## Lebanon

# DIALOGUES: MANAGEMENT FIELD MANUAL

## Table of Contents

# 1 Program Introduction

Over the coming months you will be the manager of a discussion groups program that will be undertaken as part of a research project for the Lebanese Center for Policy Studies (LCPS) and researchers from the University of Pittsburgh. The full-scale research project involves 120 discussion groups and 720 participants and will take 10 weeks to implement during the period from January 2016 – March 2016.

The main goal of this project is to understand whether and why people support confessional politics and to investigate possible ways to increase support for programmatic politics that crosses confessional lines. These discussions are being conducted in the context of the recent protests in response to the trash crisis in Lebanon as well as the recent discovery of the potential for oil and natural gas. This presents a critical opportunity for all Lebanese to consider their hopes and fears regarding the future and the extent to which they support political change in Lebanon.

Overall, we hope that the discussions will shed light on the following broad questions:

1. To what extent do people support the current confessional system and why?

2. When do people increase their support for cross-sectarian, issue-based politics? In particular, how do concerns about economic interests and economic security affect support for confessional politics?

## 1.1 Program Components

As the Program Manager overseeing the implementation and data collection phases of the project, you will be responsible for ensuring the success of all components of the program with the support of the Research Team based at the Lebanese Center for Policy Studies (LCPS) and the University of Pittsburgh. All components of the program, which you are responsible for supervising, are listed below. Each component will be elaborated on in detail either in this Management Field Manual or in the Full Moderator Manual, which you will also be provided:

| | |
|---|---|
| Translation of all materials into Arabic | This guide |
| Recruitment and randomization | This guide |
| Screening potential participants | This guide |
| Participant check-in and informed consent | Moderator manual |
| Pre-discussion data collection | Moderator manual |
| Discussion | Moderator manual |
| Post-discussion data collection | Moderator manual |
| Session data compilation | Moderator manual |
| Data entry and transmission to research team | This guide |

# 2 Dialogue Group Composition

A central goal of these discussions is to understand how interacting on political and economic issues with people from different economic and confessional backgrounds affects support for cross-sectarian politics. In other words, we are interested in answering the following question: ***To what extent does discussing these issues with participants from a similar or different confessional background and participants from a similar or different economic background affect participants' preferences for change?*** This will help us to understand the critical trade-offs people face when considering ties to confessional identity and the need to secure vital economic goods.

To answer this question, we will vary the group composition of the discussions in four ways. Each group will have six participants, where participants belong to the:

(1) Same sectarian group and same economic class
(2) Mixed sectarian groups and same economic class
(3) Same sectarian group and mixed economic classes
(4) Mixed sectarian groups and mixed economic class

Table 1 summarizes these four different group types and shows the number and type of participants that will take part in each group.

**Table 1: Discussion group type variations (120 total groups)**

| | ***Same sectarian group*** | ***Mixed sectarian group*** |
|---|---|---|
| ***Same economic class*** | No. of groups: 30<br>No. of participants = 180<br>No. of participants per group: 6<br>Backups per group: 3<br><br>Sect: 6 Sunni or 6 Christian or 6 Shia<br>Econ: All lower income OR all upper income | No. of groups: 30<br>No. of participants = 180<br>No. of participants per group: 6<br>Backups per group: 4<br><br>Sect: 2 Sunni, 2 Christian, and 2 Shia<br>Econ: All lower income OR all upper income |
| ***Mixed economic class*** | No. of groups: 30<br>No. of participants = 180<br>No. of participants per group: 6<br>Backups per group: 3<br><br>Sect: 6 Sunni or 6 Christian or 6 Shia<br>Econ: 3 lower income and 3 upper income | No. of groups: 30<br>No. of participants = 180<br>No. of participants per group: 6<br>Backups per group: 6<br><br>Sect: 2 Sunni, 2 Christian, and 2 Shia<br>Econ: One of each is low income, one of each is high income |

To control for other possible sources of differences between respondents, we are organizing the discussion groups such that they will be all male or all female. There will be no mixed gender groups. Additionally, we will control for participant age by specifying that two of the sets of male-only sessions will be composed of men under 35 years of age and the third set of the male-only sessions will be composed of men over 35 years of age. For the female-only groups in the sample: one set will be composed only of women over age 35 and the other set will be composed only of women under age 35.

By varying the composition of the groups along confessional and economic lines, we aim to answer the following specific questions:

1. To what extent does discussions amongst people from same vs. different sectarian groups affect support for sectarian politics versus cross-sectarian issue-based politics?

2. To what extent do discussions amongst people from same vs. different economic classes affect support for sectarian politics versus cross-sectarian issue-based politics?

# 3 Recruitment

This section summarizes the recruitment and randomization protocols for all 120 policy discussions. These discussions will be divided equally among 4 types of groups based on different combinations of socio-economic characteristics, as shown in **Table 1** above. Groups vary based on:

1) Economic class of group members
2) Sectarian affiliation of group members

## 3.1 Recruitment Goals

Each of the 120 groups taking part in the policy discussions is made up of 6 individuals. The socio-economic characteristics of these individuals vary according to group type. Within each of the 4 group types, there are 30 groups.

The 4 group types are summarized as follows:

| | | Sect | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Same** | **Mixed** |
| **Economic Class** | **Same** | 1 30 groups | 2 30 groups |
| | **Mixed** | 3 30 groups | 4 30 groups |

In other words:
1) In the 30 groups of group type 1, all of the 6 individuals in a group will belong to the same economic class and have the same sectarian affiliation.
2) In the 30 groups of group type 2, the 6 individuals in a group will all belong to the same economic class but have different sectarian affiliations.
3) In the 30 groups of group type 3, the 6 individuals in a group will all belong to different economic classes but have the same sectarian affiliation.
4) In the 30 groups of group type 4, the 6 individuals in a group will all belong to different economic classes and also have different sectarian affiliations.

Within group types 1 and 2 (same economic class), groups are further divided by class, with a total of 15 rich or upper class groups and 15 poor or lower class groups within each quadrant/group type. Additionally, within group types 1 and 3 (same sectarian affiliation), the groups are further divided by sect with a total of 10 Sunni groups, 10 Shia groups, and 10 Christian groups. This means that within quadrant 1, there are 5 poor Sunni groups, 5 poor Shia groups, 5 poor Christian groups, 5 rich Sunni groups, 5 rich Shia groups, and 5 rich Christian groups.

In summary, the division of group types and individual profiles is presented below:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" rowspan="3"></td><td colspan="4">Sect</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Same</td><td rowspan="2">Mixed</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sunni</td><td>Shia</td><td>Christian</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Economic Class</td><td rowspan="2">Same</td><td>Poor</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>2 15 groups</td></tr>
<tr><td>Rich</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>1<br>5 groups</td><td>2 15 groups</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Mixed</td><td>3<br>10 groups</td><td>3<br>10 groups</td><td>3<br>10 groups</td><td>4 30 groups</td></tr>
</table>

In addition, gender within a group will be held constant, and we will conduct the policy discussions with male-only and female-only groups. To preserve balance between different group types within each gender there will be an unequal number of male and female groups. To do this we look at the smallest group set that can be formed to achieve balance between group types. The group set must contain all different types of groups. We start with group type and quadrant 1, since we have the highest number of different groups. We need at least 1 group of each of these types:

- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Poor Sunni group
- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Poor Shia group
- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Poor Christian group
- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Rich Sunni group
- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Rich Shia Group
- 1 Same Economic Class/Same Sect Rich Christian group

This gives us 6 groups within group type 1, meaning we should have 6 groups from each of group types 2, 3 and 4 to form the smallest group set where there is balance between group types.

Within group type/quadrant 2 we need:

- 3 Same Economic Class/ Mixed Sect Poor groups
- 3 Same Economic Class/ Mixed Sect Rich groups

Within group type/quadrant 3 we need:

- 2 Mixed Economic Class/ Same Sect Sunni groups
- 2 Mixed Economic Class/ Same Sect Shia groups
- 2 Mixed Economic Class/ Same Sect Christian groups

Within group type/quadrant 4 we need:

- 6 Mixed Economic Class/ Mixed Sect groups

In total this gives us 24 group sessions that make up the smallest group set, as summarized below:

| | | Sect | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Same | | | Mixed |
| Economic Class | Same | 1 Poor Sunni | 1 Poor Shia | 1 Poor Christian | 3 Poor |
| | | 1 Rich Sunni | 1 Rich Shia | 1 Rich Christian | 3 Rich |
| | Mixed | 2 Sunni | 2 Shia | 2 Christian | 6 Mixed |

With 120 policy discussion groups, we can have 5 group sets. Of these 5 group sets, we will assign 3 group sets as all-male groups and 2 group sets as all-female groups.

| Group # | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group Type | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /S Sect | S Econ /M Sect | S Econ /M Sect | S Econ /M Sect | S Econ /M Sect | S Econ /M Sect | S Econ /M Sect |
| Individual Profiles | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Sunni | R.Sunni | P.Sunni | R.Sunni | P.Sunni | R.Sunni |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Sunni | R.Sunni | P.Sunni | R.Sunni | P.Sunni | R.Sunni |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Shia | R.Shia | P.Shia | R.Shia | P.Shia | R.Shia |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Shia | R.Shia | P.Shia | R.Shia | P.Shia | R.Shia |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ | P.Christ | R.Christ |
| Group # | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| Group Type | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /S Sect | M Econ /M Sect | M Econ /M Sect | M Econ /M Sect | M Econ /M Sect | M Econ /M Sect | M Econ /M Sect |
| Individual Profiles | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | P.Sunni | P.Sunni | P.Sunni | P.Sunni | P.Sunni | P.Sunni |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Sunni | R.Sunni | R.Sunni | R.Sunni | R.Sunni |
| | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | P.Sunni | P.Shia | P.Christ | P.Shia | P.Shia | P.Shia | P.Shia | P.Shia | P.Shia |
| | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | R.Shia | R.Shia | R.Shia | R.Shia | R.Shia | R.Shia |
| | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | P.Christ | P.Christ | P.Christ | P.Christ | P.Christ | P.Christ |
| | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | R.Sunni | R.Shia | R.Christ | R.Christ | R.Christ | R.Christ | R.Christ | R.Christ | R.Christ |

In summary, there are 5 sets of 24 groups each, with 3 sets that are all male groups and 2 sets that are all female groups:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups |
| 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups | 6 groups |
| Set 1 | | Set 2 | | Set 3 | | Set 4 | | Set 5 | |
| Male | | Male | | Male | | Female | | Female | |

In terms of recruitment, we want to recruit individuals based on their 1) sect 2) gender and 3) economic status. Consequently we end up with **12 unique profiles** ($3^{\text{sect}}$ x $2^{\text{gender}}$ x $2^{\text{economic status}}$):

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) Poor Female Sunni | 7) Poor Male Sunni |
| 2) Poor Female Shia | 8) Poor Male Shia |
| 3) Poor Female Christian | 9) Poor Male Christian |
| 4) Rich Female Sunni | 10) Rich Male Sunni |
| 5) Rich Female Shia | 11) Rich Male Shia |
| 6) Rich Female Christian | 12) Rich Male Christian |

Furthermore, we want to control for the age of participants in the group sessions. Thus, two of the three male sets should be composed entirely of men under age 35, and the third set should be composed entirely of men over age 35. For women, one set will be composed entirely of women over age 35, and the other will be composed entirely of women under age 35.

## 3.2 Summary of Group Types

We want the groups to be homogenous when it comes to gender, i.e., all participants in a group should be females or all participants in a group should be males. Within each gender, we have 12 different group combinations that are part of the 4 main group types. For both genders, we end up with **24 unique group combinations** (combination of group type, gender and individuals' profiles).

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Poor Sunni Group | 13) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Poor Sunni Group |
| 2) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Poor Shia Group | 14) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Poor Shia Group |
| 3) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Poor Christian Group | 15) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Poor Christian Group |
| 4) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Rich Sunni Group | 16) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Rich Sunni Group |
| 5) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Rich Shia Group | 17) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Rich Shia Group |
| 6) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Female Rich Christian Group | 18) Same Sect/Same Econ Class Male Rich Christian Group |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7) Mixed Sect/Same Econ Class Female Poor Group | 19) Mixed Sect/Same Econ Class Male Poor Group |
| 8) Mixed Sect/Same Econ Class Female Rich Group | 20) Mixed Sect/Same Econ Class Male Rich Group |
| 9) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Female Sunni Group | 21) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Male Sunni Group |
| 10) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Female Shia Group | 22) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Male Shia Group |
| 11) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Female Christian Group | 23) Same Sect/Mixed Econ Class Male Christian Group |
| 12) Mixed Sect/Mixed Econ Class Female Group | 24) Mixed Sect/Mixed Econ Class Male Group |

## 3.3 Implementation of Recruitment Plan

It is anticipated that the Moderation Team will be able to accommodate up to 2 dialogue sessions per day. The number of policy discussions per day and the days of the week during which policy discussions are held may vary from week to week and from set to set, but the idea is that 2.5 weeks are assigned for each set of 24 group discussions.

Thus, the 24 group discussions for each of the 5 sets will be held over 2.5 weeks, with 2 policy discussions per day for approximately 4-5 days per week. Implementation of all 5 sets is expected to take place over the course of approximately 14 weeks.

Below is an example of what one particular 2.5 week period of 24 discussions might look like:

| | Day 1 | Day 2 | Day 3 | Day 4 | Day 5 | Day 6 | Day 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Week 1 | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | Rest | Rest |
| Week 2 | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | Rest | Rest |
| Week 3 | 2 discussions | 2 discussions | Rest | | | | |

The 5 sets will alternate between male and female as follows:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Week 1</td><td colspan="2">Week 2</td><td colspan="2">Week 3</td><td colspan="2">Week 4</td><td colspan="2">Week 5</td><td colspan="2">Week 6</td><td colspan="2">Week 7</td><td colspan="2">Week 8</td><td colspan="2">Week 9</td><td colspan="2">Week 10</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Set 1</td><td colspan="5">Set 2</td><td colspan="5">Set 3</td><td colspan="5">Set 4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">24 Male groups</td><td colspan="5">24 Female groups</td><td colspan="5">24 Male groups</td><td colspan="5">24 Female groups</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Week 11</td><td colspan="2">Week 12</td><td colspan="2">Week 13</td><td colspan="2">Week 14</td><td colspan="12" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Set 5</td><td colspan="3" rowspan="2">Extra</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">24 Male groups</td></tr>
</table>

Recruitment will take place **in 5 sets and in 2.5-week periods** corresponding to the 5 sets of 24 policy discussion groups. Ultimately, each set includes 144 people participating in the 24 group discussions. The **profile** of participants and the **number of participants** of each profile required in each set is **the SAME** for each set, except that the **gender of participants alternates** every set.

## 3.4 Recruiting Backups

We want to over-recruit individuals so that we minimize the risk of one of the participants not showing up and therefore having to cancel that policy discussion. Given the importance of attaining the correct profile of participants in every policy discussion, recruiters cannot recruit just any individual to fill any given spot. **We are anticipating 50% attrition for every participant profile in a group**. This means that recruiters **<u>must</u>** over-recruit at the following rates depending on Group Type:

For each type of individual per set (e.g. poor male Sunnis in Set 1), we will need the following to actually participate in the groups:

| | Same sect | Mixed sect |
|---|---|---|
| Same econ | 6 | 6 |
| Mixed econ | 6 | 6 |

These individuals will be assigned to participate in the following number of groups per set:

| | Same sect | Mixed sect |
|---|---|---|
| Same econ | 1 group * 6 in each | 3 groups * 2 in each |
| Mixed econ | 2 groups * 3 in each | 6 groups * 1 in each |

With anticipated 50 percent attrition, we will need to recruit the following extras of that type per set

| | Same sect | Mixed sect |
|---|---|---|
| Same econ | 3 extras/group * 1 groups = 3 extras | 1 extra/group* 3 groups = 3 extras |
| Mixed econ | 2 extra/group x 2 groups = 4 extras | 1 extra/group * 6 groups = 6 extras |

This means that for any given type of person for one set we will need to recruit a total of 40 individuals, of whom 24 will actually participate and 16 will be backups. This also means that for each set we will need to recruit 240 males or females (40 of each type * 6 types).

| | Same sect | Mixed sect |
|---|---|---|
| Same econ | 9 | 9 |
| Mixed econ | 10 | 12 |

Thus over the course of five sets we will recruit 1200 individuals of which 720 will actually participate.

| **Males** | Main | Backups | Sets | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor Sunnis | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |
| Poor Shia | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |
| Poor Christians | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |
| Rich Sunnis | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |
| Rich Shia | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |
| Rich Christians | 24 | 16 | 3 | 120 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 720 |

| **Females** | Main | Backups | Sets | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor Sunnis | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| Poor Shia | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| Poor Christians | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| Rich Sunnis | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| Rich Shia | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| Rich Christians | 24 | 16 | 2 | 80 |
| | | | | 480 |

## 3.5 Recruiters & Recruitment Schedule

To eliminate the risk of recruiters contaminating the participant pool by knowing too much about the exact profiles we are interested in, the Project Manager will communicate as little as possible in terms of the profiles of interest. The Project Manager will encourage all recruiters to recruit as widely and broadly as possible, from as many different neighborhoods, sectarian groups, and economic classes as possible.

Ultimately, the most important thing is that each recruiter in a given wave of recruitment is able to supply a minimum of 4 potential participants of each unique type (confession + economic background, given assigned gender and age for that wave of recruitment). If this minimum cannot be met, then it will not be possible for the Research Team to properly conduct the randomization in a way that will ensure that participants do not already know one another. The Field Manager is responsible for ensuring that all recruiters are able to provide this minimum of 4 potential participants per unique type.

It is imperative that all 6 of the participants in any given session are complete strangers. Their first contact with one another must be during the dialogue session. To maximize the probability that this can be achieved for all scheduled group sessions, we must make the following assumptions:

- Recruits from different sects (even if recruited by the same recruiter) will likely be from different circles and will therefore not know each other. Therefore, a poor Sunni and a poor Christian recruited by the same recruiter **can** safely be in the same group together.
- Recruits from different recruiters are unlikely to know each other even though they are from the same sect and economic class

In summary, this means that for every 2.5-week wave of recruitment, each recruiter must recruit at least 4 participants who fit each of the 6 profiles depicted above. This could be achieved in a number of ways depending on the total number of recruiters working in that wave of recruitment.

- Let’s say we:
  - Need to recruit 240 total participants, 40 each of 6 unique types
  - And need each recruiter to recruit at least 4 of each unique type
- Then, if there are 10 recruiters:
  - Each would 1 recruiter would need to recruit:
    - 4 Poor Sunni
    - 4 Poor Shia
    - 4 Poor Christian
    - 4 Rich Sunni
    - 4 Rich Shia

    - 4 Rich Christian
- Thus, each 1 recruiter would need to recruit a minimum total of 24 participants in that wave.

# 4 Implementing the Randomization

In order to achieve the distribution of group types described above, we need to randomly assign participants. For each set, the implementation team will provide the Research Team in Pittsburgh with a (de-identified) list of the 240 recruited participants. The information will be provided in an excel sheet with the following columns completed, at minimum:

- Unique Participant ID (PID)
- Respondent’s gender
- Respondent’s economic class
- Respondent’s sectarian group
- Recruiter ID (RID) corresponding to the Recruiter who recruited each respondent
- General area/neighborhood the respondent was recruited from

The following table gives an abbreviated example of what this might look like:

| No. | Participant ID | Sex | Econ | Sect | Recruiter ID | Area |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1346 | Male | Poor | Christian | 11 | A |
| 2 | 1349 | Male | Poor | Sunni | 12 | B |
| 3 | 1357 | Male | Rich | Christian | 15 | C |
| 4 | 1366 | Male | Rich | Sunni | 16 | D |
| 5 | 1370 | Male | Poor | Shia | 17 | A |

The research team will implement the randomization according to the principles outlined below (see Lebanon_FGD_randomization_v8 in the project Dropbox). For any given set, the randomization for rich and poor will be done separately.

We will aim to block treatment assignment on recruiter and area where possible. This will not necessarily lead to achieve perfect blocking in practice due to the inability anticipate which respondents will actually participate and due to the unequal number of each type of individual that needs to be assigned to groups (see above). We will take steps to ensure balance in recruiter and area across all five sets.

The Research Team will conduct the random assignment of recruited individuals to the 4 group types and send this dataset back to the Program Manager. The list that is returned to the Manager will dictate which type of group each participant has been assigned to, but it will be the Manager’s job to schedule the exact date and time of the session in which any given individual will participate. This means that the Manager may have some flexibility in scheduling individuals to attend sessions, as long as the Manager adheres to the random assignment to group type provided by the Research Team.

The Research Team expects that if any difficultly should arise in the process of recruitment and randomization which might impact the integrity of this procedure that the Manager will alert the full Research Team so that we can all work together to coordinate a solution in keeping with the principles and limits of experimental research design.

# 5 Training of Field Staff

## 5.1 Transport Staff

The Manager is expected to offer all dialogue recruits transportation to the dialogue session site. The Research Team understands that some participants may insist on arriving via their own means of transportation. As such, it is critical that the Moderation Team keep track of how all participants arrive to the session. A question for data entry to this effect is included on the Check-In Sheet that the Moderators will use onsite.

Participants are expected to arrive to the dialogue location in groups of 3 when opting to use the transportation provided. It is possible that participants sharing a car will be coming from the same neighborhood, though not necessarily, since the drivers will be instructed to proceed in a linear fashion towards the dialogue site. The Program Manager will oversee the implementation of multiple reminder phone calls in the 2-3 days leading up to an individual's scheduled session appearance.

The Manager is responsible for executing this aspect of the logistics in such a way that is consistent across all dialogue sessions throughout the implementation period. Any deviations from the proposed plan to provide transport for all recruits to the session sites must be documented and reported to the Research Team, including when and why the deviation occurred.

## 5.2 The Recruiters

The Manager will be responsible for selecting and training Recruiters, as well as supervising all Recruiters' work to ensure the successful recruitment of dialogue participants in line with the goals of the research project. This section outlines the expectations of the Research Team with regard to how the Recruiters will be trained and evaluated.

### 5.2.1 Training

The Manager is responsible for finding and training the Recruiters in line with the needs and expectations of the Research Team, including with regard to their ability to recruit from a range of economic and confessional backgrounds. How to select Recruiters falls under the purview of the Manager. It is expected that the Recruiters will be drawn from a varied enough background that they will be able to recruit participants from all pools of the population required for this project.

The method of training the Recruiters is largely up to the discretion of the Manager, with the understanding that Recruiters are to be trained on specific protocols with regard to the following items:

- Securing consent to be contacted in the future to attend a discussion group – using the proper consent form
    - This form will be provided in English and translated into Arabic by the Manager for use in the field
    - Emphasize that consenting and responding to the questions on the Screening Survey does not guarantee that you will be selected for full participation in a discussion group

- Review the Screening Survey and related protocols in detail (See the **Appendix** for a copy of the survey used)
    - Recruiters should encourage answers on all questions to the best of their ability, even if this requires the respondent to make “an educated guess” rather than to give an answer that he or she is certain is correct
    - Special codes, such as “Don’t Know, Refused, Not Applicable” should only be accepted as a last resort
    - All questions MUST be marked in some way – blank answers are not acceptable for any questions

- Proper method for delivering the “Screening Survey” data to the Manager in a timely and efficient manner

**Note:** At no point should Recruiters be informed of how the randomization process works; Recruiters should not be aware of how participants will later be assigned to specific dialogue sessions.

### 5.2.2 Pilot Testing

The full recruitment protocol will be pilot tested prior to full-scale implementation. Recruiters will have a chance to practice the procedure when they recruit for the pilot dialogue sessions where the Moderation Teams will be piloting the dialogue content and related protocols. Any issues that arise in the pilot testing of the recruitment strategy should be brought to the attention of the full Research Team and addressed before full-scale implementation is allowed to begin.

## 5.3 The Moderators

### 5.3.1 Training & Pilot Testing

The Research Team has developed a “Full Moderator Manual” that you should use to guide the training of all Moderators and Assistant Moderators who will be part of the dialogues. It is crucial that all moderators receive the same breadth and depth of training, and they would ideally all be trained at the same time. That guide contains information that is different from what you have in this manual, and you should also take the time to become familiar with it. You will notice that it contains extensive information and suggestions for the Moderators on how to navigate particular aspects of the dialogue session, as well as step-by-step instructions on all of the related administrative duties that will be required of them with regard to confirming the correct group attendees, getting informed consent, and data collection, among other things.

It is expected that “classroom” training of the Moderators will take approximately two days. After that, each Moderator and Assistant Moderator should also be able to practice his or her skills in (at minimum) two pilot dialogue sessions. These pilot dialogues should be taken seriously and conducted as true to the real event as possible to ensure that all elements of the dialogue program are working correctly. As the supervisor, you should oversee each of these pilot sessions so that you can provide feedback to the Moderators on areas of strength and weakness. You should especially watch out for:

- Correct identification of the group composition – including both economic and sectarian backgrounds
- Consistency with hitting all points and questions embedded in the dialogue guide
- Ability to draw all 6 participants into the conversation
- Ability to draw out BOTH commonalities AND differences between group members
- Reiteration of the group types and of individuals' economic and sectarian background periodically throughout the discussion
- Moderator's level of focus and engagement with the group
- Moderator's ability to get the participants to engage with one another and not just to reply to the Moderator directly
- Assistant Moderator's use of precise language in describing the public goods game; quality of explanation of the activity and attention to the full understanding of all participants of the payoff scheme; full and accurate use of all scripts and worksheets; correct calculation of payoffs

The Research Team recognizes that it is likely that more than one Moderator will be conducting the 120 discussion groups. Ideally, all Moderators and Assistant Moderators would be trained at the same time, prior to the launch of the full-scale implementation phase. However, in the event that it is necessary to replace a member of the moderation team part-way through implementation, it should be understood that this new person should also be exposed to the full training program and be permitted to practice in two pilot sessions before being utilized as a replacement for an actual, planned session.

**If there will be multiple Moderators facilitating the discussions, it is essential that the choice of which sessions are moderated by which Moderators be decided randomly.** This is critical in order to avoid introducing Moderator bias into the data. We must avoid having particular group composition types over-moderated by one of the Moderators, while being under-moderated by the other Moderator(s). Thus, it is expected that across all four types of groups, each Moderator on the Moderation Team will moderate equal proportions of the groups. This means that if there are two lead Moderators, where one of them is moderating 75% of the 120 groups and the other is leading the remaining 25%, these proportions must be spread evenly across the group types such that it is never the case that one Moderator leads ALL groups of a particular composition while not leading any groups of another composition type. The same is true of the Assistant Moderators who will be conducting the public goods exercise. If there will be multiple Assistant Moderators assisting over the course of the implementation period, it is essential that the choice of which sessions each Assistant participates in be decided randomly.

# 6 Data Collection

The dialogue program will be accompanied by a rigorous evaluation to study its effects on participating individuals. Data will be collected using a number of different survey and behavioral methods. Both of these strategies are important and complementary. The surveys shed light on how individuals think and feel, but a central problem with surveys is social desirability bias—people report how they think they should feel rather than how they actually feel. Therefore, we are accompanying the surveys with two behavioral outcome measures that require people to take action to see if participants are really willing to do something. The behavioral outcome measures include a public goods game ("participatory exercise") and the option to sign a petition. The details of each of these are broken down in the Full Moderator Manual.

During implementation, data will be collected in all of the following forms:

- Screening Survey – includes economic screening questions and general demographics
- Participant Check-In Sheet – including affirmation of verbal commitment of informed consent
- Verbal commitment on informed consent sheets (on site of dialogue sessions)
- Participant pre- and post-discussion surveys
- A Moderator/Asst. Moderator post-dialogue survey
- "Examples Worksheets" with a "Practice Problem" filled by participants prior to the public goods participatory activity
- "Practice Grids" filled by participants prior to the public goods game
- "Record Sheet" from the public goods game
- A map exercise
- A Petition – must provide indicator for whether participant signed or not
- Audio recordings of all dialogues – approximately 8 of the dialogues will ultimately need to be transcribed
- Signed receipts for participant compensation

## 6.1 Unique Identification Numbers

With data being collected via so many different platforms, it is critical that we maintain organization to a very high degree. To this end, we will be using identification (ID) numbers to keep track of all the materials that are tied to each respondent and to each dialogue group. Moderators and Assistant Moderators should also be assigned unique identification numbers so that they can be identified consistently in the data with all of the groups that they are involved in moderating. Furthermore, all potential participants and their "Screening Survey" data will be linked to the Recruiters who referred them using their Participant IDs (PIDs) and a set of assigned Recruiter IDs (RIDs). It is critical that we remain consistent in using these codes throughout.

### 6.1.1 Group Identification Number (GIDs)

The Group ID (GID) is a three-digit numeric identifier designed to help all members of the project team easily identify the specific group in question.

One set of 24 dialogue groups will be conducted every 2.5 weeks as follows:

- ***Type 1: Same sect/Same economic class (6 groups)***
- ***Type 2: Mixed Sect/Same Economic Class (6 groups)***
- ***Type 3: Same Sect/Mixed Economic Class (6 groups)***
- ***Type 4: Mixed Sect/Mixed Economic Class (6 groups)***

| **Group Type 1** | **Same sect/Same econ** | **Same sect/Same econ** | **Same sect/Same econ** | **Same sect/Same econ** | **Same sect/Same econ** | **Same sect/Same econ** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christian | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christian |

***Type 1: Same sect/Same economic class***

| **Group Type 2** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** | **Mixed sect/Same econ** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni |
| | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni | Poor Sunni | Rich Sunni |
| | Poor Shia | Rich Shia | Poor Shia | Rich Shia | Poor Shia | Rich Shia |
| | Poor Shia | Rich Shia | Poor Shia | Rich Shia | Poor Shia | Rich Shia |
| | Poor Christ | Rich Christ | Poor Christ | Rich Christ | Poor Christ | Rich Christ |
| | Poor Christ | Rich Christ | Poor Christ | Rich Christ | Poor Christ | Rich Christ |

***Type 2: Mixed sect/Same economic class***

| **Group Type 3** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** | **Same sect/Mixed econ** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ |
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ | Poor Sunni | Poor Shia | Poor Christ |
| | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ |
| | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ |
| | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ | Rich Sunni | Rich Shia | Rich Christ |

***Type 3:*** **Same sect/Mixed economic class**

| Group Type 4 | Mixed sect/Mixed econ | Mixed sect/Mixed econ | Mixed sect/Mixed econ | Mixed sect/Mixed econ | Mixed sect/Mixed econ | Mixed sect/Mixed econ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor Sunni | Poor Sunni | Poor Sunni | Poor Sunni | Poor Sunni | Poor Sunni |
| | Rich Sunni | Rich Sunni | Rich Sunni | Rich Sunni | Rich Sunni | Rich Sunni |
| | Poor Shia | Poor Shia | Poor Shia | Poor Shia | Poor Shia | Poor Shia |
| | Rich Shia | Rich Shia | Rich Shia | Rich Shia | Rich Shia | Rich Shia |
| | Poor Christ | Poor Christ | Poor Christ | Poor Christ | Poor Christ | Poor Christ |
| | Rich Christ | Rich Christ | Rich Christ | Rich Christ | Rich Christ | Rich Christ |

***Type 4: Mixed sect/Mixed economic class***

- Every 2.5 weeks the implementation team will conduct 1 full set of dialogues, which includes groups type 1, type 2, type 3, and type 4 as detailed in the tables above.

- Overall, there will be 5 full sets of 24 groups conducted during the implementation period. These sets will be homogenous in terms of the gender of participants, such that 3 of the sets will involve only Male participants, and 2 of the sets will involve only Female participants.

- Two of the full sets will be Males below age 35, one full set will be Males above age 35, one of the full sets will be Females below age 35, and one of the full sets will be Females over age 35.

The Group ID is designed to allow easy reference to the type of group (type 1, type 2, type 3, or type 4) and the order in which that discussion group was held out of the 30 possible groups of each type that will be held during the implementation period. Each digit of the ID has a particular meaning referring to the type and timeline of the session's occurrence. The first digit refers to the type of group (1, 2, 3, or 4) and the latter two digits to whether that particular session is the $1^{st}$, $2^{nd}$, $3^{rd}$ and so on (out of 30), of its type. To illustrate, the Group IDs will proceed as follows:

**<u>Group Identification Numbers – Three Digit Identifiers:</u>**

- Group Type 1 (all begin with "1"): range from 101 to 130
- Group Type 2 (all begin with "2"): range from 201 to 230
- Group Type 3 (all begin with "3"): range from 301 to 330
- Group Type 4 (all begin with "4"): range from 401 to 430

This coding scheme should be used to uniquely identify all of the 120 discussion group sessions.

### 6.1.2 Participant Identification Number (PIDs)

The Participant ID number (PID) allows the research team to uniquely identify each participant in the dialogue sessions and to connect them to all of the data materials that they produce through their answers and involvement in the discussion activities. The Program Manager will assign a unique PID to each potential participant identified by the Recruitment Team via a completed Screening Survey. This means that every time a Screening Survey comes in from a Recruiter, all of the responses associated with the individual identified by the Recruiter should be recorded under a unique PID, regardless of whether this individual is ever actually selected to enter the pool of participants randomized to group sessions.

**To be clear, this means that every completed Screening Survey should be entered into a separate dataset composed entirely of Screening Surveys and the individual whose data is being recorded and entered into that dataset should be given his or her unique PID at that point.**

These PIDs should take the form of four-digit numeric codes that uniquely identify every person who is identified during the course of recruitment for the entire implementation period. All data entered into any Excel or data file that goes to the Research Team based in Pittsburgh should be entered under this PID. To simplify the process, the PIDs should be assigned in the order in which you receive the information on the particular potential participants. For instance, the first four Screening Surveys that get entered should be assigned PIDs: "1001" "1002" "1003" "1004". **Please note that the first digit for a PID should never be zero.**

Since you will ultimately be recruiting enough people to fill up to 1,200 spots in the randomization (720 participants + up to 240 unique extras per set), the PIDs will at minimum range from "1001" to "2200". However, we expect that some of the people who answer the Screening Survey will not qualify for inclusion in the study. For instance, there will likely be some people who are excluded from the mini-dataset of 1,200 that is sent to the Pittsburgh Team for randomization because they will qualify as "middle-income" economic status, and thus be excluded from consideration in order to create enough differentiation between the low and high economic status people participating in the discussion groups.

This means that the PIDs will begin at "1001" and continue for as many Screening Surveys are entered into the initial Screening Dataset. PIDs might thus include numbers like "1045" "1543" "1998" "2137" and so on.

The Manager is responsible for providing the Pittsburgh-based members of the Research Team with a (de-identified) list of the 240 potential participants for each cycle of the dialogues. While the Manager should maintain a list of all potential participants that includes their names and contact information, for the purpose of random assignment to groups the Research Team should only have access to a copy of the data where potential participants are only identifiable by their unique Participant Identification Numbers (PIDs).

To be clear, it is essential that the list provided to the Pittsburgh-based members of the Research Team **not contain any personal identification information** and that ALL potential participants will be identified ONLY using these generic respondent identification codes. Only the Manager should have access to the key necessary to match these codes to the names of the actual participants.

When each participant checks in with the Moderation Team at the dialogue site, he or she will be given **a packet of materials that are labeled with his or her unique Participant ID** of the type described here. The Manager will ensure that full packets are pre-labeled for all participants scheduled for a particular session so that the packets are ready to go regardless of who actually shows up to any given session. Any packets not used will be "recycled" for use in a future session by revising the PID labels.

It is essential that the Moderation Team makes sure that each person is given the correct packet when they check in at the dialogue site. This is primarily the responsibility of the Assistant Moderator handling the check process. The Asst. Moderator must impress upon the participants the importance of ONLY using the packet materials handed out to them.

### 6.1.3 Moderator and Asst. Moderator Identification Numbers (MIDs)

All Moderators and Assistant Moderators should also have unique identification numbers to identify them in the resulting data file. The MIDs will be composed of three numeric digits. If someone serves as both a Moderator and an Asst. Moderator during the implementation period, he or she will still only need to use one identification number and this must be consistent throughout. To summarize, the Moderation Team's identification numbers can proceed as follows:

- Moderator / Asst. Mod. #1 = "100"
- Moderator / Asst. Mod. #2 = "200"
- Moderator / Asst. Mod. #3 = "300"
- Moderator / Asst. Mod. #4 = "400"
- And so on… for as many Moderators or Assistant Moderators are involved in the project

### 6.1.4 Recruiter Identification Numbers (RIDs)

Every Recruiter who works on the project must be assigned a Recruiter Identification number (RID). This should be a unique numeric code such that no two Recruiters have the same RID. It must be possible to connect every single participant identified in the recruitment process to his or her Recruiter. This means that when data from the Screening Survey is recorded (described in the next section) for a potential participant, there should also be a column noting the ID number of the Recruiter associated with locating and recruiting that individual.

The RIDs will be composed of two numeric digits. Recruiters should only be assigned one RID and they should use this same ID number throughout the entire project. To summarize, the Recruiters' identification numbers can proceed as follows:

- Recruiter #1 = "11"
- Recruiter #2 = "12"
- Recruiter #3 = "13"
- Recruiter #4 = "14"
- …….
- Recruiter #9 = "19"
- Recruiter #10 = "20"
- Recruiter #11 = "21"
- And so on… for as many Recruiters are involved in the project

## 6.2 Data Protocols for the Screening Survey

It will be up to the Manager to collect and systematically evaluate the data on each potential participant provided by the Recruiters via the Screening Survey. The Manager is expected to compile the collected data into a Microsoft Excel worksheet file (or similar software) for analysis. This will facilitate the process of accurately grouping participants and assigning them to dialogue group sessions according to economic status and confessional affiliation.

In general, the Manager should adhere to all principles of the general data entry guidelines, including especially the protocols for data coding, specified in **Section 6.3** of this manual.

### 6.2.1 Random Assignment to Group Sessions: Using the PIDs

The Research Team will implement the randomization according to the principles outlined in **Section 1** of this manual and will turn the results of the randomization procedure over to the Manager **within 24 hours** of receiving the initial list. To be clear, the process of identifying participants will look like this as the data changes hands:

1. Manager compiles data from Screening Surveys – assigns PIDs

2. Manager identifies 240 people who meet the criteria in terms of sectarian and economic status AND gender AND age for that set (out of the 5 sets)

3. Manager sends a mini-dataset containing only these 240 people + all their data from the Screening Survey to Pittsburgh with PIDs only (names and contact information removed) + all information on the Recruiter (RID) and the area each participant was recruited from.

4. Pittsburgh Team uses data to assign individuals to group compositions (for groups 1-4). The Pittsburgh Team will return the Excel data file with the information on group assignment (each of the 240 people will be assigned to one of the 4 group types) back to the Program Manager.

5. The Program Manager will then match the PID to the real identities of the individuals and proceed to schedule the participants for specific sessions based on their assignment. For some sessions, there will be more scheduling flexibility than for others. For instance, for those assigned to group 1 there will be only one session of that type held so there will be less flexibility in when any individual can attend. For those assigned to group 4, in theory they could attend one of six possible sessions.

6. Once all participants are scheduled for specific sessions, the Program Manager will record which session each participant is assigned to by completing the Group ID (GID) column in the dataset. Therefore at this point we will have a GID and PID for every participant in the discussions.

7. Once all 240 slots have been filled for the first set of 24 sessions, the Program Manager will prepare the “Check-In Sheet” for each session that will go to the Moderation Team. This sheet includes the names and assigned PIDs of the participants expected for that group. A template for this Check-In Sheet can be found in the Moderator Manual.

8. In addition, the Program Manager will also pre-enter all PIDs for participants into all materials that will go in the participant packets for each of the sessions in that set of 24.

9. At each discussion session, the Moderation Team will use the “Check-In Sheet” to correctly identify each assigned group member and to conduct any replacements. We anticipate up to 50% attrition for each unique profile, so every session has been over-recruited accordingly. In the event that more people show up than needed for a given profile, the Moderation Team will randomly determine which individual will participate and the extra participant(s) for that profile will be asked to leave. All of this data will be recorded on the “Check-In Sheet.”

10. The Assistant Moderator will be responsible for handing out participant packets according to PIDs. Any unused packets should be set aside and reused (after removing the original PID) in future sessions.

11. All collected data should be turned over by the Moderation Team to the Program Manager and properly labeled with Group ID and PIDs, where appropriate. The Program Manager is responsible for overseeing data entry to ensure that all responses are compiled according to the PID and GID (Group ID) as appropriate.

12. At the conclusion of implementation and data entry, the Program Manager will then turn over all datasets and appropriate materials to the Pittsburgh Team for analysis.

### 6.2.2 Using the Screening Survey to Identify Potential Participants

The Research Team has worked with the Manager to develop a series of economic identity indicator questions (9 total questions) as part of the screening process. All of these questions are embedded in the initial Screening Survey used for recruitment of potential dialogue participants. The answer options for these questions have all been assigned values (in addition to the answer codes) that distinguish each of the possible answer options for a given question as being indicative of low (1), middle (2), or high (3) economic status. For each potential participant, the answers to these economic status questions will be converted to one of these three values. All values for these questions will then be totaled to yield an "economic status index" that will be used to approximate the economic status of the potential participant.

To summarize what this index will look like in practice:

- The minimum score is 9 (1 point on each question above)
- The maximum score is 9 (3 points on each question above)
- Scores below 9 mean that at least one question was not responded to

To determine the cut points of the index, the following scale will be used:

- Score between 9 and 14 = lower income individuals
- Score between 15 and 21 = middle class individuals – *(disregarded as potential participants)*
- Score between 22 and 27 = upper middle class individuals

To ensure significant differentiation between the lower and upper class individuals in the mixed groups, those whose scores total in the middle range (shown above) will be disregarded as potential participants.

Please see the **Appendix** for a copy of the Screening Survey with embedded values for each response indicating whether it was converted to a 1,2, or 3 for the index.

## 6.3 General Data Entry Protocols

This section reviews the expectations with regard to the data entry process. The Research Team expects that the Manager will oversee the successful collection of all data as outlined in the Full Moderator Manual. At the conclusion of the Implementation Period, the Research Team expects that the Manager will supervise the data entry process that involves digitizing all collected hard copy data materials. The Research Team has coordinated with the Manager to develop an online data entry format using Google Forms. This procedure is outlined in **Section 6.3.1** below.

It is essential that any and all data that is shared with the Pittsburgh-based members of the Research Team remain de-identified at all times. Participants should only be able to be identified via their unique identification codes, as described above.

### 6.3.1 Manual Entry Using Google Forms

The Research Team will develop two online meta-survey questionnaires for the manual entry of recorded hard copy data from the actual dialogue sessions: (1) Individual-Level Session Form; and (2) Group-Level Session Form. The Research Team will incorporate every question and variable identified in the data collected during the dialogue sessions in these two meta-surveys. The details for which materials are to be included in each virtual Google Form are outlined in **Sections 7.3** and **7.4** below.

### 6.3.2 Data Coding

When drafting the Data Forms, the Research Team will pay careful attention so that the questions and answer options built into the Forms match the data coding outlined in the hard copies of the data collection instruments. The basic principles for using the Google Forms method of data entry are outlined below:

- All questions in each survey that require a response of some kind must be uniquely labeled (within the context of that particular survey instrument) and entered into the data form. This means that all questions should have a unique question number in the Google Form that is clearly related to the question number on the paper copy of the survey instrument.

- The unique question number in the paper survey MUST match the unique question number in the data file submitted to the Research Team so that it is possible to identify which columns of responses correspond to which questions in the paper survey.

- For all responses where the paper copy of the survey contains a scale of answers, i.e. 0 = No, 1 = Yes, the code entered into the data form should match the coding scale used in the paper survey. To avoid any mistakes in moving from the paper to the digital Google Form, all answer options should be listed in the Google Form with BOTH the code and the label. For example, if the two answer options for a question on the paper copy are “1 Yes” and “0 No” then the two answer option fields on the Google Form should be designated as “0 No” and “1 Yes”.

- If it is necessary to deviate from the paper copy scales for answer options in any way, this must be carefully documented with an explanation provided to the Research Team of the new coding scheme upon delivery of the final data file.

- Upon completion, every question in every survey should be answered in some way. Even if the answer is a special code: “Don’t Know” / “Refused” or “Prefer not to answer” / “Not Applicable” – the answer should be recorded on the paper copy of the survey. For data entry into the data file, these special codes should be recorded using the following coding:
    - Don’t Know = -7
    - Refused or Prefer not to answer = -8
    - Not Applicable = -9

### 6.3.3 Quality Control of Manual Entry

The Manager is responsible for sourcing at least two separate people who are qualified to undertake the manual entry of data from the various components into the two Google Form templates. This is necessary to ensure that double entry of responses will be possible for ALL surveys, petition signings, and other data deliverables.

# 7 Data Deliverables

At the conclusion of the discussion program, R'ai will provide the research team in Pittsburgh with **four datasets** for analysis. These will be considered the final deliverables.

## 7.1 Screening Dataset

This is the dataset that will contain all data related to the screening surveys. This dataset will include all of the people screened in the process of locating the 1200 participants who were actually included in the randomization. It will contain the unique participant ID (PID) and then one column for every question in the screening survey. Additionally, it will contain new columns that are created to determine the confession and economic status of the participants for the purpose of randomly assigned them to group types.

**To summarize, in the end this dataset will:**

- Have (at least) 1200 people (listed in the rows)
- Will include a column with the unique PID for each potential participant (from 1001)
- Will include columns with data entry for each question in the screening survey
- Will include any additional columns created as part of determining the confessional and economic status of the potential participant
- Recruiter ID
- Area participant was recruited from

## 7.2 Recruitment and Randomization Dataset

This is the dataset that will record how participants were randomly assigned to different group compositions. This dataset will include **only** the 1200 people who were randomly assigned to groups. It will also include columns for the economic status of each participant, the confessional status of each participant, the recruiter who recruited them, and the area that they were recruited from. This data will be sent in excel format to the Pittsburgh research team for each of the five sets. The Pittsburgh team will then randomly assign participants to groups and to backup and main status. The Program Manager will then confirm the scheduling for each participant and will enter the ID for the group that each participant will be attending in the GID column (Group ID column).

**To summarize, in the end this dataset will:**

- Have 1200 people (listed in the rows)
- Include a column with the unique PID for each potential participant (from 1001)
- Include columns for gender, age, economic status, confessional status, recruiter, and area
- Include columns associated with random assignment (these will be added by the Pittsburgh team and will include randomly generated numbers, group assignment, and backup and main status).
- Include the Group ID (GID) of the session that each participant is scheduled to attend. Note that this MUST be entered into this dataset so that we can merge datasets together.

## 7.3 Individual-Level Session Dataset

This is the dataset that will contain all data at the individual level for the 120 sessions. This dataset will be 720 rows (one row for each of the participants in the actual discussions). The columns will include all data entry from the multiple documents that are collected at the session. There will be multiple documents collected from each individual participant and all of these need to be compiled together in the final dataset.

This dataset will be produced as a function of using the Google Forms method for manual data entry. Each of the 720 participants in the dialogues will have all of their data entered into a single Individual-Level Session Form. For the data entry officer, this Form will resemble filling out a survey for each individual in the dialogue sessions where the data entry officer will "answer" questions that correspond to the answers given by the participant in the pre- and post-discussion survey, public goods contributions, map exercise, and petition. Once completed, the data entry officer with "submit" the "Form" for each particular participant and the data will be stored on Google's servers and accessible by the Research Team. Once all 720 participant Forms have been submitted by BOTH data entry officers, the Research Team can download the data from Google Forms as an Excel file where each column corresponds to a "question" or variable from the collected data and each row corresponds to a unique participant, identified only by their PID.

**To summarize, in the end this dataset will contain:**

- 1 row for all 720 participants in the actual discussions
- A column with the unique PID for each participant
- A column for the GID
- A column confirming that they verbally consented to participate (should be yes for everyone) – this confirmation can be found on the Check-In Sheet
- A column for how each participant arrived to the dialogue session (mode of transportation)
- Pre-discussion survey (columns depends on the final number of questions in the survey)
- Public goods Examples Worksheet Practice Problem exercise (3 columns)
    - 1 column = yes/no correct entry for 1 cell of "Each person's share from Group Pot"
    - 1 column = yes/no correct entry for all 6 rows of "Earned from Group Pot"
    - 1 column = yes/no correct entry for all 6 rows of "Total Earned"
- Public goods game Practice Grid allocation exercise (12 columns)
    - 1 column = unconditional contribution
    - 11 columns = conditional contributions given average contribution of other members
- Map exercise (26 columns, one for each district)
- Public goods contributions (3 columns for the amount contributed in rounds 1 and rounds 2 and amount taken home)
- Post-discussion survey (columns depend on the final number of questions in the survey)
- Petition (1-3 columns, to be discussed with the research team)

## 7.4 Group-Level Session Dataset

This is a dataset that will contain data for the 120 sessions. This dataset will be 120 rows deep (one row for each session). The columns will include all data entry from the multiple documents that apply to each session.

Similar to the Individual-Level Session Dataset above, this dataset will be produced as a function of using the Google Forms method for manual data entry. The difference here is that data entry officers will only complete one of these Forms for each of the 120 dialogue groups. Again, for the data entry officer this Form will resemble filling out a survey for each group, where the data entry officer will "answer" questions that correspond to answers that apply at the level of the dialogue group. Once completed, the data entry officer will "submit" the Form for each dialogue group and the data will be stored on Google's servers and accessible by the Research Team. Once all 120 group Forms have been submitted by BOTH data entry officers, the Research Team can download the data from Google Forms as an Excel file where each column corresponds to a "question" or variable from the collected data and each row corresponds to a unique group, identified by the GID (Group Identification number).

**In the end this dataset will contain:**

- One row for each of the 120 sessions
- A column with the group ID (GID) for each session
- Moderator survey (columns depend on the number of questions in the survey)
- Total group pot from rounds 1 and rounds 2 of the public goods game, as well as the round that was randomly selected for payouts (3 columns, from the record sheet)
- Columns corresponding to relevant data from the Check-In Sheet

### 7.4.1 Storing Data

It is possible that we will need to check the original data during the analysis phase. R'ai agrees to store and keep safe all original documents and data forms for **one year** following the completion of implementation of the discussions.

## 7.5 Google Forms Data Entry Timeline

The Program Manager will oversee the data entry officers as they upload the data collected during the sessions. Data for each of the 5 sets of dialogues will be entered and uploaded at the conclusion of each 2.5-week cycle of sessions. This means that the Research Team will have access to data as it is uploaded throughout the implementation period in order to begin preparing the analysis.

This also means that at some points during the implementation period, the Program Manager will simultaneously be overseeing: (1) recruitment for sessions; (2) scheduling and assigning individual participants to groups based on random assignment; (3) moderation of dialogue sessions; (4) data collection; and (5) data entry.

# Appendix A: Screening Survey

Add final English version when available – there is one document that includes the consent script + questions + values for econ indexing → Zeina Helou was going to make some final adjustments to this