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**A. Hypotheses**

• Specific objectives or hypotheses.

o Research Question: Does foreign funding of development interventions undermine state legitimacy in the foreign aid-receiving state?

o Hypothesis: Knowledge about foreign funding of development interventions will cause people to view the state as less legitimate.

**B. Subjects and Context**

• Eligibility and exclusion criteria for participants.

• Procedures used to recruit and select participants.

o We administered the survey to a convenience sample recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Respondents were offered $0.15 to “take a 10-minute survey in which we ask your opinions about a healthcare program in India.” Mechanical Turk provided the most cost-effective way of recruiting a sample of developing-country respondents.

• Recruitment dates defining the periods of recruitment and when the experiments were conducted.

o The survey was available on Mechanical Turk from 7 August 2012 through 24 August 2012.

• Settings and locations where the data were collected.

o All data was collected via Internet. Respondents might have taken the survey in a variety of different contexts: home, school, office, Internet cafe. We do not have information about the specific locations.

• If there is a survey: Provide response rate and how it was calculated.

o We do not have information about how many Mechanical Turkers who were eligible for the survey looked at the “HIT (Human Intelligence Task)” and declined to do it.

**C. Allocation Method**

• Details of the procedure used to generate the assignment sequence (e.g., randomization

procedures).

o The survey was administered using the Qualtrics online survey software. For each respondent, the software randomly assigned them to one of the four treatment conditions.

• If random assignment used, then details of procedure (e.g., any restrictions, blocking).

o We used simple random assignment.

• If random assignment used, provide evidence of random assignment.

o A multinomial logit model regressing a variable indicating the five treatment statuses on age, gender, education, income, attentiveness to the news, a set of employment indicators, measures on three questions about perceptions of HIV/AIDS, and an index of political activity produces a chi-squared statistic of 62.80 (p < 0.25). Background covariates do not meaningfully predict treatment assignment.

• Blinding: Were participants, those administering the interventions, and those assessing the

outcomes unaware of condition assignments?

o Treatment assignment was done automatically, and respondents did not know that they were participating in an experiment.

**D. Treatments**

• Description of the interventions in each treatment condition, as well as a description of the control

group.

o The control group read the following text:

Now we would like to tell you about an HIV/AIDS prevention program.

The Samastha project is a comprehensive HIV/AIDS program in the state of Karnataka, a state that exhibits high rates of HIV infection. The project’s goal is to reduce transmission and the impact of HIV in selected districts, with a focus on rural areas. The Samastha project provides system strengthening at the state level and services in 13 high-HIV/AIDS prevalence districts in Karnataka.

Since the beginning of the project in 2006, the program increased coverage of care for children affected by HIV and AIDS to about 54.5% of the estimated 33,000 infected children in Karnataka, and among Karnataka’s estimated 1.2 million pregnant women each year, the proportion who received counseling and testing for HIV increased from 20% in 2008 to more than 67%.

o Treatment Group 1:

Now we would like to tell you about an HIV/AIDS prevention program.

The Samastha project is a comprehensive HIV/AIDS program in the state of Karnataka, a state that exhibits high rates of HIV infection. The program is supported by the government of Canada through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The project’s goal is to reduce transmission and the impact of HIV in selected districts, with a focus on rural areas. The Samastha project provides system strengthening at the state level and services in 13 high-HIV/AIDS prevalence districts in Karnataka.

Since the beginning of the project in 2006, the program increased coverage of care for children affected by HIV and AIDS to about 54.5% of the estimated 33,000 infected children in Karnataka, and among Karnataka’s estimated 1.2 million pregnant women each year, the proportion who received counseling and testing for HIV increased from 20% in 2008 to more than 67%.

o Treatment Group 2:

Now we would like to tell you about an HIV/AIDS prevention program.

The Samastha project is a comprehensive HIV/AIDS program in the state of Karnataka, a state that exhibits high rates of HIV infection. The program is supported by the government of the United States through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The project’s goal is to reduce transmission and the impact of HIV in selected districts, with a focus on rural areas. The Samastha project provides system strengthening at the state level and services in 13 high-HIV/AIDS prevalence districts in Karnataka.

Since the beginning of the project in 2006, the program increased coverage of care for children affected by HIV and AIDS to about 54.5% of the estimated 33,000 infected children in Karnataka, and among Karnataka’s estimated 1.2 million pregnant women each year, the proportion who received counseling and testing for HIV increased from 20% in 2008 to more than 67%.

o Treatment Group 3:

Now we would like to tell you about an HIV/AIDS prevention program.

The Samastha project is a comprehensive HIV/AIDS program in the state of Karnataka, a state that exhibits high rates of HIV infection. The program is supported by the government of the United States through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and is administered by the Karnataka State AIDS Prevention Society and local NGOs. The project’s goal is to reduce transmission and the impact of HIV in selected districts, with a focus on rural areas. The Samastha project provides system strengthening at the state level and services in 13 high-HIV/AIDS prevalence districts in Karnataka.

Since the beginning of the project in 2006, the program increased coverage of care for children affected by HIV and AIDS to about 54.5% of the estimated 33,000 infected children in Karnataka, and among Karnataka’s estimated 1.2 million pregnant women each year, the proportion who received counseling and testing for HIV increased from 20% in 2008 to more than 67%.

o Treatment Group 4:

Now we would like to tell you about an HIV/AIDS prevention program.

The Samastha project is a comprehensive HIV/AIDS program in the state of Karnataka, a state that exhibits high rates of HIV infection. The program is supported by the government of the United States through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and is administered by international NGOs. The project’s goal is to reduce transmission and the impact of HIV in selected districts, with a focus on rural areas. The Samastha project provides system strengthening at the state level and services in 13 high-HIV/AIDS prevalence districts in Karnataka.

Since the beginning of the project in 2006, the program increased coverage of care for children affected by HIV and AIDS to about 54.5% of the estimated 33,000 infected children in Karnataka, and among Karnataka’s estimated 1.2 million pregnant women each year, the proportion who received counseling and testing for HIV increased from 20% in 2008 to more than 67%.

• How and when manipulations or interventions were administered.

o The survey was administered through the Qualtrics survey interface. Subjects read the treatment online.

o Most respondents took around five minutes to answer the complete survey.

o There was only a single survey session.

o The experiment did not involve direct deception, although the various conditions omit relevant information.

o The answer to a follow-up question about the role of foreign aid in social service provision provides evidence that the treatment was delivered as intended.

• Report any instructional anomalies or inaccuracies.

o None.

• Were subjects given quizzes on the experimental instructions?

o NA

• Were there practice rounds? If so, how many and what were the results?

o NA

• Did subjects complete a post-experiment debriefing, interview, or questionnaire? If so, is there evidence that subjects understood the instructions and treatments?

o No.

• Did the experimental team observe aspects of the intervention?

o No.

• Provide description of manipulation checks, if any.

o NA

• Were incentives given? If so, what were they and how were they administered.

o Respondents were paid $0.15 to take the survey. The money was transferred through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk interface.

**E. Results**

**1. Outcome Measures and Covariates**

• Provide precise definition of all primary and secondary measures and covariates.

o In general, how do you assess the job that the national government is doing in addressing the problem of HIV/AIDS across India? Very poor, poor, good, very good.

o In general, how do you rate the job that your state government is doing in addressing the problem of HIV/AIDS within [respondent’s state]? Very poor, poor, good, very good.

o How much do you think that foreign aid from other countries contributes to the provision of social services in India? Nothing, a little, some, a lot.

o Now we would like to ask you about your opinion toward several institutions. For the following institutions can you tell me whether you have a very favorable, favorable, unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of each one? (1)Prime Minister Manmohan Singh; (2) Lok Sabha; (3) Indian National Congress; (4) Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP); (5) Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPI(M)); (6) United States; (7) Canada; (8) European Union; (9) Australia

• Clearly state which of the outcomes and subgroup analyses were specified prior to the experiment and which were the result of exploratory analysis.

o We did not pre-commit to particular subgroup analyses. We conducted a number of exploratory subgroup analyses ex post.

**Sample Descriptive Statistics**

As described in the text, we recruited a sample of 1,400 Indian respondents through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk in August 2012. In the table below, we provide basic descriptive statistics.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Min | Max |
| male (0/1) | 1482 | 0.62 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| age (seven-category scale) | 1482 | 2.90 | 0.96 | 1 | 7 |
| education (nine-category scale) | 1482 | 7.60 | 1.29 | 1 | 9 |
| income (nine-category scale) | 1482 | 5.59 | 3.08 | 1 | 9 |
| full-time employment (0/1) | 1480 | 0.41 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
| agricultural work (0/1) | 1480 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0 | 1 |
| retired (0/1) | 1480 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0 | 1 |
| unemployed (0/1) | 1480 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0 | 1 |
| student (0/1) | 1480 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0 | 1 |
| 2009 voter (0/1) | 1482 | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |

Location of Respondents:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Andaman and  Nicobar Islands | 0 | Dadra and Nagar Haveli | 0 | Jammu and Kashmir | 0 | Manipur | 0 | Rajasthan | 14 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 108 | Daman and Diu | 2 | Jharkhand | 4 | Meghalaya | 0 | Sikkim | 1 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 0 | Delhi | 33 | Karnataka | 103 | Mizoram | 0 | Tamil Nadu | 571 |
| Assam | 7 | Goa | 2 | Kerala | 467 | Nagaland | 0 | Tripura | 0 |
| Bihar | 3 | Gujarat | 15 | Lakshadweep | 0 | Orissa | 4 | Uttar Pradesh | 16 |
| Chandigarh | 5 | Haryana | 7 | Madhya Pradesh | 8 | Pondicherry | 5 | Uttarakhand | 3 |
| Chhattisgarh | 1 | Himachal Pradesh | 6 | Maharashtra | 81 | Punjab | 4 | West Bengal | 12 |

**Ex Post Power Analysis**

In Figure 1, we present ex-post power analyses based on the estimated treatment effects and the observed variances for the four political legitimacy variables. The plots suggest that if we had obtained an N=2,000 sample across a single U.S.-funding treatment condition and a control group, then we would have observed statistical significance for the Lok Sabha favorability measure and the perceptions of national government performance measure. With a similarly divided sample of N=3,000, we might have been able to observe a statistically significant result for the prime minister favorability measure. The very small estimated differences on the state government performance measure suggest that we would need an implausibly large survey to observe statistically significant results for that variable.



Figure 1. Power Analyses. Based on estimated standardized effect sizes from the combined U.S. conditions versus the control condition. Assuming a desired significance level of α = 0.05.