

# Ideological congruence and support for breaching democratic norms (#264964)

## Author(s)

This pre-registration is currently anonymous to enable blind peer-review.  
It has 3 authors.

## Pre-registered on:

2025/12/19 03:45 (PT)

### 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?

This study examines whether citizens' willingness to tolerate violations of liberal-democratic norms depends on whether those violations serve policy goals congruent with their ideological preferences. We focus particularly on whether individuals who are economically left-wing and socio-culturally right-wing - those whose preferences are most at odds with liberal-market institutional arrangements - exhibit elevated tolerance for democratic norm violations.

H1. Respondents who are economically left-wing and socio-culturally right-wing will express lower declarative support for liberal-democratic norms than respondents in other ideological quadrants.

H2. Respondents with left-wing economic preferences will be more likely to select conjoint profiles that include democratic norm violations when those profiles also include left-wing economic policies, compared to profiles with centrist or right-wing economic policies.

H3. Respondents with right-wing socio-cultural preferences will be more likely to select conjoint profiles that include democratic norm violations when those profiles also include conservative socio-cultural policies, compared to profiles with centrist or progressive socio-cultural policies.

H4. Respondents who are both economically left-wing and socio-culturally right-wing will show elevated tolerance for democratic norm violations across all conjoint profiles, regardless of the specific policy content.

H5. The magnitude of congruence effects identified in H2 and H3 will be larger in whichever policy domain is more salient to the respondent, as indicated by the extremity of their ideological self-placement.

H6. The magnitude of congruence effects identified in H2 and H3 will decrease as declarative support for democratic norms increases.

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

Anti-liberal-democratic attitudes index: Index score derived from confirmatory factor analysis of 13 question items measuring agreement with statements concerning liberal democracy (Q5.1). Items will be recoded so that higher values indicate greater opposition to liberal-democratic norms.

Conjoint profile selection (binary): For each of 15 paired comparisons (CONJ1\_1 to CONJ1\_15), which policy approach the respondent prefers (Option A = 1, Option B = 0, or vice versa).

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

This study uses a conjoint experimental design. All participants complete the same conjoint task, but the specific attribute levels shown in each profile are randomly assigned. Each respondent evaluates 15 paired comparisons of hypothetical government policy approaches. Each profile in a pair is defined by 5 attributes, each with 3 levels, fully randomised and independently assigned.

1. Economic policy ("In the sphere of economic policy, the government intends to..."): (1) implement wealth taxes on high-income earners and large corporations to fund expanded social programs; (2) implement a tax system that imposes moderately higher rates on higher-income earners and corporations to fund social programs; (3) implement reduced corporate and personal income tax rates regardless of income, cutting social programs.

2. Socio-cultural policy ("In the sphere of sociocultural policy, the government intends to..."): (1) provide universal access to abortion services through publicly funded healthcare with no restrictions; (2) ensure legal abortion access with restrictions after 20 weeks except for maternal or foetal health reasons; (3) restrict abortion access with exceptions only for rape, incest, and maternal health.

3. Legislative control ("If parliament tries to delay or block their policies, the government will..."): (1) work through the normal legislative process, accepting delays and modifications; (2) use executive orders to implement key provisions while negotiations continue; (3) declare the policy in question a national priority and override parliamentary objections.

4. Public control ("If their policies face significant protests by interest groups, the government will..."): (1) consult with those groups to address their concerns; (2) engage in limited dialogue with some interest groups but stick to the core plan; (3) ignore these concerns and implement the policy in question anyway.

5. Judicial control ("If concerns are raised about the compatibility of their policies with the constitution, the government will..."): (1) amend the policy in question to ensure it is fully compatible with the constitution; (2) seek to amend the constitution to enable the policy in question to be implemented; (3) implement the policy in question regardless of these concerns.

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

Declarative hypotheses (H1)

Ordinary least squares regression of the anti-democratic attitudes index on socio-cultural ideology (Q3.1), economic ideology (Q3.3), and an interaction of socio-cultural and economic ideology, with age, gender, education, religiosity, subjective socio-economic status and place of residence

as control variables.

#### Conjoint hypotheses (H2-H6)

We test all hypotheses using Average Marginal Component Effects (AMCEs), with interaction models as the primary test of moderation and subgroup estimates for interpretation and visualisation. For the congruence hypotheses (H2, H3), we estimate models that include interactions between respondent ideology (economic for H2; socio-cultural for H3), profile policy content, and norm-violation attributes. The interaction term directly tests whether norm-violation effects differ under congruent vs. incongruent policy conditions; the hypotheses are supported if the interaction indicates smaller penalties (AMCEs less negative) under congruence. We supplement these tests with subgroup-specific AMCEs, filtering by respondent ideology and profile congruence, to illustrate effect magnitudes within each condition. For the dispositional hypothesis (H4), we estimate AMCEs within each of four ideological quadrants; to distinguish dispositional effects from congruence effects, we additionally restrict to profiles where neither policy dimension is congruent. H4 is supported if the left-economic/right-sociocultural quadrant shows smaller norm-violation penalties than other quadrants, even on incongruent profiles.

For the moderation hypotheses (H5, H6), we estimate interaction models that include the moderating variable as continuous: ideology extremity for H5 (calculated for socio-cultural and economic self-placement separately, by taking the absolute distance of the respondent's self placement from the mid-point of the scale) and declarative democratic support for H6 (using the anti-democratic attitudes index). The three-way interaction between the moderator, policy congruence, and norm-violation attributes provides the primary test of each hypothesis. H5 is supported if extremity amplifies congruence effects; H6 is supported if declarative support attenuates them. We supplement these tests with subgroup-specific AMCEs to visualise how congruence effects vary across high vs. low levels of the moderating variable.

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

Respondents answering "Don't know / Hard to say" on the observational variables will be excluded.

#### **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.**

1,500 in each case (Great Britain, Poland and Spain), drawing on quota-sampled surveys representative of the adult population by gender, age group, level of education, region of residence, and level of urbanisation.

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

A rating scale variable is included in the conjoint questions, with respondents asked to rate the likelihood that they would vote for a party proposing the given policy approach. We will conduct exploratory analyses using Independent Marginal Component Effects (IMCEs) with respect to our key hypotheses.

---

#### **BUNDLE**

This pre-registration is part of a bundle which includes:

#264,766 - <https://aspredicted.org/d98cv8.pdf> - Title: 'Personality traits and hostility on social media' #264,947 - <https://aspredicted.org/2z8y7g.pdf> - Title: 'The Age of Political Sectarianism'