

Can TV change attitudes?

Jake Bowers and Chris Grady (Illinois)

Graham Couturier and team (Equal Access International and Arewa24)



Rough Context:

Nigeria population: 200 million

Nigerian Muslims: 50 million

Northern States: 90%+ Muslim, Hausa Speakers

Support for violence widespread in these states: (Jigawa, Kano, Katsina, Kaduna, Zamfara, Sokoto): From a 2013 Baseline Survey (N=2700):

48% report that their own family has suffered as a result of violence in Nigeria

38% report agree that “While the current level of violence in Nigeria is regrettable, violence will eventually produce necessary changes in society.”

28% of the total agree with both statements



Implementer: Equal Access International



REWA
24

SHIRYE-SHIRYE

TSARIN SHIRYE-SHIRYE

SAUKEWA

LABARU

f t i y

Hausa



DADIN KOWA- KAFIN A NUNA

Zamo na farko wurin kallon shirin da ya zamo gwarzon shekara na AMVCA
Danna nan don kallon shirin tun kafin a nuna shi a wannan tashar!

Cadbury
**Bourn
Vita**



Why should watching TV change attitudes or norms?

The Social Learning Theory of learning from vicarious experience
(Bandura, 1961)

Key element: Relatable models/actors doing behaviors that can be done by the observer.

We suspect:

If you want peaceful attitudes, show people who are attractive and not too different from viewers expressing them.

Attitude change and norm change requires repeated exposure to such experiences.

Design(s)

- **Observational Study:** Surveys before, during, and at end of study. Panel if possible. Record GPS coordinates and satellite dish size to use as instruments. Also Focus Groups.
- **Experimental Study:** Encouragement+Placebo Design. Also Focus Groups.

Encouragement Design

- Randomize into two groups:
 - People **encouraged** to watch the soap opera. (outcome $Y(Z=1, D=1 \text{ or } 0)$)
 - Control (outcome is $Y(Z=0, D= 1 \text{ or } 0)$)
- Measure **compliance** and outcomes via automated telephone calls each week for 6 months.
- **Average Effect of Intent to treat:**
 - $\text{mean}(Y(Z=1) - Y(Z=0))$ [regardless of compliance, D]
- **Average Effect of Watching the Show (Effect on Compliers, Local Effect):**
 - If $Y(Z=1, D=1) = Y(Z=0, D=1)$ and $Y(Z=1, D=0) = Y(Z=0, D=0)$ and Z is randomized (plus some other smaller things like treatment doesn't reduce the outcome) then we can use random assignment as an instrumental variable to learn about the effect of watching the shows on the kinds of people who choose to watch them:
 $\text{mean}(Y(D=1) - Y(D=0)|D(Z=1)=1)$

Encouragement+Placebo

- Randomize into two groups:
 - People **encouraged** to watch the Arewa soap opera. ($Y(Z=1, D= 1 \text{ or } 0)$)
 - People **encouraged** to watch another soap opera. ($Y(Z=2, D=1 \text{ or } 0)$)
 - Control ($Y(Z=0, D= 1 \text{ or } 0)$)
- Measure **compliance** and outcomes via automated telephone calls each week for 6 months.
- **Average Effect of Watching the Show (Effect on Compliers, Local Effect):**
 - Can use $Z=0$ vs $Z=1$ as an instrument if we believe **exclusion restriction**.
 - Can use $Z=1$ vs $Z=2$ if compliance is same between $Z=1$ and $Z=2$ and outcomes are same between $Z=2$ and $Z=0$. (!Testable!)
- **ITT(s):** Effect of $Z=1$ versus $Z=0$. Or, even if $Z=2$ is not a credible placebo, then $Z=1$ versus $Z=2$ teaches us about effect of Arewa soap opera versus other soap opera.

Can you use an experiment?

- If you randomize encouragement, you can learn about active treatment even if active treatment would be very difficult or wrong to randomize.
- Placebos can be a safe-guard for situations where the exclusion restriction might not hold and/or provide another local effect.