number of social activities. Participants will only be responsible for transportation to Abu Dhabi, most of their meals, and incidental expenses.

But enough of the commercial – Dustin suggested I write this brief report to share with you insights that I have gained from my time in Abu Dhabi (and also some lab in the field research I have conducted in China) on laboratory experimentation outside the traditional westernized environment. To be honest, some of what I learned is probably already well known by experimentalists who have been working in nonwesternized countries for some time and not nearly what I expect to learn in future years as our lab in Abu Dhabi grows. So I do not pretend to have any special secret knowledge or necessarily new knowledge. Yet, my experiences may be helpful for some of you.

Insight #1 – You can't just go on the streets and interview people you don't know in Abu Dhabi.

OK, so I didn't actually try to do this myself. Our bravest researchers are our undergraduates at NYUAD. And a couple of them, without getting approval from the university or any other authority, decided they were going to interview shopkeepers in the area around the university's campus as to their feelings about the fish market that had existed in the space before the university displaced it. After only a few minutes policemen showed up and the interviewing was put on hold as some shopkeepers had called them and complained. The students learned something, maybe more than they expected. But what does this experience really mean? What I have learned is that you cannot choose subjects just randomly approaching houses or individuals or from phone listings in Abu Dhabi, you have to work through channels formal and informal. I also have learned this about recruiting subjects in China in my collaboration there, but fortunately or unfortunately there is no story of trying random interviewing to relate.

Nevertheless, often the formal channels are amazingly opaque in the UAE. One other colleague thought that a good way to reach subjects would be to put up flyers in supermarkets. Despite a lot of effort, however, it was nearly impossible to find out which governmental agency could actually give approval for such flyers. And then, even when such approval seemed to be given by the authority that others said should give it (although these officials did not seem to think it was their responsibility), the supermarket owners refused to let the researcher put up the flyers and signs anyway.

So what can be done? The informal channels in the UAE are best to reach subjects (and they can lead to formal approval when you need it). You can survey and interview strangers, but through common intermediaries, not just randomly at your own choosing. And you have to spend some time with these common intermediaries, getting to know them, work with them, explain what you are doing and not doing. For example, a colleague of mine at NYUAD, Rahma Abdulkadir, is doing research on displaced

Somalis in the UAE. To do so, she works through local Somali community groups to reach her subjects. Other researchers have worked through local embassies and religious institutions to reach particular expat communities within the UAE. I've had the Ambassador from Sri Lanka (the home country of many workers in the region) come to my class and met with him several times in such an effort as well as other community leaders. We are taking this route more broadly to build some of our nonstudent subject pool for SSEL. Research with nonstudents in the community is definitely possible, but you want to make sure that you do so in a way that does not lead your subjects to want to call the police.

Insight #2 – There is a way for political economists and psychologists to collaborate in building a common subject pool.

Given the above difficulties in building subject pools learned in Insight #1 – it makes sense to try to collaborate with other researchers who want to recruit subjects in the UAE. However, traditionally I have worried about the methodological issues of collaborating with psychologists who use deception in their experiments. In my experiments it is important that subjects believe me when I convey information to them and I have always used labs and subject pools with strict no deception rules. Yet, recruiting subjects in the UAE (working through the informal channels described above) really needs full time personnel to help in the process and it would be nice to be able to share the expense with the psychologists at NYUAD.

And we were able to work out a compromise to do so. We did so by designating experiments as two types – “Standard” and “Advanced Studies.” Standard Studies are studies that are conducted in a completely transparent manner. They inform participants at the beginning of the study that the study is an examination of human behavior and provide truthful information throughout the whole study as to the mechanisms and procedures of the study. Typical examples for such studies are experiments on language processing or investigations involving economic games. Standard studies will use the SSEL protocol, which has been approved by the NYUAD IRB for all experiments in the SSEL lab or using the SSEL laptops off-campus. Specifically, standard studies meet the following requirements:

1. Subjects make one or more evaluations or decisions or other choices. If more than one such evaluation or decision or choice is taken, the exact number is known, or if it is not known, the rule that determines when they will stop is known.
2. Subjects are told if they are making judgments or decisions on their own, or if the outcome also depends on what others choose. If it also depends on what others choose, the way in which they are grouped together is explained to them.
3. When subjects are participating in a group exercise where their payments depend on the group choice, what they know and what others know is told to everyone. That is, if there is something each subject is told in private, all subjects know that others have such private information.
4. If subjects are asked to take decisions in a practice run, or dry run, those decisions do not affect their final payoffs or the agreed upon compensation for the experiment.

5. When a study involves incentivized payoffs, the way by which payoffs are determined is explained to the subjects. The payoffs of one subject are not shown to other subjects (unless all subjects are paid the same amount).

Advanced Studies are studies that are conducted in a semi-transparent manner. These studies focus on phenomena that may change when participants are fully aware about what is being studied. Hence, they inform participants at the beginning of the study only partially about the study goal and may provide misleading information during the study. Importantly, advanced studies will always restore full transparency towards the end of the study (i.e., participants will be informed of the study's goal and potentially misleading information). Note that advanced studies will always give participants the option to ask for their data to be deleted, once they have been informed about the study's entire intention. Typical examples for advanced studies are experiments on helping behavior given that many people are more willing to help others when they are aware that their helping behavior is monitored. Hence, studies on helping tend to refrain from informing participants about their exact goal at the beginning of the study.

When subjects sign up for experiments, they are automatically placed in the Standard Studies pool. They have the option to also participated in the Advanced Studies pool. And when I recruit subjects from the pool for a particular experiment I will stress to them that my experiment is a Standard Study and remind them of the five requirements of Standard Studies. Of course, our collaboration is in its infancy, so it may not work out. But I am hopeful and pleased that we were able to come up with a compromise so that we could join forces in recruiting.

Insight #3 – You can't gamble with frames.

Many experiments conducted by political economists involve lotteries, often represented as gambles, which subjects must choose between. But such a frame may be offensive to Muslim subjects as we learned when one of my colleagues wished to ask such questions in an experiment in a rural area of the UAE since gambling is frowned upon in their religion. But such subjects do take risks in other ways and it is possible to devise experimental treatments which allow them to make such choices. For example, exchange rates vary over time and a frame which has subjects choosing whether to exchange currency at today's known rate versus tomorrow's uncertain rate (but with given probabilities), can be used if you are interested in studying choice over time with uncertainty. Alternatively, you can have subjects choose different routes to the airport from their home or some other location, which vary in the probabilities of arriving by a particular time. The bottom line is that not only do you need to work with intermediaries to recruit subjects, you also may need to have them give you advice on how to ask questions that may be sensitive for the subjects. Changing the frames, nevertheless, may make some of the replicability across subject pools difficult and it may mean that we need to re-run some experiments conducted in other cultures with more similar frames if the point of the study is to say compare risk preferences across cultures.

Insight #4 – Gender and Age Matters

Fortunately for our building a subject pool with students both at NYUAD and local universities, the legal age of maturity in the UAE is 18. However, if you want to do an experiment with children, you

need to get informed consent from the father unless the mother has become the legally-appointed guardian of the child (e.g, after divorce) and then the mother can sign the consent form. Many undergraduate institutions in the UAE (not NYUAD) have completely divided campuses with women and men taught in separate classrooms and a wall between the two campuses. If you conduct experiments at these universities, you will then conduct them with the sexes separated as well. It is unclear at present how separated such subjects would need to be if they come to our lab at NYUAD; the exact arrangements will depend on the rules at the local institution. For at least one more conservative institution with which we have discussed collaboration, a trip to our lab would be a field trip and, for women undergraduates, require their father's permission. Since these permissions are sometimes refused for more standard field trips, for these students it may be best to conduct experiments at their own lab if possible. Other undergraduate institutions do not require such permissions and women eagerly participate in field trips and our contacts report will be more than willing to come to our lab. In general, the enthusiasm to participate in experiments seems higher among women Emirati subjects than male ones. However, this experience may be a fluke of our initial recruitment strategies rather than a robust finding and we hope to increase our recruitment efforts among Emirati male subjects.

Insight #5 – Incentivizing experiments with Emirati subjects may be difficult.

Many Emirati subjects are well off; the UAE is a wealthy country. For those of us who conduct experiments where we incentivize subjects with financial inducements, figuring out how to incentivize Emirati subjects is not necessarily easy.¹ One solution is to find other things that are important to the subjects. One thing that is important is some recognition for their participation in the research and the provision of something to them in compensation in terms of learning or training. What do I mean? A simple form of recognition is a Certificate of Completion, something that a subject can put on his or her resume. It might be possible to have different levels of certificates. The learning and training can be the opportunity to attend lectures by the experimenter or other colleagues that also provides a certificate of completion, which can be given as a reward for performance in an experiment.

There are problems with using Certificates for incentives. Most importantly, they aren't easily divisible as money is, so there are limitations to the types and varieties of treatments one can conduct. One solution is to have subjects earn points that increase the probability of receiving a certificate, but then you will also be asking subjects to participate in a lottery, i.e. gamble, see Insight #3. Even if the lumpiness is ok for the experimental design, the fact that random assignment may mean that some subjects have a higher probability of earning a certificate than others may be problematic for the same reason. So far, the fact that "chance" can affect one's monetary earnings in experiments has not been raised as a concern by our Emirati subjects or other Muslim subjects.

Concluding Remarks

These five insights are just the few things I've learned in the past year and a half with the lab in existence. I'm sure that in future years I will learn much more as we expand our experimental work in the UAE and the region broadly. I hope that many of you will come and visit us and also use our lab for

¹Note that incentivizing expat subjects in the UAE is not so problematic since many of them are sending money back to their home countries to families who have serious financial needs and they value monetary payments highly.

your experiments! We can offer programming assistance for lab experiments, portable equipment for lab-in-the-field experiments, and once our subject pool recruitment is fully operational, subject pool assistance. Please contact me at rbm5@nyu.edu if you are interested.

From imagining to doing: Building a hands-on component into an experimental methods course

Cindy Kam
Vanderbilt University
cindy.d.kam@vanderbilt.edu

In 1909, APSA president A. Lawrence Lowell claimed that “Politics is an observational, not an experimental science” (Lowell 1910, cited in Druckman et al. 2006, p. 627). In less than one hundred years, political science has resolutely proved Lowell wrong. Today, amidst the explosion of experimentation in political science (Druckman et al. 2006; Kam, Wilking, and Zechmeister 2007) and on the heels of the causal inference revolution, scholars are increasingly incorporating experimental designs. And, all signs point to a new reality in which political science graduate students and undergraduates are increasingly being exposed to and trained to conduct experiments.

As Wilson, Aronson, and Carlsmith (2010) note, “Experimentation is very much like a trade, like plumbing or carpentry or directing a play: the best way to learn to do it is by apprenticing oneself to a master” (p. 51-52). This apprenticeship model works well in the psychological sciences, where students are more formally affiliated with faculty laboratories and where faculty work closely with a few selected students. In political science, formal laboratories of this sort are rare, and training in experiments may arise not necessarily through apprenticeship but through formal coursework in experimental design. I find myself caught in this transition period, as someone who has never taken a formal class in experimental design, but who has taught such a course on several occasions in the past ten years. With this note, I want to offer some reflections on ways of introducing a hands-on component into a formal course in experimental methods that moves students from imagining an experimental study to doing an experimental study. By incorporating a hands-on component - where students, either in a group or individually, engage in the process of designing, implementing, and analyzing their own experiment - a formal course in experimental methods can provide some of the valuable training experiences that have traditionally been forged via informal apprenticeship.

The broad structure of my course resembles that of other courses in experimental design. The introductory meeting sets the stage, looking at the growth of experimentation in political science, the role of experimentation in real politics, and lays common ground for the students by taking a close look at a canonical experiment in political science. Subsequent class meetings focus on the logic of causal inference, mechanisms, internal and external validity, types of designs, ethics of interventionist research, measurement, and types of experimental studies (lab studies inspired by psychology and economics, survey experiments, field experiments). I also include a class period where we walk through strategies for the analysis of experimental data. In many iterations of the course, the final deliverable

has been a research design, where students have the chance to reflect on the tools they acquired during the course of the seminar and imagine applying them to a hypothetical project they could someday execute. Such exercises in imagination have been valuable, as many students have used their designs as a basis for a TESS proposal or for the collection of data on our student subject pools.

In recent years, I have incorporated a more hands-on approach that pushes students beyond imagining an experimental study and into doing an experimental study. I have used two models for conducting research in an experimental methods course: a group project and individual projects.

The Group Project

To set the stage for our group project, I reserved course time for students to brainstorm ideas for the project. We ended up using a research idea I had been kicking around for a while but had never developed very far: the relationship between the number of candidates and electoral decision-making. In class, we laid out the basic design (exposing subjects to one, three, or six candidate biographies, with or without an incumbency cue). Then, teams of students developed various parts of the project: one team proposed a draft of the stimuli (judicial candidate biographies); one team developed the dependent variables (questions about candidate preference, certainty, and difficulty of the decision, as well as attitudes towards the election); one team identified potential moderators (e.g., need for cognition, political awareness). Each team sent a memo to the group, and we devoted time in-class to debating and drilling into the fine details of our study. We debated the wording and design of stimuli, the wording, order, and design of questions, and the additional covariates we might want to collect (and why we would want to collect them).

After we finalized the study in class, each student received IRB certification, and I submitted the IRB application for our study. We received approval within a few weeks. In our particular case, the group project was to be executed in our experimental lab.² The RA for the experimental lab programmed the study. Each student walked through the study for timing and proofing, and each student attended a mandatory orientation session to receive training on how to administer the study in our experimental lab. Each student was required to participate in subject recruitment: students paired up to visit political science courses, explain the nature of the study, hand out a study information sheet, and answer any questions that arose. Each student worked a minimum of one hour in the experimental lab (several volunteered more time), an experience that gave them a hands-on feel for collecting data. And at the close of the study period, each student was given access to the data and submitted a data analysis memo that explored a question of particular interest to the student. We devoted a class period to discussing what each student uncovered from the data analysis and discussed how one might develop an academic paper based on the results. In addition to participating in the group project, each student submitted a final paper that constituted an original research design tailored to the student's interests.

The Individual Project

More recently, my students have each designed, executed, and analyzed their own original studies in the experimental methods course. The final deliverable for the course was an article-style research paper. Such an approach requires each student to come up with a research topic quickly and

²<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/rips>

independently - a task that some students are more prepared for than others. Each experiment was to be fielded using subjects from one of two convenience samples: our political science subject pool or Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk pool (see Berinsky et al. 2012 for details). Most students elected to collect their data on MTurk. By week 8, after seminar meetings that focused on causal inference, validity, reliability, design, and measurement, each student was prepared to give a class presentation that detailed the research question and the specifics of the experimental design (including the stimuli and questions). The class presentations (and friendly though constructive feedback) helped students refine their studies. By week 10, each student was required to program the study using Qualtrics³, a user-friendly, WYSIWYG (what-you-see-is-what-you-get) web-based survey questionnaire platform. Because each student programmed her own study, she was forced to confront choices about stimuli design, question selection, placement, wording, and visual presentation. By week 10, each student was also required to submit an IRB application tailored to her project. By week 11, each student had created a Requester profile in Amazon's Mechanical Turk, had prepared a HIT (Human Intelligence Task) ad to recruit subjects, and was awaiting IRB approval. Once a study received IRB approval, the student published the HITs⁴, and the data rolled in. By week 13, each student prepared a second class presentation equivalent to a conference presentation. The final deliverable was an article-style research paper.

Comparison

There were advantages and disadvantages to each type of project. The group project actively engaged students in a collaborative effort from start to finish. It focused all students on a single project that had multiple layers to it. It was cost-effective, in that we fielded only one study, and the students volunteered their time to subsidize most of the data collection costs. It had some downsides, though. The most prominent downside was that no single student had a deep-seated stake in the project.

The individual projects gave students the space (and modest resources) to pursue topics of their own choosing. Indeed, several initiated projects that they intend to use as pilots for their dissertation. Settling on a topic was difficult for some students, but generally they seemed to throw themselves wholeheartedly into their individual projects. The downside? The individual projects required far more oversight on my part. I reviewed (and eventually signed off on) twelve IRB applications. I reviewed, proofed, and trouble-shooted twelve experimental studies, and I checked and approved their Amazon HITs before funding their accounts. And, these individual projects did require a modest amount of funding (although one could imagine fielding these studies on convenience samples that are not compensated monetarily, such as undergraduates).

From Imagining to Doing

The nature of experimental data collection has evolved rapidly in the past fifteen years. For my very first experiment, I remember using a hand truck to haul 300 shuffled packets into Hanes Walton's Introduction to American Politics course. I passed out the paper-and-pencil instrument, waited for the students to fill out the "survey," and spent a full week on data entry. These days, experimental data can

³Each student signed up for a free demonstration copy of Qualtrics; with the demonstration license, a user can collect up to 200 responses.

⁴I provided each student with a nominal research fund (\$220) to enable them to collect data on MTurk.

be collected and processed in a very short span of time (sometimes a matter of hours), by delivering an experiment on the web and using an easily accessible convenience sample such as MTurk. These changes make it all the more plausible to execute a study within a semester-long course, and the myriad skills and experiences gained by moving students from imagining to doing seem to make it well worth the investment.

References

- Berinsky, Adam J., Gregory A. Huber, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2012. Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political analysis* 20: 351-368.
- Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. The growth and development of experimental research in political science. *American political science review* 100 (4): 627-635.
- Kam, Cindy D., Jennifer R. Wilking, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2007. Beyond the 'narrow database': An alternative convenience sample for experimental research. *Political behavior* 29 (4): 415-440.
- Wilson, Timothy D., Elliot Aronson, and Kevin Carlsmith. 2010. "The art of laboratory experimentation." In *Handbook of social psychology*, fifth edition, eds. Susan T. Fiske, Daniel T. Gilbert and Gardner Lindzey. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 51-81.

A Survey of Experimental Methods Courses in Political Science Departments

C. Daniel Myers
University of Michigan
myerscd@umich.edu

Experimental methods are growing in prominence in the discipline. Since Druckman et al. (2006) documented the rise in the number of papers in the *American Political Science Review* that used experimental methods, we have seen the creation of an APSA section, several annual conferences on experiments in political science, and now a journal. However, the success of any methodological revolution depends in large part on its ability to train young scholars. This article will examine the extent of formal graduate training on the use of experimental methods in American political science departments. As others have noted (e.g. Kam, this volume) training in experimental methods does not always happen in the classroom. Students may learn experimental methods working as a research assistant. Nevertheless, formal course offerings in experimental methods are important, as they allow for more comprehensive training and also demonstrate a higher degree of commitment to experimental methods by the department offering the course.

A number of previous articles have examined the content of methodology course offerings and course requirements in political science departments (Burns 1990; Dyer 1992; Schwartz-Shea 2003). However, none of these examine the presence of experimental methodology courses; indeed most

pre-date the recent renewed interest in experimental methods in the discipline. To address this gap, we examine how many political science departments offer courses in experimental methodology. To put this number in context, we also report data on the number offering courses in survey methodology, a more established research method within the discipline. We then present an analysis of the content of experimental methods courses, examining eight syllabi from classes taught at a range of universities across the country. As an appendix, we provide a repository of syllabi for graduate experimental courses, available at this [link](#), that may provide useful for faculty designing their own courses.⁵

Method

Our sample was the 103 departments listed in the National Research Council's ranking of universities offering Ph.D. degrees in political science, politics, or government (National Research Council 2011). We looked for four different types of courses, based on course titles and descriptions. We looked at graduate-level courses only. For departments that made a distinction between masters-level courses and doctoral-level courses we examined only doctoral-level courses.

- **Experimental Methodology Courses:** Courses whose primary focus was the design and conduct of experiments.
- **Courses Mentioning Experimental Methodology:** Courses whose primary focus was not the design of experiments, but that mention the design and conduct of experiments as one of the topics covered. For example, a general course on research design might mention experiments as one of the data collection techniques covered. We include courses whose primary focus is experimental methods in this count.
- **Survey Methodology Courses:** Courses whose primary focus was the design and conduct of surveys.
- **Courses Mentioning Survey Methodology:** Courses whose primary focus was not the design of surveys, but that mention the design and conduct of surveys as one of the topics covered. We include courses whose primary focus is survey methods in this count.

A few courses were explicitly focused on both survey and experimental design. These courses were counted as both an experimental methodology course and a survey methodology course. We coded departments as a one if they offered at least one course that met the description, and zero otherwise.

Following the method of Schwartz-Shea (2003), we examined official course listings drawn from one of three sources: a) department websites, b) official university bulletins available from university websites or from the database College Source, or c) semester-by-semester listings of courses offered by the department in previous semesters. We only include departments for which fairly recent and complete data could be obtained. For data drawn from department websites or official university bulletins we drop departments where the most recent data was from before the 2011-2012 academic year; for data drawn from semester-by-semester listings of courses we only include departments where

⁵Faculty who would be willing to contribute their syllabus to the repository should email myerscd@umich.edu.

	Percent of Departments
Offers Experimental Methods Course	13
Course Mentions Experimental Methods	34
Offers Survey Methods Course	22
Course Mentions Survey Methods	39

Table 1: Percentage of Departments with Experimental and Survey Courses

at least four years of course listings were available. We are interested in the institutionalization of experimental methods training as shown by their inclusion as distinct courses with their own course numbers and names. Thus, we exclude courses on these methods that are taught as “special topics” courses or reading courses, except when there is evidence that the special topics label was regularly used to teach experimental or survey methods courses. Using this methods, we collected data from 91 out of 103 departments.

While measuring course offerings using official course bulletins and listings has advantages, notably the ability to quickly examine course offerings across a large number of departments in a uniform manner, this method also has some weaknesses. By focusing on official course bulletins, we ignore training offered through other formal or informal channels. We also do not attempt to measure course offerings in other departments (e.g. psychology or economics) where graduate students might seek methodology training. Additionally, we do not attempt to ascertain how frequently these courses were offered. Official university bulletins are notoriously littered with classes that have not been offered in years, raising the possibility that we are overestimating the number of departments offering training in experimental and survey methods. All of these weaknesses should be taken into account when evaluating our results.

Results

Despite the fact that experimental methods have gained prominence within political science only recently, we find that a sizable minority of departments offer courses that include at least some training in experimental methods. Table 1 reports the result of this survey. Thirteen percent of departments offer courses focused on experimental methods, and roughly one-third offer courses whose descriptions mention the design or conduct of experiments. This is fewer than the number of departments that offer training in survey methodology: roughly one in five departments have a course focused on survey methodology, while almost 40 percent offer a course that includes some training in survey methodology.

A department’s ability to offer specialized methodology reports may be in part determined by the department’s status in the discipline and the number of graduate students taking classes at any one time. Tables 2 and 3 show the frequency with which departments of different rank and size, respectively, offer experimental courses. We draw on data from the NRC rankings of political science programs. Size is based on the NRC’s calculation of average incoming cohort size between 2002 and 2006, the most recently available data on entering cohort size. The NRC reports rankings as a range; we assign each department the midpoint of the department’s range, and then divide departments up

	1st Quartile (top-ranked)	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile (bottom-ranked)
Offers Experimental Methods Course	26	22	4	0
Course Mentions Experimental Methods	57	48	17	13
Offers Survey Methods Course	22	22	22	22
Course Mentions Survey Methods	48	39	35	30

Table 2: Percentage of Departments with Experimental and Survey Courses by Department Ranking

	1st Quartile (largest)	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	4th Quartile (smallest)
Offers Experimental Methods Course	26	17	4	0
Course Mentioning Experimental Methods	57	35	22	22
Survey Methods Course	26	30	9	22
Course Mentions Survey Methods	43	48	17	43

Table 3: Percentage of Departments with Experimental and Survey Courses by Department Size

into quartiles.⁶

The results suggest a strong relationship between ranking and offering an experimental methods course. Only one department in the bottom half of these rankings offered a course specifically focused on experimental methods, and these departments were also much less likely to offer classes that mention experimental methods in their description. Interestingly, no such relationship appears with respect to survey methodology courses. Dedicated survey methodology courses appear at a roughly similar rate in higher and lower ranked departments, and courses mentioning survey methods are offered only slightly more frequently in higher ranked departments. We see a similar relationship with department size. Larger departments are considerably more likely to offer experimental methodology courses, but only slightly more likely to offer survey methodology courses. At nearly all department sizes and rankings, survey methodology courses are more common than experimental methodology courses. The exception is top-ranked departments, where experimental courses are slightly more common.

These relationships suggest that while training in experimental methodology has made significant inroads in the last decade, it is still limited to particular kinds of departments. Experimental methods courses are also significantly less common than courses in survey methodology, a more established research technique. This may be caused by the fact that the widespread use of experimental methods is relatively new in political science. As students trained at larger and higher-ranked departments take jobs at smaller and lower-ranked departments, experimental training may diffuse through the discipline. Thus, the distribution of survey methodology courses, without a strong relationship with

⁶We use the NRC's S-rankings, but results are similar using the R-rankings.

department size or rank, may show the future of experimental methodology training. This depends, of course, on experimental methodology remaining a mainstream research technique in political science.

The Content of Experimental Methodology Courses

To examine the content of experimental methods courses offered in the discipline, we sought copies of the syllabi for all of the experimental methods courses identified in our survey of courses, as well as syllabi for courses taught occasionally as special topics classes that were not captured in the survey. We gathered nine syllabi that were either publicly available on the internet or by emailing the course instructor directly.

Several topics appear in all of the syllabi. Most begin with a discussion of different types of experiments in the discipline. However, the syllabi differed in whether they present this as an examination of different methods (lab vs. field vs. survey) or different theoretical traditions (economics vs. psychology); some used both lenses. All courses also included a discussion of the theory of causal inference, generally based around a discussion of the Rubin causal model. All courses spent at least some class time on applied design and data analysis issues, including discussions of blocking, power, moderators, mediation analysis, and modeling heterogeneous treatment effects. Interestingly, most courses included some discussion of natural or quasi-experiments, including discussions of regression discontinuity and instrumental variable designs. Other topics were covered in some courses but not others. Notable among these were issues of validity, hands-on training in software like z-Tree, Qualtrics or MediaLab, and research ethics.⁷

Teaching a graduate experimental methods course has been made easier in recent years by the publication of two textbooks on the subject written by political scientists: Morton and Williams (2010)'s *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality* and Gerber and Green (2012)'s *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Six of the eight syllabi analyzed used one of these as the primary text with an even split between the two. Other popular texts, assigned as either required texts or for select chapters, were Druckman et al. (2011)'s *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science* and Angrist and Pischke (2009)'s *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*.

All courses required some kind of a project, though the specifics of the project varied.⁸ All but one course required students to create an original experimental design, while four asked students to go further and collect at least preliminary data. The remaining course asked students to replicate and extend the analysis of data collected in an existing experiment. Most courses asked students to work alone on their designs, though two employed group or class projects. Two courses explicitly tied the project to learning how to apply for funding by asking final projects to follow the format of a grant proposal to a funding agency like the National Science Foundation. A majority of courses used the project as the centerpiece of the course, accounting for most of the course's grade. Nearly all courses also devoted a substantial portion of class time for the presentation of students' experimental designs or results. In the other courses, projects were a smaller portion of the grade; all but one of the classes

⁷Though most syllabi explicitly required students to complete IRB certification, only a few included class sessions dedicated to discussing ethical issues.

⁸See Cindy Kam's contribution to this issue for an in-depth discussion of projects in experimental methods courses.

Type of Journal	Mean Percent	Range
Economics Journal	18	5 - 31
Psychology Journal	15	0 - 33
Political Science Journals	52	41 - 62
Other Journals	16	8 - 28

Table 4: Mean Percentage of Assigned Readings from Different Disciplines' Journals

included problem sets or some other assignment not related to the final project, and four of the eight had a final exam.

Experimentation in political science has always been a hybrid of two traditions, experimental economics and experimental psychology. To see the balance of these two traditions in graduate training we examined the frequency with which readings from psychology, economics, and political science journals were assigned in these courses. Six of the eight syllabi examined included detailed reading lists; we counted the discipline of the journal that all required readings were published in or, for unpublished readings, the discipline of the lead author. Table 4 shows that in the average course a slight majority of readings were taken from political science journals, with economics journals, psychology and journals in other fields each accounting for roughly the same percentage of course readings.⁹ The analysis also reveals a considerable range in the discipline of assigned readings, with articles in psychology journals accounting for between 0 and 33 percent of readings and articles in economics journals accounting for between 5 and 31 percent of readings in different courses.

Conclusion

Experimental methods in political science have come a long way in the past decade, and the sizable minority of departments that offer graduate courses in experimental methods is further evidence of this trend. Still, the data reported in this article show that there is a long way to go before training in experimental methods becomes as accessible as training in more established methods like surveys. At present, training in experimental methods is concentrated in large, top-ranked departments, though experimental course offerings may disperse further as students trained in these departments begin to teach their own methods courses. Hopefully, the second section of this article will be of some assistance to section members who are considering developing their own experimental methods courses.

References

- Angrist, Joshua D. and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ.
- Burns, Nancy. 1990. Methodology in Graduate Political Science Programs. *The Political Methodologist*. 3(1): 9-10.
- Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2011. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge University Press. New York.

⁹Other journals included statistics, sociology and public health journals as well as papers in journals like *Nature* and *PNAS*.

- Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science. *American Political Science Review*. 100(4): 627-635.
- Dyer, James A. 1992. A Survey of Political Science Research Methods Courses. *The Political Methodologist*. 5(1): 17-19.
- Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York.
- Kam, Cindy. 2013. From imagining to doing: Building a hands-on component into an experimental methods course. *The Experimental Political Scientist*. 4(1)
- Morton, Rebecca B. and Kenneth C. Williams. 2010. *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality: From Nature to the Lab*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- National Research Council. 2011. *A Data-Based Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States*. National Academies Press. Washington, DC.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2003. Is This the Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology. *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 36(3): 379-386.

Methods for Using Surveys to Estimate Behavioral Effects

Victoria Shineman

CSDP Princeton

victoria.shineman@gmail.com

A common question within social science research is whether changes in attitudes also generate changes in behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein 2000; Glasman and Albarracinn 2006). As such, a researcher might want to estimate the effects of a given experimental treatment on both political attitudes and behaviors. Many experiments use post-treatment surveys to estimate the effects of experimental stimuli. However, using survey questions to estimate behavioral outcome variables introduces a particular set of challenges. This essay reviews a series of innovative strategies for embedding questions and tasks into surveys in order to estimate changes in behaviors, particularly in cases where incentives for misreporting actual attitudes and behaviors are increased by the sensitive nature of the research question. The list of strategies is extracted and inspired from current research in the discipline, and is intended to summarize some of the current trends in experimental research.

Self-Predicted Hypothetical Behavior

A common method for estimating behavioral responses is to ask a subject to self-identify how she would act in a hypothetical scenario. Self-predicted hypothetical behavior can be incredibly informative, and can reveal significant differences between treatment groups. However, self-predicted hypothetical behavior can be subject to systematic error, particularly when a question involves sensitive content, such as whether or not a subject would engage in a socially desired behavior.

Even if respondents try to be sincere, reporting hypothetical behavior is not the same thing as making a real choice. For example, Morton and Williams (2010, p. 359) cite several studies which demonstrate that hypothetical choices differ significantly from choices made in settings where actions are incentivized with real consequences. Subjects consistently over-report socially desired behaviors.

There are several strategies which can increase the accuracy of self-identified responses: 1) Embed Question or Responses with Acceptable Excuses: A researcher might want to ask a subject whether she voted in a recent election. In comparison to a direct survey question with only “yes” and “no” as alternative responses, questions which include a forgiving preamble, or which offer multiple responses embedded with acceptable excuses, have been found to decrease the frequency of over-reporting (Duff et al. 2007; Peter and Valkenburg 2011). 2) Increase Anonymity of Response: The accuracy and honesty of responses to sensitive questions can also be increased by maximizing the privacy of the subject’s response. Both the Item Count Technique (ICT) and the Randomized Response Technique (RRT) increase the anonymity and deniability of responses, and have been found to generate an increase in honest responses (Tourangeau and Yan 2007; Holbrook and Krosnick 2010; Blair and Imai 2012; Glynn 2013; and Kramon and Weghorst 2012). Surveys in the field can introduce unique challenges with regard to maximizing the privacy of responses. Alternative strategies can adapt to varying settings. For example, when surveying populations with limited literacy, researchers can preserve the usage of written surveys by using images instead of words (Chauchard 2013; Kramon and Weghorst 2013). If a survey must be conducted in a highly observable environment, a researcher can also increase the privacy of the subject by playing pre-recorded questions or statements through headphones attached to an MP3 player (Chauchard 2013). 3) Inferred Valuation: Instead of asking a subject what choice she would make in a given scenario, survey questions that ask a subject to evaluate what choice “most people” (or some other reference group) would make have been found to increase the accuracy of predicted behaviors (Norwood and Lusk 2011). 4) Alert Subjects to Hypothetical Response Bias: Making subjects aware of the existence and causes of hypothetical response bias before asking hypothetical questions can also increase the accuracy of self-assessments (Ajzen, Brown, and Carvajal 2004).

Linking Responses to Non-Hypothetical Behavior

The section above summarizes common strategies for increasing the accuracy of self-predicted hypothetical behaviors. There are also several strategies for designing survey questions and survey tasks which enable estimation of incentivized behavioral responses.

Interactions with Other Subjects: Behavioral Games

Behavioral games can be useful for estimating behavioral responses which are linked to particular attitudes, such as trust, reciprocity, egalitarianism, or risk preferences (Camerer 2003). An experimenter can estimate the effects of a treatment on behavior by comparing behavior in post-treatment games across treatment groups. An experimenter might also inform subjects that the other player in the game is of a particular subgroup – such as groups based on ethnicity, gender, or income – in order to estimate whether an experimental treatment affected attitudes toward particular groups (Bra as-Garza 2006; Wilson and Eckel 2006; Chen and Li 2009; Chang 2013; and Michelitch 2013). However, the usage of behavioral games requires interactive capabilities that might not be possible across all survey formats, and behavioral games might not be suitable for addressing all research questions.

Introduce Impact on Outside World

In some cases, a researcher might want to assess the intensity of a subject’s opinion toward a

particular policy or advocacy. For example, a traditional survey question might ask a subject to identify whether she believes the Mississippi law which forbids same-sex couples from adopting children should be maintained or repealed. But what if the researcher wanted to identify the effects of a given treatment on not just self-identified attitudes toward the law, but also on a subject's propensity to act on behalf of the proclaimed advocacy?

One alternative would be to ask a subject to self-identify hypothetical behavior in a series of potential scenarios. Suppose the researcher identified two non-profit organizations, one in support of maintaining the law and the other in support of repealing this law. Consider a question that begins with the following stem:

STEM: Mississippi enforces a law which forbids same-sex couples from adopting children. [ORGANIZATION #1: MAINTAIN] is actively lobbying the government to *maintain* this law and [ORGANIZATION #2: REPEAL] is actively lobbying the government to *repeal* this law. . . .

And then continues as follows:

Question 1: Would you be willing to [donate money / sign a petition / volunteer your time / etc.] in order to provide support for either organization?

Section 1 reviewed methods for increasing the accuracy of hypothetical responses. However, the reliability of self-identified hypothetical behavior is still limited because predicting engagement with a behavior during a survey incurs no cost to the subject and provides little or no actual support for the cause. These concerns are particularly aggravated when a question involves content relating to socially desired behaviors. Suppose a given individual believed that support for the adoption rights of same-sex couples was a socially-desired attitude, yet at the same time, that individual was personally in opposition to allowing same-sex couples to adopt a child. Such an individual could easily indicate that she would offer her resources in support of the organization trying to repeal the law, in order to appear more favorable in the eyes of the experimenter. In this case, it is easy for the subject to provide the response she believes is socially desirable, because neither response incurs a cost to the subject or provides actual support for the purported advocacy.¹⁰

However, a similar behavioral question can be structured such that a subject is unable to provide a positive response without also providing actual support for the cause. One form of support a subject could be asked to provide is financial support to organizations or actors who act on behalf of a particular advocacy (Miller and Krosnick 2004; Carpenter, Connolly, and Myers 2008; Han 2009; Harrison and Michelson 2012; and Lee and Hsieh 2013). From a design perspective, monetary donations are particularly useful because an option to donate can be introduced at no cost to the subject, and because donation options are easily manipulated to provide an ideal ratio between cost to

¹⁰Although I describe the declaration of an advocacy within a survey as an action that does not provide direct support for that advocacy, some benefits toward the advocacy might occur. If an attitude is perceived to be more commonly held, people who are on the margin might feel more comfortable agreeing. Furthermore, legislators might be more likely to pursue public policies that are thought to respond to public opinion. In both these cases, the mere act of influencing the outcome of a public opinion survey might increase the strength of a social movement. Additionally, reporting a false preference might cause a subject to incur a cost, through the discomfort the subject feels for being dishonest.

the subject and benefit to the advocacy.

Free Support – Monetary: A survey question can provide a subject with the opportunity to provide financial support for a given advocacy, without the need to incur any cost to herself. Consider again the Mississippi ban on same-sex couples adopting, with two organizations working on either side of the issue. A survey question could give a subject the opportunity to contribute to one of these organizations, without incurring any cost to herself. For example, a question could begin with the same stem as above, and continue as follows:

Question 2A: . . . In addition to the [\$Y] that you will earn for completing this survey, we have set aside an additional [\$X] which can be donated to either of these non-profit organizations. At no cost to yourself, you can choose whether we donate this money to [ORGANIZATION #1: MAINTAIN], to [ORGANIZATION #2: REPEAL], or to neither organization. If the money is not donated, the extra [\$X] remains with the experimenter. Please indicate your choice: (1) Donate [\$X] to [ORGANIZATION #1: MAINTAIN]; (2) Donate [\$X] to [ORGANIZATION #2: REPEAL]; or (3) Do not donate [\$X] to either organization.

Whereas Question 1 enables a subject to express support for repealing the law without external consequences, Question 2A prevents a subject from expressing support for repealing the law without also providing actual support for an organization working to repeal the law. The opportunity for cheap talk is eliminated. If a subject viewed “Repeal” as the socially desired response, but actually preferred to “Maintain” the law, the subject would be less likely to indicate false support to the repeal organization in Question 2A. For a subject who genuinely wanted to repeal the law, Question 2A offers a free opportunity to both demonstrate willingness to provide support, and to provide actual support.

Variations on this approach could include more nuanced options between the two extremes. For example, the question could set aside a possible \$0.50 budget, and allow the subject to decide whether to donate several different amounts (e.g. none, \$0.25, or \$0.50), could allow the subject to donate any amount within a given interval, or could allow the subject to split the donation between the two alternatives.

Introduce Costs for the Subject

Costly Support – Monetary: In Question 2A, the subject is able to provide financial support for a given advocacy group, without incurring any cost. Alternative variations can integrate a cost to the subject, in order to generate a stronger test of support. For example, a question could begin with the same stem as above, and continue as follows:

Question 2B: . . . You will receive [\$Y] in exchange for your participation in this study. If you would like, we can donate [\$X] of your [\$Y] to either of the organizations mentioned above. Would you like to donate [\$X] of your [\$Y] to either of these organizations?

In this case, either donation option would provide a benefit for the proclaimed advocacy, but would do so by introducing a direct cost to the subject. Incorporating more costly demonstrations of support will lower the baseline level of engagement. Such an extreme approach would be best when ceiling effects are predicted to be high.

Question 2B asks the subject to donate from her own endowment at a 1:1 ratio. A third alternative could balance the desire to integrate tangible benefits for the declared advocacy with tangible costs to the subject, but in a manner that further incentivized donations. For example, the researcher could offer to match donations. A question might read (again with the same stem):

Question 2C: . . . You will receive [$\$Y$] in exchange for your participation in this study. If you choose to donate [$\$X$] from your [$\Y] to either of these organizations, we will match your donation by 100%, providing a total donation of [$\$X * 2$] at a cost to you of [$\X]. Would you like to donate [$\$X$] of your [Y] to one of these organizations, in order to provide a total donation of [$\$X * 2$]?

Variations on Question 2C might increase the matching ratio. For example, the survey could offer to donate a full dollar if the subject is willing to give up \$0.10. By varying the relative cost to the subject and benefit to the cause, such variations can pinpoint how much a subject is willing to pay in order to provide a given level of support for an advocacy.

Offering subjects a chance to donate an experimenter's money can substantially increase research costs. A researcher can minimize additional costs by engaging strategies resembling the *Conditional Information Lottery* procedure (Bardsley 2000), whereby subjects make choices in several possible conditions, but only a subset of those conditions are executed. For example, Carpenter, Connolly, and Myers (2008) asked subjects to choose whether to donate or keep a possible \$100 endowment, with the understanding that the funds would only be distributed in a randomly selected 10% of cases. Similarly, Lee and Hsieh (2013) told subjects that 10% of participants would receive an extra \$5 endowment at the end of the experiment. The authors then asked subjects to indicate whether they were willing to donate this potential endowment to various organizations, before each subject became aware of whether he or she had been selected to actually receive the extra money. In both cases, subjects still make the decisions as if they are considering the full amount, but the net cost to the experimenter is substantially lower, increasing the number of possible observations.

Costly Aversion: The strategies discussed above are designed to estimate the strength of a subject's support for a given advocacy. Monetary donations can also be used to estimate a subject's aversion to a given advocacy. For example, White, Laird, and Allen (2013) asked subjects to divide a \$100 donation budget between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney. Some subjects were simply asked to divide the money, but other subjects were given an additional incentive to donate more money to Romney: for every \$10 that the subject donated to Romney, she was promised an extra \$1 for herself. The experiment was conducted among a population who strongly favored Obama, in order to estimate the conditions under which a personal financial incentive could motivate subjects to provide tangible support for an otherwise non-preferred political candidate.

Such a strategy could be applied in other cases, in order to pinpoint the conditions under which a subject could be motivated to donate to her non-preferred cause, or to block donations to her preferred cause. It is worth noting that actually motivating a subject to donate money toward an advocacy that she does not support would introduce a series of ethical concerns. White, Laird, and Allen's experiment used deception, and did not actually provide donations to either campaign. However, the usage of deception itself also introduces both ethical and methodological concerns (Hertwig and Ortmann 2008;

Morton and Williams 2010, Chapter 5).

Monetary Support – Summary: Overall, giving a subject an opportunity to provide financial support for an advocacy group – whether for free, or for a cost – can be a useful method of estimating support for that advocacy. Such an approach could be applied to a series of policy questions. The primary hurdle is for the researcher to identify potential recipients that support the advocacy in question, but do not support other issues which might affect a subject’s desire to donate. A monetary donation option could also be used in response to experimental treatments focused on framing and campaign appeals. For example, after being exposed to an experimental stimulus, a respondent might be given the option to donate to one of the major political parties, or to a candidate. In cases where fictitious candidates are used, however, requests for donations would either have to be hypothetical or would have to involve deception. Despite multiple potential applications, the case of monetary donations is not appropriate for all cases.

Costly Support – Non-Monetary: In addition to financial support, surveys can estimate a subject’s behavioral support for a given advocacy by asking whether the subject is willing to engage in other costly behaviors that would provide concrete support for that advocacy.

Sign a petition: A survey question might ask a subject if she is willing to sign a petition or declaration of support for a particular advocacy (Margetts et al. 2011; Milner, Nielson, and Findley 2012; Aare 2012; Lee and Hsieh 2013; and Mvukiyehe and Samii 2013). The petition option is particularly useful because a petition can be written to specifically address nearly any public policy or social issue. The survey can vary the cost to the subject (how many steps required to sign), as well as the perceived visibility of the signature.

Share Resources: A survey could initially ask a subject to declare her attitude on a given issue, and then might follow-up by asking the subject to share and promote this attitude within her social network. The survey could introduce opportunities for sharing information – such as a link to a website, a photograph, a quotation, or a pledge of support or advocacy. Subjects might be asked to forward an e-mail, or to share such content through social networking sites.

Contact Representative: A survey could offer a subject the opportunity to contact her elected representatives (or other key actors) about an issue. For example, the survey could ask the subject if she is willing to forward a sample e-mail supporting a particular advocacy (Bergan 2009). Surveys in the field can also incorporate opportunities for expressing opinions to representatives, such as providing subjects with the option to contact representatives and other key actors by sending postcards (Mvukiyehe and Samii 2013; Paler 2013), sending SMS messages (Milner, Nielson, and Findley 2012), or by recording audio messages (Bleck and Michelitch 2013).

Complete Another Survey: The participation literature has primarily focused on voter turnout, but there are also several other types of participation in which individuals might engage. A central question in this literature asks whether electoral mobilization treatments also increase the propensity to engage in other forms of participation. In order to estimate residual effects of electoral mobilization among a panel survey sample, Shineman (2013) added a question to the post-election survey, asking previously mobilized and non-mobilized subjects to indicate whether they would be willing to participate in a

subsequent study. Although the follow-up request for participation was hypothetical, subjects were asked to provide a phone number or e-mail address, indicating that they agreed to be contacted. McClendon (2013) similarly introduced a treatment intended to increase participation in an LGBTQ rally, and then asked treated and non-treated subjects to complete an online survey after the event, in exchange for a chance at a lottery prize. Both examples enable the researchers to estimate whether being mobilized in one setting made a subject more willing to participate in another setting.

Variations on a general participation request might also include a request for participation directed at a particular cause. For example, Hur's (2013) post-treatment survey asks subjects if they would be willing to complete an additional survey for no money, as a service to the government. She uses variation in subjects' willingness to complete the extra unpaid survey to estimate not only whether the experimental treatments affected self-assessed perceptions of duty to the government, but also whether the treatment generated behavioral changes as well.

Seek Additional Information: A researcher might want to estimate the effects of an experimental treatment on subjects' willingness to invest in additional information. A survey could give subjects the opportunity to watch a short video from an advocacy organization, or could provide a link to an external website that promises to provide additional information about an issue. The researcher could then track whether subjects in each treatment group watch the video or follow the external link. In some cases, online survey platforms enable the researcher to track which buttons are clicked and how long a subject remains on each page. Even in cases where these capabilities are not built into the survey itself, if researchers control the external website(s), providing unique links within each survey treatment enables a comparison of the particular content that subjects engage, as well as the amount of time subjects spend in each area of the website.

Surveys conducted in the field can also be adapted to offer subjects the opportunity to engage in a post-treatment behavioral task focused on gathering information. For example, Michelitch and Bleck (2013) provide subjects with an opportunity to enter a booth where they can listen to recordings including information about political and health issues. Similarly, Mvukiyehe and Samii (2013) present subjects with the opportunity to purchase a set of news clippings from recent news wires, in order to become more informed.

Conclusion

As researchers continue to use surveys to estimate post-treatment behaviors, it is important to continue to think creatively about methods for extracting honest and meaningful responses. The best approach will vary by research question, sample population, and the method of survey delivery. This article describes a series of strategies extracted and inspired from current research in the discipline, focused on the goal of evaluating incentivized decisions within a survey context. This list of strategies is intended to summarize some of the current trends in experimental research, and should by no means be considered to be exhaustive. Incorporating behavioral questions or tasks into post-treatment surveys enhances opportunities for estimating the extent of the effects of experimental treatments. Behavioral tasks can also be used to gather more accurate estimates of sensitive attitudes (Shelef and Zeira 2013). In addition to further applying the strategies discussed above, scholars should continue to innovate

with new strategies and applications, so that we can continue to improve our ability to estimate behavioral responses to experimental treatments.

References

- Aaroe, Lene. "Does Tolerance of Religion in the Public Space Depend on the Salience of the Manifestation of Religious Group Membership?" *Political Behavior* 34.4 (2012): 585-606.
- Ajzen, Icek, and Martin Fishbein. "Attitudes and the Attitude-Behavior Relation: Reasoned and Automatic Processes." *European Review of Social Psychology* 11.1 (2000): 1-33.
- Ajzen, Icek, Thomas C. Brown, and Franklin Carvajal. "Explaining the Discrepancy Between Intentions and Actions: The Case of Hypothetical Bias in Contingent Valuation." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30.9 (2004): 1108-1121.
- Bardsley, Nicholas. "Control Without Deception: Individual Behavior in Free-Riding Experiments Revisited." *Experimental Economics* 3 (2000): 215 – 240.
- Bergan, Daniel E. "Does Grassroots Lobbying Work? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effects of an E-mail Lobbying Campaign on Legislative Behavior." *American Politics Research* 37.2 (2009): 327-352.
- Blair, Graeme, and Kosuke Imai. "Statistical Analysis of List Experiments." *Political Analysis* 20.1 (2012): 47-77.
- Bleck, Jaimie and Kristin Michelitch. "Voices From Contested Territory: 531 Messages for President Obama from Northern Mali." *The Monkey Cage*, January 17, 2013.
- Braoas-Garza, Pablo. "Poverty in Dictator Games: Awakening Solidarity." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 60.3 (2006): 306-320.
- Camerer, Colin. *Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments in Strategic Interaction*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Carpenter, Jeffrey, Cristina Connolly, and Caitlin Knowles Myers. "Altruistic Behavior in a Representative Dictator Experiment." *Experimental Economics* 11.3 (2008): 282-298.
- Chang, Han Il. "Strategy Manipulation of In-group Bias for Cooperation." Paper Presented at the 2013 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Chauchard, Simon. "Using MP3 Players in Surveys: The Impact of a Low-Tech Self-Administration Mode on Reporting of Sensitive Attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77.S1 (2013): 220-231.
- Chen, Yan, and Sherry Xin Li. "Group Identity and Social Preferences." *American Economic Review* 99 (2009): 431-57.
- Duff, Brian, Michael Hanmer, Won-Ho Park, and Ismail White. "Good Excuses: Understanding Who Votes With an Improved Turnout Question." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71.1 (2007): 67-90.
- Glasman, Laura R., and Dolores Albarracón. "Forming Attitudes that Predict Future Behavior: A Meta-Analysis of the Attitude-Behavior Relation." *Psychological Bulletin* 132.5 (2006): 778.
- Glynn, Adam N. "What Can We Learn With Statistical Truth Serum? Design and Analysis of the List Experiment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77.S1 (2013): 159-172.
- Han, Hahrie C. "Does the Content of Political Appeals Matter in Motivating Participation? A Field Experiment on Self-disclosure in Political Appeals." *Political Behavior* 31.1 (2009): 103- 16.

- Harrison, Brian F., and Melissa R. Michelson. "Not That There's Anything Wrong with That: The Effect of Personalized Appeals on Marriage Equality Campaigns." *Political Behavior* 34.2 (2012): 325-344.
- Hertwig, Ralph, and Andreas Ortmann. "Deception in Experiments: Revisiting the Arguments in its Defense." *Ethics & Behavior* 18.1 (2008): 59-92.
- Holbrook, Allyson L., and Jon A. Krosnick. "Social Desirability Bias in Voter Turnout Reports Tests Using the Item Count Technique." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74.1 (2010): 37-67.
- Hur, Aram. 2013. "What Does Citizen Belonging Mean? A Survey Experiment in Taiwan." Working Paper, Princeton University.
- Kramon, Eric and Keith Weghorst. "Measuring Sensitive Attitudes in Developing Countries: Lessons from Implementing the List Experiment." *The Experimental Political Scientist*, 3.1 (2012): 14-24.
- Kramon, Eric and Keith Weghorst. "Can We Count on the Item Count Technique? Overcoming Response Bias in Developing Countries." Paper Presented at the 2013 Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Lee, Yu-Hao, and Gary Hsieh. (forthcoming). "Does Slacktivism Hurt Activism?: The Effects of Moral Balancing and Consistency in Online Activism." Paper to be presented at the 2013 CHI: ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.
- Margetts, Helen, Peter John, Tobias Escher, and Stephane Reissfelder. "Social Information and Political Participation on the Internet: An Experiment." *European Political Science Review* 3.03 (2011): 321-344.
- McClendon, Gwyneth H. "Social Esteem and Participation in Contentious Politics." Paper Presented at the 2013 New York University Center for Experimental Social Science Conference on Experimental Political Science.
- Michelitch, Kristin. 2013. "Electoral Competition and Interpartisan Economic Discrimination." Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University.
- Michelitch, Kristin and Jaimie Bleck.. "Good Morning Timbuktu! The Impact of Radio of Public Action in Rural Islamic Africa." Paper Presented at the 2013 African Studies Association Conference.
- Miller, Joanne A. and Jon A. Krosnick. "Threat as a Motivator of Political Activism: A Field Experiment." *Political Psychology* 25.4 (2004): 507-23.
- Milner, Helen V., Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael G. Findley. 2012. "Which Devil in Development? A Large-N Survey and Randomized Field Experiment Comparing Bilateral Aid, Multilateral Assistance, and Government Action in Uganda." Working Paper.
- Morton, Rebecca B., and Kenneth C.
- Williams. Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality: From Nature to the Lab. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mvukiyeye, Eric & Cyrus Samii. 2013. "Democracy Promotion in Fragile States: Insights from a Field Experiment in Liberia." Working Paper, Columbia University and New York University.
- Norwood, F. Bailey, and Jayson L. Lusk. "Social Desirability Bias in Real, Hypothetical, and Inferred Valuation Experiments." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 93.2 (2011): 528-534.
- Paler, Laura. 2013. "Keeping the Public Purse: An Experiment in Windfalls, Taxes, and the Incentives to Restrain Government." Working Paper.
- Peter, Jochen, and Patti M. Valkenburg. "The Impact of "Forgiving" Introductions on the Reporting of Sensitive Behavior in Surveys: The Role of Social Desirability Response Style and Developmental

Status." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75.4 (2011): 779-787.

Shelef, Nadav G. and Yael Zeira. 2013. "Assessing the Impact of International Recognition on Conflict Attitudes." Working Paper, University of Wisconsin-Madison and Stanford University.

Shineman, Victoria. "A Critical Test of Residual Mobilization and Habitual Voting: Tracking Mobilized Voters in Subsequent Elections." Paper Presented at the 2013 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Conference.

Tourangeau, Roger, and Ting Yan. "Sensitive Questions in Surveys." *Psychological Bulletin* 133.5 (2007): 859.

White, Ismail K., Chryl Laird, and Troy D. Allen. "Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts Between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest." Paper Presented at the 2013 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Conference.

Wilson, Rick K., and Catherine C. Eckel. "Judging a Book by Its Cover: Beauty and Expectations in the Trust Game." *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (2006): 189-202.

Review of West Coast Experiments (WCE)

Kevin Esterling

UC Riverside kevin.esterling@ucr.edu

Mike Tomz

Stanford University tomz@stanford.edu

The sixth annual West Coast Experiments conference was held on May 10, 2013, on the campus of Stanford University. The WCE is a methods conference that focuses on advances in the design and analysis of experiments.

This year's conference was a fantastic success. Over 100 faculty and graduate students attended the meeting. As always, the presentations were not only informative, but also provided practical advice that attendees could apply to their own experimental research.

Two presentations contained new theoretical results about the design and analysis of experiments. Guido Imbens (Stanford GSB) analyzed the merits of complete randomization versus stratified randomization, and Luke Keele (Penn State) explained how to condition on post-treatment quantities by using structural mean models.

Four presenters used experiments to shed light on important substantive issues. Alvin Roth (Stanford Economics), winner of the 2012 Nobel Prize for Economics, combined experimental and observational data to infer how "organ donor" rules affect the likelihood that individuals will register to donate their organs. Eric Dickson (NYU) presented a novel experiment about how the political institutions - especially provisions for transparency and compensation - affect the willingness of citizens to help authorities enforce contributions to a public good. Gabe Lenz (Berkeley) showed how he had been using experiments to identify the effect of candidate appearance on voting, and Jennifer Merolla (CGU) gave a primer on the Dynamic Process Tracing Environment, which she has been using to study how citizens incorporate information into voting decisions.

Finally, the conference featured two talks on research ethics. Scott Desposato (UCSD) summarized the findings from a recent NSF-sponsored conference on ethical issues for comparative politics experiments. Edward Miguel (Berkeley Economics) provided an overview of the new Berkeley Initiative on Transparency in the Social Sciences (BITSS), and the reasons for encouraging scholars to preregister social science research projects.

For more detailed information about the conference, along with links to papers, talks and other resources, please visit the conference webpage at <http://ps-experiments.ucr.edu/conference/western>. Please check that same website over the next few months for updates regarding the date and location of next year's conference.

Section News and Announcements

- **Call for book proposals**

Call for Proposals: Routledge Studies on Experimental Political Science www.routledge.com/politics

Series Editors: Kevin T. Arceneaux, Temple University and Cindy D. Kam, Vanderbilt University

Advisory Board: Howard Lavine, University of Minnesota; Joshua Tucker, New York University; Rick Wilson, Rice University; and Elizabeth Zechmeister, Vanderbilt University

Political scientists are increasingly using experiments to study important political and social phenomena. The logic of experimentation makes it an appealing and powerful methodological tool that enables scholars to establish causality and probe into the mechanisms underlying observable regularities. Experiments, because of their transparency, also enable researchers to communicate their findings to a broad audience. Although highly technical knowledge is not necessary for understanding the gist of experiments, experiments must be designed, administered, and analyzed with care and attention to detail.

The Routledge Studies on Experimental Political Science was developed to publish books that educate readers about the appropriate design and interpretation of experiments and books that showcase innovative and important applications of experimental work. We are particularly interested in scholarly monographs, but proposals for edited volumes will also be considered.

The series will showcase experimental work in political science in at least two ways:

Pedagogy: Books that provide pedagogical guidance on the design, administration, and analysis of experiments, particularly tailored for a political science audience. Such books would be targeted at advanced undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty members.

Applications: Books that use experimental methods, particularly innovative experimental methods, to understand important causal relationships in political and social settings.

If you have a book proposal or idea in mind which might be suitable for the series, please do not hesitate to contact:

Series Editors Kevin Arceneaux: arceneau@temple.edu Cindy Kam: cindy.d.kam@vanderbilt.edu

Acquisitions Editor Natalja Mortensen, Political Science Research:
natalja.mortensen@taylorandfrancis.com

- **TESS Proposals Wanted**

We are pleased to announce that Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) was renewed for another round of funding by NSF starting last Fall. TESS allows researchers to submit proposals for experiments to be conducted on a nationally-representative, probability-based Internet platform, and successful proposals are fielded at no cost to investigators. More information about how TESS works and how to submit proposals is available at <http://www.tessexperiments.org>.

Additionally, we are pleased to announce the development of two new proposal mechanisms. TESS's Short Studies Program (SSP) is accepting proposals for fielding very brief population-based survey experiments on a general population of at least 2000 adults. SSP recruits participants from within the U.S. using the same Internet-based platform as other TESS studies. More information about SSP and proposal requirements is available at <http://www.tessexperiments.org/ssp.html>.

TESS's Special Competition for Young Investigators is accepting proposals from June 15th-September 15th. The competition is meant to enable younger scholars to field large-scale studies and is limited to graduate students and individuals who are no more than 3 years post-Ph.D. More information about the Special Competition and proposal requirements is available at <http://www.tessexperiments.org/yic.html>.

For the current grant, the principal investigators of TESS are Jeremy Freese and James Druckman of Northwestern University, who are assisted by a new team of over 65 Associate PIs and peer reviewers across the social sciences. More information about our APIs is available at <http://www.tessexperiments.org/associatepi.html>.

James Druckman and Jeremy Freese
Principal Investigators, TESS