**What am I doing?**

This design is a 2x2x2 factorial following DeSante (2013) and Hayes et al. (2020). It seeks to address the question: “Do Americans punish women who apply for federal aid relative to men?” In other words, when comparing two otherwise identical applicants for federal aid, are Americans more generous toward male applicants? While a wealth of literature considers how, when, and why Black Americans are punished when they apply for welfare ((Gilens 1999; Smith 1987; Sears et al. 1997), few have considered if Americans treat male and female aid applicants differently (but see Rabinowitz et al. 2009). Instead, nearly all experiments use female names in order to hold sex constant as they evaluate race-based punishment. Using names that are distinctly white according to Hayes and Mitchel’s (2020) name-characteristics dataset, I hold race fixed as white and instead vary names by sex.

The basic design of the experiment is a budgeting task in which the respondent is asked to allocate $1,500 to two applicants for federal assistance, each of whom is said to need $900. Respondents may also choose to give some (or all) of the funds to “offset the federal deficit.” Given the budget constraint—both applicants’ full need cannot be met—I will use the amount awarded to each— Applicant 1, Applicant 2, and the Government—as an estimate of an applicant’s deservingness. These allocations will become my main variables of interest. Everything about the applicants will be the same except for a randomly assigned name (Misty, Sandra, Sammie, or James) and worker quality assessment (Excellent/Poor).

These names come from Hayes and Mitchell’s (2020) name-characteristics dataset and are matched on important characteristics. Specifically, James and Sandra are rated highly in professionalism, competence, and work ethic, while Sammie and Misty are rated lower in all three categories. The figure below shows the full breakdown of name characteristics.
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