

Political Science UN3952 (POLSW3952) : Spring 2018

Discrimination and Political Inequality Research Seminar

Instructor: Macartan Humphreys | mh2245@columbia.edu

Location: 7:11, IAB; 8:10 am – 10:00 am; Schedule, see below

This senior seminar focuses on the measurement of political inequalities and between group discrimination, and strategies to address inequalities. Political inequalities include differences in the levels of engagement of different types of people in political processes, differences in the benefits different people get from the state, and differences in the ability of individuals to influence political processes. This seminar will be unusual in a few respects. First it follows an irregular schedule, with meetings concentrated into three intense weeks spread out over the Spring term. Second, the seminar seeks both to engage existing research and to produce new research with each student producing an original field based research project over the course of the semester. The goal for each project is to develop a new approach to measure some aspect of political inequality and/or assess strategies that seek to address inequalities. This is not a methods class and the aim is not to train you on methods but rather to bring you close to the cutting edge of research in this area; methods skills will be needed though to complete projects (but there will also be support for this).

Schedule overview:

22 Jan: Introduction and goals: Power and political inequality

23 – 26 Jan: Class based discussions of readings on political inequality and discrimination focusing on ethnic discrimination, gender discrimination, and inequalities in government responsiveness.

26 Jan – 12 Feb: Review readings and complete basic design form.

12 Feb – 16 Feb Class based discussion on research design and research ethics. Including deconstructing new

16 Feb – 23 April: Design completion and implementation. See suggested schedule below.

23 – 26 April Research presentations and stock taking. What has been learned about the measurement of inequality and discrimination? Proposals for policy and / or measurement.

Grades: Grades depend 30% on class participation and 70% on your final project. Class participation will include some assignments to present readings in the first week long block, a design simulation in the second block, and a presentation of a policy proposal in the third block.

Attendance: You are expected to attend all sessions.

Readings. There are no required purchases of books. All required readings are available online.

Writing. See my webpage for suggestions on reading (<http://www.macartan.nyc/teaching/how-to-read/>), writing (<http://www.macartan.nyc/teaching/on-writing/>) and critiquing (<http://www.macartan.nyc/teaching/discuss/>).

Projects: The most ambitious part of this seminar is that each student will be expected to implement an original empirical study on discrimination and inequality. This means generating a design and implementing it *in the field* in a very short time. A typical project will choose one area of discrimination or inequality and seek (a) to measure it and/or (b) to assess a theoretically motivated intervention to assess it. That is obviously asking a lot. Realistically we expect that most of these will be implemented in or around New York City (unless e.g. they are done by e-mail or using some other distance method). We expect that they will be zero budget projects. These may well involve human subjects research, in which case they will normally require IRB approval, and great concern will be paid in class to the ethics of any proposed research projects with consent sought of subjects when feasible.

A typical table of contents for a final paper might look like this:

1. Introduction – overall motivation and description of the project (1 page)
2. Theoretical motivation (1 page)
3. Design (2 pages)
4. Data description (2 pages)
5. Results (2 pages)
6. Interpretation and conclusions (1 page)
7. References (1 page)

So, compact.

Statistical skills: You will likely need basic statistical skills to analyze the data from your projects; with clean designs it may be possible to do all analyses using simple t-tests or by running simple regressions

Contact / Office hours: Despite the irregularity of meetings you should stay in close contact throughout the term by email or Skype. In addition there are slots scheduled for one on one meetings at the beginning of the second class block.

Detailed schedule and readings

Sessions I

22 Jan: Introduction and goals: Power and political inequality

- Stephen Lukes. Power: A Radical View. <https://clio.columbia.edu/catalog/12434408?counter=2> (If you read the recent text focus on Ch 1 PRV; though later chapters will also be of interest)
- Verba, Sidney. 2001. "Thoughts About Political Equality: What Is It? Why Do We Want It?" <https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/u4/Verba.pdf>

Note: you won't have read these before class but they are worth going over when you have time to catch your breath next week.

23 Jan: Readings on ethnic and racial inequalities

1. Habyarimana, James, et al. "Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision?" *American Political Science Review* 101.4 (2007): 709-725. www.columbia.edu/~mh2245/papers1/HHPW.pdf Especially Section: "Three Families Of Mechanisms"
2. Milkman, Katherine L., Modupe Akinola, and Dolly Chugh. "Temporal distance and discrimination: An audit study in academia." *Psychological Science* 23.7 (2012): 710-717. http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~dchugh/articles/PsychSci_2012.pdf
3. Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. "Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination." *The American Economic Review* 94.4 (2004): 991-1013. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/0002828042002561>
4. Michelitch, Kristin. 2015. "Does Electoral Competition Exacerbate Interethnic or Interpartisan Economic Discrimination? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Market Price Bargaining." *American Political Science Review* 109(1) 43-61. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/S0003055414000628>

Additional

- Ditmman, Ruth K., and Paul Lagunes. "The (Identification) Cards You Are Dealt: Biased Treatment of Anglos and Latinos Using Municipal-Issued versus Unofficial ID Cards." *Political Psychology* 35.4 (2014): 539-555.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Dominik Hangartner. "Who gets a Swiss passport? A natural experiment in immigrant discrimination." *American Political Science Review* 107.1 (2013): 159-187. <https://web.stanford.edu/~jhain/Paper/APSR2013.pdf>
- Alexandra Scacco and Shana Warren, "Can Social Contact Reduce Prejudice and Discrimination? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Nigeria" https://www.nyu.edu/projects/scacco/files/Scacco_Warren_UYVT.pdf

24 Jan: Readings on gender inequalities [Guest: Sarah Khan]

1. Sen, A. (2001). The many faces of gender inequality. *New republic*, 35 -39.
<http://prof.chicanas.com/readings/SenInequality.pdf>
2. Beaman, L., Chattopadhyay, R., Duflo, E., Pande, R., & Topalova, P. (2009). Powerful women: does exposure reduce bias?. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4), 1497-1540.
<https://economics.mit.edu/files/3122>
3. Beath, A., Christia, F., & Enikolopov, R. (2013). Empowering women through development aid: Evidence from a field experiment in Afghanistan. *American Political Science Review*, 107(3), 540-557. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43654923>
4. Parthasarathy, Ramya; Rao, Vijayendra; Palaniswamy, Nethra. 2017. Unheard voices : the challenge of inducing women's civic speech (English). Policy Research working paper; no. WPS 8120. Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/216591498569537722/Unheard-voices-the-challenge-of-inducing-womens-civic-speech>

Additional:

- Seema Jayachandran “The Roots of Gender Inequality in Developing Countries”
http://www.seemajayachandran.com/roots_of_gender_inequality.pdf
- Htun, M. (2004). Is gender like ethnicity? The political representation of identity groups. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(3), 439-458.
- Karpowitz, C. F., Mendelberg, T., & Shaker, L. (2012). Gender inequality in deliberative participation. *American Political Science Review*, 106(3), 533-547.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000329>
- Benstead, L. J., Jamal, A. A., & Lust, E. (2015). Is It Gender, Religiosity or Both? A Role Congruity Theory of Candidate Electability in Transitional Tunisia. *Perspectives on Politics*, 13(1), 74-94.
- Karpowitz, Christopher F., J. Quin Monson, and Jessica Robinson Preece. "How to Elect More Women: Gender and Candidate Success in a Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science* (2017).

25 Jan: Readings on political responsiveness

1. Nikhar Gaikwad, Garreth Nellis, “Do Politicians Discriminate Against Internal Migrants? Evidence from Nationwide Field Experiments in India.” Working paper. WP
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a0895ce5274a27b200003f/89119_Do-Politicians-Discriminate-MAR16.pdf
2. Butler, Daniel M., and David E. Broockman. "Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? A field experiment on state legislators." *American Journal of Political Science* 55.3 (2011): 463-477. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00515.x/pdf>
3. Chen, Jidong, Jennifer Pan, and Yiqing Xu. "Sources of authoritarian responsiveness: A field experiment in China." *American Journal of Political Science* 60.2 (2016): 383-400.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajps.12207/full>

4. Hemker, Johannes, and Anselm Rink. "Multiple Dimensions of Bureaucratic Discrimination: Evidence from German Welfare Offices." *American Journal of Political Science* 61.4 (2017): 786-803. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajps.12312/full>

Additional

- Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. "Constituency influence in Congress." *American political science review* 57.1 (1963): 45-56.
- Butler, Daniel M. *Representing the advantaged: How politicians reinforce inequality*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

26 Jan: Elements of a research design [Lecture/Discussion]

1. Green and Gerber. *Field Experiments*. Chapter 1. (In courseworks)
2. Heckman, James J. "Detecting discrimination." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12.2 (1998): 101-116. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.12.2.101>
3. Bertrand, Marianne, and Esther Duflo. "Field experiments on discrimination." *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments* 1 (2017): 309-393. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22014>

Additional

- Butler, Daniel M., and Jonathan Homola. "An Empirical Justification for the Use of Racially Distinctive Names to Signal Race in Experiments." *Political Analysis* 25.1 (2017): 122-130.
- Castillo, Marco, et al. "Lost in the mail: a field experiment on crime." *Economic Inquiry* 52.1 (2014): 285-303.

Between 26 Jan and 9 Feb you should complete and turn in the initial design form given at the end of this document.

Sessions II

9 Feb deadline: Turn in initial design form.

12 Feb: Design, analysis, and interpretation [Lecture]

1. Blair et al "A general framework for learning about research designs"
<http://declaredesign.org/paper.pdf>

We will work through examples of design declarations in class. These will be used for design simulation and development on 14, 15, 16 Feb.

13 Feb afternoon: Schedule a one on one meeting with me to discuss your development of your design.
Time slot to be circulated.

13 Feb: Research ethics and human subjects research [Lecture by Columbia Morningside IRB]

1. Humphreys, Macartan. "[Reflections on the ethics of social experimentation.](https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jgd.2015.6.issue-1/jgd-2014-0016/jgd-2014-0016.xml)" *Journal of Globalization and Development* 6.1 (2015): 87-112.
2. Read Gelman blog discussions on Milkman experiment (http://andrewgelman.com/2010/05/06/63000_worth_of/)
3. Scott Desposato. Ethics and research in comparative politics. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/11/03/ethics-and-research-in-comparative-politics/?utm_term=.751ccfe99096

14 Feb: Design simulations [Group presentations]

Groups will seek to deconstruct and simulate designs from the following two papers, or any other paper relevant to projects:

- Ewens, Michael, Bryan Tomlin, and Liang Choon Wang. "Statistical discrimination or prejudice? A large sample field experiment." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 96.1 (2014): 119-134. https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/REST_a_00365
- Fried, Brian J., Paul Lagunes, and Atheendar Venkataramani. "Corruption and inequality at the crossroad: A multimethod study of bribery and discrimination in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* 45.1 (2010): 76-97. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/372960>

Each presentation should have a slide deck that (a) summarizes the study goals (b) describes the design (c) simulates the design (or, if data is available replicates it) (d) provides a critique. Ca 10 slides.

15 Feb: Group discussion of Designs and Design declarations [Individual presentations 1]

16 Feb: Group discussion of Designs and Design declarations [Individual presentations 2]

Individual projects are to be implemented between Sessions II and III. These involve the following steps:

- 1 Close out design. Aim for end of February at latest.
- 2 Seek IRB approval, continue analysis plan and start writing. Aim for 21 March.
- 3 Implementation. Aim for a design that can be implemented in 1 or 2 weeks. Aim to complete 7 April.
- 4 Analysis and write up. Aim to complete 20 April.

Sessions III

23 Apr: Research presentations 1 [Individual presentations]

24 Apr: Research presentations 2 [Individual presentations]

25 Apr: Reassessing approaches to measuring inequality: Current policies, future directions. Readings and assignments to be circulated.

26 Apr: Reassessing interventions to address inequality. Readings and assignments to be circulated.

Design Form: To be Completed by 9 February

Section 1: Introduction	
1. Researcher Name:	The name of authors of research that you are reading
2. Research Project Title:	
3. One sentence summary of research question:	
4. Substantive motivation: [half page]	
5. Primary Hypothesis [half page]	This is a more specific form of the research question; one hypothesis is enough, give no more than three
Section 2: Identification Strategy	
6. Y	Dependent variable: What is your primary outcome of interest?
7. X	Independent variable: What are your treatments? Note that you might have a “treatment” for measurement but also for an intervention.
8. Units	What are the units for your X and Y? (Individuals? Communities? Schools?)
Section 3: Sample, Data, & Implementation Strategies	
9. Sample	How many units will you select? What is your sampling frame? How will you select your sample?
10. Effect Size	What are your expected effect sizes? (in units of variance)
11. Implementation strategy	Other key details on data gathering. How long will data gathering take? Will you gather data yourself or recruit others to help?
12. Measurement strategy	Describe measurement of Y,X, and auxiliary data. Be clear about units of analysis, methods (admin data, surveys, games, other), # of data collection rounds.
13. Ethics	What ethical issues do you foresee? Will this study involve manipulations? Will you have informed consent? Are there any risks to subjects?
Section 4: Analysis and Interpretation	
14. Analysis strategy	What are the main comparisons you plan to look at.
15. Interpretation strategy [3-5 sentences]	Summarize the substantive conclusions you will draw from your analysis. Describe the conclusions both for the case where you do find and where you do not find what you expect to find.