Pre-Analysis Plan for the first follow up survey for
"(Not) Thinking About the Future: Maternal Labor Force Participation"

[This is an exact copy of the PAP published on November 18, 2022, with all identifying information that might reveal the identity of the participating regions removed.]

1. Introduction

This document pre-specifies the analysis we will conduct with data from our first follow up survey and complements the overall PAP for this study.

The goal of this survey wave is to test potential persistence of the treatment on women's financial awareness and behaviors as well as their labor supply aspirations. It is conducted approximately two months after the main intervention.

The randomized control trial was implemented among mothers[1] who work as teachers in the cantons of [name of canton A, canton B, and canton C] in Switzerland.

2. Recruitment of participants and timeline

We will invite all our study participants from the Cantons of [canton B and C] via email to our first follow up survey on the third week of January 2023. This first round of invitations will serve as a soft launch. In total, we will send emails to about[2] [N in canton B and C] teachers in these two cantons.

One to two weeks later, we will invite all study participants from the Canton of [A] via email. About [N in canton A] teachers that completed our baseline survey in [canton A] will receive the invitation to participate in the follow-up survey.

3. Primary outcomes

As primary outcomes of this survey wave, we consider measures of financial awareness and participant's desired labor force participation.

Hypotheses:

The treatment intervention is hypothesized to increase:

   a) Financial empowerment: women's financial awareness and likelihood of considering long-term financial factors.

---

[1] The sample also includes pregnant women.

[2] We exclude those who choose not to be contacted after the reminder. This also applies in [canton A].

b) Workload aspirations: teachers' desired future workload

We summarize the two dimensions here:

1) Financial awareness.
   a. <u>Important factor question</u>. We will analyze if participants in the treatment group rank long-term financial factors relatively higher in the following question: "Now we would like you to imagine the following situation: a teacher colleague at your school is asking you for your advice. She currently works 40% and has a 3-year-old child, who attends the local Kita when she works. Which factors do you think she should consider the most if she increases her workload to 80%? *Please, rank the following factors in order of relevance, such that the first factor is the most important one by dragging the factors to the desired position.*" For our analysis, we code a variable that considers the relative ranking of long vs short term financial factors.
   b. <u>Open ended question on key factors for workload decisions in the future.</u> We will also analyze if participants in the treatment group mention different groups of decision factors or have different narratives in the following open-ended question: *"Try now to visualize how your life will look like in 10 years from now. What are the key factors you think you will consider in deciding how much to work?"*

2) <u>Workload aspirations</u>. We have three questions in this domain. We will study each of these questions separately. We will also aggregate these in an index, focusing in particular on the longer-term workload aspirations, as short-term choices might be more constrained:
   a. Desired workload next school year
   a. Desired workload 10 years from now
   b. Workload in 3, 5, and 10 years considered to be reported anonymously to the cantonal authorities (3 questions)

4. Heterogeneity analysis

We will consider the same heterogeneity dimensions that we pre-specified in our PAP for the baseline and admin data, with two small extensions:

Social desirability: One additional dimension we will explore is experimenter demand effects. We use a 5-question short form of the Crowne and Marlowe (1960) module developed by Reynolds (1982) and used in Dahr et al. 2022. The social desirability score sums how many of the responses are the socially desirable ones. A low score means a lower tendency to give answers that have social desirability bias. Given that we did not pilot this shorter version of the scale, we will first check if there is enough variation.

Flexibility in short-term WL adjustment: We ask additional questions that complement our baseline measures regarding the ease and opportunity to adjust workload for the next schoolyear by eliciting more details on the timing of the decision making and implementation of participants' short term preferred workload.