Addendum to Data analysis plan for "Preferences for affirmative action policies" (August 18, 2025)

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

In response to a reviewer report, we will collect further survey data with two purposes:

1. We will elicit the previous questionnaire in a separate study with a population representative US sample that does not participate in the experiment before answering the survey. The aim is to learn whether answers to the survey after participating in the experiment differ from answers to the survey only.
   Caveat: we anticipate different (likely lower, perhaps more polarized) levels of support for affirmative action programs than in the initial survey given US President Donald Trump's ban of any DEI (diversity, equity, inclusion) programs in the meantime. The recent dynamics in the US may also affect the results on predictors of support for affirmative action if different groups in the population adjust their support for affirmative action policies differently in response to the change in the public debate.

2. We will elicit a few further variables that are possible drivers of preferences for affirmative action to investigate their role in predicting support of affirmative action policies by adding them to the questionnaire, namely

   (i) Beliefs about the sources of inequality that underly the three different affirmative action policies under study, namely beliefs to which extent women/people belonging to racial minorities/people with disabilities

   ... are facing unjustified disadvantage and/or discrimination in everyday life

   ... are exerting less effort to perform strongly in everyday life (e.g. in education or work environments) than men/people who do not belong to a racial minority/people who are not disabled

   ... tend to have lower inborn skills than men/people who do not belong to a racial minority/people who are not disabled

   (ii) Beliefs to which extent affirmative action programs for women/racial minorities/people with disabilities induce efficiency losses, e.g., due to less productive people being admitted to university or being hired or promoted

   (iii) Personal exposure to affirmative action policies and whether people feel they have benefitted or been harmed by them

   (iv) Disability status (https://www.cdc.gov/dhds/datasets/index.html, https://www.census.gov/topics/health/disability/guidance/data-collection-acs.html)

   (v) Incentivized version of our previously unincentivized measure of preference for efficiency

(vi) Fairness perception of the three different affirmative action policies under study

Analysis plan:

We will analyze the additional data as in Table 7 of IZA DP 16640, adding the newly elicited variables (i)-(iv) to the regression and using (v) and (vi) to replace their previously collected version.

We expect higher support for affirmative action policies from people with stronger discrimination beliefs, lower support for higher beliefs on low effort provision, while the role of beliefs regarding lower inborn skills is a priori unclear (fairness motives predict higher, efficiency motives lower support). We will add three dummies capturing personal exposure to affirmative policies (whether people believe to be not affected, have rather benefitted or have rather been harmed). We expect higher support from those who report to have rather benefitted than from those who have not yet been affected than from those who feel they have rather been harmed. We expect disabled people to be more supportive of affirmative action policies favoring disabled people. We expect to continue to document lower support for affirmative action policies from people with stronger preferences for efficiency and higher support from those with a higher fairness perception.

Planned N = 600 on Prolific (we expect about 10% of those observations to fail the attention check and about 15% to answer “no opinion” regarding their support for affirmative action policies so that they won’t be part of the main analysis in line with current Table 7).