
WHEN SENSITIVITY BIAS VARIES ACROSS SUBGROUPS: THE IMPACT OF NON-UNIFORM POLARITY IN LIST EXPERIMENTS*

A PREPRINT

Sophia Hatz

Department of Peace and Conflict Research
Uppsala University

sophia.hatz@pcr.uu.se

David Randahl 

Department of Peace and Conflict Research
Uppsala University

david.randahl@pcr.uu.se

September 27, 2024

ABSTRACT

Survey researchers face the problem of sensitivity bias: since people are reluctant to reveal socially undesirable or otherwise risky traits, aggregate estimates of these traits will be biased. List experiments offer a solution by conferring respondents greater privacy. However, little is known about how list experiments fare when sensitivity bias varies across respondent subgroups. For example, a trait that is socially undesirable to one group may be socially desirable in a second group, leading sensitivity bias to be negative in the first group, while it is positive in the second. Or a trait may be not sensitive in one group, leading sensitivity bias to be zero in one group and non-zero in another. We use Monte Carlo simulations to explore what happens when the polarity (sign) of sensitivity bias is non-uniform. We find that a general diagnostic test yields false positives and that commonly used estimators return biased estimates of the prevalence of the sensitive trait, coefficients of covariates, and sensitivity

*The research was funded by the European Research Council, project H2020-ERC-2015-AdG 694640 (ViEWS) and Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, grant M21-0002 (Societies at Risk)

bias itself. The bias is worse when polarity runs in opposite directions across subgroups, and as the difference in subgroup sizes increases. Significantly, non-uniform polarity could explain why some list experiments appear to ‘fail’. By defining and systematically investigating the problem of non-uniform polarity, we hope to save some studies from the file-drawer and provide some guidance for future research.

Keywords List experiments • Sensitivity bias • Social desirability bias • Simulation

1 Introduction

Sensitivity bias² has been recognized as a fundamental barrier in survey research on a variety of phenomenon, spanning drug use, racial prejudice, sexual preferences and voting behavior (Fisher 1993). The problem is that since people do not want to openly admit to sensitive traits –opinions and behaviors considered socially undesirable, offensive, or otherwise risky to reveal– estimates of the population prevalence of these traits will be biased.

The list experiment is a popular technique for mitigating sensitivity bias. A list experiment provides survey respondents with additional confidentiality by embedding the sensitive question within a list of non-sensitive items, making it impossible to identify individual responses to the sensitive question. Assuming that people answer truthfully under the guise of privacy, list experiments will produce unbiased estimates of sensitive traits. While a wealth of methodological work has refined the design and analysis of list experiments, we call attention to an important complication: the polarity (sign) of sensitivity bias can vary across respondent subgroups, even cutting in opposite directions.

For example, consider a survey question measuring belief in claims of fraud in the 2020 US Presidential Election. Belief in Trump’s claims of fraud may be a sensitive trait for Democrats, who are likely reluctant to admit they believe Democratic President-elect Joe Biden’s win was illegitimate. On the other hand, Republicans may not interpret belief in electoral fraud as a sensitive topic. Alternatively, it could be the case that Republicans are reluctant to admit that they *do not* believe Trump’s claims.³ In either case, the sign of sensitivity bias would differ across Democrats and Republicans. The bias from sensitivity for Democrats would be negative, while for Republicans it would be zero or positive. We refer to the situation where the (expected or observed) sign of sensitivity bias differs across subgroups as non-uniform polarity.

The idea of non-uniform polarity is not entirely new. Methodologists have pointed out that the possibility exists (e.g., Aronow et al. 2015, 58; Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020, 1307; Chou 2018). There is also some empirical support for the phenomenon in prior research: subgroup analyses in list experiments often show apparent differences in sensitivity bias across groups defined by characteristics such as partisanship, education, gender (e.g., Blair and Imai 2012; Heerwig and McCabe 2009; Kim and Kim 2016; Carkoglu and Aytaç 2015; Gonzalez Ocantos, Jonge, and Nickerson 2014; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023). While the differences in these studies are not large enough to show with statistical conventional statistical certainty that the sensitivity bias cuts in opposite directions across subgroups, they do provide an indication that non-uniform polarity may indeed exist as an empirical phenomenon. Additionally, when violations of the monotonicity assumption are detected in list experiments this may lead the researchers to falsely conclude that the list experiment has failed, when in fact the problem is non-uniform polarity, leading to the researchers not publishing the results. The absence of statistically significant empirical evidence of non-uniform polarity in the literature may be thus be due to a ‘file-drawer’ problem where studies which find non-uniform polarity are misdiagnosed as failed list experiments and not published.

²This is also referred to as social desirability bias (Krumpal 2013; Fisher 1993). We use the broader term introduced in Blair, Coppock and Moor (2020) which encompasses misreporting for a variety of reasons not limited to social desirability.

³For example: <https://nytimes.com/2023/02/16/business/media/fox-dominion-lawsuit.html>

Drawing on the literature on social norms and preferences, there are also good theoretical reasons to expect that group-based norms will determine what is sensitive and what is socially desirable (e.g., Young 2015; Kuran 1990). Considering a range of sensitive topics— e.g., vote choice, prejudice, abortion and same-sex marriage— it seems unlikely that different social groups agree on what is socially acceptable and what is sensitive. This may be especially true for topics where small subgroups hold a belief that is contrary to the majority view and would thus be considered sensitive. For instance, while we may theorize that for a majority of respondents it would be considered sensitive to express skepticism about the efficacy of vaccines, respondents who are members of the broader anti-vaxxer community may consider it sensitive to express a belief in the efficacy of vaccines. Similarly, for a majority of respondents it would be considered sensitive to express a belief that the world is flat, while for respondents who are members of the broader flat earth community it may be considered sensitive to express a belief that the world is round. In both cases, the sign of sensitivity bias would differ across subgroups.

Despite the fact that the problem of non-uniform polarity has been discussed in several research papers, to our knowledge, no systematic research has been conducted to establish the consequences of non-uniform polarity for a range of estimation goals and techniques. *How do the estimators we rely on for sensitive topics hold up when sensitivity bias varies across subgroups? How large does a subgroup need to be to shift estimates? Are some estimators more robust than others?*

This paper calls attention to the issue and explores its consequences. We first discuss the potential problems that can arise from non-uniform polarity. We describe how essential list experiment assumptions, or tests of their violation, rely on an underlying implicit assumption of uniform polarity. This implies that non-uniform polarity can cause commonly used diagnostic tests to falsely detect violations of list experiment assumptions. Second, estimation techniques relying on these assumptions are likely to yield biased estimates. This concerns maximum likelihood (ML) model estimates of the prevalence of a sensitive trait, as well as the correlates of a sensitive trait. Third, estimates of sensitivity bias itself will be biased in the presence of non-uniform polarity. For example, positive and negative biases on the subgroup level could cancel each other out, leading to an aggregate estimate of no sensitivity bias.

To study the consequences of non-uniform polarity we set up a simple Monte Carlo simulation. The simulation assesses the reliability of a general diagnostic test, as well as bias in three commonly estimated quantities of interest: the prevalence of the sensitive trait, the correlates of the sensitive trait, and the extent of sensitivity bias. We find that when the polarity of sensitivity bias is the opposite across subgroups, Aronow et al's (2015) joint placebo test falsely indicates the violation of list experiment assumptions. We also show that, in the presence of non-uniform polarity: ML estimators combining direct- and list experiment-measures generally return positively biased estimates of the prevalence of a sensitive trait, the estimated coefficients of covariates are biased in standard ML and combined ML models under certain conditions, and estimates of sensitivity bias are biased towards zero. For all three quantities, the bias is worse when polarity runs in opposite directions across subgroups, and as the difference in subgroup sizes increases.

From our simulation results, we provide some suggestions for researchers when designing and analyzing list experiments. First, given the limitations of existing diagnostic tests in detecting non-uniform polarity, we urge researchers to theorize about potential subgroup variation in sensitivity bias and to conduct confirmatory subgroup analyses. Second, researchers could design list experiments to minimize bias from non-uniform polarity, for example by phrasing the sensitive item so that it is non-sensitive to one subgroup. Third, it's crucial to understand that biases can emerge in both the prevalence estimate and in covariate estimates, especially when covariate effects differ across subgroups. This calls for a nuanced approach in theorizing about sensitive traits and their correlates across different groups. Overall, understanding the theoretical underpinnings of non-uniform polarity in a given sample can help guide design and analysis choices.

Most broadly, the results have implications for political science and survey research. Non-uniform polarity could explain why some list experiments appear to ‘fail’: diagnostic tests could return false positives and countervailing biases across subgroups could net out, leading researchers to incorrectly infer their experiment failed to recover the true population prevalence. As others have pointed out (Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020; Gelman 2014; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023), this can lead to a file-drawer problem, whereby list experiments with unexpected results are not submitted for publication. This suggests that we may know little about the prevalence of traits when sensitivity bias moves in unexpected ways or is complex, perhaps varying along more than one dimension.

This paper makes specific but important contributions. The list experiment is widely used to measure public opinion on sensitive topics. There has been a great deal of attention to the properties and assumptions of list experiment estimators, and several important advancements have been made. We focus on a concern that has been raised in concluding paragraphs (Aronow et al. 2015; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023) and on blogs (Gelman 2014), yet has not been investigated systematically. Our aim in this paper is to call attention to the problem and anticipate its consequences via simulation. We believe further theoretical, empirical and methodological research is needed, particularly employing real-world data, in order to better understand the issue and develop solutions.

2 The problem of non-uniform polarity

List experiments are a popular survey technique used to get accurate estimates of sensitive traits: opinions and behaviors people don't want to reveal openly. In a list experiment, the sensitive trait is embedded in a list of non-sensitive traits and survey respondents are asked only to report how many statements apply, but not which ones. This makes it impossible to identify individual responses to the sensitive topic and offers respondents privacy. By randomly assigning respondents to receive the sensitive statement (treatment) or not (control), researchers can calculate an aggregate prevalence rate using the difference-in-means (DiM) across treatment and control. The logic of list experiments is that respondents will answer truthfully when afforded privacy, allowing researchers to avoid the bias from respondent misreporting.

List experiments thus produce unbiased estimates under the assumption that respondents will tell the truth. However, as Ahlquist (2018) points out, this is a fundamental contradiction, since list experiments are used in a context where we expect respondents to lie about their beliefs or experiences. Also, the list experiments offer only imperfect privacy:

answering affirmatively to all the statements would reveal the respondent possesses the sensitive trait. More precisely, list experiments rely on the assumption that respondents will only lie in certain (strategic) ways.

Our focus in this paper is to point out that this assumption in turns depends on the assumption that the polarity (sign) of sensitivity bias is *uni-directional* for a given topic and *uniform* across subgroups. That is, we must assume either that possessing the trait (i.e. answering affirmatively on the sensitive item) is the sensitive response, or that not possessing the trait (i.e. answering negatively on the sensitive item) is the sensitive response. This means we expect sensitivity bias to be *either* negative or positive: polarity is uni-directional for the survey topic (Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023; Gelman 2014). We also must assume that the same response is sensitive across subgroups defined by partisanship, gender, and so on. This means we expect sensitivity bias will be of the same sign (positive or negative) for all subgroups: polarity is uniform. With these assumptions in place, we know what types of (strategic) lying to expect, and how to test for unwanted types of lying (nonstrategic lying/measurement error).⁴

To illustrate the essential role of these underlying polarity assumptions, consider the essential *no liars* assumption: this states that respondents will not lie about the sensitive item in the list experiment (Blair and Imai 2012, 51–52). However, given that privacy fails if respondents answer yes to all statements, respondents may in fact lie strategically by avoiding the maximum value of statements. One way to test whether the *no liars* assumption holds is by looking for ‘ceiling’ liars in the sample: respondents who choose one less than maximum value in the list experiment (Blair and Imai 2012; Ahlquist 2018). However, as Hatz et al (2023) point out, what we consider a ‘floor’ or ‘ceiling’ liar depends on what we as researchers assume is the sensitive response (Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023, Appendix B.4). And, if we are wrong about which response is sensitive, or if which answer is sensitive varies across subgroups, then the tests for ‘floor’ and ‘ceiling’ liars may falsely detect violations of the no-liars assumption.

Similar issues arise when looking for ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ coder error processes in the data, i.e. respondents who simply select the maximum or minimum value on the list experiment. Ahlquist (2018) notes that ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ error processes may be either strategic or non-strategic. The error process is non-strategic if the respondent simply chooses the maximum or minimum value out of inattentiveness, but it may be strategic if the respondent chooses the maximum or minimum value in order to avoid revealing the sensitive trait. Following the same logic as tests for floor- and ceiling liars, whether we interpret the presence of ‘top’ or ‘bottom’ lying as strategic or as a violation of assumptions depends on our assumptions about which response is the sensitive response. In the presence of non-uniform polarity, this test could misdiagnose the type of error process.

Extending the same logic, consider the *monotonicity* assumption introduced by Aronow et al (2015). The monotonicity assumption states that individuals will not *falsely confess* to a sensitive trait in a *direct* measure. This a fairly

⁴We think of uni-directional polarity as an assumption at the topic-level. For a given topic Z , researchers usually articulate uni-directional expectations: Z is a sensitive trait, therefore answering affirmatively to Z is the sensitive response, and we expected Z to be under-estimated in the aggregate (Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020; Gelman 2014; Ahlquist 2018; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023). We think of uniform polarity as an assumption at the group-level. For topic Z and groups A and B , researchers usually articulate uniform expectations: Z is a sensitive trait to groups A and B , therefore answering $Z=1$ is the sensitive response for A and B , and we expected $Z=1$ to be under-estimated in the aggregate. The assumption that sensitivity bias is uniform thus also implies the assumption that it is uni-directional.

straightforward assumption of rationality: why falsely confess, in a setting without additional privacy, to an opinion that is socially undesirable? However, whether this assumption is violated or not again depends on our polarity assumptions. In the presence of non-uniform polarity where *not* possessing the trait is the sensitive response for one group, then *false confessions* would be rational (strategic lying) for this group⁵. Again, if we are incorrect about what is sensitive, or if what is sensitive varies across subgroups, then the diagnostic test could indicate non-strategic measurement error while at least for some respondents the misreporting is strategic. Additionally, considering a subgroup for whom *not* possessing the trait is the sensitive response, the monotonicity violation might instead be termed a *false denial*: it would be irrational to falsely deny possessing the trait. Under the uni-directional and uniform polarity assumption that possessing the trait is sensitive, however, we would not detect this form of non-strategic measurement error while testing the monotonicity assumption.

Another way to think about the problem is that list experiments rely on an underlying assumption of ‘one-sided lying’: we assume lying will only occur in the direction specified by our theoretical assumptions about the sensitive topic (Ahlquist 2018). If we observe lying in the opposite direction (e.g., floor effects when we expect ceiling effects, or false confessions) then we interpret these as non-strategic error processes, which violate list experiment assumptions about specific forms of (strategic) lying.

The additional point we are trying to emphasize is that since we assume one-sided lying for the entire sample we apply diagnostic tests on the sample-level, so if one relatively large subgroup lies in the ‘wrong’ direction then the diagnostic test may incorrectly suggest the list experiment as whole fails to meet design assumptions. The implication is thus that non-uniform polarity can cause commonly used diagnostic tests to falsely detect violations of essential list experiment assumptions. Here, when we say falsely detect, we mean that the test may mislabel response behavior that is rational for some respondents as non-strategic. A diagnostic test could also fail to detect true violations of assumptions among subgroups, via the same mechanism of testing at the aggregate level and misdiagnosing the type of error at least for some respondents.

In addition to being problematic for diagnostic tests, the more general problem is that list experiments rely on assumptions such as no liars and monotonicity in order to produce unbiased estimates. This means that when these assumptions are violated (as they appear to in the presence of non-uniform polarity) then list experiment estimators which rely on these assumptions will be biased. In particular, this has implications for maximum likelihood (ML) estimators which rely on the monotonicity assumption, such as estimators which combine the list experiment and direct measure into a combined measure of prevalence Eady (2017).⁶ In fact, combined ML estimators rely on the

⁵Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl (2023) elaborate this point in Appendix B.4

⁶The monotonicity assumption must be met in order to model responses to the list experiment and direct measure simultaneously, such as when calculating a combined measure of prevalence. When this assumption holds, we can treat reports of sensitive opinions in the direct measure as the truth. This makes it possible to combine list experiment and direct measures to get a single prevalence estimate (Aronow et al. 2015). It also must be met in order to model the effect of covariates on the likelihood of the respondent concealing the sensitive trait in the direct measure, as in Eady’s (2017) misreporting estimator.

monotonicity assumption to the extent that ‘false confessors’ must be identified and removed from analysis prior to estimation.⁷

In specific situations, non-uniform polarity may also have implications for the standard ML estimator (Blair and Imai 2012), which relies only on the no liars assumption. In particular, if polarity varies across subgroups, and a covariate which predicts the (assumed) sensitive trait has *different effects* across subgroups, then this may result in biased estimates of the covariate. This is the case because the model would be unable to separate the effects between the two (or more) groups. For example, consider the covariate “political engagement” in the initial example of measuring belief in Trump’s claims of electoral fraud. Assume that among Democrats, political engagement is negatively correlated with belief in Trump’s claims and assume that among Republicans, political engagement is positively correlated with belief in Trump’s claims. Since the covariate is essentially co-linear with the variable identifying the respondent subgroups, the model will produce biased estimates of the effect of the covariate. While this is in essence a problem of model misspecification it is nonetheless not a trivial one, as solving this would both require knowing that polarity varies across subgroups, and having enough respondents to ensure that the estimation is still properly powered.

It follows from this discussion that estimates of sensitivity bias itself are likely to be biased. Estimating sensitivity bias may be of theoretical interest (for example, see Lax and Stollwerk 2016; Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020) or used to validate whether the list experiment successfully reduced misreporting (e.g., Kramon and Weghorst 2019). Sensitivity bias is commonly operationalised as the difference between the list experiment estimate and the direct question estimate (Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020). However, if list experiment assumptions do not hold, and the estimated prevalence is biased, then so will be the estimate of sensitivity bias. Further, in the particular case of non-uniform polarity there are intuitive reasons estimates of sensitivity bias could be off, as others have speculated (e.g., Lax and Stollwerk 2016; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023). For example, if sensitivity bias is positive within a large respondent subgroup, then the overall estimated sensitivity bias will be positive although sensitivity bias may negative or null for other subgroups. Or, if sensitivity bias cuts in opposite directions across subgroups, the bias may net-out. In this case, a topic which is highly sensitive for each subgroup may appear non-sensitive in the aggregate.

3 Simulation study

To study the consequences of non-uniform polarity, we conduct a small Monte Carlo simulation experiment.

Our simulation is set up as follows. We are interested in the sensitive topic Z and we assume possessing the trait ($Z = 1$) is sensitive. We generate data from a standard list experiment with 2000 respondents, of which 1000 are in the list experiment treatment group and 1000 are in the list experiment control group. There are two subgroups in the experiment, group A and group B. In group A, possessing the trait ($Z = 1$) is the sensitive response, while in group B not possessing the trait ($Z = 0$) is the sensitive response. Given this non-uniform polarity, the monotonicity

⁷False confessors can be identified by looking for ‘top-coders’: respondents who answer the maximum number of items in the list experiment (i.e., confess) yet answer negatively to sensitive item in the direct measure (i.e., they falsely confess). However, as we have explained, this diagnostic requires the assumption that possessing the trait is the sensitive response (i.e. assuming polarity is uni-directional and uniform).

assumption may appear violated in the aggregate, since some respondents will appear to *falsely confess* in the direct measure. However, we ensure monotonicity holds on the subgroup level, i.e. group A will not falsely confess to $Z = 1$ in the direct measure and group B will not falsely confess to $Z = 0$. We also ensure that the following list experiment assumptions hold: no liars, no design effects and treatment independence. Apart from group membership (x_1), we include two covariates, x_2 and x_3 , where x_2 predicts the likelihood of the respondent having the trait $Z = 1$ and x_3 affects the likelihood of respondents lying in the direct measure. The true proportion of respondents with $Z = 1$ is fixed to 25% in both group A and group B.⁸

In the simulations we vary several conditions. First, we vary the type of non-uniform polarity. In one set of simulations, $Z = 1$ is the sensitive response to group A and $Z = 0$ is the sensitive response to group B, so that sensitivity bias is positive for group A and negative for group B (i.e. the polarity of sensitivity bias is the opposite for group B). In the other set of simulations, $Z = 1$ is the sensitive response to group A and Z is non-sensitive to group B, so that sensitivity bias is positive for group A and zero for group B (i.e., there is no sensitivity bias in group B).

Second, we vary the proportion of respondents in group B from 0 to 50%.

Third, we vary whether the effect of covariate x_2 on Z is the same or different across the subgroups. In one set of the simulations, x_2 has the same effect on the likelihood that respondents have $Z = 1$ in both group A and group B (i.e. the correlation between x_2 and Z goes in the *same direction* for group A and B). In the other set of simulations, the covariate x_2 predicts $Z = 1$ for group A and $Z = 0$ for group B (i.e. the correlation between x_2 and Z goes in the *opposite direction* for group A and B).

In each simulation, we estimate the p-value for Aronow et al's (2015) joint placebo test for the no liars, no design effect, treatment independence and monotonicity assumptions. Since the simulations are set up to ensure no design effects, treatment independence and monotonicity on the sub-group level, we can interpret this as a test of the monotonicity assumption on the aggregate level, under the underlying polarity assumption that $Z = 1$ is the sensitive response for all. We then estimate the bias in three common quantities of interest: 1) the estimated prevalence of $Z = 1$ using the difference in means (DiM) estimator, the standard maximum likelihood (ML) estimator (Blair and Imai 2012) and the estimator combining the direct and list experiment measures (Aronow et al. 2015; Eady 2017) (Combined ML⁹); 2) the beta coefficients for the effect of covariates x_1 , x_2 , and x_3 on the likelihood of $Z = 1$ from the maximum likelihood methods; and 3) the aggregate sensitivity bias (the estimated prevalence of $Z = 1$ using DiM minus the estimated prevalence in the direct measure). Although we do not expect the DiM estimator or the ML estimator to produce biased estimates for the proportion of respondents with $Z = 1$ as they do not rely on the monotonicity assumption, we include these for reference.

⁸This may be considered unreasonable as then the vast majority of respondents in group B would hold the, to them, undesirable trait, but allows for a better illustration of the effect of the problem.

⁹In order to estimate the combined ML estimator in the presence of apparent 'false confessors', as implied by non-uniform polarity, we run the combined ML model while including one extra control item which is always 0. This ensures total anonymity for top-coders, so they cannot appear as 'false confessors'. The extra item does not affect the bias calculations in any way. This change only affects the variance of the estimates, which are not being analyzed in the study.

For each setup we run the simulation 1000 times and report the p-value for the diagnostic test as well as the bias introduced in the different quantities of interest.

4 Results

4.1 Aronow et al's joint placebo test

Figure 1 shows the p-values for Aronow et al's (2015) joint placebo test for the no liars, no design effect, treatment independence and monotonicity assumptions. We see that when the polarity of sensitivity bias is the opposite sign for group B, the test rejects the null hypothesis that all four assumptions hold. From our simulation set-up, when know that the test is flagging a violation of monotonicity on the aggregate level, although we know monotonicity holds on the subgroup level. This result is consistent once group B reaches around 25% of the sample. The test does not reject the null when Z is not sensitive to group B beyond what is expected by random chance.




Figure 1: P-values for Aronow et al's (2015) joint placebo test

4.2 Estimated prevalence of the sensitive trait

Figure 2 shows the bias in the estimated proportion of respondents with $Z = 1$. From this figure it is clear that since there is no violation of the no liars assumption, both the DiM and the standard ML estimators give unbiased estimates of the true proportion with $Z = 1$ across all specifications. However, since the monotonicity assumption is violated in the aggregate, the ML model which combines the direct and list experiment measures generates positively biased estimates of the prevalence of $Z = 1$. There is an exception in the special case where Z is not sensitive to group B and the effect of x_2 is the same across both subgroups.




Figure 2: Bias in the estimated prevalence of the sensitive trait

4.3 Estimated coefficients of covariates

Figure 3 shows the bias in the estimated beta coefficient for the effect of covariate x_2 on the likelihood of the respondent having $Z = 1$. Here we can see that both the standard ML model and the combined ML model produce biased beta coefficient estimates for x_2 . There is an exception for the standard ML model when the effect of x_2 is identical across both subgroups and for the combined ML model when the topic is not sensitive in group B *and* the effect of x_2 is the same across groups.




Figure 3: Bias in the estimated beta coefficient for the effect of x_2 on the likelihood of the sensitive trait

4.4 Sensitivity bias




Figure 4: Bias in the estimated sensitivity bias

Figure 4 shows how estimates of sensitivity bias (the estimated prevalence of $Z = 1$ using DiM minus the estimated prevalence in the direct measure) are affected by non-uniform polarity. We see that even when the size of group B is relatively small, the estimated sensitivity bias shrinks quickly towards zero. The problem is much more severe when the polarity is of opposite signs across group A and group B, but is also noticeable when Z is not sensitive to group B.

5 Discussion

The results from the simulation study largely confirm our expectations. Under the simulated condition of subgroups with opposite polarities, Aronow et al's (2015) joint placebo test detects a violation of the monotonicity assumption on the aggregate level, although the simulations ensure monotonicity holds on the sub-group level. This result is consistent once the size of the subgroup becomes substantial (at 25% of the sample). However, the test does not flag a monotonicity violation in the simulated case that the topic is not sensitive to one group.

We also find that list experiment estimators return biased estimates of three common quantities of interest. ML estimators combining direct and LE-measures generally return positively biased estimates of the prevalence of a sensitive trait, the estimated coefficients of covariates are generally biased in standard ML and combined ML models, and estimates of sensitivity bias are attenuated. For all three quantities, the bias is worse when polarity runs in opposite directions across subgroups, and as the difference in group sizes increases.

The headlines are perhaps not surprising. Since having a subgroup with the opposite polarity patently violates the monotonicity assumption, a general diagnostic test will point to list experiment failure. It is also not surprising that combined ML estimators, which rely on the monotonicity assumption, return biased estimates in the presence of non-uniform polarity: Aronow et al (2015) call attention to this problem already in their initial paper. And as many intuit, the estimated aggregate sensitivity bias shrinks when sensitivity bias takes opposite signs across subgroups. Yet, we believe that these results highlight a number of important points to keep in mind when designing, analyzing and interpreting list experiments.

First, there is currently no diagnostic test for non-uniform polarity.¹⁰ Aronow et al's (2015) placebo test is a joint test of the monotonicity, no liars, no design effects, and treatment independence. In a non-simulated setting, the researcher will not be able to know which of the assumptions have been violated when the test is rejected.¹¹ Even if we could isolate the monotonicity assumption, as in our controlled simulations, the test will only flag non-uniform polarity in the case of opposite polarities; it does not detect non-uniform polarity where the topic is sensitive in one subgroup but not sensitive in another. In the absence of post-hoc tests for non-uniform polarity, we urge researchers to draw on theory. For instance, are there theoretical reasons to believe that certain subgroups have different norms or beliefs regarding the topic? Although list experiments are often motivated by uni-directional assumptions (Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020; Gelman 2014; Ahlquist 2018; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023), we suspect that few topics that are truly sensitive also correspond to universally-held values. In particular, we believe that when the joint test is rejected that researchers should consider the possibility of non-uniform polarity as the culprit and revisit the theoretical expectations among subgroups. If theoretically motivated subgroups with potentially different sensitivity bias are identified, researchers should proceed with subgroup analyses of these groups and investigate the potential for non-uniform polarity by running the diagnostic tests separately for each subgroup. Ideally, researchers should also pre-register expectations about subgroup variation in sensitivity bias in order to motivate specific confirmatory sub-group analyses while avoiding multiple comparisons.

Second, we have shown that bias in ML estimators is worse when polarity runs in opposite directions across subgroups, and as the difference in group sizes increases. At the design stage, researchers should consider both the nature of non-uniformity and the relative size of relevant subgroups. Since bias tends to be worse in the case of opposite polarities, researchers may consider phrasing the sensitive item in a list experiment so that it is non-sensitive to one subgroup.

¹⁰Although it is possible to estimate sensitivity bias by subgroup in order to observe non-uniform polarity, issues of greater variability in list experiment measures and insufficient statistical power make this unreliable (Carkoglu and Aytaç 2015, 558; Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020).

¹¹An additional problem is that the test has limited power, and will only reject the null when the sample size is sufficiently large.

As even a relatively small group with the opposite polarity can induce bias, researchers should not discount minority groups.

Third, we've noted that bias occurs in estimates of prevalence and in estimates of covariate effects when the effect of a covariate differs across subgroups with different polarities. While this is essentially a problem of model mis-specification rather than with the estimators themselves, it is not unreasonable to believe that covariates which predict the trait may differ across groups with different attitudes toward the sensitive trait. Beyond theorizing around which groups may differ in what they consider sensitive, it's important to think about the correlates of the sensitive trait in each group.

Fourth, non-uniform polarity can cause researchers to draw incorrect conclusions from the data. One reason is that diagnostic tests may mislabel strategic response behavior among some respondents as non-strategic. This may lead researchers to falsely conclude that the list experiment has failed to satisfy key assumptions. It could also lead to poor post-hoc analysis decisions. For example, removing 'false confessors' from the data may imply removing the rational respondents while preserving inattentive respondents; removing strategic liars in one subgroup while allowing non-strategic liars in another subgroup to stay. In the presence of a large subgroup with the opposite polarity, it could also mean removing a large share of respondents, reducing statistical power and generalizability. Additionally, because diagnostic tests rely on uni-directional and uniform polarity assumptions, and are carried out on the sample-level, the tests cannot detect violations of list experiment assumptions within respondent subgroups. Another reason non-uniform polarity could cause researchers to draw incorrect conclusions is that the estimated sensitivity bias may run in the opposite direction as expected, or be close to zero. Since the presence of sensitivity bias is often used to validate the list experiment as a measurement technique, this could lead to the conclusion that the experiment failed to encourage truthful responses. The longer-term consequence of apparent list experiment failure is a 'file-drawer problem', whereby scholars with unexpected results chose not to pursue publication (Blair, Coppock, and Moor 2020; Gelman 2014; Hatz, Fjelde, and Randahl 2023).

Finally, as the non-uniform polarity only causes bias for the ML based estimators we also urge researchers to always consider simpler estimators, such as the difference-in-means estimator or standard ML estimator, when analyzing list experiments in cases where there is a theoretical reason to believe that the monotonicity assumption *could be* violated. These estimators do not rely on the monotonicity assumption and are therefore unbiased in the presence of non-uniform polarity. If there are large differences in the estimated aggregate sensitivity bias across subgroups, this may be an indication that the monotonicity assumption is violated, and the simpler estimators should be used instead.

This initial paper is only a first step in the direction of understanding the implications of non-uniform polarity. Further theoretical, empirical and methodological research is needed. Drawing on the literature on individual-level preferences and social norms could deepen our understanding of the roots and nature of divergent attitudes towards sensitive topics. Empirical research could establish the extent of non-uniform polarity in real-world survey data. Methodological work may potentially develop new diagnostic tests and robust estimators, as well better guidance for the design of list experiments in the context of non-uniform polarity.

References

- Ahlquist, John S. 2018. "List Experiment Design, Non-Strategic Respondent Error, and Item Count Technique Estimators." *Political Analysis* 26 (1): 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2017.31>.
- Aronow, Peter M, Alexander Coppock, Forrest W Crawford, and Donald P Green. 2015. "Combining List Experiment and Direct Question Estimates of Sensitive Behavior Prevalence." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 3 (1): 43–66.
- Blair, Graeme, Alexander Coppock, and Margaret Moor. 2020. "When to Worry about Sensitivity Bias: A Social Reference Theory and Evidence from 30 Years of List Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 114 (4): 1297–1315.
- Blair, Graeme, and K Imai. 2012. "Statistical Analysis of List Experiments." *Political Analysis* 20 (1): 47–77.
- Carkoglu, Ali, and S Erdem Aytac. 2015. "Who Gets Targeted for Vote-buying? Evidence from an Augmented List Experiment in Turkey." *European Political Science Review* 7 (4): 547–66.
- Chou, Winston. 2018. "Lying on Surveys: Methods for List Experiments with Direct Questioning." Technical report, Princeton University.
- Eady, Gregory. 2017. "The Statistical Analysis of Misreporting on Sensitive Survey Questions." *Political Analysis* 25 (2): 241–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2017.8>.
- Fisher, Robert J. 1993. "Social Desirability Bias and the Validity of Indirect Questioning." *Journal of Consumer Research* 20 (2): 303–15.
- Gelman, Andrew. 2014. "Thinking of Doing a List Experiment? Here's a List of Reasons You Should Think Again." (accessed on: 2021-08-24). <https://statmodeling.stat.columbia.edu/2014/04/23/thinking-list-experiment-heres-list-reasons-think/>.
- Gonzalez Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David W. Nickerson. 2014. "The Conditionality of Vote-buying Norms: Experimental Evidence from Latin America." *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (1): 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12047>.
- Hatz, Sophia, Hanne Fjelde, and David Randahl. 2023. "Could Vote Buying Be Socially Desirable? Exploratory Analyses of a 'Failed' List Experiment." *Quantity and Quality*.
- Heerwig, Jennifer A., and Brian J. McCabe. 2009. "Education and Social Desirability Bias: The Case of a Black Presidential Candidate." *Social Science Quarterly* 90 (3): 674–86.
- Kim, Sueng Hyun, and Sangmook Kim. 2016. "Social Desirability Bias in Measuring Public Service Motivation." *International Public Management Journal* 19 (3): 293–319.
- Kramon, Eric, and Keith Weghorst. 2019. "(Mis) measuring Sensitive Attitudes with the List Experiment: Solutions to List Experiment Breakdown in Kenya." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 83 (S1): 236–63.
- Krumpal, Ivar. 2013. "Determinants of Social Desirability Bias in Sensitive Surveys: a Literature Review." *Quality & Quantity* 47 (4): 2025–47.
- Kuran, Timur. 1990. "Private and Public Preferences." *Economics & Philosophy* 6 (1): 1–26.

- Lax, Justin H. Phillips, Jeffery R., and Alissa F. Stollwerk. 2016. "Are Survey Respondents Lying about Their Support for Same-Sex Marriage? Lessons from a List Experiment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80: 510–33.
- Young, H. Peyton. 2015. "The Evolution of Social Norms." *Annual Review of Economics* 7: 359–87.