Appendix A

Survey Details

A.1 SURVEYS WITH POLITICIANS IN MALAWI

I conducted three separate surveys with politicians in Malawi. All surveys were codesigned and fielded by Brigitte Seim at the University of Minnesota. Jimmy Mkandawire (Malawi Ministry of Labour and Statistics) and Johan Ahlbäck (LSE) were responsible for on-site management of these surveys. Additional assistance was also provided by Petra Matsi and Nonne Engelbrecht. The survey firm, rtSurvey, assisted with the technology for displaying the survey and managing survey output for most of these studies. The enumeration itself was always conducted by a trained and local enumeration team.[1]

First, in 2015 and 2016, we conducted an in-person survey with 333 elected councilors. The purpose of this survey was to collect information about councilor spending decisions and to pilot the experimental protocol we describe in Chapter 6. I especially draw on this study to assess the effects of foreign aid on voting in Chapter 5. This was an in-person survey with trained Malawian enumerators. Further details on this survey can be found at Jablonski and Seim (2018). A full survey instrument can be found on the preregistration statement at http://egap.org/registration/1588.

Second, following this survey, we randomly sampled 101 of these councilors for a follow-up phone survey. This phone survey asked the politicians to describe in more detail how they get information about constituents and donor activities. It also asked politicians to describe their recent interactions with donors. I draw on this survey in Chapter 2

[1] Jimmy Mkandawire, Bright Chimatiro, Francis Kamungu, Frank Sulamoyo, Richard Ganiza, Frazier Mkwaila, Hector Honde, and Felix Chauluka.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009789127.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to explain how frequently politicians interact with different kinds of donors.

Third, in spring of 2017, we conducted a third survey with 125 in-office Members of Parliament (MPs) and 335 in-office Local Councilors (LCs) in Malawi, or 63 percent and 73 percent of each population, respectively. The purpose of this survey was to collect information about what politicians know about their constituencies, as well as to field the experiment described in Chapter 6. We also collected additional information about politicians' interactions with donors as described in Chapter 2. Further details on this survey can be found in Jablonski and Seim (2023). All original survey instruments can be found on the dataverse at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/HS5R5S. I draw on data from this survey to describe heterogeneity in politician-donor relationships in Chapter 2. I also draw on these data to assess the effects of the experimental treatments described in Chapter 6.

No politicians refused to participate in these surveys. The main reason for sample attrition was the difficulty of reaching some politicians (particularly MPs) due to their frequent travel schedule. Some politicians were also excluded for data availability reasons. See attrition statistics in Appendix A. All participants were offered compensation for their time.

These surveys were funded by AidData at the College of William and Mary and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Global Development Lab through cooperative agreement AID-OAA-A-12-00096, by The Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines, and by the London School of Economics and Political Science.

These studies were reviewed and approved by the London School of Economics Research Ethics Committee and the Malawi National Commission on Science and Technology of Malawi. Participants provided verbal consent prior to participating in all studies. Per agreement with interviewees and ethics bodies, all identifying information is redacted.

A.1.1 Politician Sample Characteristics

We have 460 politicians included in the main politician survey referred to in the text. Out of 462 Local Councilors (LCs), 335 were included in the sample. Out of 193 MPs, 125 were included in our sample. Politicians were excluded largely due to missing data on key variables (e.g., due to by-elections) or because there were not enough schools to make the treatment protocol feasible. Additionally, a few MPs were excluded

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009789127.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE A.1 *Local councilor sample statistics*

Variable	In_Sample	Out_of_Sample
Mean School Enrollment	938.859 (411.212)	1566.974 (964.155)
Mean Number of Teachers	13.26 (5.631)	20.948 (12.028)
Mean Student to Teacher Ratio	72.946 (18.749)	77.365 (26.933)
Number of Aid Projects	11.03 (10.836)	4.681 (7.567)
Number of Schools	12.94 (6.226)	6.447 (5.295)
Turnout	0.699 (0.086)	0.678 (0.129)
Incumbent Victory Margin	0.259 (0.193)	0.172 (0.148)
Registered Voters	18090.91 (7642.809)	15736.553 (14056.628)
Incumbent Percent	0.49 (0.143)	0.436 (0.12)
DPP Incumbent	0.334 (0.471)	0.468 (0.504)
UDF Incumbent	0.036 (0.186)	0.021 (0.146)
MCP Incumbent	0.232 (0.422)	0.234 (0.428)
PP Incumbent	0.104 (0.306)	0.043 (0.204)
Independent Incumbent	0.069 (0.253)	0.064 (0.247)
Average School Population Density	11.356 (15.838)	39.7 (63.663)

because they were travelling or otherwise unavailable. No politicians refused to participate.

Our sample is reasonably representative of the country as a whole. In Tables A.1 and A.2, we show variable means for included and excluded wards and constituencies with standard deviations in parentheses.

Across both groups, population characteristics (turnout and number of registered voters) are well balanced. Since we were forced to exclude some smaller wards, our LC sample includes, on average, more schools and lower average enrolment. We generally see good balance on political characteristics of MPs and LCs. It is perhaps noteworthy that we sampled fewer ruling party (DPP) MPs. This is likely due to the fact that ruling party MPs are more likely to travel on a regular basis and were therefore harder to contact.

See also Appendix E for analysis of the relationship between experimental treatment variables and attrition.

A.2 SURVEY WITH CITIZENS IN MALAWI

In October 2016 I conducted an in-person panel survey with citizens in Malawi to assess the views of recipient teachers and citizens about

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009789127.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE A.2 *MP sample statistics*

Variable	In_Sample	Out_of_Sample
Mean School Enrollment	938.859 (411.212)	1566.974 (964.155)
Mean Number of Teachers	13.26 (5.631)	20.948 (12.028)
Mean Student to Teacher Ratio	72.946 (18.749)	77.365 (26.933)
Number of Aid Projects	11.03 (10.836)	4.681 (7.567)
Number of Schools	12.94 (6.226)	6.447 (5.295)
Turnout	0.699 (0.086)	0.678 (0.129)
Incumbent Victory Margin	0.259 (0.193)	0.172 (0.148)
Registered Voters	18090.91 (7642.809)	15736.553 (14056.628)
Incumbent Percent	0.49 (0.143)	0.436 (0.12)
DPP Incumbent	0.334 (0.471)	0.468 (0.504)
UDF Incumbent	0.036 (0.186)	0.021 (0.146)
MCP Incumbent	0.232 (0.422)	0.234 (0.428)
PP Incumbent	0.104 (0.306)	0.043 (0.204)
Independent Incumbent	0.069 (0.253)	0.064 (0.247)
Average School Population Density	11.356 (15.838)	39.7 (63.663)

foreign aid and relationships with politicians. This survey was codesigned and fielded by Brigitte Seim at the University of Minnesota. Jimmy Mkandawire (Malawi Ministry of Labour and Statistics) and Johan Ahlbäck (LSE) were responsible for on-site management of the survey. The survey firm, rtSurvey, assisted with the technology for displaying the survey and managing survey output.

The survey was designed to overlap with a set of decisions that politicians in Malawi made over the allocation of goods to schools in Malawi. We utilized a hierarchical sampling procedure in order to select the schools to be included in this survey. We began with the sample of 333 wards which were involved in piloting activities. From these, we then randomly selected 60 wards, stratified by region, to be involved in the survey.

This process resulted in a total intended sample of 13 people per school at three schools in 60 wards, or 2340 people at 163 schools. Because of logistical issues in sampling from some communities, the total sample was 2019.

Within the community surrounding each school, we used a random walk procedure to sample potential voters in the area. A team of two Malawian enumerators first located the school and recorded its GPS

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009789127.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

coordinates. Then, they spun a bottle and walked in the direction of the bottle opening. They sampled the male head of household at the first house, skipped two houses, and then sampled the female head of household at the next (fourth) house. They then continued until they had sampled six heads of households in that direction, at which point they returned to the school and repeated the process in a different direction, sampling a female head of household the second time. There were almost no instances of participants refusing to participate, but where this occurred or where the head of household was not home, the house was skipped, and the sampling procedure simply ignored this house in the random walk pattern.

All participants gave verbal consent to participate and were given between MK200 ($0.25) and MK1000 ($1.25) as a token of appreciation for their time (the payment was greater for head teachers and greater at baseline).

As described in Chapter 5, the survey was a panel. In December 2016, we attempted to recontact all individuals involved in the original survey. We successfully interviewed 1,502 of the same individuals at endline.

Further details on this survey, including the survey instrument can be found in the preregistration statement at https://osf.io/zuxw6.

A.3 SURVEY WITH TEACHERS IN MALAWI

Our survey of head teachers focused on the same schools as those used for the survey of citizens (as described above). At each sampled school, enumerators were instructed to contact the head teacher. In total, they were able to contact 314 head teachers at 311 school. The survey covered a number of topics, including the condition of the school, the investments of donors and politicians in the school, and perceptions of politician performance.

We also contacted 119 teachers again at endline. The lower number of respondents is due to the fact that we only visited those schools that had both teacher and citizen surveys at baseline.

Further details on this survey, including the survey instrument can be found in the preregistration statement at https://osf.io/zuxw6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009789127.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press