

## Index

- 95% confidence interval, 31–32, 38, 114
- Abortion, survey experiment involving, 55
- Academic fraud, 75–76
- Alternative hypothesis, 103
- American Psychological Association, 69
- Anik, Lalin, 45
- Anonymity  
   Common Rule and, 72, 77, 127  
   ethical issues in human subject experiments, 70, 72, 77, 127  
   human subject experiments generally, 78  
   Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and, 72
- Aroma/purchasing behavior, human subject experiment involving, 84–85, 91–92, 130–133
- Aronow, Peter M., 84
- Attrition  
   human subject experiments and, 130  
   in lab experiments, 47  
   random assignment, as a problem in, 16, 47, 113
- Average treatment effect (ATE)  
   changes scores and, 33–34  
   covariates and, 14  
   defined, 11  
   estimation and, 11–12  
   exercises, 21, 38–39, 110–112, 114–116  
   experimental design and, 43  
   in human subject experiments, 130–133  
   hypothesis testing and, 105  
   *p*-value and, 103–105  
   population average treatment effect (PATE), 11  
   in practice experiments, 29–30  
   in pre-analysis plans, 87  
   random assignment and, 13  
   regression and, 105, 108–109, 138  
   standard error and, 15  
   substantive importance, demonstrating, 103  
   *t*-ratio and, 104–105  
   unbiased estimation (*See* Unbiased estimation)
- Balcells, Laia, 4, 57, 65, 113
- Barber, Michael, 53, 55, 64
- Baseline variable, 62, 117
- Battery bounce experiment, 37–38
- Becerra-Valbuena, Luis, 60, 66
- Belmont Report* (1978), 69–71
- Beneficence principle, 69
- “Benign interventions,” 71, 76, 78, 127
- Benin, land lottery in, 60–62, 66–67, 125–127
- Biden, Joe, 46
- Blood donation, human subject experiment involving, 86–87
- Body Mass Index (BMI), 9–12, 14, 107, 135–137
- Bolsen, Toby, 52, 64
- Bordia, Prashant, 20, 90
- Brauer, Markus, 44–46, 51–53, 93, 95–96, 103–104, 106, 108–109
- Bruneau, Emile G., 46, 63
- Campaign donations, 32
- Campbell, Grace, 83
- Cause and effect, 1, 42
- Changes scores  
   average treatment effect (ATE) and, 33–34  
   posttest difference score, 62–63, 117–119  
   standard deviation and, 33  
   standard error and, 33
- Charitable activities, human subject experiment involving, 79, 91
- Checklist, 35
- Children as vulnerable subjects, 77, 127–128
- Chile  
   human rights, field experiment involving, 57, 65, 123–124  
   Museum of Memory and Human Rights, 4–5, 57, 65, 113
- Christensen, Larry, 72
- Clingingsmith, David, 60
- Collazos, Daniela, 7

- Collective action, human subject experiment
  - involving, 79
- College admission/political affiliation, human subject experiment involving, 82–83
- Common Rule, 70
  - anonymity and, 72, 77, 127
  - “benign interventions,” 71, 76, 78, 127
  - confidentiality and, 72, 77, 127
  - deception and, 72–77, 128
  - exercises, 76, 127–129
  - human subjects research defined, 70, 76, 127
  - informed consent and, 70–71, 77, 128
  - minimal risk, studies involving, 71
  - minimization of risk, 72
  - more than minimal risk, studies involving, 70–71, 76, 127
  - norms beyond Common Rule, 73
  - research proposal evaluation criteria, 70–71
  - vulnerable subjects, 71, 77, 127–128
- Communication, 16
- Competition for resources, 16
- Compound treatment, 17
- Confidence interval
  - 95% CI, 31–32, 38, 114
  - in pre-analysis plans, 87
- Confidentiality
  - Common Rule and, 72, 77, 127
  - ethical issues in human subject experiments, 70, 72, 77, 127
  - human subject experiments generally, 78
  - Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and, 72
- Conflicts of interest, 74, 77, 128–129
- Consumer preference, survey experiment involving, 52
- Control conditions, 6–7
  - in field experiments, 57–58
  - gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 85–86
  - in lab experiments, 46–47
  - in naturally occurring experiments, 60
  - in practice experiments, 24
  - in survey experiments, 53–54
  - TV sitcoms, lab experiment involving, 46–47
- Control groups
  - covariates and, 14
  - exercises, 20, 38, 111, 114
- Coppock, Alexander, 106
- Corruption
  - field experiment involving, 57
  - human subject experiments and, 74
- Covariates
  - average treatment effect (ATE) and, 14
  - balance, checking for, 28–29, 39–40, 49, 58, 61
  - covariate-adjusted estimator, 99–101
  - covariate adjustment, 97–99, 105–106
  - defined, 13
  - difference-in-means estimation and, 14
  - in field experiments, 58
  - “jitter,” 28–29
  - in lab experiments, 49
  - in naturally occurring experiments, 61
  - null hypothesis and, 39–40
  - in practice experiments, 28–29
  - precision, effect of covariate adjustment on, 101–102
  - treatment and control groups, use in ensuring similar attributes, 14
  - variation in treatment effects, use in discovering, 14
- Creativity, 89
- Criminology, interventions in, 7
- Cue-taking, survey experiment involving, 53, 64, 122–123
- Dangerous and addictive interventions, 76–77, 127
- Data analysis, 5, 93
  - exercises, 106–109, 133–139
  - regression (*See Regression*)
  - statistical significance (*See Statistical significance*)
  - substantive significance of results, 102–103
- Dataset, 26–27
- “Debriefing,” 69, 77, 128
- Deception, 72–78, 128
- Degrees of freedom, 32, 101, 104–105
- “Dictator” game, 45
- Difference-in-means estimation
  - covariates and, 14
  - defined, 11–12
  - exercises, 21, 112–113
  - regression and, 95–96, 106, 133–134
  - unbiased estimation and, 16–18, 21
- Displacement, 16
- Double-blind studies, 17
- Economics, interventions in, 7
- Ellison, Brenna, 90
- Environmentally friendly behaviors, human subject experiment involving, 81
- Estimation
  - average treatment effect (ATE) and, 11–12
  - covariate-adjusted estimator, 99–101
  - defined, 11–12
  - difference-in-means estimation (*See Difference-in-means estimation*)
  - estimand, 11
  - estimate, 11
  - estimator, 11
  - least squares estimation, 95
  - in practice experiments, 29–30
  - unbiased estimation (*See Unbiased estimation*)
- Ethical issues in human subject experiments, 5, 68, 76
  - academic fraud, 75–76
  - anonymity, 70, 72, 77, 127
  - Belmont Report* (1978), 69–71
  - beneficence principle, 69
  - Common Rule (*See Common Rule*)
  - confidentiality, 70, 72, 77, 127

- Ethical issues in human subject experiments (cont.)
- conflicts of interest, 74, 77, 128–129
  - dangerous and addictive interventions, 76–77, 127
  - deception, 72–77, 128
  - design choice and, 76
  - “ethics review,” 73
  - exercises, 76, 127–129
  - “file drawer problem,” 75, 77, 111–128
  - informed consent, 70–71, 77, 128
  - Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) (*See* Institutional Review Boards (IRBs))
  - job postings/resumes and, 77, 128–129
  - justice principle, 70
  - Milgram obedience experiment and, 69
  - Nazi experiments and, 68
  - norms beyond Common Rule, 73
  - publication bias, 75, 111–128
  - recommendations, 73
  - respect for persons principle, 69
  - transparency, 75
  - Tuskegee Syphilis Study and, 69
  - TV sitcoms, lab experiment involving, 76
  - vulnerable subjects, 71, 77, 127–128
  - written results, discussion in, 88
  - Zimbrano prisoner/guard experiment and, 69
- Everyday activities, human subject experiment involving, 84
- Experimental design, 42
- average treatment effect (ATE) and, 43
  - conditions, 43
  - context of, 42–43
  - ethical issues in human subject experiments, design choice and, 76
  - factors affecting selection of, 43–44
  - field experiments (*See* Field experiments)
  - interventions and, 42
  - lab experiments (*See* Lab experiments)
  - measurement of outcomes and, 42–43
  - naturally occurring experiments (*See* Naturally occurring experiments)
  - random assignment and, 43
  - research hypothesis, 43
  - subjects and, 42–43
  - survey experiments (*See* Survey experiments)
- Experts, 2
- External validity, 18
- Extrapolation, 18–19
- “Failure-to-treat” problem, 7
- Fair tests, 4
- Fertilizer experiment. *See* Practice experiments
- Field experiments
- Chilean human rights example, 57, 65, 123–124
  - control conditions in, 57–58
  - corruption example, 57
  - covariate balance, checking for, 58
  - design elements, 59
  - empirical results, 58–59
  - examples, 57
  - exercises, 65–66, 123–125
  - factors affecting selection of, 43
  - instructions to subjects in, 58
  - intergroup conflict example, 57
  - interventions in, 56
  - limitations of, 59
  - measurement of outcomes in, 58
  - naturally occurring experiments compared, 59
  - nonpartisan encouragements to vote example, 56–59
  - policing tactics example, 57, 65–66, 124–125
  - in political campaigns, 56
  - random assignment in, 58
  - research hypothesis in, 56
  - selection of subjects in, 58
  - treatment in, 57–58
  - “File drawer problem,” 75, 77, 111–128
- Finkelstein, Amy, 60
- Fitted regression line, 96–97
- FOMO, lab experiment involving, 45
- Food waste, human subject experiment involving, 90, 130
- Fox News, 36
- Friends* (TV sitcom), 46–47, 95–96, 128
- Frijters, Paul, 60, 107
- Galiani, Sebastian, 60
- Games, lab experiment involving, 45
- General Social Survey, 52
- Gerber, Alan S., 7, 21, 106
- Gifford, Robert, 81
- Ginis, Marnie, 34
- Gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 81
- control conditions and, 85–86
  - measurement of outcomes and, 85–86
  - random assignment and, 85, 90, 111–129
  - regression and, 106–107, 134–135
  - treatment and, 85–86
- Green, Donald P., 7, 21, 106
- Gürhan-Anli, Zeynep, 45
- Gym sanitary habits, human subject experiment involving, 90, 129
- Hainmueller, Jens, 52
- Hannity, Sean, 36
- Hayran, Ceren, 45
- Health insurance/health outcomes, naturally occurring experiment involving, 60
- Hopkins, Daniel J., 52
- Houngbedji, Kenneth, 60, 66
- Human subject experiments, 5, 78, 89
- anonymity, 78
  - aroma/purchasing behavior, 84–85, 91–92, 130–133
  - attrition and, 130

- average treatment effect (ATE) in, 130–133  
 blood donation, 86–87  
 charitable activities, 79, 91  
 collective action, promoting, 79  
 college admission/political affiliation, 82–83  
 confidentiality, 78  
 corruption and, 74  
 cost considerations, 79  
 creativity in, 89  
 deception, avoiding, 78  
 defined, 70, 76, 127  
 environmentally friendly behaviors, promoting, 81  
 ethical issues (*See* Ethical issues in human subject experiments)  
 everyday activities, variations in, 84  
 exercises, 89, 129–133  
 expedited review, 78–79  
   as exploratory studies, 79  
 food waste, reducing, 90, 130  
 gratuities, 81, 85–86, 90, 111–129  
 gym sanitary habits, 90, 129  
 informed consent and, 78, 129  
 Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) (*See* Institutional Review Boards (IRBs))  
 manipulation check, 84  
 meat consumption, reducing, 81  
 minimal risk, studies involving, 78  
 music videos, 89, 129  
 organ donation, promotion of, 89–90, 129  
 pedagogical interventions, 82  
 “pilot tests,” 89, 89  
 political constraints, 74  
 pre-analysis plans (*See* Pre-analysis plans)  
 random assignment in, 129  
 recycling, 79  
 retail sales, 81  
 study descriptions, 84, 87  
   as survey experiments, 81  
 symmetry assumption and, 130  
 taste-testing, 82  
 tax status and, 74  
 time considerations, 79  
 types of experiments, 79–84  
 vulnerable subjects, avoiding, 78  
   written results, 88–89 (*See also* Written results)
- Hypothesis testing, 105–106
- Immigration, survey experiment involving, 52
- Implicit Association Test (IAT), 49, 62–63, 120
- Informal empiricism, 1–2
- Informed consent  
   ethical issues in human subject experiments,  
     70–71, 77, 128  
   human subject experiments generally, 78, 129
- Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), 70  
   anonymity and, 72  
   confidentiality and, 72  
   deception and, 72–77  
   “ethics review” and, 73  
   expedited review, 78–79  
   human subjects research defined, 70  
   “pilot tests” and, 89
- Intergroup conflict, field experiment involving, 57
- Internal validity, 18
- Interventions  
   “benign interventions,” 71, 76, 78, 127  
   in criminology, 7  
   dangerous and addictive interventions, 76–77, 127  
   defined, 7–8  
   in economics, 7  
   effectiveness of, 103  
   experimental design and, 42  
   in field experiments, 56  
   pedagogical interventions, human subject  
     experiment involving, 82  
   in political science, 7  
   in psychology, 7  
   survey experiments and, 52–53
- IRBs. *See* Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
- Iyengar, Shanto, 20–21, 45
- “Jitter,” 28–29
- Job postings/resumes, ethical issues in human subject  
   experiment involving, 77, 128–129
- Justice principle, 70
- Key terms, 5–6, 19  
   average treatment effect (ATE) (*See* Average  
     treatment effect (ATE))  
   covariates (*See* Covariates)  
   difference-in-means estimation (*See* Difference-in-  
     means estimation)  
   estimand, 11  
   estimate, 11  
   estimation (*See* Estimation)  
   estimator, 11  
   external validity, 18  
   extrapolation, 18–19  
   internal validity, 18  
   interventions (*See* Interventions)  
   outcomes (*See* Outcomes)  
   participants (*See* Subjects)  
   random assignment (*See* Random assignment)  
   sampling distribution (*See* Sampling distribution)  
   standard deviation (*See* Standard deviation)  
   standard error (*See* Standard error)  
   subjects (*See* Subjects)  
   treatment (*See* Treatment)  
   unbiased estimation (*See* Unbiased estimation)
- Khwaja, Asim Ijaz, 60
- Kremer, Michael, 60
- Lab experiments  
   attrition in, 47  
   control conditions in, 46–47  
   covariate balance, checking for, 49

- Lab experiments (cont.)  
 design elements, 51  
 empirical results, 49–51  
 examples, 45  
 exercises, 63, 120–122  
 factors affecting selection of, 43  
 FOMO example, 45  
 game example, 45  
 instructions to subjects in, 47–48  
 limitations of, 51  
 measurement of outcomes in, 48–51  
 perspective-giving example, 46, 63, 120–122  
 random assignment in, 47  
 research hypothesis in, 46  
 selection of subjects in, 47  
 sermon example, 45  
 survey experiments compared, 52–53  
 treatment in, 46–47  
 TV sitcom example, 44–51
- Lacroix, Karine, 81
- Least squares estimation, 95
- Little Mosque on the Prairie* (TV sitcom), 44–51, 76, 95–96, 98, 103–104, 109, 127–128, 138–139
- Local honey, 1–2
- Lotteries  
 Benin land lottery, 60–62  
 as naturally occurring experiments, 44, 59  
 Lynn, Michael, 106
- Manipulation check, 84
- McCarthy, Kevin, 83
- McClendon, Gwyneth, 45
- McGrath, Mary C., 84, 91–92
- Measurement of outcomes, 8–10  
 aroma/purchasing behavior, human subject experiment involving, 84–85  
 blood donation, human subject experiment involving, 86–87  
 exercises, 39, 116–117  
 experimental design and, 42–43  
 in field experiments, 58  
 gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 85–86  
 in lab experiments, 48–51  
 in naturally occurring experiments, 61  
 in practice experiments, 25, 27–28, 39, 116–117  
 in pre-analysis plans, 87  
 in survey experiments, 54–55  
 symmetry assumption and, 17
- Meat consumption, human subject experiment involving, 81
- Mecca pilgrimage, naturally occurring experiment involving, 60
- Milgram, Stanley, 69
- Military service/criminal activity, naturally occurring experiment involving, 60
- Mousa, Salma, 57
- Mullinix, Kevin J., 52, 64, 107, 123
- Murrar, Sohad, 44–46, 51–53, 93, 95–96, 103–104, 106, 108–109
- Music videos, human subject experiment involving, 89, 129
- Mutz, Diana C., 19
- Mynier, Kirby, 106
- “Natural experiments,” 44
- Naturally occurring experiments, 56–57  
 Benin land lottery example, 60–62, 66–67, 125–127  
 control conditions in, 60  
 covariate balance, checking for, 61  
 design elements, 59–62  
 empirical results, 61  
 examples, 56–57  
 exercises, 66–67, 125–127  
 factors affecting selection of, 44  
 field experiments compared, 59  
 health insurance/health outcomes example, 60  
 instructions to subjects in, 61  
 limitations of, 62  
 lotteries as, 44, 59  
 measurement of outcomes in, 61  
 Mecca pilgrimage example, 60  
 military service/criminal activity example, 60  
 random assignment in, 61  
 research hypothesis in, 60  
 roommate/weight example, 60  
 selection of subjects in, 61  
 treatment in, 60
- Nazi experiments, 68
- Nickerson, David, 56, 58–59
- Noninterference assumption  
 communication and, 16  
 competition for resources and, 16  
 displacement and, 16  
 practice experiments and, 25–26  
 unbiased estimation, required for, 16
- Nonpartisan encouragements to vote, field experiment involving, 56–59
- Norris, Robert J., 52, 64
- Null hypothesis, 14, 39–40, 103
- One-tailed alternative hypothesis, 103
- Open Science Framework, 26–27
- Organ donation, human subject experiment involving, 89–90, 129
- Ortmann, Andreas, 72
- Osbaldiston, Richard, 81
- Outcomes  
 defined, 8–10  
 exercises, 21, 111  
 measurement of (*See* Measurement of outcomes)  
 potential versus observed outcomes, 10–11, 21, 111  
 in practice experiments, 25, 27–28, 39, 116–117  
 proxy for health, 8–10

- regression, demonstrating relationship between treatment and outcome, 105–106  
 statistical independence of, 12
- p*-value, 103–105
- Palanza, Valeria, 4, 57, 113
- Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, 48, 62, 75
- Panagopoulos, Costas, 20, 52
- Participants. *See* Subjects
- Pedagogical interventions, human subject experiment involving, 82
- Peisakhin, Leonid, 57, 74
- Perspective-giving, lab experiment involving, 46, 63, 120–122
- “Pilot tests,” 89, 89
- Pinochet, Augusto, 4, 65
- Pinto, Paul, 57, 74
- Planning document, 27
- Plant experiment. *See* Practice experiments
- Police  
   policing tactics, field experiment involving, 57, 65–66, 124–125  
   use of force, survey experiment involving, 52, 64, 123
- Political campaigns, field experiments in, 56
- Political constraints on human subject experiments, 74
- Poori experiment, 37, 127
- Pope, Jeremy, 53, 55, 64
- Population average treatment effect (PATE), 11
- Posttest difference score, 62–63, 117–119
- Potential versus observed outcomes, 10–11, 21, 111
- Practice experiments, 5, 23  
   average treatment effect (ATE), estimating, 29–30  
   battery bounce example, 37–38  
   changes scores, use of, 33–34  
   checklist, 35  
   context of, 25–26  
   control conditions, determination of, 24  
   covariate balance, checking, 28–29  
   dataset, 26–27  
   defining outcomes in, 25  
   estimation in, 29–30  
   exercises, 38–39, 114–117  
   measurement of outcomes in, 25, 27–28, 39, 116–117  
   noninterference assumption and, 25–26  
   planning document, 27  
   poori example, 37, 127  
   pumpkin/hairspray example, 34–35  
   random assignment in, 40–41  
   statistical conclusions, 34  
   statistical uncertainty, assessing, 30–32 (*See also* Statistical uncertainty)  
   subjects, selection of, 24  
   substantive conclusions, 34  
   symmetry assumption and, 26  
   testable experimental questions, 23–24  
   treatment, determination of, 24  
   YouTube example, 35–37
- Pre-analysis plans  
   average treatment effect (ATE) in, 87  
   confidence interval in, 87  
   importance of, 88  
   measurement of outcomes in, 87  
   random assignment in, 87  
   research hypothesis in, 87  
   specialized research questions, 87  
   standard error in, 87
- Prior research, substantive significance of results in context of, 102
- Proxy for health, 8–10
- Psychology, interventions in, 7
- Publication bias, 75, 111–128
- Public Health Service Syphilis Study (Tuskegee Syphilis Study), 69
- Pumpkin/hairspray experiment, 34–35
- R Companion*, 24, 26, 85, 99
- R (software), 26–27, 87, 99
- Racial discrimination, 20–21, 111
- Rahmani, Bardia, 36
- Random assignment  
   aroma/purchasing behavior, human subject experiment involving, 84  
   attrition as problem in, 16, 47, 113  
   average treatment effect (ATE) and, 13  
   blood donation, human subject experiment involving, 86  
   defined, 12  
   exercises, 19–21, 110–113  
   experimental design and, 43  
   in field experiments, 58  
   gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 85, 90, 111–129  
   in human subject experiments, 129  
   in lab experiments, 47  
   list of all possible assignments, 13  
   “natural experiments” and, 44  
   in naturally occurring experiments, 61  
   in practice experiments, 40–41  
   in pre-analysis plans, 87  
   statistical independence of outcomes, 12  
   in survey experiments, 54  
   unbiased estimation, required for, 16
- Randomized experiments, 3–5
- Recycling, human subject experiment involving, 79
- Reeves, Byron, 19
- Regression, 93  
   advantages of, 105–106  
   average treatment effect (ATE) and, 105, 108–109, 138  
   body mass index (BMI) and, 107, 135–137  
   covariate-adjusted estimator, 99–101  
   covariate adjustment, 97–99, 105–106  
   defined, 93

- Regression (cont.)  
 difference-in-means estimation and, 95–96, 106, 133–134  
 equation, 93–95  
 exercises, 106–109, 133–139  
 fitted regression line, 96–97  
 gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 106–107, 134–135  
 least squares estimation, 95  
 minimizing sums of squared residuals, 95–96  
 notation used in, 94–95  
 police use of force and, 107–108, 137–138  
 precision, effect of covariate adjustment on, 101–102  
 standard deviation and, 108–109, 138  
 standard error and, 108–109, 138  
 treatment and outcome, demonstrating relationship between, 105–106  
 TV sitcoms, lab experiment involving, 95–96, 98, 104, 127–128, 138–139
- Research hypothesis, 43  
 in field experiments, 56  
 in lab experiments, 46  
 in naturally occurring experiments, 60  
 in pre-analysis plans, 87  
 in survey experiments, 33
- Respect for persons principle, 69
- Retail sales, human subject experiment involving, 81
- Riedl, Rachel, 45
- Rind, Bruce, 20, 90
- Robitaille, Nicole, 89–90
- Rogan, Dennis, 57, 65
- Roommate/weight, naturally occurring experiment involving, 60
- Rossi, Martín, 60
- Rutherford, Kylan, 37
- Sampling distribution  
 defined, 15, 31, 112  
 exercises, 21, 112  
 statistical uncertainty and, 31
- SAT preparatory courses, 2–4
- Saxe, Rebecca, 46, 63
- Schargrofsky, Ernesto, 60
- Schott, John Paul, 81
- Sénémeaud, Cécile, 86
- Sermon, lab experiment involving, 45
- Sherman, Lawrence, 57, 65
- Shorwell, Vivien, 84
- Sierra Club, 91
- Skepticism, 2–4
- Social science experiments,  
 5, 62  
 cause and effect and, 42  
 experimental design (*See* Experimental design)  
 field experiments (*See* Field experiments)  
 lab experiments (*See* Lab experiments)  
 naturally occurring experiments (*See* Naturally occurring experiments)  
 survey experiments (*See* Survey experiments)
- Social welfare spending, survey experiment involving, 52
- Specialized research questions, 87
- Standard deviation  
 changes scores and, 33  
 defined, 15  
 exercises, 38, 114  
 regression and, 108–109, 138  
 statistical uncertainty and, 31
- Standard error  
 changes scores and, 33  
 defined, 15, 112  
 exercises, 21, 38–39, 112–116  
 in pre-analysis plans, 87  
 regression and, 108–109, 138  
 statistical uncertainty and, 31
- Statistical significance, 106  
 alternative hypothesis, 103  
 hypothesis testing, 105–106  
 null hypothesis, 103  
 $p$ -value, 103–105  
 statistically insignificant findings, 105, 109, 138  
 $t$ -ratio, 103–105  
 test statistic, 103  
 two-tailed alternative, 103
- Statistical uncertainty  
 95% CI, 31–32, 38, 114  
 degrees of freedom, 32, 101, 104–105  
 practice experiments, assessing in, 30–32  
 sampling distribution and, 31  
 standard deviation and, 31  
 standard error and, 31  
 $t$ -distribution, 31–32
- Study descriptions, 84, 87
- Subjects  
 “debriefing,” 69, 77, 128  
 defined, 8  
 exercises, 21, 113–114  
 experimental design and, 42–43  
 in field experiments, 58  
 in lab experiments, 47–48  
 in naturally occurring experiments, 61  
 in practice experiments, 24  
 in survey experiments, 54  
 vulnerable subjects, 71, 77–78, 127–128
- Substantive significance of results, 102–103
- Survey experiments  
 abortion example, 55  
 consumer preference example, 52  
 control conditions in, 53–54  
 cue-taking example, 53, 64, 122–123  
 defined, 51

- design elements, 55–56  
 empirical results, 55  
 examples, 52  
 exercises, 64, 122–123  
 factors affecting selection of, 44  
 human subject experiments as, 81  
 immigration example, 52  
 instructions to subjects in, 54  
 interventions and, 52–53  
 lab experiments compared, 52–53  
 limitations of, 56  
 measurement of outcomes in, 54–55  
 police use of force example, 52, 64, 123  
 random assignment in, 54  
 random manipulation and, 51–52  
 research hypothesis in, 53  
 selection of subjects in, 54  
 social welfare spending example, 52  
 treatment in, 53–54
- Symmetry assumption  
 compound treatment and, 17  
 different administrative procedures and, 17  
 different outcome measurement and, 17  
 human subject experiments and, 130  
 practice experiments and, 26  
 taste-testing and, 82  
 unbiased estimation, required for, 17, 113
- t*-distribution, 31–32  
*t*-ratio, 103–105  
 Tampering, 16  
 Target population, 11  
 Taste-testing, human subject experiment involving, 82  
 Tax status, human subject experiments and, 74  
 Test statistic, 103  
 Testable experimental questions, 23–24  
 Tipping. *See* Gratuities, human subject experiment involving  
 Transparency, 75  
 Treatment  
 average treatment effect (ATE) (*See* Average treatment effect (ATE))  
 in biomedical research, 6–7  
 compound treatment, 17  
 control conditions (*See* Control conditions)  
 defined, 6–7  
 exercises, 19–20, 110–112  
 in field experiments, 57–58  
 gratuities, human subject experiment involving, 85–86  
 in lab experiments, 46–47  
 in naturally occurring experiments, 60  
 placebo, 7  
 in practice experiments, 24  
 regression, demonstrating relationship between treatment and outcome, 105–106  
 in survey experiments, 53–54  
 TV sitcoms, lab experiment involving, 46–47
- Treatment groups  
 covariates and, 14  
 exercises, 20, 38, 111, 114
- Trump, Donald, 53, 64, 122–123
- “Trust” game, 45
- Tuskegee Syphilis Study, 69
- TV sitcoms, lab experiment involving, 44–51  
 control conditions and, 46–47  
 ethical issues in human subject experiments, 76  
 regression and, 95–96, 98, 104, 127–128, 138–139  
*t*-ratio and, 104  
 treatment and, 46–47  
 two-tailed intervention and, 103
- Two-tailed alternative hypothesis, 103
- Unbiased estimation  
 assumptions for, 16–18, 21, 113  
 defined, 13, 15  
 difference-in-means estimation and, 16–18, 21  
 exercises, 21, 112–113  
 noninterference required for, 16, 113 (*See also* Noninterference assumption)  
 random assignment required for, 16  
 symmetry required for, 16–17, 113 (*See also* Symmetry assumption)
- “Uncivil discourse,” 19–20, 110–112
- Voytas, Elsa, 4, 57, 113
- Vulnerable subjects, 71, 77–78, 127–128
- Westwood, Sean J., 20–21, 45
- Will and Grace* (TV sitcom), 44–51
- Wren-Lewis, Liam, 60–61, 66
- Written results  
 checklist, 91–92  
 conclusion, 88–89  
 ethical issues, discussion of, 88  
 exercises, 91–92, 133  
 in human subject experiments, 88–89  
 introduction, 88
- Yadav, Monika, 37
- YouGov, 54
- YouTube, 35–37, 89, 129
- Zhou, Alan, 83
- Zimbardo, Philip, 69