

Protocol for Constructing Ancillary Studies of Experiments Database

1. Database Search

Searched database using the following key word search:

“Downstream Experiment” OR (“Natural Experiment” AND (“Random” OR “Randomized” OR “Randomization” OR “Randomised” OR “Randomisation” OR “Lottery” OR “By lot” OR “Drew lots”)) OR (“Completed OR Old OR “Previously conducted”) Field Experiment”)

Databases searched:

- (1) Social Science Research Network (SSRN)
- (2) Social sciences citation index(SSCI)
- (3) Social sciences full text
- (4) Web of Science
- (5) Jolis
- (6) JSTOR
- (7) Cambridge journals online
- (8) British Library for Development Studies (BLDS)
- (9) IDEAS Economics and Finance Research
- (10) ScienceDirect
- (11) Sage full-text collections
- (12) C2 SPECTR
- (13) Google scholar
- (14) Google

2. List-Serv Solicitations

E-mailed the following organizations to request they forward our message to members:

- (1) APSA—Experimental Research**
- (2) APSA—Political Methodology**
- (3) APSA—Public Policy**
- (4) E-GAP**
- (5) IPA*
- (6) JPAL
- (7) UNRISD
- (8) NBER

** indicates that organization forwarded our message broadly to members

* indicates that organizational leader responded

Text of e-mail:

SUBJECT: Do you know of any causal analyses using lotteries or randomized experiments administered by third parties?

Dear colleagues,

We are conducting a review of studies that use *a lottery or randomized experiment administered by another scholar or organization* to identify causal effects. While we are searching various databases for such studies, we are keen to be as comprehensive as is possible, and therefore request your assistance in pointing us to any work (especially unpublished or in-progress) that uses this identification strategy.

There are three sets of studies that we are interested in tracking:

- studies that use experiments administered by other scholars to identify the effects of the randomized intervention on a new outcome.
- “downstream experiments,” which use a randomized intervention as an instrument to identify the effect of the outcome in the original experiment on a new variable.
- “natural experiments” based on randomized lotteries.

Please send references/citations to: downstreamexperiments@gmail.com

We apologize for any cross-listing, and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,
Kate Baldwin
University of Florida

Rikhil Bhavnani
University of Wisconsin-Madison

3. Snow-Ball Sampling

Once an “ancillary study” was identified, we tried to use it to locate others by (a) looking for papers that cited it (b) looking at the papers it cited and (c) googling to see if we could find other analyses that use the same initial intervention.¹

¹ Specifically, we googled:
“Vietnam draft lottery”
“random” “case assignment” Nevada
“credit card” “random solicitation”
“Spanish Christmas lottery”
“electoral quotas in India”
“women” “quotas in India”
“gender quotas in India”
“Arkansas legislature committees” “random”
“randomized physician teams”
“Brazil corruption audits”
“draft lottery”

Once we had compiled the list of articles and papers identified through these methods, we read them and included them in the final data base only if they met the following criteria:

- (1) The paper employed a randomized intervention that the researchers had not themselves designed.
 - (a) The intervention had to be randomized by a lottery or some other randomization device; “as if” random studies did not count.
 - (b) At least one researcher on the “ancillary research team” had not played a role in designing the experiment. In cases of ancillary studies leveraging experiments previously conducted by researchers, there had to be at least one author of the ancillary study who was not a co-author on the original study.
- (2) The project used data beyond the data collected as part of the initial study.

4. Database entry

For each paper reporting an ancillary study, the following fields were coded:

Identifying Studies

1. Author(s) of ancillary study
- 2a. Date of ancillary study – use most recent version of paper found
- 2b. Other bibliographic information for publication (title, journal, date)
- 2c. Whether ancillary study published in a peer-reviewed journal – Y/N
3. Setting/location of study – i.e. country or countries

Description of Experiment

4. Brief description of experiment/intervention
5. Units over which experiment randomized
6. Actor(s)/agency(ies) responsible for intervention
7. Date of experiment/intervention
8. Immediate/original outcome of experiment (if possible to infer)
- 9a. Whether the government is typically responsible for this outcome – Y/N
- 9b. Whether the government intervened – Y/N
- 9c. 9a or 9b Y/N
- 10a. Whether an academic study was conducted by the implementing agency (if known – look in citations from ancillary study to determine this)

“randomized campaign ads”

“randomized school admissions”

“randomized school vouchers”

“school voucher lottery”

“randomized Congressional committee assignments”

“conscription lottery”

“college roommate experiment”

“migration lottery Tonga”

- 10b. Publication date of academic study
- 10c. Other bibliographic information for publication (title, journal, date)
- 11. Whether the intervention was randomized for the purpose of evaluation – Y/N
- 12a. Effect of experiment on original goal – This may be communicated qualitatively or quantitatively, depending on the information available, and the number of outcomes examined in the original experiment. In cases where an estimate of the effect of the intervention on the original experiment is available, provide the coefficient and standard error, with * indicating significance at the 90 percent confidence level, ** indicating 95 percent confidence level, and *** indicating 99 percent confidence level. Make sure to indicate the estimate method used (difference-in-differences, ATE, ITT, etc.).
- 12b. Source of information on effect of experiment on original goal – answers could be the ancillary study, the initial publication, or possibly even a third source, in which case you should provide detailed source information

Description of Ancillary study

- 13. Outcome of interest in ancillary study
- 14a. Independent variable of interest in the ancillary study
- 14b. Whether it would be considered a “downstream” experiment – Downstream experiments are experiments that use the randomized intervention as an instrument to identify the effect of the DV in the original experiment on a third variable.
- 15. Mode of data collection for ancillary study – i.e. official election results, survey, qualitative interviewing, etc.
- 16. Whether original survey data were collected, or interviews were conducted – Y/N
- 17. Units over which data collected for ancillary study
- 18. Date of data collection for ancillary study
- 19. Estimated effect in ancillary study – Provide coefficient and standard error, if available, for the effect of the main IV of interest on the main outcome of interest, with * indicating significance at the 90 percent confidence level, ** indicating 95 percent confidence level, and *** indicating 99 percent confidence level. Indicate the method of estimation used by the author to obtain this effect (ATE, ITT, IV, Difference-in-Difference). If multiple estimates are available, provide estimates of the Average Treatment Effect from the unadjusted differences between the experimental groups if at all possible.

Description of Relationship between Ancillary and Original Experimenter

- 20. Describe affiliation between actor(s) who oversaw the original and ancillary studies
- 21. Availability of data from original experiment – make notes indicating how the ancillary scholar obtained this data

Uncertainty about inclusion

- 22. Whether there is uncertainty about inclusion in the database – Y/N
- 23. Other notes
- 24. Included based on the one additional co-author rule

25. Uncertainty about whether authors were involved in designing the study