

## CONFIDENTIAL - FOR PEER-REVIEW ONLY

### Gender Quota Policies and Evaluations of Female Politicians - Morocco, 2023 (#144381)

Created: 09/20/2023 10:46 AM (PT)

This is an anonymized copy (without author names) of the pre-registration. It was created by the author(s) to use during peer-review. A non-anonymized version (containing author names) should be made available by the authors when the work it supports is made public.

#### 1) Have any data been collected for this study already?

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

#### 2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

Do citizens evaluate quota and non-quota politicians similarly? Do voters perceive non-quota female politicians as more competent than those elected via quotas?

H1a: Voters will view women elected via quota as less competent than either non-quota women or men.

H1b: Voters will view men as the most competent, followed by non-quota women, and will view women elected via quota as the least competent.

H1c: Voters will view women elected via quota as more pawn-like than either non-quota women or men.

H1d: Voters will view men as the least pawn-like, followed by non-quota women, and will view women elected via quota as the most pawn-like.

H2a: Among quota-elected women, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as more competent than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H2b: Among quota-elected women, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as less pawn-like than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H2c: Among non-quota women, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as more competent than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H2d: Among men, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as more competent than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H2e: Among non-quota women, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as less pawn-like than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H2f: Among men, voters will view those portrayed as working across party lines as less pawn-like than those portrayed as working just with members of their own party.

H3a: The effect of being portrayed as working across party lines will be larger among quota women than among those not elected via quota (men and women, pooled).

H3b: The effect of being portrayed as working across party lines will be larger among women (quota and non-quota, pooled) than among men.

#### 3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

(1) If you had to rate this politician on a scale from 1-10, how would you rate him/her in terms of competence?

(2) If you had to rate this politician on a scale from 1-10, how would you rate whether this politician is a pawn of party elites?

(3) If you had to rate this politician on a scale from 1-10, how would you rate whether this politician is cooperative? [We plan to use this outcome measure as a robustness check that pawn is not understood as a positive form of cooperation.]

#### 4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

This is a 3x2 survey experimental design. Respondents can be assigned to one of three conditions about the gender of the politician and how they are elected (see below), as well as one of two conditions about who they are working with (see below).

For the condition on the politician gender and how they were elected, respondents have a 50% chance of being assigned to quota woman condition, a 25% chance each of being assigned to the non-quota woman, and a 25% chance each of being assigned to the man conditions. The condition on who the politician is working with is assigned with equal probability across the two conditions.

Vignette:

A [man elected as an MP in the district elections / woman elected as an MP in the district elections / woman elected as an MP through the gender quota] during the 2021 elections, has been successful in getting a new proposal approved to create new jobs in Morocco. [He/She worked on this proposal with other members of his/her party. / He/She worked on this proposal with members of other parties.] In a recent television interview, [he/she] stressed the importance of the development of work prospects in the field of the economy of care, within the framework of the global policy of employment and support for families.

**5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.**

Hypotheses 1 will be evaluated by comparing the outcome variable means among quota-elected women, non-quota women, and men.

Hypotheses 2 will be evaluated by comparing the outcome variable means among politicians who work across party lines versus those who work with their co-partisans for quota-elected women, non-quota women, and men respectively.

To test H3a, in an OLS regression, we would interact an indicator for quota-elected politicians with the indicator for working across party lines. To test H3b, we would interact an indicator for female politicians with the indicator for working across party lines.

**6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.**

We will conduct a number of data quality checks, including those for near-duplicates, failed manipulation checks, or those who straightlined through the survey. We will exclude responses on the basis of these checks in robustness checks. Main results will include all responses.

**7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.**

The quota vignette experiment will be randomly presented to half the respondents. With  $n = 1800$  respondents in total, we will have  $n = 900$  for the experiment. Respondents ( $n=900$ ) will answer three outcome questions about the vignette. All (competency, pawn-like, and cooperative) are measured on a 1-10 scale. To determine whether the overall sample size and allocation of respondents across treatment conditions would permit inferences about effect sizes of substantive interest, we conducted simulations of our planned analyses, randomly generating datasets with "true" effect sizes that varied and assessing how frequently our tests correctly identified those effects as present with a critical value of  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Our design has power = 0.8 to detect an effect size of approximately 0.34 or smaller for each comparison of two groups in H1, and approximately 0.36 (between each group) when we test for the jointly ordered outcome of all 3 groups; 0.34 for the comparison in H2 among quota women, and 0.5 for the comparison among either non-quota women or men; 0.57 for the comparison between quota-elected women and all non-quota politicians in H3; and 0.66 for the comparison between women and men in H3. The only test for which this design is somewhat poorly powered is H3b, which compares effects among women vs. among men. Given our greater theoretical interest in the effects of our other treatments among quota women specifically and among women in general, we view this as an acceptable trade-off.

**8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)**

Respondent Gender:

H1a: Male respondents are less likely to provide favorable competency evaluations for quota women (compared to non-quota politicians) than female respondents.

H1b: Male respondents are more likely to see quota women as "pawns" (compared to non-quota politicians) than female respondents.

H1c: Male respondents are less likely than female respondents to provide favorable competency evaluations for female politicians regardless of female politicians' quota status.

H1d: Male respondents are more likely than female respondents to see female politicians as "pawns" regardless of female politicians' quota status.

Hostile Sexism:

H2a: Respondents who hold hostile sexist views are less likely to provide favorable competency evaluations for quota women (compared to non-quota politicians) than respondents who do not hold those views.

H2b: Respondents who hold hostile sexist views are more likely to see quota women as "pawns" (compared to non-quota politicians) than respondents who do not hold those views.

H2c: Respondents who hold hostile sexist views are less likely to provide favorable competency evaluations for women regardless of female politicians' quota status than respondents who do not hold those views.

H2d: Respondents who hold hostile sexist views are more likely to see female politicians as "pawns" regardless of female politicians' quota status than respondents who do not hold those views.

Patriarchal Views:

H3a: Respondents who hold patriarchal views are less likely to provide favorable competency evaluations for quota women (compared to non-quota politicians) than respondents who do not hold those views.

H3b: Respondents who hold patriarchal views are more likely to see quota women as "pawns" (compared to non-quota politicians) than respondents who do not hold those views.

H3c: Respondents who hold patriarchal views are less likely to provide favorable competency evaluations for women regardless of female politicians' quota status than respondents who do not hold those views.

H3d: Respondents who hold patriarchal views are more likely to see female politicians as "pawns" regardless of female politicians' quota status than respondents who do not hold those views.