

Pre-Analysis plan for:
“Can International Trade Change Minds?”

May 5 2017

David Atkin, MIT
Amit Khandelwal, Columbia GSB
Adam Osman, UIUC

1. Introduction

Most economists believe that international trade provides economic benefits to both the exporting and importing countries. A large literature characterizes and estimates the welfare gains from trade, and identifies the mechanisms through which trade affects workers, firms and the aggregate economy. Some policymakers believe that international trade has effects beyond changing economic outcomes such as prices, expenditures, wages, employment and productivity. Trade may change individuals’ views and attitudes towards other countries and cultures. For example, individuals who have directly benefited from international trade by selling their production abroad may hold more cosmopolitan views and be more favorable towards the values of their buyers.

Of course, participation in international trade and an individual’s views and attitudes may simply be correlated. It is hard to estimate the causal impact of trade on views and attitudes because of the difficulty of finding a convincing counterfactual since substantial evidence suggests that exporters differ from non-exporters. It is also difficult to estimate this relationship because one needs to complement trade data with surveys on individual attitudes.

We hope to make progress on these issues and provide the first rigorous evidence on how exposure to trade with Western Democracies affects participants’ views and attitudes. We do this by utilizing the randomized allocation of export orders to rug-making firms in Fowa, Egypt, as described in Atkin, Khandelwal and Osman (forthcoming). In our sample of 219 rug-making firms, 87% had never knowingly produced a product for export markets at baseline. We randomized which firms received an initial export order from buyers located in OECD countries (treatment firms), primarily Germany and the US; and which firms did not (control firms). All orders passed through a local intermediary, and future orders were left to the discretion of the intermediary and foreign buyers. Takeup firms successfully filled their trial orders, and continue to obtain and fill subsequent export orders to these same markets. By comparing the outcomes of the treatment group to the control group we can estimate the causal impact of exporting.

More than five years after the initial randomization, and three years after our last follow up survey, we re-surveyed producers to collect information on their attitudes and world views. We developed a survey that focused on issues of economic equality, gender equality, information sources and international trade. Most importantly, given the geographic and historical context of our sample, we also asked questions about Western bias and attitudes towards terrorism. Our main hypothesis, as we outline below, is that trade with Western democracies decreases anti-Western bias and support for terrorism.

The rest of the pre-analysis plan proceeds as follows. Section 2 outlines our primary hypotheses. Section 3 outlines our estimation strategy. Section 4 outlines our secondary hypotheses. We also append to this pre-analysis plan our survey in its entirety.

2. Primary Hypotheses

We have three primary hypotheses that we would like to test as the main objective of this paper. Our three hypotheses are: (A) international trade leads to a decrease in support for terrorism against trading partners; (B) international trade leads to a decrease in support for terrorism in general; and (C) international trade leads to an improvement in attitudes towards other countries and foreigners. We outline how we plan to test each of these hypotheses below.

Primary Hypothesis A: *International trade leads to a decrease in support for terrorism against trading partners*

We will test whether international trade leads to a decrease in support for terrorism against trading partners through a series of regressions. We will use two different questions from our survey and our treatment variable. Q82 asks whether or not attacks against civilians are ever justified across a set of 7 different countries, and Q81 asks if a terrorist attack in that country would affect their business. We will use Q81 to try to assess how much of the change in support for terrorism is due to a profit motive.

Our first set of regressions will focus on responses to the above questions only for US & Germany, where our treatment variable is strongest since we were able to explicitly provide exporting opportunities to our treatment group to those countries.

- (1) We will generate a binary variable from Q71 for the US & Germany (the variable will take the value 1 if they ever exported to either country) and regress it on treatment as a type of “first-stage” regression. This will tell us if there is a

- difference in the response to the question “Which other countries have you exported to in the past?” using the firm self-reports.
- (2) We will regress Q82 on treatment to test if exporting led to a decrease in support for terrorism with US & Germany, the trading partners most directly linked to our treatment.
 - (3) We will then regress Q82 on treatment and include Q81 as a control. Q81 is endogenous and we only have 1 instrumental variable (treatment assignment), so while we cannot separately estimate the causal impact of exporting on support of terrorism and profit motive on support for terrorism, the coefficient on Q81 and how the coefficient on treatment changes when Q81 is added will shed light on whether any change in support for terrorism comes from a profit motive. If the coefficient on Q81 is positive and the coefficient on treatment decreases substantially this will imply that a profit motive is an important part of the overall change in attitudes.

We will also run a set of complimentary regressions that are non-experimental in nature to showcase what we could have done if we only had observational data. In our non-experimental regressions we will regress Q82 on Q71 (excluding Egypt) to assess whether trade with a country correlates with your views on terrorism in that country. We will also run this regression again while controlling for Q81, as above, to see if the effect is attenuated when controlling for the profit motive. For these regressions we will be able to include all countries in the analysis, and so will be able to report results where we control for baseline characteristics as well as results that include firm fixed effects

We will further probe the impact of international trade on support for terrorism by utilizing Q27-Q29. These three questions in more detail are Q27 (which ask for the firm’s reaction to a 20% drop in profits due to a terrorist attack in Egypt), Q28 (which ask for the firm’s reaction to a 20% drop in profits due to an exchange rate change with Germany), and Q29 (which ask for the firm’s reaction to a 20% drop in profits due to a terrorist attack in Germany).

- (1) We will subtract Q28 from Q29 to identify the differential response to terrorist attack on Germany relative to a drop in sales that is due to an innocuous change from the exchange rate. In both questions, there is a hypothetical decline of 20% in sales. In Q28, this occurs because of a change in the bilateral Egypt-Germany exchange rate and in Q29 this occurs because of terrorist attack in Germany. If treatment firms care only about their business activity, there should not be a differential effect relative to control firms. If treatment firms are relatively more upset by the terrorist attack, this suggests that their attitudes towards terrorism have shifted.

- (2) We will subtract Q27 from Q29 to identify the differential response to foreign vs domestic terrorism on the treatment group, controlling for the impact on their business. Our hypothesis is that treatment firms will care relatively more about terrorist attacks in countries they have exported to.

Finally, we examine if treatment firms' views on terrorist attacks in Germany and US differ from control firms. We regress Q86 and Q88 on treatment. For those reporting that they are not familiar with the event, we will set the value of their support for the event as "indifferent".

Primary Hypothesis B: *International trade leads to a decrease in support for terrorism in general*

We will also utilize the full set of data, as well as our treatment assignment to test if there are ancillary effects of treatment on views of terrorism in other countries. These effects could be due to either (a) an increase in the probability of exporting to other countries due to our original treatment, or (b) because the treatment has impacts on views of terrorism in foreign countries even if not exporting to them.

We will regress Q82 on our treatment and an interaction of treatment on a binary of whether they export to that country for all countries in our data except for the US, Germany and Egypt to test for the effect (a) above. The interaction term should be negative if these effects come disproportionately through exporting to a country. If the effects are more general, the main effect should be negative. We will also report if treatment assignment impacts the likelihood of ever exporting to any country other than the US, Germany and Egypt. For these regressions we can include firm fixed effects.

We will further explore the impact of exporting on general support for terrorism by utilizing Q83-Q84, Q87 and Q89. Those questions ask about their support of different terror events across the world. We will generate an index about their support of particular terrorist events outlined in each of these questions. For those that are not familiar with the event we will set value of their support for the event as "indifferent". We will regress the index on treatment.

Finally, we also examine how treatment firms differ in their views on domestic terrorism within Egypt. We compare the response in Q82 for Egypt between treatment and control firms by regressing Q82 on treatment. We will also run a second regression of Q82 on treatment while controlling for Q81, as we do above, to assess how much of the effect comes from a profit motive. Unlike above, here we are looking for general support for

terrorism (as displayed by their views on terrorism locally), so the profit motive channel is of less interest than above.

Primary Hypothesis C: *International trade leads to an improvement in attitudes towards other countries and foreigners*

We use the following questions to explore attitudes towards other countries: Q76-Q80 (which asks about opinions on other countries), and Q49 (trust of foreigners).

For Q76-Q80, for the US & Germany, we propose the following regressions:

1. OLS regression of outcome on treatment, we expect a positive impact of trade on relationships with the US & Germany since these are the two countries that our intervention exogenously increased the treatment groups likelihood to trade with.
2. We will also generate a variable that indexes the responses to each question for US & Germany and regress that on treatment.
3. We will then use the rest of the data by regressing the responses to Q76-Q80 on treatment and a treatment variable interacted with whether or not they have exported to this country in the past. In these regressions we can include firm fixed effects.

We will also run a non-experimental regression where we compare the opinions of countries that firms have exported to with the opinions on countries they have not exported to, in an effort to show what the results would be for this analysis using only observational data. We will separately regress Q76-Q80 (excluding Egypt) on a binary variable that indicates if they ever exported to that country. As above, we can include firm fixed effects.

For Q49 which asks them to rate how much they trust people of another nationality on a scale from 1 (trust completely) to 4 (don't trust at all). We will regress the outcome on treatment. We expect a positive impact of trade on trust of people of other nationalities and will change the direction of this effect so that a positive estimate means more trust.

3. Estimation Strategy

Unless otherwise indicated, the basic regression specifications across all hypotheses groups are:

$$\text{Outcome}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Treatment}_i + \beta_2 \text{StratificationVariables}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (\text{ITT})$$

$$\text{Outcome}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Takeup}_i + \beta_2 \text{StratificationVariables}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (\text{TOT})$$

We stratified the export experiment (Atkin et al, forthcoming) by the size of the primary loom that the firms use in their production (very large, large, medium, and small). In addition, we had two recruitment rounds with each round being split into its own set of size strata. This gives us 8 different stratified groups. We will also report results using baseline characteristics to improve power. We include household income, household size, education, age, years in rug business, if they had ever exported before the study, all as reported on the initial baseline survey for each sample.

For all terrorism related questions we will perform a one-sided test of whether there is a positive impact of the exporting treatment on views towards terrorism, where positive is defined as being more upset by terrorism and terrorist activities. We will do the same for the attitude related questions outlined above, where we expect a more positive attitude towards foreign countries that they have traded with (i.e. US and Germany) for those in treatment. For all the other outcomes we test in the paper we will use two-sided tests.

Multiple Hypothesis Testing

Our survey covers over 100 outcomes which raises econometric concerns related to multiple hypothesis testing. We follow three different strategies for dealing with these concerns. The first strategy is outlining our primary hypotheses, as described above. These outcomes are the main focus of our paper and cover a small subset of all outcomes we collect. For these outcomes we will report all the outcomes separately. The second strategy is to generate indices for the other outcomes that we collect, which we allocate to 9 different families of secondary hypotheses below. As outlined below we create an index for each family of outcomes and will test whether the index differs across treatment and control firms. Finally, we will report the impacts on individual outcomes for our secondary hypotheses for completeness and provide sharpened q-values that will help control the false discovery rate.

Indices

In some of our primary hypotheses and all of our secondary hypotheses we will create indices to test for impacts of exporting on different families of outcomes. Following Anderson (2008) we will create indices by:

- (1) Changing the signs of the outcomes so that they all move in the same direction (higher is better).
- (2) Demean all outcomes and dividing by the standard deviation of the control group.
- (3) Apply the rule noted above to remove noisy variables.
- (4) Creating a weighted average of all outcomes in the family using the inverse covariance matrix to weigh the different outcomes.

First Stage

We will provide two different estimates of the “first stage” impact of treatment. We will provide a first stage using data from the endline from our earlier paper which uses responses to the question “have you ever knowingly exported”. (This is Table IV of Atkin et al. (forthcoming) As the endline was several years ago, firms may have forgotten their previous exporting behavior, and so we will also provide a second “first stage” regression that uses data from the current survey Q70. This procedure evaluates two (slightly) different treatment effects: knowingly exporting 2 years ago, and knowingly exporting today. Both these first stages allow us to report Treatment on the Treated estimates. For questions that relate specifically to the US or Germany, we will use answers to Q71 (whether they write US or Germany) as the first stage.

4. Secondary Hypotheses

We will examine the impact of international trade on additional variables, which we categorize into 9 different groups (listed below). For each group of outcomes we will create an index whose details we outline below, and regress that index on treatment and the 8 stratification variables outlined above unless otherwise noted. As above, we will also report results using baseline controls.

- A. Corruption: firm owners engaging in international trade might have more exposure to best practices and international standards; hence, they might have become more sensitive and aware of misconduct, and have different attitudes towards corruption.
- B. International trade: firm owners engaging in international trade might have changed their support for international trade.
- C. Gender: engaging with liberal Western countries (albeit through an intermediary) may reduce participants’ gender bias.
- D. Trust: we expect participants to have developed more trust in foreigners by engaging with people from diverse backgrounds (as discussed in our primary hypotheses), and this might have a positive spillover on their trust in people locally.
- E. Domestic economy: engaging in international trade might impact firm owners’ confidence in the domestic economy.
- F. Immigration: engaging in international trade may impact views on immigration into Egypt.
- G. Economic equality: trading with much richer countries may lead the treatment group towards preferring an economy that provides more equal opportunity to its citizens.

- H. General knowledge and awareness: we expect that participation in international trade motivates firm owners to track local and international events more closely, which will result in accumulation of more general knowledge and facts about the world.
- I. Information sources: we expect that participation in international trade motivates firm owners to seek out more information about the outside world and may lead them to utilizing more diverse information sources.

Secondary Hypothesis Group A: Corruption

We will include Q17, Q24, Q25, Q30, Q31, Q33, and Q35 in our corruption index. This index is constructed to measure the sensitivity to and distaste for corruption perceived by respondents. For Q17, we will create a binary that takes the value 1 if the firm listed corruption as one of the top three problems facing Egypt.

Secondary Hypothesis Group B: International trade

We will include Q22, Q52-Q56, Q58-Q59, Q62 in our index for attitudes about international trade.

Secondary Hypothesis Group C: Gender

We will include Q39, Q41 and Q42 in our index for attitudes about gender roles.

Secondary Hypothesis Group D: Trust

We will create an index from Q44-Q46 which is the level of trust people have in those they already know. We will create another index from Q47-48 which is the level of trust they have in new and different people. We will regress the index of trust in new and different people while controlling for the individual's trust in people they know.

Secondary Hypothesis Group E: Domestic economy

We will include Q19-21 in our index which aims to measure confidence in the domestic economy.

Secondary Hypothesis Group F: Immigration

We will include Q50 and Q51 in our index on immigration. These questions aim to assess support foreign immigration into Egypt.

Secondary Hypothesis Group G: Economic equality

We will include Q26, Q36-37 in our index on economic equality. These questions aim to assess support of a fair economic system

Secondary Hypothesis Group H: General knowledge and awareness

We ask some general knowledge questions in Q64-Q68 about the leaders of different countries and several international conflicts, as well as question on whether they are familiar with certain international events in Q83-Q84, Q86-89. In all these questions we control for whether the response to Q63 is correct (“Who is the current Egyptian Prime Minister?”).

Secondary Hypothesis Group I: Information Sources

We want to explore whether the treatment group shifts to utilizing information sources that are more independent or foreign and shifts away from using government owned news sources which are often seen as promoting a pro-government view.¹

Utilization of Information Sources:

Q93-Q100 ask about utilization of different types of information sources. We will generate an index that will reflect if they utilize a variety of sources to get their information. This index will include the response to the utilization questions in Q93-Q100.

Trust of Information Sources:

Q93-Q100 also ask about how much they trust different news sources. We split these sources into 3 different types: (1) Government sources (Q96 and Q100), (2) Local Independent Sources (Q97 and Q99), and (3) Foreign Sources (Q98). We separately ask about trust and utilization of these three sources. We will generate a trust index with a negative weight on government sources and a positive weight on other sources. We will not include Q93-95 in the trust index since they cover SMS, social media, and radio, which could include both reliable and unreliable news.

¹ <http://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/sisification-egypts-media-1458142427>

Appendix: Complete Survey

Data collection occurred in February and March 2017, before we submitted this pre-analysis plan. The data were collected on tablets using SurveyCTO software. The data are automatically encrypted and uploaded to the cloud based survey set up by SurveyCTO for the authors' account. No one had downloaded the data before the pre-analysis plan was finalized and uploaded to the AEA registry. We provide evidence of this by posting the full server logs of activity along with this pre-analysis plan.²

There are several questions in the survey that we have not included in the pre-analysis plan which can be split into three groups. Group 1 contains questions that were part of our normal follow up survey (Q1-Q16). Group 2 contains questions that were asked to provide more descriptive data about the views of the sample, but were not meant to be analyzed directly (Q18, Q69, Q72, Q73, Q74, Q75, Q91, Q92). Group 3 are questions that relate to our hypotheses but after further consideration we felt they were not as clearly linked to our hypotheses as the other questions we included in the pre-analysis plan. These include Q23, Q34, Q38, Q40, Q43, Q57, Q60, Q61, Q85, and Q90.³

² SurveyCTO is not able to keep server logs for over 30 days and so Adam Osman had a research assistant, Dana Shaat, download those server logs independently for safe keeping and uploading to ensure that the logs were not tampered with.

³ Note that due to a numbering error by the data collection company there is no Q32.

	Question	Codes				Remarks
1	What it is the description of your product?	1. Joblan 2. Tubs 3. Double 4. Half Double 5. Bertita 6. Qsaqas				
2	When did you start working in this business (as owner of the loom)? Worker: when did you start working on the loom alone					
3	Including yourself, how many weavers do you employ? Weavers				
4	How many looms do you own? I will ask you a few more questions about each loom (at most 4) Looms				
5	Cost of loom at time of purchase	1-	2-	3-	4-	
6	If you sold the loom today, how much would you make?	1-	2-	3-	4-	
7	If you lease your loom, how much would you charge?	1-	2-	3-	4-	
8	How much is the maintenance cost for the loom (annually)?	1-	2-	3-	4-	
9	How much did you earn from rug sales in the past four weeks (including rugs sold from your inventory)? Worker: How many meters/pieces did you manufacture during the past 4 weeks Pounds				
10	How much did you spend on the particular inputs (including wages paid to weaver but excluding any wages you paid yourself) that you used to make the rugs you sold in the past four weeks? Pounds				
11	Last month, how many hours did you work in the rug industry in a normal full work day ? Hours per day				
12	How many days did you not work in the last month (include days or half days take off due to low orders, weekends, sickness, family issues, holidays etc.) For surveyor, answer should be in days or half days. days				
13	What was the total income from the rug business last month after paying all expenses (inputs, wages to weavers but excluding yourself). That is, what were your profits from this business last month? Pounds				
14	Do you have another source of income other than this project - secondary job or additional income earning activities?	Yes				Proceed to Q16
		Mention (other project, employee, ...) No				
15	What is your income from any secondary job or additional income earning activities in the last four weeks after subtracting all costs? How many hours did you work on dedicate to this other activities in the past month? Pounds Hours				
16	How often did you eat Fish, Beef, Lamb or Chicken over the past month? Times				
17	From your point of view: What is the biggest economic challenge/problem in Egypt? (Please rank the top 3 challenges)	1. Unemployment 2. Terrorism 3. Weak economy 4. Inflation 5. Corruption				

		6. Security 7. Population increase 8. Dwelling Other (specify)		
18	Do you have any family members that are living outside of Egypt? How many and where do they live?	Yes Quantity Where do they live:	1	
		No	2	
19	What is your assessment of the current economic activity?	1. Very good 2. Good 3. Abstain 4. Bad 5. Very bad 97. Don't know (don't read) 98. Refused to answer (don't read)		
20	How do you compare the current situation with last year?	1. Much better 2. Slightly better 3. Same 4. Slightly worse 97. Don't know (don't read) 98. Refuse to answer (don't read)		
21	From your point of view: How to you expect next year to compare with this year?	1. Much better 2. Slightly better 3. Same 4. Slightly worse 97. Don't know (don't read) 98. Refuse to answer (don't read)		
22	From your point of view: What is the impact of trade on international relations? Surveyor: please specify one option	1. Substantial improvement in international relationships 2. Modest improvement in international relationships 3. No effect 4. Hinder international relationships 5. Ends international relationships 7. Other		
23	From your point of view: What is the impact of depreciation (Egyptian pound)?	1. Positive 2. Negative 3. No effect		

Second: business environment and ease of doing business with regards to fug manufacturing

From your point of view; Please answer the following questions On a Scale from 1 to 10:

		Response
24	When dealing with Kilim businesses or projects, what is your assessment of the level of corruption?	
25	When dealing with governmental entities: How widespread do you think corruption is?	
26	In your opinion, how important is it to work in an environment where people have equal opportunities?	

On a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being not at all upset, and 10 being very upset:

27	How upset would you be if there was a terrorist attack in Egypt which led to a 20% drop in your sales?	
28	How upset would you be if there was a change in the currency exchange rate with Germany which led to a 20% drop in your sales? (If respondent doesn't export to Germany, then pose this question hypothetically)	
29	How upset would you be if there was a terrorist attack in Germany which led to a 20% drop in your sales?	

Based on a recent experience (or experiences) you are personally aware of, On a Scale from 1 to 5, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

	1- Strongly Agree, 2-Agree, 3-Abstain, 4-Disagree, 5-Strongly Disagree, 8-Don't know, 9-Refused to answer	
30	I need to pay a bribe when dealing with issues in my business life?	
31	I need to pay a bribe when dealing with issues in my personal life?	
33	The government is doing enough to fight corruption	
34	The government is doing enough to fight terrorism	
35	It is impossible to obtain a job without connections	
36	There are equal chances for all to move to better life	
37	The economic system is fair and treats the rich and the poor equally	
38	Women are better at managing daily affairs of the household?	
39	When jobs are scarce men should have more right to a job than women?	
40	Education is important it improves better opportunities for future generations	
41	My sons/daughters and grandsons/granddaughters should get the same level of education	
42	I would like for my daughters or female grandchildren to have a career other than caring for the household?	
43	I encourage young adults to immigrate illegally	

I 'd like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all? (Read out and code one answer for each):

	Trust completely	Trust somewhat	Do not trust very much	Do not trust at all
44. Your family	1	2	3	4
45. Your neighborhood	1	2	3	4
46. People you know personally	1	2	3	4
47. People you meet for the first time	1	2	3	4
48. People who have different background	1	2	3	4
49. People of another nationality	1	2	3	4

Can you please indicate the effect of the following situations (on a scale of 1 to 5)

“1” Indicates a great positive impact “5” Indicates a great negative impact “8” Don't know “9” Refuse to answer

50	The effect of allowing more Chinese citizens to reside and work in Egypt on the economy	
51	The effect of allowing more Syrians to reside and work in Egypt on the economy	
52	The effect of expanding international trade on you personally	
53	The effect of increasing FDI and presence of international companies on manufacturing growth in Egypt	
54	The effect of increasing exports on employment	
55	The effect of increasing international trade on wages	

56	The effect of expanding international business operations and acquisition of local companies on the economy	
57	The effect of increasing international trade on the price of raw materials	
58	The effect of increasing international trade on the Egyptian economy	
59	The effect of increasing international trade on the bilateral relationships with those countries	
60	The effect of increasing government support to local power generators on the economy	
61	The effect of increasing government support to local power generators on international relationships	
62	The effect of expanding international trade on creating more equal opportunities	

Please let me know if you know or don't know the any of the following (on a scale of 1 to 3)

“1” I know and follow “2” heard of it/him and but don't follow “3 don't know”

63	Name of current prime minister	
64	Name of United States president	
65	Conflict in Myanmar	
66	Who is the King of Jordan?	
67	Conflict between India and Kashmir	
68	Name of German Prime minister	
69	Name something that drew your attention recently	

70	Have you ever produced goods that were exported to other countries?	1. Yes directly 2. Yes indirectly 3. No (proceed to question 73)				
		Country 1	Country 2	Country 3	Country 4	Country 5
71	Which other countries have you exported to in the past?					
72	What proportion of your production went to those countries in the past year?					

For each of the following region/country: please answer each of the following question (add export markets mentioned above by respondent)

		Egypt	US	Germany	India	China	Saudia Arabia	Kenya	Other from Q71	Other from Q71	Other from Q71
73	Do you want to start or continue exporting to these countries (1- yes 2-no)	//////// ////////									
74	How strong is annual economic growth in ... : (1 being very weak, 5 being very strong)										
75	On a scale from 1 to 5 how would you think the improvement of the economy in the following countries impact your business? (1 strong negative impact, 5 strong positive impact)										
76	How much do you trust people from various countries to do business with. (5 significant trust 1 do not trust at all?)										
77	Do you think <i>people</i> from these countries are supportive of Egypt? (1 No supportive 5 very supportive)										
78	Do you think the <i>government</i> of these countries is supportive of Egypt? (1 No supportive 5 very supportive)										
79	Do you prefer to strengthen future relations between Egypt and this country? (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 agree, 4 strongly agree)										
80	What kind of impact do you think these countries have on the Middle East and North Africa? (1 strong negative impact, 5 strong positive impact)	//////// //////// ////////									
81	Would a terrorist attack in this country affect your business? If yes, to what extent (1 strong negative impact, 5 strong positive impact)										
82	Is there any justification for attacks on civilians? (1 no justifications 5 strong justifications)										

The following questions measure the extent to which you are aware of the local business environment, international events, and your reaction to these events

I will list a few events and I would like you to indicate your familiarity (1 Familiar 2 Unfamiliar) and your personal position (1 Strong condemn, 2 Somewhat disapprove, 3 Indifferent, 4 No objections, 5 Strongly support, 8 Unfamiliar, 9 Refuse to answer)

	Familiarity	Position
83. Russian plane incident in Sharm El Sheikh (October 2015)		
84. Terrorist attacks in Paris (November 2015, July 2016) and Belgium (March 2016)		
85. Economic reform and the economy in general		
86. The attack on the Twin Towers in NY in 2001		
87. Botroseya Church Bombing in Cairo (December 2016)		
88. Terrorist attacks in Berlin, Germany (December 2016)		
89. Assassination of Russian ambassador in Turkey (December 2016)		
90. Egypt's expansion of the Suez Canal		
91. Other events you would like to add		
92. Other events you would like to add		

This part measures the awareness and the extent to which you follow the news:

		Each week how much time (how many hours) do you spend getting information from the following sources	To what extent do you trust fairness and honesty in presenting the news	To what extent do you think these sources present different opinions
		1 I don't follow those sources; 2 Rarely; 3 Sometimes; 4 Often; 5 Always; 6 Refuse to answer	1. to great extent; 2. To a medium extent; 3. to limited extent; 4. not fair not honest; 5. I don't know; 6. Declined to answer	1. to great extent; 2. To a medium extent; 3. to limited extent; 4. not fair not honest; 5. I don't know; 6. Declined to answer
93	News over SMS			
94	Social Media (like Facebook)			
95	Radio			
96	Local public newspapers			
97	Local private newspapers			
98	International news channels			
99	Local private new channels			
100	Local public new channels			