

Ideology 2.0 Study

Ideology 2.0 was a massive, multivariate, planned missing data design that collected data on Project Implicit from December 2007 to June 2012. It is one giant study with over 280,000 unique sessions that included ~50 implicit measures, ~20 self-report items on the same topics as the implicit measures, ~25 individual difference questionnaires, and dozens of individual self-report items.

Study Overview

Design

Participants were assigned to one of two study designs that collected the following data:

1. Detailed demographics information taken from their site-wide signup.
2. Session information such as time, date, browser information, etc.

Design A

3. Implicit and explicit measures for 1 of 52 topics
 - a. Standard IAT or Single-Target IAT measures of evaluation, stereotyping identification, or validation
 - b. 1-item relative preference (or liking) measure
 - c. 8 of 20 possible explicit measures
4. Individual Differences Scales and Items
 - a. 4 items each from 5 of 25 possible scales or sets of scales
 - b. 8 items from a pool of 186

Design B

3. Implicit and explicit measures for 2 of 52 topics
 - a. Standard IAT or Single-Target IAT measures of evaluation, stereotyping identification, or validation
 - b. 1-item relative preference (or liking) measure
4. Individual Differences Scales and Items
 - a. 4 items each from 2 of 25 possible scales or sets of scales
 - b. 6 items from a pool of 186

Data Structure

The data is structured by topic so that sessions with Design B have multiple rows in the data. All rows have session ids to identify unique sessions. Individuals were asked to make site-wide user ids and passwords prior to participating in any study so that users could be followed across sessions and studies. Most sessions have user ids that can be used to track repeat participants.

Availability

Data, codebooks, and code

An exploratory data subset and corresponding codebooks and data processing code are available by request. Please email Kathleen Schmidt (kathleenschmidt1@gmail.com) for access.

Terms of Use

The exploratory dataset is available as part of a [call for Registered Reports](#). This data should only be shared among potential authors within each group requesting the data. The confirmatory dataset will be sent upon acceptance of a Stage 1 Registered Report (see call for details). The full dataset will be publicly available on the Association of Religion Data Archives once the staged release initiative is completed.

Citation

A paper describing the dataset is in preparation. Prior to its publication, please cite the data as:

Schmidt, K., Stevens, A., Szabelska, A., Graham, J., Hawkins, C. B., & Nosek, B. A. (2022). The Ideology 2.0 Dataset. <https://osf.io/2483h/>.

Dataset Contents

The full variable list, including source, item text, and scoring, can be found in the [processed data codebook](#).

Demographic Items

- Gender
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Date of Birth
- Country of Residence
- Country of Citizenship
- Education
- Major
- Political Ideology
- English Fluency
- Religiosity
- Religion (and Denominations)
- Occupation
- Zip Code (Not publicly available. Please contact the organizers with proof of ethical approval for access).

Implicit-Explicit Topics

Participants were assigned to complete implicit (Implicit Association Test) and explicit (self-report) measures for one or two of 52 different topics. Topics included measures of attitude/evaluation (good vs. bad), identification, stereotyping, and validation (true vs. false). The below table provides an overview of the topics and tasks available in the dataset.

Task Name	Explicit Target X	Explicit Target Y	IAT Procedure	IAT Measure	IAT Target Pair	IAT Attribute Pair
20501950_ds	2050	1950	standard_IAT	Stereotyping	1950, 2050	Danger, Safety
20501950_gb	2050	1950	standard_IAT	Evaluation	2050, 1950	Good, Bad
ambiguousclear_gb	Ambiguous	Clear	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Clear, Ambiguous	Good, Bad
anarchyhierarchy_gb	Anarchy	Hierarchy	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Hierarchy, Anarchy	Good, Bad
blackwhite_gb	Black	White	standard_IAT	Evaluation	White People, Black People	Good, Bad
changepreserve_gb	Change	Preserve	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Change, Preserve	Good, Bad
clintonbush_ch	Bill Clinton	George W. Bush	standard_IAT	Stereotyping	George Bush, Bill Clinton	Corrupt, Honest
collectiveindividual_gb	Collective	Individual	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Collective, Individual	Good, Bad
communityindividual_gb	Community	Individual	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Community, Individual	Good, Bad
complexsimple_gb	Complex	Simple	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Simple, Complex	Good, Bad
conspiracyaccident_tf	Conspiracy	Accident	standard_IAT	Validation	Accident, Conspiracy	True, False
dangersafety_tf	Danger	Safety	standard_IAT	Validation	Safety, Danger	True, False
defendattack_gb	Defend	Attack	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Defend, Attack	Good, Bad
democracyfascism_gb	Democracy	Fascism	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Democracy, Fascism	Good, Bad
equalunequal_gb	Equal	Unequal	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Equal, Unequal	Good, Bad
evolutioncreationism_tf	Evolution	Creationism	standard_IAT	Validation	Evolution, Creationism	True, False
fairbiased_gb	Fair	Biased	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Fair, Biased	Good, Bad
foreignlocal_gb	Foreign	Local	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Local, Foreign	Good, Bad
forwardbackward_gb	Forward	Backward	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Forward, Backward	Good, Bad
freedomsecurity_gb ¹	NA	NA	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Freedom, Security	Good, Bad
futurepresent_gb	Future	Present	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Present, Future	Good, Bad
gaystraight_gb	Gay	Straight	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Straight People, Gay People	Good, Bad
government_gb	Government	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	Government	Good, Bad

¹ No explicit data for this topic.

Task Name	Explicit Target X	Explicit Target Y	IAT Procedure	IAT Measure	IAT Target Pair	IAT Attribute Pair
hopeduty_gb	Hope	Duty	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Hope, Duty	Good, Bad
individualgroup_gb	Individual	Group	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Individual, Group	Good, Bad
justiceinjustice_gb	Justice	Injustice	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Justice, Injustice	Good, Bad
labormanagement_gb	Labor	Management	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Management, Labor	Good, Bad
motherfather_gb	Mother	Father	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Mother, Father	Good, Bad
newold_gb	New	Old	standard_IAT	Evaluation	New, Old	Good, Bad
non-profitscorporations_gb	Non-Profits	Corporations	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Non-Profits, Corporations	Good, Bad
novelfamiliar_gb	Novel	Familiar	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Familiar, Novel	Good, Bad
nurturingstrict_gb	Nurturing	Strict	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Nurturing, Strict	Good, Bad
possiblecertain_gb	Possible	Certain	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Certain, Possible	Good, Bad
presentpast_gb	Present	Past	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Present, Past	Good, Bad
progressrestore_gb	Progress	Restore	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Progress, Restore	Good, Bad
protestaccept_gb	Protest	Accept	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Accept, Protest	Good, Bad
regulationmarkets_gb	Regulation	Markets	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Markets, Regulation	Good, Bad
riskycautious_gb	Risky	Cautious	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Cautious, Risky	Good, Bad
sciencereligion_tf	Science	Religion	standard_IAT	Validation	Science, Religion	True, False
self_ar	Religious	Atheist	ST_IAT	Identification	Religious, Atheist	Self
self_dr	Democrat	Republican	ST_IAT	Identification	Democrat, Republican	Self
self_gb	Self	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	Self	Good, Bad
self_lc	Liberal	Conservative	ST_IAT	Identification	Liberal, Conservative	Self
self_sa	Sadness	Anger	ST_IAT	Identification	Sadness, Anger	Self
selfother_gb	Self	Other	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Self, Other	Good, Bad
socialismcapitalism_gb	Socialism	Capitalism	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Capitalism, Socialism	Good, Bad
socialorder_gb	Social Order	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	Social Order	Good, Bad
society_gb	Society	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	Society	Good, Bad
statechurch_gb	State	Church	standard_IAT	Evaluation	Church, State	Good, Bad
statusquo_gb	Status Quo	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	Status Quo	Good, Bad
system_cj	System	NONE	ST_IAT	Stereotyping	System	Justified, Corrupt
system_gb	System	NONE	ST_IAT	Evaluation	System	Good, Bad

Indirect Measurement Tasks

Implicit measures were captured using standard IATs or Single-Target IATs. The exploratory data includes ~490 valid observations per IAT task.

The standard IATs (Greenwald et al., 1998) included seven blocks of 20-40 trials as recommended by Nosek et al. (2005). The Single-Target IATs (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006; Wigboldus et al., 2004) included three blocks of 20-48 trials.

Processed data contains several variables related to the IATs:

1. *D*-score calculations following recommendations by Greenwald et al. (2003)
2. IAT block order (congruent or incongruent first)
3. Performance summaries, including accuracy and latency (e.g., *Mean* and *SD* of reaction times, % accuracy)
4. Multiple exclusion criteria

Direct Measurement Tasks

While Design B included a single item preference measure, Design A included nine measures: the same preference item and 8 other items randomly assigned in pairs where applicable out of a possible 20 items, including measures of evaluation, identification, and perceptions of others' evaluations (see [codebook](#)). The exploratory data has ~890 observations per task for the preference item, and ~130 observations per task for the other items.

Some of these items ask about concept categories X and Y separately. Processed data contains:

- Responses for X alone
- Responses for Y alone
- A mean score
- A difference score

Individual Differences Scales

Participants were randomly assigned 4 items from 2 (Design B) to 5 (Design A) of the following scales or scale combinations. Response options were altered where possible to appear on a 7-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree (see [codebook](#) for details). The data includes item level responses, mean scores for non-missing items (if 2 or more), and the number of items included in the mean calculation. The exploratory data includes 1,000-2,000 observations per item and ~5,000 observations per scale mean.

- Social Dominance Orientation (16 items; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994)
- Belief in a just world (6 items; Dalbert et al., 2001) combined with Need to Evaluate (3-items; Bizer et al., 2004)
- Protestant Work Ethic (11 items; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; Katz & Hass, 1988)
- Need for Cognitive Closure (14 items; Pierro & Kruglanski, 2006)
- Racism scales (22 items; 16 from Bayesian Racism Scale, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2002; 8 from Modern Racism Scale, McConahay, 1986)
- Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale (10 items; Rosenberg, 1965)
- Moral Foundations Questionnaire - Relevance (21 items; Graham et al., 2008)
- Moral Foundations Questionnaire - Statements (20 items; Graham et al., 2008)
- Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (11 items; Higgins et al., 2001)
- Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (18 items; Lockwood et al., 2002)
- Right-Wing Authoritarianism (15 items; Zakrisson, 2005)
- Right-Wing Authoritarianism (10 items; McFarland, 2005)
- System justification and opposition to equality (15 items [8 for SJ scale plus 7 for OEQ]; Kay & Jost, 2003 and Kluegel & Smith, 1986)
- Economic ideology scales (23 items [17 for economic SJ plus 6 for fair market ideology]; Jost & Thompson, 2000, and Jost et al., 2003)
- Sources of Meaning Profile (16 items; Reker & Wong, 1988)
- BIS/BAS Scales (20 items; Carver & White, 1994)
- Need for Cognition (18 items; Cacioppo & Petty, 1982)
- Disgust Scale-Revised (12 items; Olatungi et al., 2007)
- Collective self-esteem - religious group (16 items; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992)
- Collective self-esteem - nation (16 items; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992)
- Collective self-esteem - political party (16 items; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992)
- Individualism/Collectivism Scale (24 items; Singelis, 1994)
- Regulatory Mode Scale (24 items; Kruglanski et al., 2000)

- Belief in God scale (12 items; Junge et al., 2007)
- Political Expertise (8 items; Federico et al. 2007)

Individual Differences Items

Participants were also randomly assigned individual difference items. Either 8 (Design A) or 6 (Design B) items out of a possible 186 were assigned per session, individually rather than from item groups. See codebook for full documentation and item text. The data includes item level responses, mean scores for non-missing items from scales (if 2 or more), and the number of items included in the mean calculation.² The exploratory data has ~2,200 observations per item.

Item sources/categories include the following:

- International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg et al., 2006)
 - Sociability, Locus of Control, Empathy, Extravagance, Machiavellianism, Achievement Striving
- American National Election Studies 2008 Questionnaire
 - Some items from Proposals (e.g., Loyola Generativity Scale, Self-monitoring, Trust of Government, Sacred Values; see codebook and <https://electionstudies.org/papers-documents/pilot-study-reports/>)
- Gallup polls (e.g., moral issues, see <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1681/moral-issues.aspx>)
- Attachment Styles (Hazan & Shaver, 1987)
- Life Orientation Test – Revised (LOT-R; Scheier et al., 1994)
- Ten Item Personality Measure (TIPI; Gosling et al., 2003)
- Daily Coping (Gunthert et al., 2005)
- Regret Scale (Schwartz et al., 2002)
- Social Desirability (Paulus, 1991)
- Nationalism & Patriotism Scales (Federico et al., 2005)
- Residential Mobility (based on Oishi et al., 2007)
- Self-rated Health (Ilder, 1992)
- Beliefs (some items adapted from Tobacyk & Milford, 1983)

² The sample sizes for the mean calculations are comparatively low because items were not assigned in groups.

- Charitable Giving (some items from Panel Study of Income Dynamics)
- Self-Confidence (Caplan & Schooler, 2007)
- Cognitive Reflection Test (Frederick, 2004)
- Mood (Schwartz & Clore, 1983)
- Beliefs about Intelligence (Hong et al., 1999)
- Self & Other's Control of Thoughts (Nosek, 2002)
- Political Issues