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| ***Table A1:*** *The Effect of Prior Attitudes on Correct Interpretations (Logistic Regression Analysis)**Panel A: Politician sample*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** | **Model 6** | **Model 7** | **Model 8** |
| Pro public sector | -3.47\*\*\*(0.99) | 2.77\*\*\*(0.68) | -0.84(0.69) | 0.76(0.74) | -2.61\*\*\*(0.71) | 1.25(0.73) | -0.17(0.61) | -0.27(0.64) |
| Intercept | 3.72\*\*\*(0.86) | -0.33(0.45) | 1.75\*\*(0.51) | 0.79(0.50) | 2.13\*\*\*(0.51) | 0.44(0.47) | 1.09\*(0.47) | 1.39\*\*(0.45) |
| Wald Chi2 | 12.19\*\*\* | 16.43\*\*\* | 1.47 | 1.03 | 13.72\*\*\* | 2.91 | 0.08 | 0.18 |
| n | 127 | 124 | 118 | 118 | 106 | 107 | 120 | 123 |
| Data | Schools;T1 | Schools;T2 | Schools;P1 | Schools;P2 | Roads;T1 | Roads;T2 | Roads;P1 | Roads;P2 |

*Panel B: Citizen sample*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** | **Model 6** | **Model 7** | **Model 8** |
| Pro public sector | -2.28\*\*(0.77) | 3.31\*\*\*(0.79) | 0.14(0.65) | -0.74(0.72) | -1.27(0.68) | 0.67(0.78) | -0.55(0.69) | 0.27(0.70) |
| Intercept | 1.87\*\*\*(0.48) | -1.09\*(0.47) | 0.63(0.43) | 1.05\*(0.44) | 0.96\*(0.44) | 0.52(0.49) | 0.74(0.42) | 0.54(0.42) |
| Wald Chi2 | 8.80\*\* | 17.48\*\*\* | 0.05 | 1.08 | 3.50 | 0.74 | 0.64 | 0.15 |
| n | 121 | 126 | 128 | 125 | 128 | 126 | 123 | 129 |
| Data | Schools;T1 | Schools;T2 | Schools;P1 | Schools;P2 | Roads;T1 | Roads;T2 | Roads;P1 | Roads;P2 |

*Note:* The dependent variable measures whether respondents identify the supplier with the highest rate of satisfaction as being the one that performs best. \*\*\*;\*\*;\*: P<0.001; 0.01; 0.05; two-sided significance tests. Entries are logistic regression coefficients. Robust standard errors in parentheses.***Table A2:*** *Differences between politician and citizen responses to experiment 1 and 2*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** | **Model 6** | **Model 7** | **Model 8**  |
| Prior attitudes (pro public sector) | 0.14(0.65) | -0.74(0.71) | -0.55(0.69) | 0.27(0.70) | -2.28\*\*(0.77) | 3.31\*\*\*(0.79) | -1.27(0.68) | 0.67(0.78) |
| Politician dummy | 1.12(0.66) | -0.26(0.66) | 0.34(0.62) | 0.84(0.61) | 1.85(0.98) | 0.76(0.65) | 1.17(0.67) | -0.08(0.68) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment dummy | 1.24(0.64) | -2.14\*\*(0.64) | 0.21(0.60) | -0.02(0.65) | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior attitudes x politicianPrior attitudes x treatmentPolitician x treatmentPrior attitudes x politician x treatment | -0.98(0.94)-2.42\*(1.00)0.73(1.18)-0.21(1.57) | 1.50(1.03)4.05\*\*\*(1.06)1.02(0.93)-2.03(1.47) | 0.38(0.92)-0.72(0.97)0.83(0.91)-1.72(1.34) | -0.55(0.95)0.40(1.05)-0.92(0.91)1.12(1.43) | -1.19(1.25)------ | -0.53(1.04)------ | -1.34(0.98)------ | 0.57(1.07)------ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 0.63(0.43) | 1.05\*(0.44) | 0.74(0.41) | 0.54(0.42) | 1.87\*\*\*(0.48) | -1.09\*(0.47) | 0.96\*(0.44) | 0.52(0.49) |
| Wald Chi2 | 27.31\*\*\* | 43.43\*\*\* | 26.00\*\*\* | 8.15 | 21.80\*\*\* | 36.99\*\*\* | 17.91\*\*\* | 4.22 |
| N | 494 | 493 | 477 | 485 | 248 | 250 | 234 | 233 |
| Data | Schools;T1, P1 | Schools;T2, P2 | Roads;T1, P1 | Roads;T2, P2 | Schools;T1 | Schools;T2 | Roads;T1 | Roads;T2 |

*Note:* The dependent variable measures whether politicians identify the supplier with the highest rate of satisfaction as being the one that performs best. \*\*\*;\*\*;\*: P<0.001; 0.01; 0.05; two-sided significance tests. Entries are logistic regression coefficients. Robust standard errors in parentheses. |
| ***Table A3:*** *Differences between politician and citizen responses in experiment 3* |
|  | Model 1Private provider performs best | Model 2Private provider performs best | Model 3Public provider performs best | Model 4Public provider performs best |
| Prior attitudes (pro public) | -2.076\*\*\*(0.360) | -1.854\*\*(0.590) | 2.805\*\*\*(0.385) | 3.358\*\*\*(0.669) |
| Politician | 0.53(0.328) | -0.107(0.512) | 0.719\*(0.314) | 1.241\*(0.552) |
| One piece of information | Ref.  | Ref.  | Ref. | Ref. |
| Three pieces of information | 0.018(0.165) | 0.687(0.568) | -0.052(0.171) | 0.699(0.579) |
| Five pieces of information | 0.030(0.167) | -0.376(0.522) | 0.224(0.179) | 0.432(0.583) |
| Prior attitudes x Politician | -0.068(0.476) | 0.604(0.763) | -0.503(0.515) | -1.460(0.876) |
| Three pieces x Prior attitudes |  | -1.330(0.919) |  | -1.171(0.932) |
| Five pieces x Prior attitudes |  | 0.470(0.836) |  | -0.421(0.948) |
| Three pieces x Politician |  | 0.416(0.816) |  | -0.773(0.766) |
| Five pieces x Politician |  | 1.649\*(0.784) |  | -0.821(0.779) |
| Prior attitudes x Three pieces x Politician |  | -0.089(1.202) |  | 1.328(1.222) |
| Prior attitudes x Five pieces x Politician |  | -2.028(1.124) |  | 1.740(1.315) |
| Constant | 1.381\*\*\*(0.241) | 1.335\*\*\*(0.366) | -1.120\*\*\*(0.260) | -1.419\*\*(0.425) |
| Wald chi2 | 83.40 | 88.04 | 104.77 | 105.79 |
| n | 993 | 993 | 967 | 967 |
| *Note:* The dependent variable measures whether respondents identify the provider with the highest rehabilitation success rate as being the one that performs best. \*\*\*;\*\*;\*: P<0.001; 0.01; 0.05; two sided significance tests. Entries are logistic regression coefficients. Robust standard errors in parentheses. |