

Deviations from original paper submitted to AER and a few clarifications

Deviations from the original paper submitted to the AER

The replication will deviate from the experiment in the original version of the paper submitted to the AER along the following dimensions.

The recipient of the donation, rather than being the AAUW, is Athlete Ally, a national non-for-profit organization that, among other things, advocates for the inclusion of transgender women in women's sports.

The statement about cultural appropriation is replaced by the following statement: "Defunding the police is a bad idea because it will inevitably lead to increased crime rates." For this statement, lower answers on the Likert are considered to be more socially acceptable.

The statement about Islam is replaced by the following statement: "Transgender women (i.e., individuals who were male at birth and transitioned later in life) should be allowed to participate in women's sports." For this statement, higher answers on the Likert scale are considered to be more socially acceptable.

For logistical reasons, I will not send out a petition. Therefore, I will not study information loss vis-à-vis the petition. I will only study information loss vis-à-vis self-reported ideology and the donations.

The experiment will be administered at UCSD rather than UCSB.

Lastly, the manipulation in the Public Treatment is a bit stronger than in the one in the original version of the paper submitted to the AER. Specifically, not only do I show participants in the Public Treatment the following paragraph:

"IMPORTANT: We will share your individual answers to the questionnaire on the next screen, as well as the individual-level answers of the other participants in this phase of the study, with approximately 200 UCSD students who are scheduled to participate in the next phase of the study. There is no need to provide your first and last name here; your information is already in the UCSD laboratory recruitment system."

On the next page of the survey, I also tell them:

"According to the UCSD laboratory recruitment system, your first and last name are:

First Name: [first_name]

Last Name: [last_name]."

Clarifications

Due to the logistical challenge described below, I might not be able to recruit a sufficiently large sample of students to completely avoid power issues. The logistical challenge is that I need to recruit students from the same university. Even at a school as large as UCSD, recruiting 1,000 students might not be easy.

In light of the above, I would like to make two things clear before I run the experiment: first, the main hypothesis on the index of sensitive attitudes is one-sided. The hypothesis is that, on average, the index of sensitive attitudes for participants in the Public Treatment is larger than the index of sensitive attitudes for participants in the Private Treatment. Therefore, the null hypothesis is that, on average, the index of sensitive attitudes for participants in the Public Treatment is weakly smaller than the index of sensitive attitudes for participants in the Private Treatment. I will perform and report a two-sided t-test, but the hypothesis I am testing on the index of sensitive attitudes is really one-sided.

Second, I will not run a test comparing the treatment effect on the index of sensitive attitudes to the treatment effect on the index of placebo. That's because I am likely to be insufficiently powered to make such comparison.