The Effects of Gender Representation in Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia (#81913)

Created: 12/03/2021 06:38 AM (PT)
Public: 04/27/2022 08:50 AM (PT)

Author(s)
Ellen Lust (Gothenburg University) - ellen.lust@gu.se
Kristen Kao (Gothenburg University) - kristenkao@gmail.com
Marwa Shalaby (University of Wisconsin - Madison) - marwa.shalaby@wisc.edu
Chagai Weiss (University of Wisconsin - Madison) - cmweiss3@wisc.edu

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
It's complicated. We have already collected some data but explain in Question 8 why readers may consider this a valid pre-registration nevertheless.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
We examine how citizens respond to gender representation in legislative committees in three Middle Eastern countries: Jordan, Tunisia, and Morocco. To do so, we implement a survey experiment, in which we describe a legislative committee, and randomize the gender balance of the committee (8 men/4 men 4 women), the decision made by the committee (support/oppose proposed legislation), and in Jordan whether the committee discussed a gendered or non-gendered policy (penalties for domestic violence/ penalties for littering. In other contexts, we hold the issue area constant on the gendered issue area).

We hypothesize that:
H1: Citizens will be less likely to agree that the committee made the right decision when the committee is gender balanced
H1A: Citizens will be more likely to agree that the committee made the right decision for women when the committee is gender balanced
H1B: Citizens will be less likely to agree that the committee made the right decision for men when the committee is gender balanced
H2: Citizens will be more likely to report negative attitudes regarding the committee's decision making process when the committee is gender-balanced
H2A: Citizens will be more likely to report lower trust towards gender balanced committees
H2B: Citizens will be more likely to report that the decision making process was unfair when the committee was gender balanced
H3: Citizens will be less likely to believe that the general public will accept a decision made by a gender balanced committee
H4: Committee decisions supporting women will further increase the negative effect of balanced committees for all outcomes in H1-4.
H5A: Hostile sexism will negatively moderate the gender balance treatment effect in H1-2.
H5B: Perceptions of conservative gender norms will negatively moderate the gender balance treatment effect in H3.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Overall Decision Evaluation (H1): We create an index based on three survey questions asking respondents to state their level of agreement (on a four point scale), with the following statements: "The committee made the right decision for women", "The committee made the right decision for men", "The committee made the right decision for all citizens".

Decision Evaluation for Women (H1A): We make use of a single item asking respondents to state their level of agreement (on a four point scale), with the following statement: "The committee made the right decision for women".

Decision Evaluation for Men (H1B): We make use of a single item asking respondents to state their level of agreement (on a four point scale), with the following statement: "The committee made the right decision for men".

Evaluation of Committee Decision Process (H2): We create an index based on two (four item) survey questions asking respondents whether "The committee can be trusted to make future decisions that are right for all citizens," and "how fair was the decision making process ".

Trust in Committee (H2A): We make use of a single item asking respondents to state their level of agreement (on a four point scale), with the following statement: "The committee can be trusted to make future decisions that are right for all citizens."

Fairness of Process (H2b): We make use of a single item asking respondents regarding the fairness of the decision making process: "how fair was the decision making process ".

Public Acceptance of Decision (H3): We make use of a single item asking respondents "How likely is the general public going to accept the committee's decision" (four point scale).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
In Tunisia and Morocco we implement a fully crossed 2x2 experimental design resulting in four experimental conditions. Respondents listen to an excerpt from a radio show describing a committee, and we randomize the gender balance of the committee (8 men/4 men 4 women), and the decision made by the committee (support/oppose proposed legislation).

In Jordan, we add a third experimental condition, resulting in a 2x2x2 experimental design with eight experimental conditions. Treatments include: the gender balance of the committee (8 men/4 men 4 women), the decision made by the committee (support/oppose proposed legislation), and the issue area of the committee (penalties for domestic violence/ penalties for littering).

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

To test hypothesis 1-3, we subset our data to include only respondents exposed to a committee discussing a gendered issue area (i.e. all respondents in Morocco and Tunisia, and 50% of respondents in Jordan). In our main specification, we implement the following OLS model:

$yic = a + B*balance + D*decision + C*country + I*individual controls + ei$

Where yic denotes a survey response from respondent i in country c. B represents our main parameter of interest relating to the ATE of gender balance across all three countries. We control for our second treatment arm relating to the committee's decision (D), and include a country fixed effect (C), as well as a set of pre-treatment individual level controls (gender, age, education) to improve precision. We further estimate additional models for each country, which follow the exact same specification, but without a country fixed effect.

To test H4-5 we estimate the following model for all outcomes reported in H1-H3 (pooled, and separately for each country):

$yic = a + B*balance + D*decision + C*country + I*individual controls + T*(balance*decision) + ei$

In these models, our main parameter of interest is T, representing the moderating effect of the decision treatment on the gender balance effect.

After testing hypotheses H1-5 amongst respondents exposed to a committee discussing a gendered issue area, we turn to implement similar analyses amongst Jordanian respondents assigned to a non-gendered issue area in order to examine the generalizability of our results across issue areas. We expect that results will generalize to the non-gendered issue area, albeit in smaller magnitude.

Finally, for all analyses above, we explore the moderating effects of the following variables on our main gender balance treatment: 1) Gender, 2) benevolent sexism (scale based on two items), 3) religiosity, 4) individual level support for democracy, 5) individual level support for current government.

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

NA

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.

Sample size decisions were informed by effect sizes reported in Clayton et. al. (AJPS 2019) who implemented a similar design, and by our own power analyses (at the individual country level). Our power analyses, in which we assume effect magnitude similar to Clayton et al. and no power benefits from covariate adjustments (a conservative assumption), suggest that with a sample of 1,600 respondents we will be able to detect gender balance main effects (H1-4), and a conditional effect of gender balance based on committee decision (H5), of the size reported in Clayton et. al. with a probability higher that 0.8. We therefore collect the following sample size in Tunisia and Morocco:

Tunisia: N = 1,600

Morocco: N= 1,600

Since we add a third treatment condition in our Jordan study, we increase our sample size as follows:

Jordan: N=3200

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

Follow up on question 1: We are currently fielding our survey, and researchers implementing the analysis do not have access to the data at this stage.