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**A. Hypotheses**

**Description of essential elements**

Individuals will award less aid to male applicants than female applicants, holding competence and quality constant.

Individuals will award less aid to high-competence male applicants than low- competence male applicants, holding quality constant.

Individuals will award more aid to high-competence female applicants than low- competence female applicants, holding quality constant.

Objective quality ratings will have no effect on the amount of aid awarded, holding sex and competence constant.

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).

This design allows me to examine respondents’ generosity to women as compared to men, high quality women (men) as compared to low quality women (men), high (low) quality women as compared to high (low) quality men, low rated women (men) as compared to high rated women (men), and high (low) rated women as compared to high (low) rated men. Thus, I can examine not only to which groups respondents are most giving, but comment on the underlying causes of generosity (and punishment) based on sex, stated quality, or perceived quality *and* the interactions between these factors.

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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**B. Methods**

**Description of essential elements**

1. **Independent variables**
   1. *Sex.* Male (0) or Female (1). Cued using names on the hypothetical public aid application—James and Sammie for Male; Sandra and Misty for Female.
   2. *Competence.* Low (0) or High (1). Cued using names from Hayes and Mitchell’s (2020) name-characteristic dataset. Sammie and Misty for low-competence; Sandra and James for high-competence names. See Fig. 1 above for validation of these characteristics.
   3. *Quality.* Poor (0) or Excellent (1). Given on the hypothetical aid application as “Worker Quality Assessment: Poor/Excellent.”
2. **Dependent Variables:** 
   1. *Amount of Aid Awarded.*
      1. To the State (0-1,500 USD)
      2. To Applicant 1 (Misty/Sammie) (0-1,500 USD)
      3. To Applicant 2 (Sandra/James) (0-1,500 USD)
      4. State + Applicant 1 + Applicant 2 = $1,500

**Planned sample**

I will test my hypotheses using survey data collected from YouGov in partnership with the Institute of Politics at Florida State University. YouGov will collect a representative sample of 1,200 Floridians in March of 2022.

Termination Rule

Power

Exclusion criteria

1. Describe anticipated specific data exclusion criteria. For example:
2. missing, erroneous, or overly consistent responses;
3. failing check-tests or suspicion probes;
4. demographic exclusions;
5. data-based outlier criteria;
6. method-based outlier criteria (e.g. too short or long response times).

Procedure

1. (Recommended element, in the online form see next page) Set fail-safe levels of exclusion at which the whole study needs to be stopped, altered, and restarted. If applicable, you can upload any files related to your methods and procedure here (e.g., a paper describing a scale you are using, experimenter instructions, etc.).
2. Describe all manipulations, measures, materials and procedures including the order of presentation and the method of randomization and blinding (e.g., single or double blind), as in a published Methods section.

**C. Analysis plan**

**Confirmatory analyses**

Describe the analyses that will test each main prediction from the hypotheses section. For *each one*, include:

1. the relevant variables and how they are calculated;
2. the statistical technique;
3. each variable’s role in the technique (e.g., IV, DV, moderator, mediator, covariate);
4. rationale for each covariate used, if any;
5. if using techniques other than null hypothesis testing (for example, Bayesian statistics), describe your criteria and inputs toward making an evidential conclusion, including prior values or distributions.

*(the online form asks the above for the first, second, third, fourth and further predictions separately)*

**Recommended elements**

Specify contingencies and assumptions, such as:

1. Method of correction for multiple tests.
2. The method of missing data handling (e.g., pairwise or listwise deletion, imputation, interpolation).
3. Reliability criteria for item inclusion in scale.
4. Anticipated data transformations.
5. Assumptions of analyses, and plans for alternative/corrected analyses if each assumption is violated.

Optionally, upload any files here that are related to your analyses (e.g., syntaxes, scripts, etc.).

**Answer the following final questions:**

Has data collection begun for this project?

* No, data collection has not begun
* Yes, data collection is underway or complete

If data collection has begun, have you looked at the data?

* Yes
* No

The (estimated) start and end dates for this project are (optional):

Any additional comments before I pre-register this project (optional):