

**This form effective December 22, 2015**

Do not use this form if:

- you are an undergraduate; instead, go to our [forms page](#) for undergraduate research, **or**
- your research activities are limited to analysis of data collected by someone else; instead, go to [Secondary Analysis of Existing Data](#) form.

**Submit** this form and required attachments:

- Send Parts A, B, your project description prepared using the instructions in Part C, and any appendices as **one** Word file by e-mail to [campusirb@duke.edu](mailto:campusirb@duke.edu).
- We do not need an original, hardcopy of the signed assurances, Part B. Faxed, scanned, and electronic signatures are acceptable. We cannot accept typed names. Send a signed copy of Part B to [campusirb@duke.edu](mailto:campusirb@duke.edu).

**Contents:**

- A. Investigator and Project Information
- B. Investigator Assurances
- C. Instructions for Preparing Research Description and Appendices

**A. Investigator and Project Information**

Project Title: The Political Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment

**Fill in one box below as appropriate.**

**Research by Faculty or Administrators**

Investigator(s): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Faculty   ☐ Administrator   ☐ Other Research Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/School: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Add more lines if needed)*

**Research by Graduate Students, Post-Doctoral Researchers, and Their Advisors**

Student/Fellow Investigator(s) Anh Le

☒ Graduate Student   ☐ Postdoctoral Fellow

Department/School: Political Science E-mail: aql3@duke.edu Phone: 919-813-8533

*(Add more lines if needed)*

Faculty Advisor(s) Edmund Malesky

Department/School: Political Science E-mail: ejm5@duke.edu Phone: 919-660-4312

**Project Information:**

1. Source of Funding: Department of Political Science, Duke University; the Asian/Pacific Studies Institute, Duke University  
(If research is externally funded, submit a copy of the application or the award.)
2. If Federally Funded, Proposal/Grant Number: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Research Site: China
4. Will the research take place in public elementary or secondary schools? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If yes, are the schools in the Durham? ☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Potentially Vulnerable Subject Populations: Please check all that apply (if any).
  - ☐ Minors, as defined at research site (under 18 years old in NC)
  - ☐ Psychology and Neuroscience Undergraduate Subject Pool
  - ☐ Other Duke research subject pool. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Students or employees of the researcher
  - ☐ Prisoners

**B. Assurances (Original signatures are required for final approval.)**

Section 1: All researchers.

Section 2: Responsible advisors for research by students and fellows.

**Section 1: Investigator(s) Assurance** (Required for all researchers listed in *Part A, Investigator and Project Information*)

*I affirm* the following:

- a. The research will not be initiated until written approval is secured from the IRB. (**Note: Approval will not be provided unless certification to conduct research with human subjects is current for the investigator[s], and if the investigator is a student, the advisor's certification is also current.**)
- b. I will conduct this study as described in the approved protocol. If any changes are anticipated, I will submit a *Request to Amend an Approved Protocol*, and I will not implement the changes until I receive approval from the IRB. I will contact the IRB staff immediately if any of the following events occur: unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, protocol deviations, and findings during the study that would affect the risks participation in the study.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator

\_\_\_\_\_  
06/10/2016  
Date

**Section 2: Faculty Advisor:**

*I affirm* that that I have read and approved the protocol, and I assume responsibility (1) for ensuring that student researchers are aware of their responsibilities as investigators, and (2) that the IRB will be immediately informed in the event of research-related unanticipated risks, protocol deviations, or findings during the study that would affect the risks of participation in the study.

Edmund J. Malesky  
Faculty Advisor

June 14, 2016  
Date

---

**HUMAN SUBJECTS ADMINISTRATION**

This section is to be completed by IRB staff or IRB members only.

<b>APPROVED as</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt <input type="checkbox"/> Expedited or <input type="checkbox"/> Full	
<input type="checkbox"/> IRB Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Expedited Reviewer or <input type="checkbox"/> Full Board	<b>Date</b>

## **C. Instructions for Preparing the Request for Protocol Approval**

### **Research Description**

#### **1. Research Design**

##### *Purpose of the Study*

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) plays a central role in China's economic miracle. In 1980, China established four coastal specialized economic zones (SEZs) in its southeast. These are the laboratories of capitalism that demonstrated the benefits of capitalism and added political fuel to further liberalization (Gallagher 2002). Today, the foreign sector continues to play a big role in China's economy, accounting for over half of China's exports and imports (World Bank 2010).

As its initial period of fast growth wanes, the quality of FDI is now crucial to China's future growth. However, we still do not understand why some localities have better FDI while others don't. The economics literature has examined the economic determinants of FDI quality (e.g. provinces' level of development, labor force quality, etc.), but none has looked at the political determinants (Wei 2012, Cheung 2004).

This study investigates how the preferences of Chinese officials play an important role in attracting a certain kind of FDI. I hypothesize that officials want FDI for two competing reasons: 1) the bribes that foreign firms bring, and 2) the technological spillover to domestic firms. An official with a short time horizon does not want to wait for the technological spillover to materialize in the years to come. Therefore, they would favor corrupt FDI for the immediate benefits. In contrast, an official with a long time horizon wants to attract high quality of FDI.

##### *Methodology*

To investigate whether an official's time horizon changes their preference for corrupt vs high quality FDI, I need to 1) measure their time horizon, and 2) measure their preference for corrupt FDI.

To measure time horizon, I check how close the official is to their mandated retirement age. The closer to the retirement, I expect the official to have shorter time horizon and more preference for corrupt FDI.

To measure officials' preference for corrupt FDI, I will rely on a survey conjoint experiment. This technique allows the researcher to tease out the preference of the officials by presenting two hypothetical FDI projects and asking the officials to indicate which one is preferable. We make the two options non-sensitive by randomizing the characteristics of the projects so that it is not clear we are focusing on corruption (Hainmueller et al. 2014). To proxy for corrupt FDI, I use how much land the project will need. This is because FDI projects need to ask for land-use rights from local officials, a process that is highly susceptible to bribery (U.S. Chamber of Commerce 2012). In addition, given the scarcity of land and the contentious nature of forced land acquisition for development, there is no reason for an official to favor a FDI project with large land requirement other than corruption (Amnesty International 2012).

The questions are attached in the Appendix.

##### *Randomized assignment to treatment*

To conduct the survey experiment, I will print out different forms of the surveys and randomly hand them out to the respondents.

## **2. Subject Selection**

### MPA Student Survey (Pilot)

For the pilot survey, I will recruit 500-800 participants within the part-time Master of Public Administration (MPA) program at Tsinghua University, who are mostly intermediate level public officials (who work as executives or supervisors at their institutes or managers of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in China) in their 30s, 40s, or 50s. Recent working papers by scholars in the United States have used similar but smaller samples (Liu 2016). The MPA student survey will be conducted during the second half of 2016.

### Chinese Public Officials Survey (Main Survey)

I plan to design a module for the 2017 China Public Officials Survey (CPOS), which will survey around 1,500-2,000 government and party officials across China. The CPOS will be administered by Tianguang Meng, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Tsinghua University, and the Institute of Quantitative Political Analysis and Research (IQPAR) at Tsinghua University.

Conducted three times over the past five years, the CPOS has been used by multiple scholars in recent published articles and working papers (Meng and Pan 2016; Meng, Pan and Yang Forthcoming). The next wave of the CPOS will be conducted in the spring of 2017.

The CPOS uses GPS sampling to generate a nationally representative sample of 15 to 20 prefecture-level administrative units (out of 334) across China (Landry and Shen 2005), sends trained enumerators to the chosen prefectures, randomly chooses around 100 officials in each prefecture, and asks them to fill supervised self-administered questionnaires on-site.

## **3. Risks and Benefits**

Surveys in authoritarian regimes such as China may pose risks to the respondents if the topics being studied are politically sensitive. Fortunately, since Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is wholehearted welcome by the Chinese Communist Party, it is not a taboo topic. For many of the officials, it is their job to evaluate FDI projects coming into their provinces. Therefore, the setup of the survey experiment, which asks officials to indicate their preferences between two hypothetical projects, should be very routine.

While it may be risky to ask officials about their preferences for corrupt FDI, our experimental design circumvents this problem with the conjoint experiment. In this design, there is no question that stands out to be explicitly about corruption. All the question presents are two hypothetical FDI projects with varying characteristics. Since an official can always say he picks a project because of a characteristic that has nothing to do with potential bribes, his answer cannot be used to incriminate him of corruption. In addition, since I am using land as a proxy for corruption, the risk of any incrimination is even more tenuous.

## **4. Confidentiality**

For both the pilot MPA student survey and the Chinese Public Officials Survey, I will collect the only

demographic information and no identity information.<sup>1</sup> Only Fengming (who share the survey with me and also filed protocol to the IRB) and I will maintain access to the data. The identities of individual respondents will not be revealed in any publication.

## **5. Compensation**

The subjects in both the pilot MPA student survey and the Chinese Public Officials Survey will not receive any compensation for participating in this study.

## **6. Informed Consent**

We request a waiver of informed consent under 45 CFR 46.116(d). As described above in Sections 3, there is no more than minimal risk to the subjects. Since both surveys will be supervised self-administered surveys, interviewees have sufficient freedom to cease participation. They can simply opt not to fill the questionnaires. In lieu of requiring participants to sign an informed consent form, I will preface each interview with the following statement. Similar statements appear in previous versions of the CPOS, in which many researchers from universities in the United States participated.

“In collaboration with researchers from China and abroad, our research team at Tsinghua University is conducting a research about local governance. We would like to ask you a few questions about your attitudes toward local governance. We are extremely grateful to your participation. Your inputs do not only benefit our research, but also help local development. We will strictly comply with relevant laws. Honoring your anonymity, we will keep your inputs confidential under any circumstance. Your name or telephone number will not be recorded or documented in any of materials. There is no obligation for you to participate in the interview and you are free to skip questions or cease participation at any time. Your decision of participation and answers will not affect your grades, class standing, or academics in any way. We know of no risks to you for participating in the study. If you have any questions about this research, please ask the enumerator now. If you think of questions later or if you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in a research study, please contact our team.”

## **7. Deception**

The survey experiment uses minimal deception in the sense that the participants are not aware that they are randomly assigned to different forms of the surveys. There is minimal risk to the respondents since they are not being given any false information.

It is critical to the study that we do not informing the participants about the different forms of the survey. If they know about the design, they may look around and discuss their different questions with their classmates, thus invalidating their answers.

## **8. Debriefing**

Not applicable.

---

<sup>1</sup> The demographic variables are sex, province and municipality, age, education level, political identity and seniority of Communist Party membership, occupation, and years of civil service

## 9. Appendices

### Appendix I: Survey Questionnaire

#### Module A (Demographic Information)

A1. What is your gender? 性别<sup>2</sup>

1. Male 男      2. Female 女

A1a. What is your ethnic identity 民族 \_\_\_\_\_

A2. Which year were you born? 您的出生年份 \_\_\_\_\_

A3. What is your degree of education? 您的文化程度是?

1. High school or less than high school 高中或高中以下 2. Vocational schools 中专  
3. Associate Degree/Junior College 大专 4. Bachelor Degree/College 大学本科  
5. Master Degree 硕士 6. Doctoral Degree 博士

A3a. What was your college major? 您在大学本科阶段的专业属于以下哪个类别?

1. Philosophy (哲学) 2. Economics (经济学) 3. Law or Social Science (法学大类)  
4. Marxism (马克思主义理论) 5. Education (教育学) 6. Literature (文学)  
7. History (历史学) 8. Math and Science (理学) 9. Engineering (工学)  
10. Agriculture (农学) 11. Medicine (医学) 12. Management (管理学)  
13. Arts (艺术学) 99. N/A (不适用)

A4. Your political identity 请问您的政治面貌:

1. Party member 中共党员      2. Member of a democratic party (united front) 民主党派  
3. No party affiliation (but a member of united front) 无党派  
4. Youth league member 共青团员  
5. Mass (no party affiliation and not a member of united front) 群众

A4a. If you are a party member, when did you join the Communist Party?

如果您是党员, 请问您于哪一年加入中国共产党 \_\_\_\_\_

A5. Which category does your employer belong to 您所在单位属于以下哪一类

1. Government agencies 行政部门  
2. Party organization 党委机构  
3. People's Congress or People's Political Consultative Conference 人大 / 政协  
4. Communist Youth League 共青团  
5. Court or procuratorate, 法院 / 检察院  
6. Mass organizations (labor union, women's union, business chamber, etc.)  
工商联、工会、青联、妇联等群团组织  
7. State-own Enterprises 国企  
8. Other 其它: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>2</sup> Questions A1, A2, A3, A4, A4a, A5, A5a, A5b, A6, A7, and A8 were adapted from the latest wave (2014-15) of the Chinese Public Officials Survey.

A5a. Do you have following identities 请问您有无以下兼职 (multiple choice)

1. Party congress delegate 党代会代表
2. People's Congress delegate 人大代表
2. Member of People's Political Consultative Conference 政协委员

A5b. What is your administrative rank? 请问您现在的职级是

1. Below deputy township party secretary/head 科员级以下
2. Deputy township party secretary/head 副科
3. Township party secretary/head 正科
4. Deputy county party secretary/head 副处
5. County party secretary/head 正处
6. Above county party secretary/head 副厅或以上

A5c. How many years have you served in civil service? 您进入党政工作 \_\_\_\_

How long have you been in the current position? 任现职已有 \_\_\_\_

A5d. Which career track does you belong to? 您现属于哪种编制?

1. Executive track 行政编制
2. Quasi-civil-service public service track 事业编制 (参照公务员法管理)
3. Public service track 其它事业编制
4. SOE track 企业编制
5. Informal track 非正式编制

A5e. If your institution is a public service one, how is it funded?

您所在事业单位属于以下哪种形式?

1. Fully funded by the state 全额拨款
2. Partially funded by the state 差额拨款
3. Self-funded 自收自支
9. I don't know 不清楚

A6. Are you a supervisor of your current institution or agency?

您是否担任本单位领导职务?

1. Yes 是
2. No 否

A7. Which field does your employer belong to?

请问您所属单位属于以下哪种类型?

1. Industry 工业口
2. Agriculture 农业口
3. Organization and personnel 组织人事口
4. Economy 经济口
5. Science, education, culture, and health 科教文卫口
6. Law and politics (law enforcement) 政法口
7. Transportation 交通口
8. Finance and taxation 财税口
9. Propaganda 宣传文化口
10. Urban administration 城建口
11. General offices 市直机关
12. Other \_\_\_\_ 其它

A8. How many employees does your institution have?

请问您所属单位的工作人员总数为

1. Fewer than 10 10人以下
2. 10-20
3. 20-50
4. 50-100
5. More than 100 100人以上



A9. Where is your institution? 您的工作单位位于哪个省市?

Province 省:\_\_\_\_\_ (Prefecture-level) Municipality 市:\_\_\_\_\_

Module B (Evaluation of FDI projects)

Two FDI projects want to enter your province. Please carefully read the following description of the projects. Then, please indicate which project you prefer.

	Project 1	Project 2
Number of employees		
Total capital		
Land used		
Technology age		
Requested a 5-year corporate income tax holiday		

## Reference

Amnesty International (2012). Standing their Ground. Technical report, Amnesty International, London.

Cheung, K. Y. and P. Lin (2004). Spillover effects of FDI on innovation in China: Evidence from the provincial data. *China Economic Review* 15(1), 25–44.

Gallagher, M. E. (2002). "Reform and Openness": Why China's Economic Reforms Have Delayed Democracy. *World Politics* 54(3), pp. 338–372.

Hainmueller, J., D. J. Hopkins, and T. Yamamoto (2014). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis* 22(1), 1–30.

Huang, Y. (2011). Are Foreign Firms Favored in China ? Firm-level Evidence on the Collection of Value-Added Taxes.

Shirk, S. (1993). The Political Lessons of Economic Reform in China'. *The Political Logic of Economic Reform in China* 24, 399.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce (2012). China's Approval Process for Inbound Foreign Direct Investment : Impact on Market Access, National Treatment and Transparency. Technical report, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

World Bank (2010). Foreign Direct Investment the China story.