

Addendum to Data analysis plan for “Preferences for affirmative action policies” (March 14, 2024)

Sabrina Herzog, Hannah Schildberg-Hörisch, Chi Trieu, Jana Willrodt

We will collect data on two further treatments (PARTIAL-GENDER and SPEC-GENDER with subgroups PARTIAL-GENDER-female and PARTIAL-GENDER-male as well as SPEC-GENDER-female and SPEC-GENDER-male). The key purpose of these additional treatments is to provide further evidence on the role of in-group favoritism for the approval of quota rules to complement the evidence in our IZA DP 16640 that, based on the minimal group paradigm, provides a “lower bound” for the role of in-group favoritism. By contrast, our new treatments that define the in-group based on gender may induce a stronger in-group and therefore a larger role of in-group bias in approval of quota rules. This is the key hypothesis that we want to test. Put formally, for the approval rates we thus hypothesize:

$\text{SPEC-GENDER-female} - \text{SPEC-GENDER-male} > \text{SPEC-TYPE-Green} - \text{SPEC-TYPE-Blue}$.

We will analyze the additional data as in Figure 2 and Table 3 of IZA DP 16640. Moreover, we will focus on the relative size of the differences in approval between both subgroups in PARTIAL-GENDER and both subgroups in SPEC-GENDER as reported in the last paragraph of p. 13 of IZA DP 16640 and compare it to the relative size of the corresponding differences in PARTIAL and SPEC-TYPE as reported in IZA DP 16640.

In principle, we could use the data from the new treatments to implement corresponding analyses to all analyses in IZA DP 16640, except for those referring to treatment SPEC. We will only do so in case of demand from the scientific community. This is to underline that the purpose of the additional treatments is to complement the “lower bound” for the role of in-group favoritism that we currently report in IZA DP 16640 with evidence on the role of in-group favoritism that relies on gender as the defining characteristic of the in-group (“upper bound”).