# Information Exposure and Belief Manipulation in Survey Experiments

Zikai Li and Robert Gulotty

University of Chicago

Prepared for IPES 2023 October 28, 2023

- Role of ingroup favoritism in support for trade (Mutz and Kim 2017; BKRTW 2022)
  - Does perception of relative gain for the US from a trade deal influence support for that deal?

- Role of ingroup favoritism in support for trade (Mutz and Kim 2017; BKRTW 2022)
  - Does perception of relative gain for the US from a trade deal influence support for that deal?
- Research hypothesis: increase in perception of US's relative gain from a trade deal → increase in support for the trade deal

- Role of ingroup favoritism in support for trade (Mutz and Kim 2017; BKRTW 2022)
  - Does perception of relative gain for the US from a trade deal influence support for that deal?
- Research hypothesis: increase in perception of US's relative gain from a trade deal → increase in support for the trade deal
- Random assignment of information about the US's relative gain from the trade deal

- Role of ingroup favoritism in support for trade (Mutz and Kim 2017; BKRTW 2022)
  - Does perception of relative gain for the US from a trade deal influence support for that deal?
- Research hypothesis: increase in perception of US's relative gain from a trade deal → increase in support for the trade deal
- Random assignment of information about the US's relative gain from the trade deal
- Difference in average support for the trade deal between the treated and control groups

- Role of ingroup favoritism in support for trade (Mutz and Kim 2017; BKRTW 2022)
  - Does perception of relative gain for the US from a trade deal influence support for that deal?
- Research hypothesis: increase in perception of US's relative gain from a trade deal → increase in support for the trade deal
- Random assignment of information about the US's relative gain from the trade deal
- Difference in average support for the trade deal between the treated and control groups
- Difference is interpreted as resulting from changes in perceptions of the US's relative gain from the deal



- Treatment effect of theoretical interest
  - Effect of change in perception/belief about some aspect of the world on downstream attitudes and behavior

- Treatment effect of theoretical interest
  - Effect of change in perception/belief about some aspect of the world on downstream attitudes and behavior
- What is actually being manipulated
  - The availability of some information embedded in the survey

- Treatment effect of theoretical interest
  - Effect of change in perception/belief about some aspect of the world on downstream attitudes and behavior
- What is actually being manipulated
  - The availability of some information embedded in the survey
- The effect of the *intent* to instill a piece of information in individuals and/or change their beliefs

- Treatment effect of theoretical interest
  - Effect of change in perception/belief about some aspect of the world on downstream attitudes and behavior
- What is actually being manipulated
  - The availability of some information embedded in the survey
- The effect of the *intent* to instill a piece of information in individuals and/or change their beliefs
  - Might not be successful

In survey experiments, the treatment effect of providing information can mask varying degrees of movement on two levels:

1. Failure to absorb information (noncompliance)

In survey experiments, the treatment effect of providing information can mask varying degrees of movement on two levels:

- 1. Failure to absorb information (noncompliance)
  - Review of information survey experiments published in AJPS, APSR, and JOP from 2019 to 2023

Category	Count	Percentage
No mention of Manipulation Checks	43	64.2%
Treatment-relevant (TR) MC	9	13.4%
Any MC (excl. TRMC)	15	22.4%
Total	67	100%

• Passing rates for TRMC range from 29% to 92%

In survey experiments, the treatment effect of providing information can mask varying degrees of movement on two levels:

- 1. Failure to absorb information (noncompliance)
  - Review of information survey experiments published in AJPS, APSR, and JOP from 2019 to 2023

Category	Count	Percentage
No mention of Manipulation Checks	43	64.2%
Treatment-relevant (TR) MC	9	13.4%
Any MC (excl. TRMC)	15	22.4%
Total	67	100%

• Passing rates for TRMC range from 29% to 92%

2. Lack or unknown extent of belief change

• We could use an instrumental-variable approach

- We could use an instrumental-variable approach
- Instrument: Random assignment of info

- We could use an instrumental-variable approach
- Instrument: Random assignment of info
- Measuring manipulations of interest:
  - 1. For information reception: Repurposed treatment-relevant manipulation checks as a measure

- We could use an instrumental-variable approach
- Instrument: Random assignment of info
- Measuring manipulations of interest:
  - 1. For information reception: Repurposed treatment-relevant manipulation checks as a measure
  - 2. For belief change: Elicitation of priors and posteriors

- We could use an instrumental-variable approach
- Instrument: Random assignment of info
- Measuring manipulations of interest:
  - 1. For information reception: Repurposed treatment-relevant manipulation checks as a measure
  - 2. For belief change: Elicitation of priors and posteriors
- IV assumptions: Random assignment, stable unit treatment value, instrument relevance, monotonicity, and exclusion restriction.

- We could use an instrumental-variable approach
- Instrument: Random assignment of info
- Measuring manipulations of interest:
  - 1. For information reception: Repurposed treatment-relevant manipulation checks as a measure
  - 2. For belief change: Elicitation of priors and posteriors
- IV assumptions: Random assignment, stable unit treatment value, instrument relevance, monotonicity, and exclusion restriction.
- Placebo test: Is the experiment an apt test of theory?

# **Empirical applications**

- Application 1: Re-analysis of three experiments replicated in BKRTW (2022)
  - Nuclear Weapons (Press et al. 2013): Perception of military utility and support for use
  - Elite Messaging (Nicholson 2012): Perception of partisan identity of politician and support for immigration policy
  - Ingroup Favoritism in Trade (Mutz and Kim 2017): Perception of relative gain for US and support for trade deal

# **Empirical applications**

- Application 1: Re-analysis of three experiments replicated in BKRTW (2022)
  - Nuclear Weapons (Press et al. 2013): Perception of military utility and support for use
  - Elite Messaging (Nicholson 2012): Perception of partisan identity of politician and support for immigration policy
  - Ingroup Favoritism in Trade (Mutz and Kim 2017): Perception of relative gain for US and support for trade deal
- Application 2: A survey experiment in Taiwan
  - Learning about economic dependence on mainland China  $\rightarrow$  Attitudes toward economic development vs. democracy

# **Empirical applications**

- Application 1: Re-analysis of three experiments replicated in BKRTW (2022)
  - Nuclear Weapons (Press et al. 2013): Perception of military utility and support for use
  - Elite Messaging (Nicholson 2012): Perception of partisan identity of politician and support for immigration policy
  - Ingroup Favoritism in Trade (Mutz and Kim 2017): Perception of relative gain for US and support for trade deal
- Application 2: A survey experiment in Taiwan
  - Learning about economic dependence on mainland China  $\rightarrow$  Attitudes toward economic development vs. democracy

- BKRTW's replication of Mutz and Kim (2017)
  - Manipulation of theoretical interest: perception of relative gain for US from trade deal
  - Downstream outcome of interest: support for trade deal

• Use results from manipulation checks

Think back to the trade policy that was described to you earlier in the survey. Will our trading partner benefit more than the US, will the US benefit more than the trading partner, or will they be impacted equally?

- The trading partner will benefit more than the US
- The US will benefit more than trading
- Both countries will benefit equally

• Use results from manipulation checks

Think back to the trade policy that was described to you earlier in the survey. Will our trading partner benefit more than the US, will the US benefit more than the trading partner, or will they be impacted equally?

- The trading partner will benefit more than the US
- The US will benefit more than trading
- Both countries will benefit equally
- Placebo test
  - Evaluate the ITT effect for those who failed to recall the theoretically relevant aspect of the treatment

• Use results from manipulation checks

Think back to the trade policy that was described to you earlier in the survey. Will our trading partner benefit more than the US, will the US benefit more than the trading partner, or will they be impacted equally?

- The trading partner will benefit more than the US
- The US will benefit more than trading
- Both countries will benefit equally
- Placebo test
  - Evaluate the ITT effect for those who failed to recall the theoretically relevant aspect of the treatment
  - If effect is nonzero: violation of exclusion restriction; interpretation of theory might not be valid

# Re-analysis of Ingroup Favoritism in Trade : Placebo test

• BKRTW's coding of treatment assignment

Treatment arm	Varying info
Baseline	US gains 10 jobs, other country gains 1,000
Baseline	US gains 10 jobs, other country loses 1,000
Treatment	US gains 1,000 jobs, other country gains 10

# Re-analysis of Ingroup Favoritism in Trade : Placebo test

• BKRTW's coding of treatment assignment

Treatment arm	Varying info
Baseline	US gains 10 jobs, other country gains 1,000
Baseline	US gains 10 jobs, other country loses 1,000
Treatment	US gains 1,000 jobs, other country gains 10

• Our coding of treatment assignment

Treatment arm	Varying info
Baseline	US gains 10 jobs, other country gains 1,000
Treatment	US gains 10 jobs, other country loses 1,000
Treatment	US gains 1,000 jobs, other country gains 10

• Expected sign of treatment effect is positive according to theory

# Re-analysis of Ingroup Favoritism in Trade: Placebo test

## **Binary coding**



## Factorial coding

Baseline: US: +1000, Other: +10



## Incorporating measures of belief: Brief overview



# if Looking for most effective intervention Use adaptive design Estimate ITT

else

if Effect of information reception is of interest
Use treatment-relevant manipulation checks
Use placebo test to assess exclusion restriction
Use IV analysis to obtain effect of information exposure
if Effect of belief change is of interest

if Nuisance beliefs are downstream

Use IV analysis to retrieve effect of belief change

if Not all nuisance beliefs are downstream

 $\mathsf{IV}+\mathsf{sensitivity}$  analysis

# **Thanks!**

- Exclusion restriction: Instrument affects outcome *only via the instrument*.
- Exclusion restriction satisfied under certain theories of belief change.
- When violated, e.g., when instrument affects those failing manipulation check: IV design is invalid but ITT is also hard to interpret.
  - Unclear what we should learn from the ITT estimate
  - Sensitivity analysis might be needed.



# Re-analysis of two other experiments

# • Nuclear Weapons (Press et al. 2013)

- Information being manipulated: relative military utility of nuclear vs. conventional strikes
- Downstream outcome of interest: support for use
- Elite Messaging (Nicholson 2012)
  - Information being manipulated: partisan identity of a fictional politician that endorses an immigration policy
  - Downstream outcome of interest: support for immigration policy

• Treatment recall rates by treatment status and study

Study	Treatment Status	Recall Rate			
Nuclear Weapons	0	0.56			
	1	0.58			
Elite Messaging	0	0.71			
	1	0.62			

• Recode treatment indicator and manipulation check to get info reception

Treatment Status	Correct Recall	Information Reception
0	0	0
0	1	0
1	0	0
1	1	1



## Economic growth vs. democracy in Taiwan

- Republic of China (ROC) government moved to Taiwan after loss on the mainland to the Chinese Communist Party in the Chinese Civil War
- ROC democratized in the 1990s
- Unification-independence has been a central dividing issue in Taiwanese politics
  - The DPP is pro-independence, while the KMT is more pro-unification

## Economic growth vs. democracy in Taiwan

- Republic of China (ROC) government moved to Taiwan after loss on the mainland to the Chinese Communist Party in the Chinese Civil War
- ROC democratized in the 1990s
- Unification-independence has been a central dividing issue in Taiwanese politics
  - The DPP is pro-independence, while the KMT is more pro-unification
- Economy and democracy are in tension given Taiwan's trade dependence on mainland China and incompatible sovereignty claims + political systems
  - Economically dependent on trade with the PRC, but politically wants to stay as an autonomous democracy

#### Taiwan's trade dependence on China





- Prior belief: Guess of Taiwan's export share to China, benchmarked against US.
- Instrument: True figures.
- Posterior belief: Sliders to guess exports to various regions.
- Outcome: Weighting of economic development vs. democracy.

## **Design: Prior elicitation**

2021年(民國110年)台灣銷往美國的出口貿易額大概佔台灣出口總額的**15%。**請問您 認為2021年台灣的出口貿易額大概有多少個百分比銷往中國大陸(包括香港)?請使用 滑桿來表示您認為最接近真實數值的猜測。



## Design: The instrument

根據財政部估計,2021年(民國110年)台灣的出口總額中有42%(也就是大概四成) 銷往中國大陸(含香港)。這比您之前猜測的數值高出\$e{round(42 / q://QID126/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/1\*100-100,1)}%,比台灣2021年銷往美國出 口總額則高出180%。

○ 我知道了

## **Design: Posterior elicitation**

您認為2021年(民國110年)台灣的出口貿易當中,有多大的百分比去到下面的這些國 家或地區?請使用滑桿來表示您認為最接近真實數值的猜測。總額應等於100。

	Ó	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
中國大陸(包括香 港)	ŀ										_
美國	ŀ										_
日本	H	_	_		_		_	_	_	_	_
卓定回知	H										_
歐洲聯盟	H										_
其他所有經濟體	ŀ										

## Design: The outcome

Between

- 1. sustained economic development and
- 2. free and fair elections,

some think the former is more important, while others think the latter is more important. Which do you think is more important for Taiwan?

### **Results: First-stage**



## **Results: Reduced-form**



## **Results: IV**

