



Request for Proposals: EGAP Metaketa Initiative

Motivating Women's Political Participation in Hybrid Regimes

The Evidence in Governance and Politics (EGAP) network is soliciting proposals for field experiments that seek to better understand women's political participation, aimed especially at improved public services in hybrid regimes. This Metaketa will center on non-electoral forms of political participation in order to focus on the multiple alternative and understudied pathways by which citizens can achieve their governance, service delivery, and political objectives in settings in which the electoral accountability mechanism is dysfunctional or broken. A critical feature of the EGAP Metaketa Initiative is that it seeks to fund experimental research that may lead to greater accumulation of knowledge in this substantive area. Doing this successfully will require a high degree of coordination across funded research teams. We invite studies that tackle the central question of how to improve the quantity and quality of women's non-electoral political participation.

The cluster of studies will focus more specifically on consultative processes in areas in which increased participation by women could reasonably be expected to improve provision of public services. For each study, a first common arm, to be rolled out in a consistent manner by all supported projects, will test how to encourage women's participation in consultative processes aimed at improved public services. A second common arm, also to be rolled out in a consistent manner, will assess approaches for improving the substantive quality of the participation. For both common treatment arms studies will aim to understand (potentially heterogeneous) individual motivations underlying the decision to participate, and the benefits and costs of doing so. Additional treatment arm(s) can be proposed by individual research teams to be studied alongside the common treatments and should address specific problems related to political participation in the hybrid-regime context. The purpose of this additional arm is to allow for a comparative assessment of interventions: if the common intervention is not effective, what is? Under what conditions do the common interventions make a difference?

Researchers should feel free to propose outcome measures that draw on resources outside of political science, new ways of thinking about participation in less democratic contexts, and proposals that consider participation from an individual or group-level perspective. Researchers are also encouraged to consider novel types of interventions that go beyond traditional field experiments with survey-based outcome measures. Winning proposals will be required to participate in a workshop before the start of data collection to ensure coherence across projects, and to adopt comparable common treatment arms and measurements of outcomes.

Table of Contents

1 EGAP's Metaketa Initiative	4
1.1 Thematic focus.....	5
1.2 Awards	5
1.3 Complementarities.....	6
1.4 Eligibility.....	6
2 Substantive Focus.....	7
3 Strategy	8
3.1 Treatment arms	9
3.2 Outcomes	10
3.3 Cases and units of analysis	10
3.4 Accumulation.....	11
4 Submission Guidelines and Review Process	13
4.1 What are the stages of the application process?	14
4.2 Who is eligible to apply?.....	14
4.3 What is the size of awards?	14
4.4 What are the selection criteria and format for full proposals?	14
4.5 Application form	15
4.6 Are there any conditions on the grant?	17
4.7 What are the benefits of participation in the Metaketa Initiative?.....	18
4.8 What is the intended timeline?	19
5 References	20

1. EGAP's Metaketa Initiative

The Metaketa Initiative is a collaborative research model that funds sets of closely coordinated studies in a way intended to accumulate policy-relevant knowledge. Researchers on each team work with governmental or non-governmental partners to implement similar interventions across geographically diverse settings in order to assess the generalizability of lessons learned from the interventions. An unusual feature of this research model is that it does not aim for innovation as the primary goal, but rather, focuses largely on the consolidation of knowledge. A Metaketa (the Basque word for “accumulation”) is a coordinated, multi-site, research grant round designed to foster knowledge accumulation.

EGAP sees an on-going crisis of external validity in development and governance research and few systemic efforts to address it. The business-as-usual model for many academic researchers is to select topics they find interesting and seek funding to implement the research in an original way. In practice, this often means the results may be difficult to integrate with learning developed in other contexts. Other research is carried out as policy evaluations of specific programs. In these cases, the research is sometimes commissioned by development agencies and implemented by researchers. Often this research responds strongly to particular local needs but is not designed to answer questions that span variegated contexts. A consequence of this is that major policy innovations often rest on fragile research foundations.

For example, major lessons have been drawn on the effectiveness of community-based monitoring of health workers for health gains, or on the advantages of disseminating information on corruption about politicians—all from single studies. Yet, there are well-known reasons for caution, not least because of the presence of publication bias afflicting academic research. Positive results get published and read, negative or null results often disappear, and little is learned about the role that context plays in determining when a finding is relevant or not.

EGAP is therefore trying to address this challenge of external validity; in part by getting the incentives right to attract excellent researchers to contribute to a collective endeavor that identifies critical areas where generalizable knowledge can have a large impact. The key idea of this initiative is to take a major question of importance for governance outcomes, identify interventions that are tried, but not tested, and implement a cluster of coordinated research studies that can provide reliable answers to the question (e.g., Dunning et al. 2019).

1.1 Thematic focus

This Request for Proposals follows EGAP's call for Expressions of Interest (EOIs) for research on how to mobilize political participation for improved provision of public services in hybrid regimes.¹ The steering committee has identified the causes and consequences of women's political mobilization as the focus of the current round and, in particular, mobilization of women to take advantage of opportunities to express their voice in a manner aimed at improving local provision of public services. Public services may include improvements in, for example, community health organizations, schools, access to water, community budgeting, etc. This theme combines ideas from several EOIs, and it speaks to the central question of how researchers can better understand what can motivate citizens to participate within hybrid regimes, how governance outcomes can be improved in non-democracies, and how increasing participation by more of the population in the expression of citizen's voices can lead to changes in the provision of public services.

1.2 Awards

In the current round we anticipate making grants to 5-7 individual research teams to conduct separate but coordinated field experiments, in total amounts of approximately \$150,000 – \$300,000 each. For individual proposals that are conceptualized as part of a group of related projects, applicants are encouraged to indicate the connection between their projects and other projects with which they may choose to link. However, awards will be made to individual projects on the basis of the quality and merit of projects, their consistency with the objectives of this proposal, and the willingness of researchers to participate in the process of post-award coordination and integration that this initiative requires.

The deadline for submission of proposals is August 9, 2019.

¹ Following Diamond (2001), we define hybrid regimes as those that combine elements of democracy, such as elections or parliaments, with authoritarian governance. However, unlike true democracies, these regimes lack an arena of contestation sufficiently open, free, and fair, so that rulers can be turned out of power if their leadership is no longer preferred by a plurality of the electorate. Hybrid regimes may include competitive authoritarian regimes (Levitsky and Way 2010), but may also include regimes without multi-party elections that are receptive to other forms of citizen participation in governance (i.e. Notice & Comment in the drafting of legislation and regulation, or community participation in local budgeting). There is no measure that we will use to define the set of potential countries, and subnational enclaves within a particular country that meets this criteria is permissible, even if the country as a whole would not be considered a hybrid regime.

1.3 Complementarities

The collection of studies will be implemented in different geographic regions with a theorized account for why outcomes might differ across areas, in light of the discussion of heterogeneity described below (section 2.3) or other considerations. In addition, we hope that the collection of studies will involve:

- *coordinated, integrated research* in which questions, interventions, and outcomes are harmonized across studies;
- *systematic thinking about theory and case selection* in the planning of multiple experiments;
- *cohesive, joint registration* of studies, *coordinated filing of pre-analysis plans*, and *integrated publication*, as a way to ameliorate reporting biases; and
- *innovation within replication*, so that the effects of the common treatment arm can be compared to alternative interventions.

In sum, the aim is that the coordinated research will allow for greater comparability of findings across disparate experimental studies; boost the credibility and accumulation of research results *as a whole*; works towards standard practices in the development of consistent outcome measures across studies; and generate a cluster of studies that share a focus on how to mobilize women's non-electoral political participation.

1.4 Eligibility

This call for proposals is open to both EGAP and non-EGAP members; and it is open both to those who submitted Expressions of Interest (EOIs) in a previous phase of the initiative and those who did not. Applications are likewise not restricted to researchers and professionals from any particular region, discipline, or stage of career. However, positive weight will be accorded to experience in implementing research of this form. Positive weight will also be given to teams with at least one member with expertise in political participation, political behavior, network analysis, and/or women in politics, including a publication record on subjects relevant to the proposal. Professors, graduate students, and development professionals are welcome to apply; teams that integrate researchers with different kinds and degrees of experience (for instance, professors, graduate students, and implementing partners) are especially welcome. Applicants from developing countries are particularly encouraged.

2. Substantive Focus

In many contexts with both some nominally democratic elements and some autocratic traits, when citizens have the opportunity to participate through consultative channels, very large shares of the population fail to take part, even when participation has the potential to improve outcomes of interest to them (e.g. Stromseth et al. 2017). Such problems may be particularly acute in hybrid regimes when combined with the potential for government surveillance or repression. This participation gap can disproportionately affect certain groups, such as women, minorities, or the poor (Welch 1977, Schlozman et al. 1994), because of their often disproportionate dependence on public services relative to their ability to influence them. The accountability and responsiveness failures of many hybrid regimes may disproportionately affect less powerful groups within society. Although voting is the most widely recognized form of political participation, this Metaketa round seeks to broaden the focus to other forms of political participation that may be more relevant in settings in which elections are not functioning as effective tools of political accountability.

The focus on women's political participation—and more specifically, women's mobilization into consultative processes—is motivated in part by the well-established correlation between improvements in women's status and overall socio-economic development indicators (Lorgelly et al. 1999, Klasen 2002). How can women be better mobilized to participate in consultative processes that would likely improve public services provision (Chattopadhyay and Duflo 2004)? In order to better understand motivations for participation, we also focus on how the act of participation affects women in these contexts and how the quality of participation can also be improved.

Previous work has shown that even when underrepresented individuals do participate in consultative processes, the substantive quality of their participation is not high enough to meaningfully influence outcomes (Dahlander and Piezunka 2014). Many participants misunderstand laws or regulations or offer infeasible and even completely irrelevant suggestions (Malesky and Taussig 2019). Combined with low rates of participation, low quality can have knock-on effects, as commenters, whose suggestions are ignored, come to see government as unresponsive, doubt the legitimacy of the process, and decline to provide participation in the future (Tyler 1991, 2006).

Studies participating in this Metaketa round should propose a common intervention designed to mobilize women's participation into consultative channels and plan to investigate 1) which tactics successfully mobilize participation; 2) which techniques

can enhance the quality of their participatory inputs; and 3) how being mobilized as a participant affects the participants (i.e. the internal/psychological costs and benefits of participation). Selected studies may narrow the focus, but proposals should consider all three outcomes.

All selected studies will share a common set of interventions aimed at increasing women's participation and should also include designated alternative treatment arms. Studies should seek to provide appropriate protections for the identity of participants and consider creative ways to provide localized behavioral measures within potentially challenging contexts with an eye towards coordination with other teams.

Proposals are encouraged (but not required) to include the following:

- A treatment that focuses on mobilizing/training women as a group rather than individually.
- Consideration of interventions that compare effectiveness between men and women.
- Consideration of women who are more or less central in community networks.
- Creative ways to gauge the psychological effects of participation.
- Attention to the possibility that increasing participation and providing increased opportunities for citizens to demand provision of public services without corresponding increases in service delivery may create ethical tensions in the study design.
- Individual and group access to systems aimed at facilitating citizen complaints about public service delivery from local governments like [I Change My City](#), [See, Click, Fix](#), or other platforms that are lower tech (i.e. based in text-messaging or using an anonymous paper-based complaint box). The platform will be coordinated among selected proposals, but all proposals should consider the most appropriate type of mechanism for individual and group voice in their proposed context.

3. Strategy

In this EGAP Metaketa round, we seek to fund a set of studies that can effectively address the questions outlined in Section 2 above and provide evidence on the conditions under which the interventions are effective or ineffective. To gain confidence that variation in findings across studies can shed light on underlying mechanisms—and not simply idiosyncratic variations in design and measurement—studies should contain strongly comparable core components in

terms of treatment arms and outcome measurements. However, this does not preclude the possibility that individual proposals will vary on other dimensions in ways that may also shed light on the question at hand. These considerations have implications for treatment arms, for outcomes, and for measurement, as outlined in the next sections.

3.1 Treatment arms

We invite studies that address the questions using two or more experimental arms designed to mobilize women’s participation in consultative channels.

1. A first arm, to be implemented in a consistent manner by all supported projects, seeks to assess how to encourage greater women’s participation in consultative processes. While the specifics of the common treatment arm will need to be developed jointly by successful teams, the common intervention should be an encouragement design aimed at mobilizing participation into a consultative channel (either existing or created by the study team) in which greater women’s participation could reasonably be expected to improve provision of public services. Proposals should describe the obstacles to political participation in their particular research context and describe how their intervention is aimed to overcome them. Please also be careful to select participation opportunities in which average citizens are more competent to participate – sending a message about improved medical or educational services being their priority – rather than a focus on public input about a policy requiring specialized expertise, which even in mature democracies might draw little interest or participation
2. A second consistent arm will focus on the substantive quality of women’s participation to enhance its uptake by or pressure on authorities. Some techniques for including the effectiveness or substantive quality of consultation include but are not limited to group-based training in community coordination, direct expert advice and assistance through individual advice or group training, and taking advantage of community networks (e.g., interactive commentary with others able to “like” and comment on an individual’s participation). Proposals should describe the barriers to participation and higher-quality participation in their research context (e.g., social norms, education, fear, constrained media) and describe how their intervention will overcome them.
3. If desired and feasible, a third supplementary arm can be considered. From a policy perspective it allows for a comparative assessment of interventions: if

the common treatment arm is not effective, what is? If it is effective, is it more effective than other interventions of similar cost? Under what conditions is it most effective? This variation opens up space for considerable differentiation and innovation across projects, but in a way that addresses a common agenda.

In all cases the research should allow comparison to a pure control or placebo condition, either through a multi-arm design or a factorial design. The proposal should describe the status quo policies and practices that would make up this arm.

3.2 Outcomes

For all experimental arms, there are three families of outcomes of interest:

1. Increased participation by women in the research setting.
2. Enhanced substantive quality of participation.
3. The psychological effects of participation on participants. Examples include but are not limited to measuring the psychological benefits of revealing one's true preferences, satisfaction in having contributed to public welfare, and increases or decreases in beliefs about regime legitimacy.

Measurement strategies and assurances of their quality should be clearly defined in the proposal. As such, proposals should describe whether accessing these data is feasible. Details of measurement strategies, as well as operationalization of key concepts (such as indicators of quality, and other relevant ancillary outcomes) are likely to change following workshop sessions with all grantees. Note that coordination across common core outcomes does not preclude a focus by individual research teams on alternative outcomes that may be important to individual studies and that may suggest avenues for future research.

3.3 Cases and units of analysis

We seek proposals for research in contexts that aim to understand non-electoral forms of political participation in hybrid regimes, broadly defined. Democracies are excluded, as are closed authoritarian regimes. However, authoritarian regimes that allow opportunities for some political competition, participation through consultative processes, and tolerate some debate over policy decisions are included. Although voting is the most widely recognized form of political participation, this Metaketa round seeks to broaden the focus to other forms of political participation that may be more relevant in settings in which elections are not functioning as

effective tools of political accountability.

We will consider proposals at both national and subnational units of analysis, and make a final determination about the appropriate levels of analysis after observing the full distribution of project proposals.

3.4 Accumulation

The EGAP Metaketa Initiative builds on the premise that poor ex-ante coordination hinders accumulation of knowledge from experimental research. Uncoordinated efforts can lead to high levels of innovation, which is critical for advancing research agendas, but it can militate against consolidation of knowledge in any given area. This round is focused specifically on knowledge accumulation and successful grantees will be asked to engage in a relatively high degree of coordination. In practice this coordination means individual research teams will engage with eight pillars of the initiative.

1. **Coordination Across Research Teams.** We seek to generate coordination between funded research teams—as the next seven pillars depend vitally on integration and collaboration among funded researchers. We will achieve this harmonization through a workshop, hosted by EGAP, bringing together successful applicants (see Section 4.6).
2. **Predefined Themes and Comparable Interventions.** Researchers funded under this round will address related questions and study the effects of comparable interventions. Interventions are *pre-defined* in two ways: (1) through this Request for Proposal’s thematic focus on women’s political participation; and (2) through the selection of winning proposals, in which we will also prioritize comparability of interventions across research teams.
3. **Comparable Measures.** We expect successful applicants to develop consistent outcome measures, both in their proposals and through the post-funding workshops.
4. **Integrated Case Selection.** Proposals should theorize the channels through which an intervention may affect a given outcome—and in doing so provide hypotheses about which of these channels may be operative in the chosen research context(s). This provides a justification of case selection and may allow greater ex-ante specification of hypotheses about heterogeneous effects across contexts. Thus, case selection (i.e. selection of research sites or

contexts) can be integrated and justified in a way that is rarely possible in uncoordinated research.

5. **Preregistration.** Funded research will be required to hew to EGAP's standards for analytic transparency (see <http://egap.org/egap-statement-of-principles>). In particular, after revision of research designs at an initial meeting of funded researchers and before initiation of outcome data collection, grantees must post a study protocol that describes a) the study's purpose; b) the hypotheses it aims to test; c) the main outcome variables; d) the randomization procedures; and e) the set of tests and the data analysis that will be performed. In addition, the *group* of funded studies will itself be pre-registered, with the comparisons and pooled analyses to be conducted from the group of studies made explicit; funded research teams, the steering committee chair, and the EGAP Methods Director will collaborate on the development of this group pre-registration document.
6. **Formal Synthesis.** Group preregistration (item 5) will allow funded researchers, the steering committee chair, and the EGAP Methods Director to pre-specify a plan for meta-analysis and formal synthesis of experimental results. In addition, research teams may collaborate on developing a causal model that can integrate results and account for ways in which contexts may condition causal effects. Here, integrated case selection (item 4) that builds on theory about channels through which interventions affect outcomes assists in stipulating ex-ante expectations of results across experiments.
7. **Third-Party Analysis.** Grantees will be expected to make their data publicly available for independent, third-party replication and analysis, with a view to early identification of errors and discrepancies.
8. **Integrated Publication.** We anticipate four types of publications will arise for individual researchers who participate in this initiative.
 - a. *Synthetic Articles.* We expect all funded researchers and the steering committee to coauthor one or more articles that present results from the distinct studies in an integrated fashion. A benefit of this format is that it may highlight the intellectual benefits of collaboration and integration across research teams.
 - b. *Standard Individual Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles or Chapters.* We expect individual grantees to publish stand-alone papers in academic outlets, which may present extended analyses or focus on particular outcomes of

interest to individual researcher(s). This offers the usual benefits to researchers and readers in terms of dissemination of individual findings. Early-stage working paper versions of these papers are to be published on or linked from the EGAP website.

- c. *Joint Publication of Individual Articles.* We will discuss with journal editors a publication model in which (1) the journal would agree to *results-blind* review of the pre-analysis plans produced under this initiative; and (2) conditional on successful review of the pre-analysis plans, research papers from the initiative could be published as a group, for example, as a journal special issue. Ultimately the decision to undertake such a joint publication will rest with the grantees and steering committee.
- d. *Policy Briefs.* We expect to engage research staff to draft policy briefs reflecting core lessons from the individual research projects.

In sum, the Metaketa Initiative seeks to strengthen the accumulation of knowledge from experimental research, while simultaneously getting the incentives right to motivated leading researchers to contribute to a shared learning agenda.

4. Submission Guidelines and Review Process

The EGAP Metaketa Initiative will be administered by EGAP research staff at the University of California, Berkeley. The Co-Chairs of this Metaketa round, Susan Hyde (UC Berkeley) and Edmund Malesky (Duke University), will lead the process of selecting proposals for this round, in consultation with Cyrus Samii, Executive Director of EGAP; and other members of the EGAP network.

The members of the Steering Committee are:

- Susan Hyde, Co-Chair, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley
- Edmund Malesky, Professor of Political Science, Duke University

To avoid conflicts of interest, the committee members will not be eligible to apply for funds under this Metaketa round. However, the committee chairs will be centrally involved in fostering collaboration between research projects as well as in coordinating integrated publication, in collaboration with funded researchers. Additional committee members may be added at a future date.

4.1 What are the stages of the application process?

This Request for Proposals (RFPs) follows a previous phase, in which we solicited Expressions of Interest (EOIs) and used them to identify clusters of promising projects that fall into one or more pre-defined areas. Submission of a short EOI provided a low-cost way for researchers to identify the fit of their project with this initiative and to receive a signal of interest from the selection committee, and doing so boosted the chance that a project fit the focus of this RFP. The EOI phase was essential for identifying common interventions and substantive issue areas. A summary of the EOI process is posted on the EGAP website (<http://egap.org/content/metaketa-v-political-participation-hybrid-regimes>).

Note that prior submission of an EOI is *not* a requirement for submission of a full proposal in response to this open call. Also note that researchers whose EOI did not propose an intervention that fits the RFP guidelines are still welcome to submit a new project in the RFP round.

4.2 Who is eligible to apply?

This Request for Proposals is open and is not restricted to EGAP members or to researchers and professionals from any particular region, discipline, or stage of career. However, positive weight will be accorded to experience in implementing research of this form as well as relevant substantive expertise. Professors, graduate students, and development professionals are welcome to apply; teams of researchers that integrate researchers with different kinds and degrees of experience (for instance, professors and graduate students) are especially welcome. Applicants from developing countries are particularly encouraged.

4.3 What is the size of awards?

As noted above, we expect to fund 5-7 proposals. We anticipate individual grant proposals that average around \$150,000 – \$300,000 over five years; with two years allocated for interventions. However, given this average, the grants may range in size due to distinct research objectives and capacities across different teams. In addition, grouped or linked proposals that integrate projects across two or more research sites may receive substantially larger awards.

4.4 What are the selection criteria and format for full proposals?

The selection criteria at this RFP stage will include individual merit of the projects and the experience of researcher(s); adherence to EGAP's transparency standards (as set forth above) is especially critical. Competitive applicants will propose experimental designs consistent with our thematic focus and the pillars of the

Metaketa Initiative as well as propose projects that are implementable in the timeline of the project. Additionally, positive weight will be given to studies that demonstrate clear routes to impact, e.g., existing interest in the study from governments, civil society organizations, and/or implementers who could potentially scale up or take forward successful trials.

However, because of the emphasis we place on integrating experimental research findings, *we are also looking for thematic and design consistency in research projects*. Thus we aim to select *groups* of proposals that offer maximum comparability, for instance, because they propose variations on interventions studied in other contexts or seek to replicate previous results while also introducing new variations in treatment (see Thematic Focus section). Pre-grouped or linked proposals that pool research projects from several research sites may have some advantage in generating consistency across projects.

4.5 Application form

The application form and budget template that researchers should use to submit a proposal is posted at <http://egap.org/content/metaketa-v-political-participation-hybrid-regimes>. Completed applications should be no longer than 10 pages (not including references or the budget template) in length and should be sent by **11:59pm EST on August 9, 2019** to **grants@e-gap.org**.

The RFP thus encourages applications with the following features:

1. **Study site and units.** Proposals should include a description of the study sites and study units included in the research design, including relevant characteristics of the hybrid regime.
2. **Motivation for common and alternative arms.** Teams should include a description of the motivations for their common and alternative treatment arms. In addition, teams should describe any elements of research that have been implemented previously (if any) with the local implementing partners.
3. **Interventions.** Experimental designs should focus on the effects of interventions that are:
 - a. Tested — there should be existing evidence that suggests that these interventions may be effective (alternatively, there may be evidence that people believe these interventions are effective, even in the absence of direct evidence).

- b. Scalable — they correspond to interventions that could be implemented by governments, civil society organizations, groups of citizens, or others, outside of the research context.
 - c. Simple — since a goal is to understand how interventions work, not simply whether they work, designs should focus on simple interventions and use complex interventions only when the design allows for an unpacking of the effects of the multiple parts.
 - d. Portable — it should be possible to implement the interventions in other settings.
 - e. Punctual — designs should focus on interventions that can be implemented in relatively short periods of time and for which it is plausible that effects would be observed in a short period of time.
 - f. Ethical — interventions should not create unusual risks for populations and insofar as they are likely to alter material or social outcomes negatively, and they should be implemented by organizations mandated to engage in interventions of this form.
4. **Outcome measures.** Designs should focus on outcomes that are central to the thematic focus.
5. **Estimation.** Project descriptions should include how effects are to be estimated. Please include power calculations.
6. **Build on existing knowledge base.** We are especially interested in designs that build on the results of prior research, or that replicate and modify interventions used in previous research. Unusually, the Metaketa grants will not prioritize studies that seek to answer new questions for the first time, but instead focus on strong research designs that seek to answer pre-existing questions. Experimental designs with variations in treatment (i.e. factorial designs) are well suited to answering such questions. They are especially well suited if variations include interventions comparable to those studied previously. Innovations to address questions of particular substantive or methodological interest to individual research teams are welcome and may form part of applications as long as these do not interfere with the primary analyses.
7. **Theorize heterogeneous effects across research contexts.** Successful proposals should consider explicitly the channels through which interventions may affect outcomes, and discuss why such channels may or may not be operative in particular contexts. We are especially interested in

proposals that use variations in treatment (factorial designs) to help identify mechanisms that are operative in distinct contexts.

8. **Allow the study of downstream effects.** Although we place emphasis on shorter-term interventions and measurement, we also value designs that allow for significant learning about downstream effects.
9. **Partnership.** Proposals should include a discussion of the partner(s) responsible for implementing the interventions (including the relevant local governments, civil society organizations, or other implementing partners), the agreements reached between the researchers and the partners, and evidence of the partners' commitment to the project.
10. **Research teams.** Teams should include the CV(s) and organizational information of all listed PI(s) as well as an indication of expertise or experience in substantively relevant areas (including notations of related publications).
11. **Line-item Budget.** Teams should provide a detailed line-item budget using the attached spreadsheet. To be included are the costs associated with the intervention and measurement, e.g., costs of baseline/endline surveys, travel and subsistence, data collection and acquisition, equipment, etc. Further, please include costs for results dissemination events, i.e. travel, venue rental, catering, etc. Per the funding requirements, indirect costs are capped at 9% for subawardees that are universities; if this is a concern for your study, please contact Jaclyn Leaver, jleaver@berkeley.edu. In addition, PI salaries will not be covered as a part of this initiative. All grants will be awarded and disbursed in US dollars.
12. **Timeline.** Proposals should also include a detailed timeline of the study, which takes into account that in this Metaketa round projects will have two years to implement the interventions, and 18 months for data analysis, write ups of the main findings, and results dissemination.
13. **Approvals.** Teams should include, if available, proof of Government Approval(s) with regards to implementation of project, collection of administrative data, and other relevant aspects of the research.

4.6 Are there any conditions on the grant?

To achieve the goals we lay out in the proposal, integration across research teams is

essential. Thus, in case of being selected for funding, applicants will be asked to fulfill the following conditions:

1. Attend a set of meetings of funded researchers to discuss and present their projects (note: EGAP will fund these meetings separately). EGAP will organize:
 - a. An initial meeting, at which research designs for funded proposals are presented and discussed, in advance of interventions or data collection. After the holding of this meeting and any subsequent revisions to designs, funded researchers must draft and post study protocols/pre-analysis plans to the EGAP study registry.
 - b. A final meeting to present results and working papers.
2. Allow for flexibility on experimental design and outcome measurement for purposes of harmonization across research teams, in the service of creating an integrated research product and shared publication across the 5-7 funded projects.
3. Hew to the transparency standards described above and the EGAP research principles described at <http://egap.org/egap-statement-of-principles>.
4. Participate in integrated publication initiatives, as outlined above, as well as any optional individual publication.
5. Provide detailed reporting of the project over the life of the grant.

4.7 What are the benefits of participation in the Metaketa Initiative?

Participation in this initiative offers substantial benefits to researchers:

- It brings funding for individual research projects, in anticipated amounts of \$150,000 – \$300,000 over five years for individual projects, or larger awards for grouped proposals.
- Pre-planning and coordination across research teams in post-funding workshops can sharpen and improve the quality of individual research projects.
- Integrated publication may limit the risk to researchers of null findings. Replications of prior research (which are otherwise often challenging to publish) are explicitly encouraged.
- Co-authorship of synthetic publications provides a way to contribute to an

innovative mode of social science research.

4.8 What is the intended timeline?

We intend to follow the timeline below for applications and awards.

- Request for Proposals (RFP) disseminated: May 28, 2019
- Submission of Proposals Deadline: August 9, 2019
- Awards announcement target: September 19, 2019

References

- Chattopadhyay, Raghavendra, and Esther Duflo. 2004 "Women as policy makers: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment in India." *Econometrica* 72.5: 1409-1443.
- Dahlander, Linus, and Henning Piezunka. 2014. "Open to suggestions: How organizations elicit suggestions through proactive and reactive attention." *Research Policy* 43.5: 812-827.
- Dal Bó, Pedro, Andrew Foster, and Louis Putterman. 2010. "Institutions and behavior: Experimental evidence on the effects of democracy." *American Economic Review* 100.5: 2205-29.
- Diamond, Larry Jay. 2002. "Thinking About Hybrid Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2): 21-35.
- Dunning, Thad, Guy Grossman, Macartan Humphreys, Susan D. Hyde, Craig McIntosh, and Gareth Nellis, eds. 2019. *Information, Accountability, and Cumulative Learning: Lessons from Metaketa I*. Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grossman, Guy, Macartan Humphreys, and Gabriella Sacramone-Lutz. 2014. "'I wld like u WMP to extend electricity 2 our village': On Information Technology and Interest Articulation." *American Political Science Review* 108.3 (2014): 688-705.
- Grossman, Guy, Melina R. Platas, and Jonathan Rodden. 2018. "Crowdsourcing Accountability: ICT for Service Delivery." *World Development* 112 (December): 74-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.07.001>.
- Iyer, Lakshmi, and Anandi Mani. 2019. "The Road Not Taken: Gender Gaps along Paths to Political Power." *World Development* 119 (July): 68-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.004>.
- Khan, Sarah. 2017. "Personal Is Political: Prospects for Women's Substantive Representation in Pakistan." Working Paper. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1329/fd1977ea48daed46040ca5d92da61f3145e2.pdf>.
- Klasen, Stephan. 2002 "Low schooling for girls, slower growth for all? Cross-country evidence on the effect of gender inequality in education on economic development." *The World Bank Economic Review* 16.3: 345-373.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lorgelly, Paula K., and P. Dorian Owen. 1999. "The effect of female and male schooling on economic growth in the Barro-Lee model." *Empirical Economics* 24.3: 537-557.
- Malesky, Edmund and Markus Taussig. 2019. "Participation, Government Legitimacy, and Regulatory Compliance in Emerging Economies: A Firm-Level Field Experiment in Vietnam." *American Political Science Review* 113.2: 530-551
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "Gender and the pathways to participation: The role of resources." *Journal of Politics* 56.4 (1994): 963-990.

- Stromseth, Jonathan R., Edmund J. Malesky, and Dimitar D. Gueorguiev. 2017. China's governance puzzle: *Enabling transparency and participation in a single-party state*. Cambridge University Press
- Theocharis, Yannis, and Will Lowe. "Does Facebook increase political participation? Evidence from a field experiment." *Information, Communication & Society* 19.10 (2016): 1465-1486.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2006. "Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation." *Annual Review of Psychology* 57:375-400.
- Tyler, Tom R. 1991. *Why People Obey the Law*. Vol. 50: Princeton University Press.
- Welch, Susan. 1977. "Women as political animals? A test of some explanations for male-female political participation differences." *American Journal of Political Science* 21.4: 711-730.