

Workshop on Experimental Methods Within Surveys

Economics and Planning Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Delhi Centre

21 – 24 November 2016

2 – 4:15 pm

Diane Coffey

Dean Spears

All participants agree to bring a (very rough, incomplete, simple, potentially bad) idea for a research project of this type for group discussion on the last day of the course. The idea does not have to be written but it will certainly facilitate the discussion if you plan out what you want to share in advance.

Monday 21: Introduction

Outline

- Why survey experiments?: Credibility, cost, and freedom to persuasively answer the question you care about (Mutz, 2011 reading) [Dean 30 minutes]
- Basics of survey econometrics: Survey Design, Weights, Design Effects based on *Deaton, 1997* reading [Diane 65 minutes]
- Discussion question, based on *Deaton & Cartwright, 2016* reading: How important is the sampling frame to randomized survey experiments? [Everyone: 15 minutes]

Readings to be discussed

Mutz, Diana. 2011. Chapter 1 : Population based survey experiments: A hybrid methodology for the social sciences. *Population based survey experiments*. Princeton University Press.

Deaton, Angus. 1997. Chapter 1: The design and content of household survey. *The analysis of household surveys: A microeconomic approach to development policy*. World Bank Publications.

Deaton, Angus, and Nancy Cartwright. 2016. Understanding and Misunderstanding Randomized Controlled Trials. NBER Working Paper, no. 22595.

See also: A [syllabus](#) on collecting demographic data from the r.i.c.e. website.

Tuesday 22: Application to Social Attitudes, and software tools

Outline

- Introduction and principles [Diane 30 minutes]
- Application to horizontal inequality [Diane 30 minutes]
 - Resume experiments – discuss *Pager, 2003*
- Further applications to caste – identifiable victims (discuss *Deshpande & Spears, 2016*) and expectations of teachers (no paper yet) [Dean 20 minutes]
- Introduction to Qualtrics and survey monkey software [Both: 30 minutes]

Readings to be discussed

Pager, Devah. 2003. The Mark of Criminal Record. *American Journal of Sociology*. 108(5): 937-75.

Desphande, Ashwini & Spears, Dean. 2016. Who is the identifiable victim? Caste and charitable giving in modern India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 64(2): 299-321.

Wednesday 23: Applications to the Social Choice Literature, and software tools

Outline

- Empirical social choice (see Gaertner and Schokkaert, 2012): Principles and classics [Dean 60 minutes]
- Empirical social choice: Dean will give examples of other recent papers in class that you're not required to read in advance [Dean 20 minutes]
- Introduction to mTurk software: [Dean 30 minutes]
 - Read Paolacci et al., 2010.

Readings to be discussed

Gaertner, W. and Schokkaert, E., 2012. Empirical social choice: questionnaire-experimental studies on distributive justice. Cambridge University Press.

Paolacci, G., Chandler, J. and Ipeirotis, P.G., 2010. Running experiments on amazon mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(5), pp.411-419.

Thursday 24: What makes a good study? Learning from examples in the literature, and brainstorming together

Outline

- Interestingness, inversions, and "the drama in the dependent variable" (read Fiske, 2004) [Dean 10 minutes]
- Kuziemko, et al., 2015 on public economics using mTurk (reading required) : [Dean 40 min]
- Karlan and Wood, 2015 on fundraising for charity (reading optional): [Dean: 20 min] – not exactly survey-only, but paper based and accessible
- Group discussion of student-proposed ideas for survey experiments: [All: 40 min]

Readings to be discussed

Fiske, S.T. 2004. Chapter 4: Developing a Program of Research. *The SAGE Handbook of Methods in Social Psychology*. Sansone, C., Morf, C., and Panter, A.T., eds. SAGE Publications.

Kuziemko, Ilyana, et al. 2015. How Elastic are Preferences for Redistribution? Evidence from Randomized Survey Experiments. *American Economic Review* 105(4): 1478-1508. (we have NBER working paper version #18865 from 2013)

Karlan, D. and Wood, D.H., 2015. The effect of effectiveness: Donor response to aid effectiveness in a direct mail fundraising experiment. NBER Working Paper #20047.