Data Description

This file describes the data and variables used in "Information and its Presentation: Treatment Effects in Low-information vs. High-information experiments" as published in *Political Analysis.*

Downloadable files
The data files available on Dataverse were created in Stata/SE 13.1 on an Apple iMac running macOS High Sierra v 10.13.3, operating with a 3.2GHz Intel core i5 processor and 16 GB of Memory. The data file loads under Stata's default settings and the .do files should take less than 1 second to run and produce output.

The available files include:

- DPTE832(InfoPres).tab – *Stata data used in the analysis, containing 52 variables and 776 cases*
- InfoPres_MainTables_Code.do – *Stata code used to generate Tables 1,2,3,4 and 5*
- InfoPres_Tables_StatLog.smcl – *Stata output generated from running Info_Pres_MainTables_Code.do*
- InfoPres_Tables_StatLog.pdf – *PDF version of output generated from running Info_Pres_MainTables_Code.do*
- InfoPres_AppendixTables_Code.do – *Stata code used to generate Appendix Tables X1, X2 and X3*
- InfoPres_AppendixTables_StatLog.smcl – *Stata output generated from running Info_Pres_AppendixTables_Code.do*
- InfoPres_AppendixTables_StatLog.pdf – *PDF version of output generated from running Info_Pres_AppendixTables_Code.do*
- InfoPres_Holms_Corrections.tab – *Excel file used to generate significance levels via Holms-Bonferroni corrections shown in Appendix Tables X4, X5, X6, and X7*

Procedure for Replicating Results

1. Open DPTE832(InfoPres).tab data file
2. Open InfoPres_MainTables_Code.do and run full file
    a. For Tables 1, and 2, each line of code produces results for one cell in the table, beginning with the uppermost leftmost box
        i. (ttest IPCandFT if Groups==1, by(FemCand) produces the results in the box for Feeling Thermometer and News Articles)
        ii. The analysis proceeds sequentially working through each experimental condition for a given dependent variable before proceeding to the next row in the table and the next dependent variable
        iii. The Difference-in-Difference scores for Table 2 appear following the two conditions ("Low Info" and "High Info") before proceeding to the next dependent variable
    b. For Table 3, the oneway ANOVAs occur in order from top to bottom of the table, beginning with the PreQuestionnaire, and proceeding through the Practice, Campaign, PostQuestionnaire and Total Time.
    c. For Table 4, the first oneway ANOVA produces the results for the left side of the table (Unique Information Viewed), and the second oneway ANOVA produces the results for the right side of the table (Total Information Viewed)
    d. For Table 5, crosstabs are used to produce results for how many subjects viewed any of the information items that appeared in the study. These crosstabs are produced

alphabetically by the type of information within each experimental condition. The results (percentage of subjects viewing each type of information) was entered into a spreadsheet and then sorted by the most viewed items in the Maximum Information Dynamic Information Board condition.

3. Open InfoPres_AppendixTables_Code.do and run full file
    a. Table X1 presents descriptive statistics and the top-line results of the multinomial logit of group assignment
    b. Table X2 and X3 recreate Table 1 and 2, but substitute the ranksum procedure for ttests, applying a difference of proportions test instead of a difference of means. The table is constructed in an identical procedure as Table 1.
4. Open InfoPres_Holms_Corrections.tab
    a. The significance levels from Tables 1, and 2, and Appendix Tables X2, and X3 are placed into the appropriate cells of the Holms-Bonferroni correction matrix. This produces new significance levels, taking into account the number of significance tests being conducted. Those significance values are used in Appendix Tables X4, X5, X6 and X7

Experiment Platform
This study was programmed and fielded in the Dynamic Process Tracing Environment (DPTE), which can be accessed at https://dpte.polisci.iowa.edu/

Subjects
776 subjects were recruited between June 2-4, 2015 from Amazon's Mechanical Turk and paid $2.25 for their participation.

Study Summary
This study can be accessed and viewed at either:

http://bit.ly/2o7cvws or

https://dpte.polisci.uiowa.edu/dpte/action/player/launch/853/21831?pass=PA2018&skip=1

This study examined how subjects react to a treatment under different information conditions. We recruited subjects from Amazon's Mechanical Turk to follow a link (above) to a study where they would learn about two political candidates running for a congressional seat. As subjects entered the experiment they were randomly sorted into one of four conditions, each presenting the candidates in different ways based upon the amount of information available about the candidates and how it was presented. The four experimental conditions were:

- News Articles - A short vignette about each candidate, including 5 attributes (Low-information, Static)
- Static Board – A static information board containing 20 attributes (High-information, Static)
- Low-Info Dynamic Board – A dynamic information board with 5 attributes (Low-information, Dynamic)
- High-Info Dynamic Board – A dynamic information board with 20 attributes (High-information, Dynamic)

Our treatment was a gender manipulation. In each condition, we determined which political party each subject preferred (Democrat or Republican) and then randomly assigned each subject to see their In-Party candidate appear as either a man or woman. The Out-Party candidate was always a man.

Subjects first answered a series of questions in a pre-questionnaire, went through a brief practice session introducing them to how the software worked, and then were presented information about the candidates. After learning about the candidates, subjects were asked to vote and evaluate the two candidates, and then the study ended.

Files Used

DPTE produces four different types of files:

1. a Subject file containing answers to all the questions in the study
2. a Count file containing counts of how many times each information boxes was available and opened by each subject
3. a Duration file containing time data on how long each item in the study was viewed by each subject
4. an Event file that lists every action taken by the DPTE program and each subject

These files were combined to capture data on every action taken by each subject during the study. The full file contains approximately 8,000 variables. Here we post a drastically slimmed down version that only includes the specific variables used in this paper's analysis.

Variables

SubjectID – A unique identifier given to each subject in DPTE

Groups – What experimental condition did subject see?

1 – News Articles (Vignette-style survey experiment)
2 – Basic Dynamic Information Board (Low-information Dynamic)
3 – Static Information Board
4 – Full Dynamic Information Board (High-information Dynamic)

Female – Did subject identify as Female?

0 – Male
1 - Female

Black – Did Subject identify as Black?

0 – Not Black
1 – Black

PartyID7 – Subjects self-reported party identification

1 – Strong Democrat
2 – Democrat
3 – Weak Democrat
4 – Independent
5 – Weak Republican
6 – Republican
7 – Strong Democrat

Republican – Did subject identify as a Republican?

0 – Not Independent
1 – Independent

Democrat – Did subject identify as a Democrat?

0 – Not Democrat

1 – Democrat

Age – Subject's years of age

Educ6 – Subject's highest level of education
1 – Some high school
2 – High School graduate
3 – Some college
4 – College graduate
5 – Masters degree
6 – PhD or professional degree

Interest – Subject's political interest
1 – Very interested
2 – Somewhat interested
3 – Not very interested
4 – Not at all interested

PartyID7 – Subject's self-placement on the 7-point Party Identification scale
1 – Strong Democrat
2 – Democrat
3 – Weak Democrat
4 – Independent
5 – Weak Republican
6 – Republican
7 – Strong Republican

LibCon – Subject's self-placement on the 7-point Liberal-Conservative scale
1 – Extremely Liberal
2 – Liberal
3 – Slightly Liberal
4 – Moderate
5 – Slightly Conservative
6 – Conservative
7 – Extremely Conservative

FemCand – Did subject see a female In-Party candidate?
0 – No
1 – Yes

IPCandFT – Post-campaign feeling thermometer rating of In-Party candidate
0 – Did not like them at all
100 – Liked them completely

IPCandLibCon - Post-campaign LibCon rating of In-Party candidate
1 – Extremely Liberal
2 – Liberal
3 – Slightly Liberal
4 – Moderate
5 – Slightly Conservative
6 – Conservative

7 – Extremely Conservative

IPCandCmpsn – Post-campaign rating of how well "compassionate" describes In-Party candidate
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandComp - Post-campaign rating of how well "competent" describes In-Party candidate
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandLead – Post-campaign rating of how well "a strong leader" describes In-Party candidate
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandTrust – Post-campaign rating of how well "trustworthy" describes In-Party candidate
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandEcon – Post-campaign rating of how well In-Party candidate would handle the economy
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandMil – Post-campaign rating of how well In-Party candidate would handle the military
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandPoor – Post-campaign rating of how well In-Party candidate would handle poverty
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

IPCandWages – Post-campaign rating of how well In-Party candidate would handle the wage gap between men and women
1 – Not at all well
2 – Not very well
3 – Somewhat well
4 – Very well

MaxInfo – What level of information was available to subjects?

0 – Minimal (low-information condition)

1 – Maximal (high-information condition)

PreQTimeADJ – How many seconds to subject take to complete the PreQuestionnaire Substage?

PracTimeADJ – How many seconds to subject take to complete the Practice Substage?

CampTimeADJ – How many seconds to subject take to complete the Campaign Substage?

FinQTime– How many seconds to subject take to complete the PostQuestionnaire Substage?

TotTime– How many seconds to subject take to complete the complete experiment?

TotItemsAdj – How many unique attributes about the candidates did subject view?

(adjusted so that viewing each News Article vignette about each candidate equal to 5 unique attributes)

TotOpnsAdj - How many total attributes about the candidates did subject view, allowing for multiple views of the same attribute?

(adjusted so that viewing each News Article vignette about each candidate equal to 5 attributes)

Att_AbortzItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Abortion Policy

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_CrimeItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Crime Policy

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_DefItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Defense Spending

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_EconPhilItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Economic Philosophy

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_EditItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Editorial about the candidate

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_EducItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Education

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_EducPolItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Education Policy

0 – No

1 - Yes

Att_EnergyItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Energy Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_FamItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Family
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_GlbWrmItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Global Warming Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_GunsItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Gun Control Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_HealthItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Healthcare Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_ImmigItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Immigration Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_IranItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Iran Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_JobsItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Jobs and Unemployment Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_PolExpItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Political Experience
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_ReligItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Religion
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_SocPhilItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Social Philosophy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_TaxesItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Tax Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes

Att_TerrorItems – Did subject view either candidate's attribute on Terrorism Policy
0 – No
1 - Yes