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# 1. Full survey questions Australia

Every year the Australian government gives aid money to poorer countries. Currently just under $1 out of every $100 of federal government spending is given as aid. Which one of the following options best reflects your opinion about aid spending: The Australian government gives far too much aid; The Australian government gives too much aid; The Australian government gives about the right amount of aid; The Australian government gives too little aid; The Australian government gives far too little aid; Don’t know.

About 30% of Australian foreign aid is spent in the Pacific. The rest is spent in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Do you think that Australia should: Spend more than 30% of its aid on the Pacific; Keep spending about 30% on the Pacific; Spend less than 30% of its aid on the Pacific; Don’t know.

Do you think Australian government aid to poor countries should be given primarily for the purpose of helping people in poor countries, or do you think Australian aid should be given primarily to help advance Australian interests and help Australians?: Strongly favour helping people in poor countries; Favour helping people in poor countries; Favour Australia's interests; Strongly favour Australia's interests; Don’t know.

# 2. Treatment New Zealand

*New research shows China is now an important aid donor to the Pacific*

October 2019

China is now an important provider of foreign aid to the Pacific according to a new study from the Australian foreign policy think tank the Lowy Institute.

The Lowy Institute’s work shows that in 2017, the most recent year with data, China was the fourth largest donor to Pacific Island countries, giving more money than the United States, but less than Australia, New Zealand and Japan.

Commenting on the finding, Jonathan Pryke, Director of the Lowy Institute’s Pacific Islands Program, said: “China is now in the top tier of aid donors to the Pacific. This will have economic and strategic ramifications. Aid can buy power. We need to keep things in perspective though. New Zealand, Japan and Australia all still give more aid to the Pacific than China does.”

# 3. Full Survey Questions New Zealand

Every year the New Zealand government gives aid money to poorer countries. Currently just under $1 out of every $100 of government spending is given as aid. Which one of the following options best reflects your opinion about aid spending: The New Zealand government gives far too much aid; The New Zealand government gives too much aid; The New Zealand government gives about the right amount of aid; The New Zealand government gives too little aid; The New Zealand government gives far too little aid; Don’t know.

About 65% of New Zealand aid is spent in the Pacific. The rest is spent in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Do you think that New Zealand should: Spend more than 65% of its aid on the Pacific; Keep spending about 65% on the Pacific; Spend less than 65% of its aid on the Pacific; Don’t know.

Do you think New Zealand government aid to poor countries should be given primarily for the purpose of helping people in poor countries, or do you think New Zealand aid should be given primarily to help advance New Zealand’s strategic and commercial interests? Strongly favour helping people in poor countries; Favour helping people in poor countries; Favour New Zealand’s interests;

Strongly favour New Zealand’s interests; Don’t know.

# 4. Balance Table Australia

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (1) |  | (2) |  | (3) | t-test | t-test | t-test |
|  |  | Control |  | Measured |  | Forceful | Difference | Difference | Difference |
| Variable | N | Mean/SE | N | Mean/SE | N | Mean/SE | (1)-(2) | (1)-(3) | (2)-(3) |
| Urban | 673 | 0.826 | 660 | 0.821 | 668 | 0.825 | 0.005 | 0.001 | -0.004 |
|  |  | (0.015) |  | (0.015) |  | (0.015) |  |  |  |
| Over fifty | 673 | 0.441 | 660 | 0.442 | 668 | 0.446 | -0.001 | -0.005 | -0.004 |
|  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  |  |  |
| Male | 673 | 0.467 | 660 | 0.471 | 668 | 0.461 | -0.005 | 0.005 | 0.010 |
|  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  |  |  |
| Academic education | 669 | 0.393 | 653 | 0.413 | 665 | 0.385 | -0.020 | 0.008 | 0.029 |
|  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  |  |  |
| Income per person | 615 | 33689.6 | 592 | 33628.5 | 601 | 33574.3 | 61.1 | 115.3 | 54.1 |
|  |  | (977.2) |  | (1054.5) |  | (1026.1) |  |  |  |
| Political right | 489 | 0.470 | 497 | 0.457 | 487 | 0.472 | 0.014 | -0.002 | -0.016 |
|  |  | (0.023) |  | (0.022) |  | (0.023) |  |  |  |
| Wave of survey | 673 | 0.499 | 660 | 0.498 | 668 | 0.499 | 0.001 | 0.001 | -0.000 |
|  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  |  |  |
| The value displayed for t-tests are the differences in the means across the groups. | | | | | | | | | |
| \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level. | | | | | | | | | |

# 5. Balance Table New Zealand

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (1) |  | (2) | t-test |
|  |  | Control |  | Treatment | Difference |
| Variable | N | Mean/SE | N | Mean/SE | (1)-(2) |
| Urban | 584 | 0.829 | 563 | 0.831 | -0.002 |
|  |  | (0.016) |  | (0.016) |  |
| Over 60 | 584 | 0.272 | 563 | 0.270 | 0.002 |
|  |  | (0.018) |  | (0.019) |  |
| Male | 584 | 0.490 | 563 | 0.472 | 0.017 |
|  |  | (0.021) |  | (0.021) |  |
| Professional | 584 | 0.293 | 563 | 0.279 | 0.014 |
|  |  | (0.019) |  | (0.019) |  |
| Income | 500 | 75780 | 494 | 70789 | 4991\* |
|  |  | (1935) |  | (1842) |  |
| Left | 584 | 0.442 | 563 | 0.456 | -0.015 |
|  |  | (0.021) |  | (0.021) |  |
| Value for t-tests is differences in the means across the groups. | | | | | |
| \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* show significance at 1, 5, & 10 percent level. | | | | | |

# 6. Full regression models Australia

## 6.1 Australian attitudes on aid volume

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks Australia gives too much aid. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the two treatment groups and the control group; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**Too much aid**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Too much aid  (OLS) | Too much aid  (logit) | Too much aid  (logit w controls) |
| Group (control omitted) |  |  |  |
| Measured | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.32\*\*\* | -0.33\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.12) | (0.14) |
| Forceful | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* | -0.52\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.12) | (0.14) |
| Urban |  |  | -0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.15) |
| Aged over 50 |  |  | -0.27\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Male |  |  | -0.01 |
|  |  |  | (0.11) |
| Party (right omitted) |  |  |  |
| Labor |  |  | -0.86\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.13) |
| Greens |  |  | -1.64\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.23) |
| Other |  |  | 0.59\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.18) |
| Academic education |  |  | -0.89\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Income per person |  |  | -0.00\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Survey date |  |  | -0.22\* |
|  |  |  | (0.11) |
| Constant | 0.52\*\*\* | 0.07 | 1.20\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.08) | (0.22) |
| Observations | 1816 | 1816 | 1488 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about aid volume (too much, right, too little). Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Aid volume (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Measured treatment* |  |  |
| Too much aid | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.08\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| About right | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Too little aid | -0.01 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| *Forceful treatment* |  |  |
| Too much aid | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| About right | 0.06\*\* | 0.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Too little aid | 0.03 | 0.04\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Observations | 1816 | 1488 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

## 6.2 Australian attitudes on Pacific focus of aid

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks Australia should focus a higher share of its aid on the Pacific. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the two treatment groups and the control group; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**More to Pacific**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | More Pacific (OLS) | More Pacific (logit) | More Pacific (logit) |
| Group (control omitted) |  |  |  |
| Measured | 0.05\* | 0.26\* | 0.32\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.14) | (0.15) |
| Forceful | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.42\*\*\* | 0.48\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.13) | (0.15) |
| Urban |  |  | -0.23 |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |
| Aged over 50 |  |  | 0.52\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.13) |
| Male |  |  | 0.44\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Party (right omitted) |  |  |  |
| Labor |  |  | 0.29\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.14) |
| Greens |  |  | 0.61\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.22) |
| Other |  |  | 0.22 |
|  |  |  | (0.19) |
| Academic education |  |  | 0.18 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) |
| Income per person |  |  | 0.00\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Survey date |  |  | 0.19 |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Constant | 0.26\*\*\* | -1.06\*\*\* | -1.96\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.10) | (0.24) |
| Observations | 1647 | 1647 | 1358 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about the share of Australian aid that should be focused on the Pacific. Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Share to pacific (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Measured* |  |  |
| More to Pacific | 0.05\* | 0.07\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Same | 0.05\* | 0.06\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Less to Pacific | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| *Forceful* |  |  |
| More to Pacific | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Same | 0.02 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Less to Pacific | -0.11\*\*\* | -0.15\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 1647 | 1358 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

## 6.3 Australian attitudes on Purpose of aid

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks Australia should focus more of its aid on advancing Australian interests. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the two treatment groups and the control group; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**Favour aid used to advance Australian Interests**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Favour Australia  (OLS) | Favour Australia (logit) | Favour Australia  (logit w controls) |
| Group (control omitted) |  |  |  |
| Measured | -0.06\*\* | -0.26\*\* | -0.20 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.12) | (0.13) |
| Forceful | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.39\*\*\* | -0.47\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.12) | (0.13) |
| Urban |  |  | 0.04 |
|  |  |  | (0.15) |
| Aged over 50 |  |  | -0.50\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.11) |
| Male |  |  | 0.13 |
|  |  |  | (0.11) |
| Party (right omitted) |  |  |  |
| Labor |  |  | -0.73\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.13) |
| Greens |  |  | -1.30\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.20) |
| Other |  |  | 0.07 |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |
| Academic education |  |  | -0.56\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Income per person |  |  | -0.00\* |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Survey date |  |  | -0.09 |
|  |  |  | (0.11) |
| Constant | 0.60\*\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 1.31\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.08) | (0.21) |
| Observations | 1844 | 1844 | 1506 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about whether aid should be used to advance Australia’s interests or to help people in poorer countries. Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Favour aid help Australia or help poor (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Measured* |  |  |
| Favour Australia | -0.06\*\* | -0.05 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Favour poor | 0.06\*\* | 0.05 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| *Forceful* |  |  |
| Favour Australia | -0.10\*\*\* | -0.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Favour poor | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 1844 | 1506 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

# 7. Full regression models New Zealand

## 7.1 New Zealand attitudes on aid volume

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks New Zealand gives too much aid. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the treatment and control groups; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**Too much aid**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Too much aid  (OLS) | Too much aid  (logit) | Too much aid  (logit w controls) |
| Treatment | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.36\*\*\* | -0.43\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.13) | (0.14) |
| Urban |  |  | 0.04 |
|  |  |  | (0.19) |
| Over 60 |  |  | -0.12 |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |
| Male |  |  | 0.10 |
|  |  |  | (0.14) |
| Support left party |  |  | -0.76\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |
| Other |  |  | 0.04 |
|  |  |  | (0.21) |
| Manager or professional |  |  | -0.20 |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |
| Income |  |  | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Constant | 0.35\*\*\* | -0.62\*\*\* | -0.24 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.09) | (0.27) |
| Observations | 1070 | 1070 | 941 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about aid volume (too much, right, too little). Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Aid volume (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Treatment effect* |  |  |
| Too much aid | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| About right | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Too little aid | -0.01 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Observations | 1070 | 941 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

## 7.2 New Zealand attitudes on Pacific focus of aid

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks New Zealand should focus a higher share of its aid on the Pacific. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the treatment and control groups; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**More to Pacific**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | More Pacific  (OLS) | More Pacific  (logit) | More Pacific  (logit w controls) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Treatment | 0.07\*\* | 0.31\*\* | 0.34\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.13) | (0.14) |
| Urban |  |  | -0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.19) |
| Over 60 |  |  | 0.71\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |
| Male |  |  | 0.26\* |
|  |  |  | (0.15) |
| Support left party |  |  | 0.55\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |
| Other |  |  | 0.42\* |
|  |  |  | (0.23) |
| Manager or professional |  |  | 0.20 |
|  |  |  | (0.17) |
| Income |  |  | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Constant | 0.31\*\*\* | -0.80\*\*\* | -1.69\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.10) | (0.29) |
| Observations | 998 | 998 | 885 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about the share of New Zealand aid that should be focused on the Pacific. Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Share to pacific (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Treatment effect* |  |  |
| More to Pacific | 0.07\*\* | 0.08\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Same | 0.02 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Less to Pacific | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 998 | 885 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

## 7.3 New Zealand attitudes on Purpose of aid

The table immediately below shows the results of three models in which the dependent variable is the whether the respondent thinks New Zealand should focus more of its aid on advancing New Zealand’s interests. The models are: (1) the results of an OLS regression that shows the simple difference in proportions between the treatment and control groups; (2) the results of a bivariate logistic regression; (3) the results of a logistic regression with controls added.

**Favour aid used to advance New Zealand interests**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Favour NZ  (OLS) | Favour NZ (logit) | Favour NZ  (logit w controls) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Treatment | -0.03 | -0.11 | -0.10 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.12) | (0.13) |
| Urban |  |  | 0.02 |
|  |  |  | (0.18) |
| Over 60 |  |  | -0.12 |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |
| Male |  |  | 0.19 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) |
| Support left party |  |  | -0.53\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.15) |
| Other |  |  | -0.14 |
|  |  |  | (0.21) |
| Manager or professional |  |  | -0.23 |
|  |  |  | (0.16) |
| Income |  |  | 0.00 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Constant | 0.53\*\*\* | 0.12 | 0.31 |
|  | (0.02) | (0.09) | (0.25) |
| Observations | 1070 | 1070 | 936 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

The table immediately below shows the results a multinomial logistic regression model run on a categorical variable capturing respondents’ views about whether aid should be used to advance New Zealand’s interests or to help people in poorer countries. Results are presented as predicted marginal probabilities in the form of differences from the control group. (Marginal predictions with other independent variables set at their mean). Two models are shown, one without controls variables included, the other with the full set of control variables included in the logistic regressions above.

**Aid help New Zealand or help poor (multinomial logistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | No controls | With controls |
| *Treatment effect* |  |  |
| Favour NZ | -0.03 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Favour poor | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Observations | 1070 | 936 |

Standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01