US - FORECASTING THE EFFECTS OF IVR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN POLITICIANS AND CITIZENS - Copy

Survey Flow

Block: Informed Consent (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 1 - Evenly Present Elements

EmbeddedData
Group = PILOT COMPLIANCE
EmbeddedData
Group = PILOT
EmbeddedData
Group = COMPLIANCE
EmbeddedData
Group = NONE

Standard: Backgound (4 Questions)
Standard: Program Overview (3 Questions)
Standard: Compliance forecasts (1 Question)
Standard: Treatment effect forecasts (1 Question)
Standard: Comparison 1 (1 Question)
Standard: Comparison 2 (1 Question)

EmbeddedData
blocking_back_buttons = yespls

Standard: Update Forecasts (8 Questions)

EmbeddedData
blocking_back_buttons = yespls

Standard: Compliance forecasts - after survey (1 Question)

Page Break

Start of Block: Informed Consent

Q1 **Researchers: Miriam Golden, Saad Gulzar, and Luke Sonnet Informed Consent** In this survey, we ask you to forecast the effects of a program aimed at increasing communication between Members of Pakistan's Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Provincial Assembly (MPA) and their constituents. We will describe the program, and ask you to use your expertise and judgement to tell us what you think happened. Your participation is completely voluntary and you are free to leave the survey at any time if you wish to. We will maintain your confidentiality by not recording any personally identifying information about you. We foresee little benefit or risk from participation, and cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study. If you have questions about this research, please contact Luke Sonnet at +1 412 359 9106 or luke.sonnet@gmail.com.
We will be asking you to make predictions about the effects of an experiment. **If you are in the top one-quarter of respondents on this mailing list (by the absolute distance between your forecasts and the estimated effects), you will win a 10 dollar Amazon gift card. We will contact you once the surveys are complete with further instructions. Note this means the more accurate your predictions, the more likely you are to receive the payment.**
Are you willing to participate in this study?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Researchers: Miriam Golden, Saad Gulzar, and Luke Sonnet Informed Consent In this survey, we as... = No

End of Block: Informed Consent

Start of Block: Backgound

Q2 Professional position

- ○ Undergraduate Student (10)
- ○ Graduate Student (1)
- ○ Post-Doctoral Fellow (9)
- ○ Faculty (2)
- ○ Other (8) _____

Q7 In what country are you based?

- ○ Pakistan (1)
- ○ United States (2)
- ○ Other (3) _____

Q8
How optimistic are you about the potential for information technology to improve governance in Pakistan?

- ○ Very pessimistic (1/5) (1)
- ○ Pessimistic (2/5) (2)
- ○ Not optimistic or pessimistic (3/5) (3)
- ○ Optimistic (4/5) (4)
- ○ Very optimistic (5/5) (5)
- ○ Don't know (6)
- ○ Refuse to answer (7)

Q9 How familiar are you with research on the use of information technology to improve governance?

- ○ Very unfamiliar (1/4) (1)
- ○ Unfamiliar (2/4) (2)
- ○ Familiar (3/4) (3)
- ○ Very familiar (4/4) (4)
- ○ Don't know (5)
- ○ Refuse to answer (6)

End of Block: Backgound

Start of Block: Program Overview

Q10 **Program Overview About the program:** In the months before the 2018 Provincial Assembly elections, we worked with 20 MPAs of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Assembly. These MPAs recorded audio messages in their own voices that were sent to the constituents of the MPAs through automated robocalls. These robocalls went sent out to 720 representative male heads-of-households across 6 of the most electorally competitive villages in each MPA's constituency. This totals to 14,400 households eligible to receive a call in the program. These people had previously agreed to be contacted by the MPA when giving their phone numbers to us. Each MPA recorded messages with two main components. 1. Each MPA recorded a message **updating** people on his latest activities and accomplishments. 2. Each MPA crafted and recorded a **question** about policy priorities that people could respond to using the keypad on their mobile phone. This feedback is used in a later set of calls that we will describe later. **Timeline:** Each respondent received up to two calls from their MPA between March and June of 2018. We are going to ask you to forecast the effects of these calls on peoples'--opinions and behavior that we measured through door-to-door surveys between August and October of 2018, after the general elections.

Display This Question:

If Group = PILOT COMPLIANCE

Or Group = PILOT

Q11 Pilot and Scale-up: This program was designed through a pilot that we conducted with one MPA in Charsadda-II in 2016 (shown in red on the map). This pilot was conducted with 1,200 households. The scale-up project was implemented in the blue areas in this map:

Display This Question:

If Group = COMPLIANCE

Or Group = NONE

Q33 This project was carried out in the areas in blue on the following map:

End of Block: Program Overview

Start of Block: Compliance forecasts

Display This Question:

If Group = PILOT COMPLIANCE

Or Group = COMPLIANCE

Q12 First, we want to ask about compliance. What percentage of people completed our program?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

What percentage of people we called answered the phone? All of these people agreed to receive a call from their MPA in a baseline survey. ()	
Among people who answered the phone, what percentage answered the question asked by the MPA? The call was recorded in the MPA's voice and the question came roughly 1 minute after the start of the call. ()	

End of Block: Compliance forecasts

Start of Block: Treatment effect forecasts

Q13 **Treatment effect forecasts**

You will now make forecasts in "standard deviation units" for ITT effects (i.e. ignoring take-up).

End of Block: Treatment effect forecasts

Start of Block: Comparison 1

Q16 COMPARISON 1 (ROBOCALL vs. CONTROL) Consider people who were called by their MPA with both the update about the MPA's activities and a question asking for feedback. Let's compare these people to those who received no call from the MPA.
Please note the units are standard deviation units.

Large negative effect	Medium negative effect	Small negative effect	No effect	Small positive effect	Medium positive effect	Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did calls affect peoples' evaluation of the MPA (MPA rating 1-10; MPA party rating 1-10; support for MPA party 0/1)? ()	
How did the calls affect peoples' evaluations of government performance (scales of whether state looks after them 1-5; importance of elections 1-5; provincial government competence 1-5)? ()	
How did the calls affect peoples' ability and willingness to hold MPAs accountable (political empowerment/efficacy scale 1-5; importance of MPA's performance in electoral choice 1-6)? ()	

End of Block: Comparison 1

Start of Block: Comparison 2

Q15 **COMPARISON 2 (RESPONSIVE vs GENERIC FOLLOW-UP)** After the first round of calls, some people received a follow-up call. Responsive calls thanked people for their input and specifically mentioned what action the MPA intended to take after receiving aggregated information from the first round of calls. Generic calls only thanked them for their input.

Please note the units are standard deviation units.

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' evaluation of the MPA (MPA rating 1-10; MPA party rating 1-10; support for MPA party 0/1)? ()	
How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' evaluations of government performance (scales of whether state looks after them 1-5; importance of elections 1-5; provincial government competence 1-5)? ()	
How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' ability and willingness to hold MPAs accountable (political empowerment/efficacy scale 1-5; importance of MPA's performance in electoral choice 1-6)? ()	

End of Block: Comparison 2

Start of Block: Update Forecasts

Display This Question:

If Group = COMPLIANCE

Or Group = NONE

Q23 **Pilot and Scale-up:** This program was designed through a pilot that we conducted with one MPA in Charsadda-II in 2016 (shown in red on the map). This pilot was conducted with 1,200 households. The scale-up project was implemented in the blue areas in this map:

Display This Question:

If Group = COMPLIANCE

Or Group = NONE

Q24

Q17 UPDATE FORECASTS

Now we want to give you an opportunity to update your forecasts. We will present you with the estimated treatment effect from our pilot with 1,200 HH in one constituency, your forecast from the previous section, and allow you to make a new forecast if you would like.

COMPARISON 1 (ROBOCALL vs. CONTROL) Consider people who were called by their MPA with both the update about the MPA's activities and a question asking for feedback. Let's compare these people to those who received no call from the MPA.

Please note the units are standard deviation units.

PILOT ESTIMATE: +0.09 standard deviation units
YOUR FORECAST: ${Q16/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/1} standard deviation units

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did calls affect peoples' evaluation of the MPA (MPA rating 1-10; MPA party rating 1-10; support for MPA party 0/1)? ()	

Q27 **PILOT ESTIMATE: -0.05 standard deviation units**YOUR FORECAST: ${Q16/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/2} standard deviation units

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did the calls affect peoples' evaluations of government performance (scales of whether state looks after them 1-5; importance of elections 1-5; provincial government competence 1-5)? ()	

Q28 **PILOT ESTIMATE: +0.12 standard deviation units**YOUR FORECAST: ${Q16/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/3} standard deviation units

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did the calls affect peoples' ability and willingness to hold MPAs accountable (political empowerment/efficacy scale 1-5; importance of MPA's performance in electoral choice 1-6)? ()	

Q29 COMPARISON 2 (RESPONSIVE vs GENERIC FOLLOW-UP) After the first round of calls, some people received a follow-up call. Responsive calls thanked people for their input and specifically mentioned what action the MPA intended to take after receiving aggregated information from the first round of calls. Generic calls only thanked them for their input. Please note the units are standard deviation units.

PILOT ESTIMATE: +0.01 standard deviation units

YOUR FORECAST: **${Q15/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/1}** standard deviation units

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' evaluation of the MPA (MPA rating 1-10; MPA party rating 1-10; support for MPA party 0/1)? ()	

Q31 **PILOT ESTIMATE: +0.03 standard deviation units**

YOUR FORECAST: ${Q15/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/2} standard deviation units

Large negative effect | Medium negative effect | Small negative effect | No effect | Small positive effect | Medium positive effect | Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' evaluations of government performance (scales of whether state looks after them 1-5; importance of elections 1-5; provincial government competence 1-5)? ()	

Q32 **PILOT ESTIMATE: +0.05 standard deviation units**
YOUR FORECAST: ${Q15/ChoiceNumericEntryValue/3} standard deviation units

Large negative effect	Medium negative effect	Small negative effect	No effect	Small positive effect	Medium positive effect	Large positive effect

-0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.25

How did receiving the responsive as compared to the generic follow-up affect peoples' ability and willingness to hold MPAs accountable (political empowerment/efficacy scale 1-5; importance of MPA's performance in electoral choice 1-6)? ()	

End of Block: Update Forecasts

Start of Block: Compliance forecasts - after survey

Display This Question:
If Group = NONE
Or Group = PILOT

Q22 Now we'd like to ask about compliance. What percentage of people completed our program?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

What percentage of people we called answered the phone? All of these people agreed to receive a call from their MPA in a baseline survey. ()	
Among people who answered the phone, what percentage answered the question asked by the MPA? The call was recorded in the MPA's voice and the question came roughly 1 minute after the start of the call. ()	

End of Block: Compliance forecasts - after survey