

Supplementary appendix for “Are Goodwill Ambassadors Good for Business? The Impact of Celebrities on IO Fundraising” (Malik and Thorvaldsdottir)

Appendix

Outcome Questions

- If you were going to give money to a charitable organization, would you be likely to give to UNICEF?
 - Yes
 - No, I would give to another organization. Which? _____
 - No, I don't give to charity
- If you were going to give money to a charitable cause, would you be likely to give in support of Girls' Education/Displaced Children (Respondents in T1 and T2 will see Girls' Education and those in T3 and T4 will see Displaced Children)?
 - Yes
 - No, I would give to another cause. Which? _____
 - No, I don't give to charity
- *(Half of the respondents will randomly get this question with the 'real world' component, the others will just get the hypothetical \$100 question. The order in which 'self' vs 'UNICEF' shows up in the response is also randomized.)*

As a thank you for participating in this survey, the researchers will randomly select one respondent's answer to this question and distribute money based on his/her choices.

Your answer has a 1/600 chance of being selected, in which case you will earn a bonus of the amount you choose to keep for yourself (If your answer is selected, the bonus you receive will be through MTurk, similar to how you get your participation reward).

Keeping that in mind, please answer the following: If you were given \$100 to divide between yourself and UNICEF for girls' education, how would you split the money? (The total must add up to \$100. Answers will be rounded to the nearest dollar.)

- Box for self
- Box for UNICEF
- Once you finish the survey, would you like to learn more about UNICEF and the causes that it supports?
 - Yes, I'd like to learn more about UNICEF's work on [Girls' Education/Displaced Children]. *(You will be provided with a website link at the end of this survey.)*
 - Yes, I'd like to learn more about UNICEF's work in general. *(You will be provided with a website link at the end of this survey.)*
 - No thank you, I would not like to learn more about UNICEF at this time.

Table A1: Treatment Vignette

Shakira (Treatment)



UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador Shakira

Expert (Control)



UNICEF Director General Henrietta H. Fore

Girls' Education

UNICEF works on several important issues, one of which is girls' education. Women are much more likely to be illiterate than men, constituting two thirds of the 774 million illiterate adult population. In the world today, there are approximately 65 million school-aged girls who are not receiving education and many of them will never attend a school in their lifetime. Not only does this have direct and immediate negative consequences for these girls' literacy and education, in the long term, it will also affect their health, income, general livelihood, and reduce the chances that any children they have will be healthy or well-educated.

Superstar Shakira, in her capacity as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, has publicly supported this issue, noting that it is a good deal for states to invest in girls' education because it will also bring returns to the state, thus making it an investment rather than charity.

In addition, UNICEF experts have noted that it is a good deal for states to invest in girls' education because it will also bring returns to the state, thus making it an investment rather than charity.

Displaced Children

UNICEF works on several important issues, one of which is supporting children who have been displaced due to conflicts or natural disasters. Refugee and displaced children and teenagers face significant challenges. Many of them have been separated from their families and they often encounter violence, exploitation, or discrimination. They miss out on education and cannot afford proper medical care. They often struggle in their new homes, as they have to learn a new language and integrate into a new culture. These difficulties can have physical and psychological effects that last into adulthood.

Superstar Shakira, in her capacity as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, has publicly supported this issue, saying that there are over 11 million child refugees in the world, many of whom have lost their families and their homes. She says that they need to be supported in building new lives in safe places until the violence at home ends.

UNICEF experts have noted that there are over 11 million child refugees in the world, many of whom have lost their families and their homes and need to be supported in building new lives in safe places until the violence at home ends.

Table A2: Number of respondents by treatment

	Endorser	
	Celebrity GA	Expert
Girls' Education	286 (154M, 132F)	270 (151M, 119F)
Displaced Children	282 (165M, 117F)	283 (155M, 128F)

Table A3: ANOVA tests for balance

Variable	Balanced
Male	✓
Age	✓
Hispanic	✓
White	✓
Democrat	✓
Independent	✓
Republican	✓
College Degree	✓
Low Income	✓
Have Children	✓
Freq. of news reading	✓
Country Knowledge	✓
Organization Knowledge	✓

Note: This table summarizes results from analysis of variance tests conducted for the listed variables in order to compare their means across all four treatment groups (namely *Shakira_GirlsEduc*, *Shakira_DisplacedChildren*, *Expert_GirlsEduc*, and *Expert_DisplacedChildren* to make sure that all of the groups are balanced on other covariates). A ✓ indicates that the p-value of the F-test was higher than 0.10. Note that *Country Knowledge* is based on a question that listed 15 countries and asked respondents to mark those that are in the continent of Africa while *Organization Knowledge* gave respondents a list of 10 organizations (some real and some hypothetical) and asked them to mark those that were actual international organizations. The number of correct answers is used in the ANOVA tests presented here. The purpose of these two questions was to check respondents' general awareness and knowledge of the world to ensure that differences in these do not drive our results.

Table A4: Dependent variable descriptives by treatment group

Statistic	N	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Min	Max
<i><u>Shakira_Girls' Education:</u></i>						
Amount Donated	286	37.892	40	29.665	0	100
Donate to UNICEF	286	0.706	1	0.456	0	1
Donate to Cause	286	0.804	1	0.398	0	1
Learn about UNICEF	286	0.371	0	0.484	0	1
<i><u>Shakira_Displaced Children:</u></i>						
Amount Donated	282	36.135	30	30.813	0	100
Donate to UNICEF	282	0.688	1	0.464	0	1
Donate to Cause	282	0.762	1	0.426	0	1
Learn about UNICEF	282	0.323	0	0.468	0	1
<i><u>Expert_Girls' Education:</u></i>						
Amount Donated	270	37.896	32.5	31.857	0	100
Donate to UNICEF	270	0.681	1	0.467	0	1
Donate to Cause	270	0.756	1	0.431	0	1
Learn about UNICEF	270	0.333	0	0.472	0	1
<i><u>Expert_Displaced Children:</u></i>						
Amount Donated	283	38.435	30	32.482	0	100
Donate to UNICEF	283	0.714	1	0.453	0	1
Donate to Cause	283	0.799	1	0.402	0	1
Learn about UNICEF	283	0.403	0	0.491	0	1

Table A5: Celebrity Endorsement and Attitudes towards UNICEF: Full Results

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Goodwill Amb.	-1.15 (1.86)	-1.13 (1.84)	-0.001 (0.03)	0.001 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)
Male		-3.97** (1.90)		-0.06** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.07*** (0.03)
Age		0.20** (0.08)		-0.0005 (0.001)		0.0001 (0.001)		0.001 (0.001)
Hispanic		6.29** (3.03)		0.12*** (0.04)		0.07* (0.04)		0.24*** (0.05)
White		-4.66** (2.29)		-0.10*** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.10*** (0.03)
Democrat		3.49 (2.58)		0.09** (0.04)		0.10*** (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)
Independent		0.33 (2.55)		-0.05 (0.04)		0.005 (0.03)		-0.07* (0.04)
College Degree		2.46 (1.91)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.003 (0.03)		0.04 (0.03)
Low Income		-4.69** (1.91)		0.002 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.03 (0.03)
Constant	38.17*** (1.33)	35.40*** (4.76)	0.70*** (0.02)	0.81*** (0.07)	0.78*** (0.02)	0.85*** (0.06)	0.37*** (0.02)	0.43*** (0.07)
N	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	-0.001	0.02	-0.001	0.04	-0.001	0.03	-0.0004	0.04

*** p < .01; ** p < .05; * p < .1

Note: This table presents our complete main results by summarizing the average treatment effect of a *Goodwill Ambassador* on four dependent variables. For each pair of regressions, the first specification is the baseline result while the second adds co-variates. Among the dependent variables *Amount Donated* refers to how much a respondent chose to donate to the UNICEF versus keep for themselves out of \$100, *Donate to UNICEF* is a dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent said ‘yes’ when asked if they would be likely to donate to the UNICEF if they were to give money to a charitable organization, *Donate to Cause* is a dummy coded 1 if the respondent said ‘yes’ when asked if they would be likely to donate to the cause they had read about if they were going to donate to a charitable cause, and *Learn about UNICEF* is a dummy coded 1 if the respondent said ‘yes’ to being interested in learning more about UNICEF’s work at the end of the study.

Table A6: Celebrity Endorsement, Ethnicity, and Attitudes towards UNICEF: Full results

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Goodwill Amb.	-2.15 (1.97)	-2.24 (1.95)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.005 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Hispanic	1.51 (4.26)	1.14 (4.26)	0.11* (0.06)	0.09 (0.06)	0.08 (0.06)	0.07 (0.06)	0.20*** (0.06)	0.19*** (0.06)
GA×Hisp.	9.29 (5.99)	10.20* (5.94)	0.04 (0.09)	0.06 (0.09)	-0.004 (0.08)	0.01 (0.08)	0.09 (0.09)	0.10 (0.09)
Male		-4.08** (1.90)		-0.06** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)
Age		0.19** (0.08)		-0.001 (0.001)		0.0000 (0.001)		0.001 (0.001)
White		-4.65** (2.29)		-0.10*** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.10*** (0.03)
Democrat		3.46 (2.58)		0.09** (0.04)		0.10*** (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)
Independent		0.25 (2.55)		-0.05 (0.04)		0.005 (0.03)		-0.07* (0.04)
College Degree		2.38 (1.91)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.003 (0.03)		0.04 (0.03)
Low Income		-4.83** (1.91)		0.001 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.03 (0.03)
Constant	38.01*** (1.40)	36.24*** (4.78)	0.69*** (0.02)	0.82*** (0.07)	0.77*** (0.02)	0.85*** (0.06)	0.35*** (0.02)	0.44*** (0.07)
N	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	0.004	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.001	0.03	0.02	0.04

*** p < .01; ** p < .05; * p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results for heterogeneous treatment effects of celebrity *Goodwill Ambassadors* on those who share an ethnicity with the celebrity. The four dependent variables and each specification is the same as presented in the main results.

Our sample has approximately 10% Latino and Hispanic respondents, which is significantly lower than the 18.5% in the US population ([United States Census, 2020](#)). To account for this, we re-weight our data to reflect the true population proportion (an approach commonly adopted in the survey literature when certain population segments are underrepresented). We do this by assigning weights based on the population-to-sample ratio for both Hispanics and non-Hispanics. For Hispanic respondents, each observation is weighted by $\frac{18.5}{10.79} = 1.715$ and for non-Hispanic respondents by $\frac{81.5}{89.21} = 0.9136$. Table [A7](#) shows results based on the re-weighted data and indicates the interaction effect is still positive and significant in the first two columns; the coefficient is smaller than before but has higher statistical significance.

Table A7: Celebrity Endorsement, Ethnicity re-weighted, and Attitudes Towards to UNICEF

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Shakira	-2.15 (2.18)	-2.20 (2.16)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Hispanic	19.27*** (2.51)	17.75*** (3.01)	0.43*** (0.04)	0.47*** (0.04)	0.44*** (0.03)	0.46*** (0.04)	0.37*** (0.04)	0.41*** (0.05)
Shak. × Hisp.	5.42** (2.32)	5.75** (2.31)	0.02 (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)	-0.002 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.05 (0.04)	0.06* (0.04)
Male		-3.58* (1.88)		-0.05* (0.03)		-0.06** (0.02)		-0.08*** (0.03)
Age		0.17** (0.08)		-0.0002 (0.001)		0.0005 (0.001)		0.0002 (0.001)
White		-4.05* (2.14)		-0.09*** (0.03)		-0.09*** (0.03)		-0.07** (0.03)
Democrat		2.57 (2.52)		0.06* (0.04)		0.07** (0.03)		-0.04 (0.04)
Independent		1.27 (2.50)		-0.06* (0.04)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.08** (0.04)
College Deg.		4.01** (1.88)		-0.001 (0.03)		0.01 (0.02)		0.06** (0.03)
Low Income		-3.88** (1.88)		-0.01 (0.03)		-0.03 (0.02)		-0.04 (0.03)
Constant	34.72*** (1.42)	32.06*** (4.42)	0.63*** (0.02)	0.73*** (0.06)	0.70*** (0.02)	0.77*** (0.06)	0.32*** (0.02)	0.44*** (0.07)
N	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	0.14	0.15	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.26	0.16	0.17

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results from a robustness check where we run the same specifications as the main results from Table A6 to investigate whether there are heterogeneous treatment effects of sharing an ethnicity with the celebrity Goodwill Ambassador but we *re-weight* the data to better reflect the proportion of Hispanics in the population.

Table A8: Celebrity Endorsement, Gender, and Attitudes towards UNICEF

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Goodwill Amb.	-4.91*	-4.97*	0.003	0.003	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02
	(2.77)	(2.75)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Male	-8.32***	-7.50***	-0.06	-0.06	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.08*	-0.08*
	(2.66)	(2.67)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
GA×Male	6.88*	6.96*	-0.01	-0.005	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.003
	(3.73)	(3.71)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Age		0.19**		-0.0005		0.0000		0.001
		(0.08)		(0.001)		(0.001)		(0.001)
Hispanic		6.03**		0.12***		0.07*		0.24***
		(3.03)		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.05)
White		-5.00**		-0.10***		-0.08***		-0.10***
		(2.29)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)
Democrat		3.42		0.09**		0.10***		0.01
		(2.58)		(0.04)		(0.03)		(0.04)
Independent		0.35		-0.05		0.005		-0.07*
		(2.55)		(0.04)		(0.03)		(0.04)
College Degree		2.48		-0.02		-0.003		0.04
		(1.90)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)
Low Income		-4.66**		0.002		-0.02		-0.03
		(1.90)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)
Constant	42.73***	37.72***	0.73***	0.81***	0.83***	0.85***	0.41***	0.43***
	(1.97)	(4.92)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.03)	(0.07)
N	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	0.01	0.03	0.002	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.004	0.04

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results for heterogeneous treatment effects of celebrity *Goodwill Ambassadors* by gender. The four dependent variables and each specification is the same as presented in earlier results.

Table A9: Celebrity Endorsement, Issues, and Attitudes towards UNICEF

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
G.Amb GE	-0.005 (2.65)	0.08 (2.62)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
G.Amb. DC	-1.76 (2.66)	-1.46 (2.63)	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.005 (0.04)
Expert DC	0.54 (2.66)	0.89 (2.63)	0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)	0.07* (0.04)	0.07* (0.04)
Male		-3.93** (1.90)		-0.06** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.07** (0.03)
Age		0.20** (0.08)		-0.0005 (0.001)		0.0001 (0.001)		0.001 (0.001)
Hispanic		6.32** (3.03)		0.12*** (0.04)		0.07* (0.04)		0.24*** (0.05)
White		-4.61** (2.29)		-0.10*** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.09*** (0.03)
Democrat		3.53 (2.59)		0.09** (0.04)		0.10*** (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)
Independent		0.36 (2.55)		-0.05 (0.04)		0.005 (0.03)		-0.07* (0.04)
College Degree		2.52 (1.91)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.001 (0.03)		0.04 (0.03)
Low Income		-4.68** (1.91)		0.002 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.03 (0.03)
Constant	37.90*** (1.90)	34.81*** (4.98)	0.68*** (0.03)	0.79*** (0.07)	0.76*** (0.03)	0.82*** (0.07)	0.33*** (0.03)	0.39*** (0.08)
N	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	-0.002	0.02	-0.002	0.03	-0.0000	0.03	0.002	0.05

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes the average treatment effect of a celebrity *Goodwill Ambassador* and two *different issues* on four dependent variables. The dependent variables and specifications are the same as all the tables before. In terms of the two issues, *GE* refers to Girls' Education and *DC* to Displaced Children where each respondent (randomly) read about *one* of these two issues in the vignette.

Table A10: Attention Robustness Check: Celebrity Endorsement and Attitudes towards UNICEF

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Goodwill Amb.	-1.30 (1.92)	-1.32 (1.91)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)
Male		-4.02** (1.96)		-0.05* (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.07** (0.03)
Age		0.21** (0.09)		-0.001 (0.001)		-0.0003 (0.001)		0.001 (0.001)
Hispanic		5.36* (3.19)		0.10** (0.05)		0.05 (0.04)		0.20*** (0.05)
White		-4.75** (2.38)		-0.10*** (0.03)		-0.07** (0.03)		-0.08** (0.04)
Democrat		3.56 (2.71)		0.11*** (0.04)		0.11*** (0.04)		0.03 (0.04)
Independent		0.36 (2.67)		-0.05 (0.04)		0.004 (0.04)		-0.05 (0.04)
College Degree		2.19 (1.97)		-0.04 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		0.04 (0.03)
Low Income		-4.90** (1.97)		0.01 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)
Constant	38.17*** (1.33)	35.48*** (4.91)	0.70*** (0.02)	0.81*** (0.07)	0.78*** (0.02)	0.86*** (0.06)	0.37*** (0.02)	0.41*** (0.07)
N	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067
Adj. R-squared	-0.001	0.02	-0.001	0.04	-0.001	0.03	0.001	0.03

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results from a robustness check where we run the same specifications as the main results from Table A5 but on a subset of respondents that *excludes* those who were in the celebrity Goodwill Ambassador treatment but did *not* remember seeing a celebrity. These results indicate that the null ATE is *not* driven by those who had not paid attention to the treatments (and therefore did not remember seeing a celebrity).

Table A11: Likeability Robustness Check: Celebrity Endorsement and Attitudes towards UNICEF

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Goodwill Amb.	-2.53 (1.98)	-2.59 (1.97)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.002 (0.03)	-0.001 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Male		-3.83* (2.02)		-0.07** (0.03)		-0.08*** (0.03)		-0.10*** (0.03)
Age		0.22** (0.09)		-0.001 (0.001)		-0.0004 (0.001)		0.002 (0.001)
Hispanic		3.72 (3.21)		0.09* (0.05)		0.05 (0.04)		0.22*** (0.05)
White		-3.30 (2.42)		-0.08** (0.04)		-0.07** (0.03)		-0.09** (0.04)
Democrat		2.39 (2.80)		0.06 (0.04)		0.06* (0.04)		0.02 (0.04)
Independent		-1.18 (2.78)		-0.08* (0.04)		-0.03 (0.04)		-0.05 (0.04)
College Degree		1.22 (2.02)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.01 (0.03)		0.02 (0.03)
Low Income		-5.66*** (2.02)		0.01 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.03 (0.03)
Constant	39.53*** (1.43)	37.13*** (5.11)	0.73*** (0.02)	0.85*** (0.07)	0.80*** (0.02)	0.91*** (0.07)	0.39*** (0.02)	0.44*** (0.08)
N	967	967	967	967	967	967	967	967
Adj. R-squared	0.001	0.02	-0.001	0.03	-0.001	0.02	0.0003	0.04

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results from a robustness check where we run the same specifications as the main results from Table A5 but on a subset of respondents that *excludes* those who strongly dislike Shakira or those who do not know who she is. These results indicate that the null ATE in our main results is *not* driven by those who do not know who she is or those who strongly dislike her.

The remaining results, in Tables A12 to A15, correspond to other pre-registered analyses that have not been discussed so far. We include them here primarily as robustness checks. Table A12 summarizes results from two dependent variables after excluding respondents who never donate to charity. In the main coding of the binary outcome variables *Donate to UNICEF* and *Donate to Cause*, the zeroes include respondents who said they would donate to a different organization or cause instead, respectively, *and* those who said they would not donate because they did not donate to *any* charity. We thus ensure that our null ATE is not driven by the ‘never donors.’

Tables A13 and A14 examine potential heterogeneous effects based on respondents’ political leanings where we limit the sample to respondents who clearly identify with one of the two parties. In the pre-analysis plan, we hypothesized that the issue of *Displaced Children* could be more politically divisive than *Girls’ Education*. Consequently, we expected less difference in donating to both issues among Democrats (compared to Republicans) regardless of endorser. As Table A13 indicates, we find no significant difference. Furthermore, we hypothesized that, among those treated, Democrats would have a smaller difference in their donation behaviour between issues than Republicans. Results of that analysis, which are in Table A14, show no difference.

Finally, Table A15 presents results on *Amount Donated* from one final randomization. When asked to divide \$100 between themselves and UNICEF, half the respondents were randomly told that one respondent’s choice would be selected at random and actually implemented; this is our ‘real world’ treatment. The purpose was to ensure that any findings were not driven by the hypothetical nature of the donation. Given the *lack* of significant findings, this randomization instead helps analyze whether that is driven by those in the ‘real’ version of the experiment. However, as Table A15 shows, we find that, while those in the ‘real world’ treatment donated approximately 6 USD less than others, on average, with this difference being statistically significant, there is no difference when interacting the two treatments.

Table A12: Celebrity Endorsement and Attitudes towards UNICEF - Robustness Check

	Donate to UNICEF (excl. 'never donors')		Donate to Cause (excl. 'never donors')	
Goodwill Amb.	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Male		-0.03 (0.02)		-0.05*** (0.02)
Age		-0.01*** (0.001)		-0.004*** (0.001)
Hispanic		0.11*** (0.04)		0.06* (0.03)
White		-0.11*** (0.03)		-0.07*** (0.02)
Democrat		0.09*** (0.03)		0.07*** (0.03)
Independent		-0.02 (0.03)		0.01 (0.03)
College Degree		-0.09*** (0.02)		-0.07*** (0.02)
Low Income		0.02 (0.02)		-0.03 (0.02)
Constant	0.83*** (0.02)	1.15*** (0.06)	0.90*** (0.01)	1.15*** (0.05)
N	952	952	979	979
Adj. R-squared	-0.001	0.09	-0.001	0.06

*** p < .01; ** p < .05; * p < .1

Note: This table summarizes results from a robustness check where we run the same specifications as the main results from Table A5 but *exclude* those respondents who, when asked if they would donate to *UNICEF* or to the *Cause* they had read about said 'No, I don't give to charity.' These results ensure that our lack of ATE in the main results is *not* driven by those who are simply not charitable donors in any situation. Note that this robustness check is only relevant in the case of these two afore-mentioned dependent variables as the other two dependent variable questions did not have an option that took into account 'never donors.'

Table A13: Political Leaning and Issue Interaction Effect (Across Treatments)

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Democrat	4.78 (3.66)	4.54 (3.62)	0.08 (0.05)	0.07 (0.05)	0.10** (0.05)	0.09* (0.05)	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)
Girls' Educ.	4.04 (4.13)	4.66 (4.08)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.06)	0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)	-0.14** (0.07)	-0.13** (0.07)
Dem. × GE	-1.96 (5.08)	-2.50 (5.03)	0.06 (0.07)	0.05 (0.07)	0.04 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)	0.11 (0.08)	0.11 (0.08)
Male		-6.31*** (2.44)		-0.08** (0.03)		-0.09*** (0.03)		-0.05 (0.04)
Age		0.16 (0.11)		0.001 (0.002)		0.001 (0.001)		0.002 (0.002)
Hispanic		3.34 (3.86)		0.11** (0.06)		0.10** (0.05)		0.20*** (0.06)
White		-4.75 (3.05)		-0.11*** (0.04)		-0.07* (0.04)		-0.13** (0.05)
College Degree		4.99** (2.47)		0.01 (0.04)		0.03 (0.03)		0.05 (0.04)
Low Income		-6.76*** (2.45)		-0.01 (0.04)		-0.02 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.04)
Constant	34.16*** (2.96)	35.06*** (6.14)	0.69*** (0.04)	0.77*** (0.09)	0.73*** (0.04)	0.78*** (0.08)	0.45*** (0.05)	0.46*** (0.10)
N	646	646	646	646	646	646	646	646
Adj. R-squared	0.001	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.003	0.03

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes the interaction effects of the issue a respondent read about and whether they identify as a *Democrat* (or *Republican*). The data is pooled across the endorser. The four dependent variables and each specification is otherwise the same as presented in earlier results. Note that the regressions are all run on the subset of respondents who clearly identify as either a Democrat or Republican.

Table A14: Political Leaning-Issue Interaction Effect within Celebrity Treatment

	Amount Donated		Donate to UNICEF		Donate to Cause		Learn about UNICEF	
Democrat	8.75*	7.96	0.07	0.05	0.12*	0.10	0.06	0.03
	(5.20)	(5.20)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Girls' Educ.	9.10	9.40	0.01	-0.002	0.11	0.11	-0.05	-0.05
	(5.88)	(5.86)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Dem. × GE	-8.39	-8.34	0.05	0.06	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.04
	(7.15)	(7.15)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Male		-2.02		-0.04		-0.05		-0.04
		(3.44)		(0.05)		(0.05)		(0.06)
Age		0.16		-0.0000		0.0002		0.002
		(0.15)		(0.002)		(0.002)		(0.002)
Hispanic		7.55		0.15*		0.10		0.20**
		(5.66)		(0.08)		(0.07)		(0.09)
White		-6.86		-0.15**		-0.10*		-0.17**
		(4.31)		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.07)
College Degree		5.19		-0.04		-0.003		0.03
		(3.56)		(0.05)		(0.05)		(0.06)
Low Income		-1.48		-0.03		-0.01		-0.07
		(3.56)		(0.05)		(0.05)		(0.06)
Constant	31.35***	29.02***	0.67***	0.84***	0.67***	0.78***	0.37***	0.44***
	(4.29)	(8.77)	(0.06)	(0.13)	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.07)	(0.14)
N	323	323	323	323	323	323	323	323
Adj. R-squared	0.003	0.02	0.003	0.02	0.02	0.03	-0.003	0.03

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes the heterogeneous treatment effects of the celebrity *Goodwill Ambassador* and the issue a respondent reads about based on whether respondents identify as *Democrats* (versus Republicans). The four dependent variables and each specification is the same as presented in earlier results. Note that the regressions are all run on the subset of respondents who clearly identify as either a Democrat or Republican and respondents who received the celebrity treatment.

Table A15: Donations to UNICEF: Real v Hypothetical Donation Question

	Amount Donated	
Shakira	-1.98 (2.64)	-2.14 (2.62)
Real	-7.03*** (2.64)	-6.73** (2.63)
Shakira × Real	1.56 (3.71)	1.86 (3.68)
Male		-3.50* (1.89)
Age		0.17** (0.08)
White		-5.56** (2.27)
Democrat		3.68 (2.58)
Independent		0.55 (2.54)
College Degree		2.31 (1.90)
Low Income		-4.63** (1.90)
Constant	41.76*** (1.89)	40.95*** (4.88)
N	1121	1121
Adj. R-squared	0.01	0.03

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Note: This table summarizes the heterogeneous treatment effects of the celebrity *Goodwill Ambassador* and whether the respondent was told that one person's *amount donated* would be randomly selected by the researchers to implement (*Real*) or not. Since this prompt was randomly shown to half the respondents for the question on the amount they would donate, the results presented pertain to only that dependent variable.

References

United States Census. 2020. "Hispanic Heritage Month 2020." tex.entrytype: electronic.

URL: <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2020/hispanic-heritage->

month.html

Ethics details

The experiment did not use any deception and respondents' consent was obtained by providing participant information and a consent statement before respondents clicked to start the online survey. That is, proceeding with the survey implied informed consent had been obtained, which participants knew before beginning to see any questions in the survey. Participants who completed the survey received a \$1.50 participation fee through MTurk.