

[Pre-analysis Plan]

Seeing Red: Perceptions of the AIIB and its Funding Activities

Soohyun Cho[†] Soo Yeon Kim[‡]

Abstract

How does the nationality of international organization (IO) leaders shape public trust and perceived effectiveness in multilateral development institutions? Existing scholarship highlights institutional design, transparency, and diversity as central to IO legitimacy, yet little is known about how leadership nationality influences recipient-country citizens' attitudes. We examine this question through the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), a China-led multilateral development bank whose leadership may cue concerns about bias and strategic influence. We plan a survey experiment with 2,000 adults in the Philippines, a borrowing country that has received financing from both the AIIB and the World Bank. Respondents will be randomly assigned to one of five conditions varying institutional identity (AIIB vs. World Bank), leadership information (Chinese vs. U.S.), and a control group. To ensure comparability across institutions, all treatments describe the same infrastructure project framed through each bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF)—the governance standard committing both lenders to environmentally and socially sustainable lending. Our primary hypotheses are that (1) identifying the AIIB president as Chinese will reduce perceived project effectiveness and institutional confidence relative to neutral framings, and (2) these effects will be strongest among respondents with pre-existing anti-China sentiment. A parallel treatment with the World Bank evaluates whether skepticism is specific to China's leadership or reflects broader concerns about great-power influence in IOs. By centering recipient-country citizens and leveraging the ESF as a benchmark, we advance theories of IO legitimacy and establish a framework for assessing how leadership cues shape public trust in multilateral development banks.

[†]Assistant Professor. Bowdoin College. s.cho@bowdoin.edu

[‡]Associate Professor. The University of British Columbia. sooyeon.kim@ubc.ca

Research Question

How do citizens in borrowing countries form opinions about the legitimacy and effectiveness of international organizations (IOs)? And how do the nationality of an IO's leader shape public trust in multilateral institutions? This study explores these questions by examining the case of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), with a focus on how China's leadership role affects public confidence in the institution's development activities.

China's growing presence in global governance has triggered widespread debate about its ability to lead international organizations. Despite China's central role in establishing and managing the AIIB, public perceptions of China remain largely negative, particularly in high-income countries (Pew Research Center 2024). This raises an important puzzle: can an international organization like the AIIB maintain credibility and trust when it is strongly associated with a country that is viewed unfavorably by many? We investigate whether explicitly identifying the AIIB's president as Chinese lowers perceptions of the institution's effectiveness and trustworthiness—particularly among individuals with pre-existing anti-China sentiment.

Although the AIIB is modeled on other multilateral development banks in terms of governance and operations (Clifton, Fuentes and Howarth 2021; Ella 2021; Kavvadia 2021), the fact that it is led by China may nonetheless trigger doubts about the institution's impartiality or strategic agenda. This concern is likely to be particularly salient among individuals who lack prior knowledge about the AIIB. For many citizens, baseline awareness of the IOs depends on their with economic conditions and cosmopolitan identity (Dellmuth 2016). In a similar vein, they may have limited understanding of the AIIB and its relationship to Chinese leadership.

As a result, explicitly identifying the organization's president as Chinese may serve as a powerful informational cue, shaping perceptions of whether the institution operates as a neutral multilateral actor or as an extension of Chinese state interests. In contexts where

China is viewed with skepticism, this cue may activate broader concerns about political influence, transparency, and self-serving foreign policy goals, even if the organization formally adheres to multilateral norms.

This pre-analysis plan outlines a survey experiment designed to investigate how the leadership of the AIIB, particularly the identification of its president as Chinese, influences public attitudes toward the institution's development goals and lending behavior. The central hypothesis posits that identifying the nationality of the AIIB's President as a Chinese national will lower confidence in the AIIB's success in achieving funding and development objectives, especially in the presence of strong anti-China sentiment.

To contextualize these findings, the study also includes a parallel intervention featuring the World Bank. By comparing perceptions of the AIIB with those of the World Bank under different leadership conditions, the experiment examines whether skepticism toward the AIIB is uniquely tied to China's leadership or reflects broader concerns about international organization leadership and effectiveness. The comparison enables engagement of the broader question of IO leadership and effectiveness and generates insights on how leadership nationality influences public confidence in multilateral lending institutions.

Theory

Existing literature has examined how institutional design, transparency, and race or gender diversity shape trust in IOs (Cho, Dietrich and Inouye 2025; Chow and Han 2023; Dellmuth and Tallberg 2021; Grigorescu 2007; Steinberg and McDowell 2024; Tallberg, Bäckstrand and Scholte 2018). Yet, far less attention has been paid to the nationality of IO leadership—a potentially important cue for how people infer the interests and biases of the organization. Most studies also focus on donor-country perspectives, leaving a gap in our understanding of how recipient-country citizens form preferences toward IO activities. This study helps fill that gap by centering on public opinion in a borrowing country.

We argue that the president of an IO often serves as a visible symbol of influence and strategic orientation. We focus on the nationality of an IO president rather than its headquarters' location for several reasons. First, an IO's leader is often seen as a reflection of the country exerting the most influence over its decision-making. Even if an IO is headquartered in a neutral or different country, the leader's nationality can signal underlying power dynamics. Second, while headquarters serve primarily as an administrative base, leaders play a direct role in shaping the organization's agenda, policies, and strategic direction. As a result, the leader's nationality may influence global perceptions of whether the IO is impartial or aligned with a particular country's interests. Lastly, whereas a headquarters location remains fixed, leadership changes over time, allowing shifts in leadership nationality to reshape perceptions of the IO's orientation and priorities.

The central hypothesis is that the information about Chinese leadership as a leading country in an international organization will negatively affect their views on the effectiveness of AIIB funding and confidence in the AIIB. This expectation is rooted in our argument that public attitudes toward international organizations are often shaped by perceptions of the dominant country's political and economic influence.

In contrast, no reference to the nationality of the AIIB President is expected to yield assessments that are not different from that of the control group. Thus, we expect respondents to evaluate the institution more in line with neutral multilateral development banks, without the additional lens of geopolitical or national influence.

H1a: When the AIIB is presented *with* information about Chinese leadership, a respondent is likely to believe that the AIIB will be *less* effective in achieving project objectives and have *lower* confidence in the AIIB.

H1b: When the AIIB is presented *without* reference to Chinese leadership, perceptions of its effectiveness and confidence in AIIB will not differ significantly from the control condition.

The study tests also the hypothesis that pre-existing sentiment toward China will have an

interaction effect with the treatment of interest. Individuals may process information about global institutions through the lens of their prior beliefs. Specifically, individuals with strong anti-China sentiment may be more likely to interpret AIIB leadership as a negative influence, reinforcing their skepticism about the institution's effectiveness.

H2: The effect of leadership nationality is more pronounced among individuals with higher levels of pre-existing anti-China sentiment.

To assess whether skepticism toward AIIB leadership is specific to China or reflects a broader pattern in how the public evaluates international organizations based on leadership nationality, the experiment includes a parallel intervention featuring the World Bank. Since the World Bank has historically been led by an American national, this treatment enables a direct comparison.

Importantly, both the AIIB and the World Bank engage in similar types of development projects, particularly in the areas of environmental sustainability and social development, and both operate under comparable multilateral frameworks—most notably, their respective Environmental and Social Frameworks (ESF). By emphasizing this shared area of institutional activity, we ensure that comparisons between the AIIB and the World Bank are made on substantively equivalent terms. Moreover, focusing on ESFs allows us to observe whether leadership nationality affects perceptions of an IO's capacity to deliver on socially sensitive and politically salient objectives—where concerns about bias may be more acute.

If concerns about leadership influence are uniquely associated with China, rather than indicative of a broader distrust of powerful states' leadership in IOs, we would expect a more muted public response when the World Bank's leadership is identified as American. These are secondary study objectives and are therefore not delineated as formal hypotheses.

Research Design

This section describes the research design for the survey experiment, including the sample of analysis and the treatments.

Sample

The survey sample will consist of 2,000 English-speaking adults over 18 years of age recruited in the Philippines. The survey firm *PureSpectrum* will recruit respondents and field the survey experiment. The Philippines is an appropriate case for examining AIIB development financing due to its strategic economic position, infrastructure needs, and geopolitical relevance (Trinidad 2016). The Philippines has received significant funding from the AIIB, with eleven projects so far approved in the years 2017 - 2024.¹ Fielding the survey in the Philippines contributes to the triangulation of evidence (Dellmuth 2018) from a similar survey conducted in India that compares local, the World Bank, and the AIIB as the preferred funding source for a local development project (Deo et al. 2024). On variability across the Philippines and India, the Pew Research Center survey of public opinion of China reports that respondents in the Philippines, like in India, have a slightly more favorable opinion of China.²

Treatment

The hypotheses of interest in this study posit that when respondents receive information about the country holding a leading role in an international organization, in this case, a multilateral development bank, they evaluate both the funded project and the multilateral development bank differently from when they are not given such information. To this end, the

¹The Philippines received funding for 36 projects from the World Bank during the same period.

²38% of respondents in the Philippines hold a favorable opinion of China as compared to 18% in India. 64% of respondents in the Philippines have an unfavorable opinion of China, while in India this figure is 52%. Pew Research Center, July 2024, “Most People in 35 Countries Say China Has a Large Impact on Their National Economy”.

treatment manipulates information about leadership in a multilateral development bank and randomly assigns respondents to one of five groups: (1) Control group, (2) AIIB Treatment, (3) AIIB-China leadership Treatment, (4) World Bank Treatment, and (5) World Bank-US leadership Treatment.

First, the Control group will receive general information about a multilateral development bank funding a project in the Philippines. To isolate the treatment effects and ensure that any observed differences in outcomes are attributable specifically to the information provided about the two banks in the treatment groups, we will avoid naming any specific institution. Instead, the control group will receive information on the type of institution (multilateral development bank), the recipient country (the Philippines), and the institution's commitment to its Environment and Social (ES) Framework.³

Control

A multilateral development bank aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

This institution has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

Second, respondents in the AIIB treatment group will receive information identical to that received by the Control group, but with 'A multilateral development bank' now replaced with 'The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB).' The treatment will include as well a photo of the AIIB building.

AIIB Treatment

³The AIIB and World Bank both express strong commitments to their respective Environmental and Social Frameworks (ESFs). The AIIB's ESF emphasizes active alignment with existing multilateral development Banks (Gabusi 2017; Wilson 2019). See [AIIB Environmental and Social Framework](#), p. 9.

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

Third, the AIIB-China leadership treatment will provide identical information as the AIIB treatment above, with one addition: a statement introducing the current President as a Chinese national. Respondents in this group will view a photo of the AIIB logo with the Chinese flag. This information is expected to lead respondents to view the project less favorably, despite its identical goals and characteristics.

AIIB-China leadership Treatment

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects. **The current President of the AIIB is a Chinese national.**

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

Fourth, respondents in the World Bank treatment group will receive information identical to that received by the Control group, but with 'A multilateral development bank' now replaced with 'The World Bank.' By investigating a parallel treatment using the World Bank, the aim is to examine whether respondents perceive the World Bank and the AIIB differently, even though both institutions are funding the same project in the same country.

World Bank Treatment

The World Bank is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

The World Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

Lastly, the World Bank-US leadership treatment will provide identical information as the World Bank treatment above, with one addition: a statement introducing the current President as a U.S. national. In the same design as above, this parallel treatment is included to compare individual perceptions of China's AIIB leadership with the leadership of the United States in the World Bank for an identical project.

World Bank-US leadership Treatment

The World Bank is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects. **The current president of the World Bank is a U.S. national.**

The World Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

Outcomes

The survey experiment includes two outcomes concerning individual perceptions of the international organization: effectiveness in terms of the prospects for achieving the objectives of the funded project; and confidence in the international organization's goals of improving economic and social outcomes in developing countries. Both outcomes are measured through

a 5-point Likert scale, for both comparability across measures and reliability (Revilla, Saris and Krosnick 2014).

IO Effectiveness The first outcome of interest is the respondent's assessment of the approved project in the Philippines. It measures the prospects for success from the viewpoint of the respondent. Responses range from "very effective" to "very ineffective."

How effective do you think the multilateral development bank/Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank/World Bank will be in achieving its project objectives in the Philippines?

Responses: *Very effective; Somewhat effective; Neither effective nor ineffective; Somewhat ineffective; Very ineffective*

Confidence in IO The survey also asks a broader questions concerning confidence in the international organization to improve economic and social outcomes for developing countries. This question on 'confidence' in the IO draws from current scholarship on the legitimacy of international organizations (Tallberg and Zürn 2019; Zaum 2013) that rely on individual beliefs for operationalization (Hurrelmann, Schneider and Steffek 2007; Steffek 2023).⁴ The operationalization engages societal perception of legitimacy using the widely used measure of the extent to which they have 'confidence' or 'trust' in the international organization (Dellmuth 2018; Dellmuth and Schlippak 2020; Dellmuth et al. 2022).

How much confidence do you have in the multilateral development bank/Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank/World Bank to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

Responses: *Very confident; Somewhat confident; Neither confident nor unconfident; Somewhat unconfident; Very unconfident*

Moderating Variables To assess heterogeneous effects, the study design examines whether a respondent's pre-existing sentiment toward China may have divergent treatment effects. The

⁴See Steffek ((2023) for an excellent survey of the three approaches for analyzing the legitimacy of international organizations. They include the measurement of individual beliefs, public discourses, and observable social action.

survey experiment will include a series of pre-treatment questions on respondent attitudes toward China as well as the United States, United Kingdom, and Russia. Controlling for pre-treatment views increases the precision of the estimated effects, as noted by Clifford, Sheagley and Piston (2021). The order of countries will be randomized across respondents.

Please tell me if you have a *very favorable*, *somewhat favorable*, *neither favorable nor unfavorable*, *somewhat unfavorable*, or *very unfavorable* opinion of China/United States/United Kingdom/Russia?

The above question is drawn from the Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Survey (2024), with the scale slightly adjusted to include a middle category indicating neither favorability nor unfavorability.

Would you say China's/the United States'/the United Kingdom's/Russia's influence in the world in recent years has been getting stronger, getting weaker or staying about the same?

Responses: *Getting stronger*; *Staying about the same*; *Getting weaker*

To take account as well of respondents' prior exposure to international institutions including the World Bank and the AIIB, the survey includes pre-treatment questions concerning familiarity with them. The order of the banks will be randomized across respondents.

How familiar are you with the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank/World Bank?

Responses: *Very familiar*; *Somewhat familiar*; *Somewhat unfamiliar*; *Very unfamiliar*

Control Variables The control variables include employment status, party identification, residence (rural or urban), education, gender, age, marital status, occupation, income, and religion.

Expected Outcomes and Implications

We expect that identifying the AIIB's president as Chinese will lead to lower perceived effectiveness and reduced confidence in the AIIB's ability to deliver on its project objectives, especially in the realm of environmental and social development. In addition, China's leadership of the AIIB is likely to lower perceptions of its effectiveness and trustworthiness, especially among respondents who already have unfavorable views toward China. In existing scholarship, Chen (2020), for example, argues that China had a status 'deficit' before the AIIB was established, but in the years since the AIIB has been in operation, China's status 'deficit' has declined significantly as the Bank has managed to attract members from both the developed and developing worlds and has successfully undertaken a lending program. This study enables us to directly interrogate this claim in a borrow member country of the AIIB. By contrast, identifying the World Bank's leadership as American is not expected to generate negative effect, suggesting that concerns about political influence may be specific to China, rather than reflecting a general skepticism toward great power leadership in international organizations.

This study makes several important contributions to the existing literature. First, while much of the current research on China's leadership in the AIIB has concentrated on institutional design (Callaghan and Hubbard 2016; Chin 2016; Kim and Lee 2024; Lichtenstein 2019; Wilson 2019), the politics surrounding membership and China's influence (Broz, Zhang and Wang 2020; Kaya and Woo 2022; Kaya, Kilby and Kay 2021; Qian, Vreeland and Zhao 2023), relatively little attention has been paid to public perceptions. This study seeks to this gap by emphasizing how public opinion influences the perceived effectiveness of these new international organizations. In doing so, this study highlights the societal dimension to the debate on changes in global economic governance due to the rise of China and rising powers more broadly (Humphrey 2022; Ransdell 2019; Xu 2021).

Second, this study highlights the importance of leadership cues—such as the nation-

ality of an IO's president—in shaping public trust in multilateral institutions. While these institutions are often designed with formal rules intended to ensure transparency and fair governance, citizens may nonetheless interpret leadership nationality as a signal of power asymmetries or hidden agendas. This suggests that perceptions of legitimacy are not based solely on institutional performance or procedural fairness, but also on symbolic representations of influence. In low-information settings where individuals may lack detailed knowledge about how IOs function, the identity of the leader can serve as a powerful heuristic, shaping whether the institution is viewed as impartial or politically motivated.

Third, this study advances knowledge beyond the specific case of China and the AIIB, extending to our understanding of leadership as an important source of institutional credibility (Johnson 2011). Specifically, the findings can advance the debate on how the leadership country in an international organization can significantly influence the success of policy initiatives. Perceptions of leadership, particularly regarding the leading country's reputation or global image, can shape how the public views the effectiveness and legitimacy of international organizations.

References

Broz, J. Lawrence, Zhiwen Zhang and Gaoyang Wang. 2020. “Explaining foreign support for China’s global economic leadership.” *International Organization* 74(3):417–452.

Callaghan, Mike and Paul Hubbard. 2016. “The Asian infrastructure investment bank: Multilateralism on the silk road.” *China Economic Journal* 9(2):116–139.

Chen, Ian Tsung-yen. 2020. “China’s status deficit and the debut of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank.” *The Pacific Review* 33(5):697–727.

Chin, Gregory T. 2016. “Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank: governance innovation and prospects.” *Global Governance* 22:11.

Cho, Soohyun, Simone Dietrich and Rikio Inouye. 2025. “Beyond Paternalism: How Leadership Diversity Shapes Foreign Aid Perceptions in South Africa.”

Chow, Wilfred M and Enze Han. 2023. “Descriptive legitimacy and international organizations: evidence from United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.” *The Journal of Politics* 85(2):357–371.

Clifford, Scott, Geoffrey Sheagley and Spencer Piston. 2021. “Increasing precision without altering treatment effects: Repeated measures designs in survey experiments.” *American Political Science Review* 115(3):1048–1065.

Clifton, Judith, Daniel Díaz Fuentes and David J Howarth. 2021. *Regional development banks in the world economy*. Oxford University Press.

Dellmuth, Lisa. 2018. Individual Sources of Legitimacy Beliefs. In *Legitimacy in Global Governance: Sources, Processes, and Consequences*, ed. Jonas Tallberg, Karin Bäckstrand and Jan Aart Scholte. Oxford University Press pp. 37–55.

Dellmuth, Lisa and Bernd Schlipphak. 2020. “Legitimacy beliefs towards global governance institutions: a research agenda.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 27(6):931–943.

Dellmuth, Lisa, Jan Aart Scholte, Jonas Tallberg and Soetkin Verhaegen. 2022. *Citizens, elites, and the legitimacy of global governance*. Oxford University Press.

Dellmuth, Lisa M and Jonas Tallberg. 2021. “Elite communication and the popular legitimacy of international organizations.” *British Journal of Political Science* 51(3):1292–1313.

Dellmuth, Lisa Maria. 2016. “The knowledge gap in world politics: Assessing the sources of citizen awareness of the United Nations Security Council.” *Review of International Studies* 42(4):673–700.

Deo, Sahil, Mark Hallerberg, Om Marathe and Jayati Sharma. 2024. Membership and its Benefits: Vote Shares in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Technical report Working paper, Hertie School.

Ella, Doron. 2021. “Balancing effectiveness with geo-economic interests in multilateral development banks: the design of the AIIB, ADB and the World Bank in a comparative perspective.” *The Pacific Review* 34(6):1022–1053.

Gabusi, Giuseppe. 2017. ““Crossing the river by feeling the gold”: The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the financial support to the Belt and Road Initiative.” *China & World Economy* 25(5):23–45.

Grigorescu, Alexandru. 2007. “Transparency of intergovernmental organizations: The roles of member states, international bureaucracies and nongovernmental organizations.” *International Studies Quarterly* 51(3):625–648.

Humphrey, Chris. 2022. *Financing the future: multilateral development banks in the changing world order of the 21st century*. Oxford University Press.

Hurrelmann, Achim, Steffen Schneider and Jens Steffek. 2007. Introduction: Legitimacy in an Age of Global Politics. In *Legitimacy in an Age of Global Politics*, ed. Achim Hurrelmann, Steffen Schneider and Jens Steffek. Springer pp. 1–16.

Johnson, Tana. 2011. “Guilt by association: The link between states’ influence and the legitimacy of intergovernmental organizations.” *The Review of International Organizations* 6:57–84.

URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:154847834>

Kavvadia, Helen. 2021. “The European Investment Bank and.” *Regional development banks in the world economy* p. 256.

Kaya, Ayse and Byungwon Woo. 2022. “China and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB): Chinese Influence over Membership Shares?” *The Review of International Organizations* 17(4):781–813.

Kaya, Ayse, Christopher Kilby and Jonathan Kay. 2021. “Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank as an instrument for Chinese influence? Supplementary versus remedial multilateralism.” *World Development* 145:105531.

Kim, Soo Yeon and Jesslene Lee. 2024. Membership and its Benefits: Vote Shares in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Technical report Working paper, National University of Singapore.

Lichtenstein, Natalie. 2019. “AIIB at three: A comparative and institutional perspective.” *Global Policy* 10(4):582–586.

Pew Research Center. 2024. Spring 2024 Global Attitudes Survey. Technical report Pew Research Center. July 9, 2024 Release.

URL: <https://www.pewresearch.org>

Qian, Jing, James Raymond Vreeland and Jianzhi Zhao. 2023. “The impact of China’s AIIB on the World Bank.” *International Organization* 77(1):217–237.

Ransdell, James. 2019. “Institutional innovation by the Asian infrastructure investment bank.” *Asian Journal of International Law* 9(1):125–152.

Revilla, Melanie A., Willem E. Saris and Jon A. Krosnick. 2014. “Choosing the Number of Categories in Agree–Disagree Scales.” *Sociological Methods & Research* 43(1):73–97.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124113509605>

Steffek, Jens. 2023. “Triangulating the legitimacy of international organizations: Beliefs, discourses, and actions.” *International Studies Review* 25(4):viad054.

Steinberg, David A and Daniel McDowell. 2024. “Race, Representation, and the Legitimacy of International Organizations.” *International Organization* 78(3):575–599.

Tallberg, Jonas, Karin Bäckstrand and Jan Aart Scholte. 2018. *Legitimacy in global governance: Sources, processes, and consequences*. Oxford University Press.

Tallberg, Jonas and Michael Zürn. 2019. “The Legitimacy and Legitimation of International Organizations: Introduction and Framework.” *The Review of International Organizations* 14(4):581–606.

Trinidad, Dennis D. 2016. “Institutional mismatch and Chinese aid in the Philippines: Challenges and implications.” *Asian Perspective* 40(2):299–328.

Wilson, Jeffrey D. 2019. “The evolution of China’s Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank: From a revisionist to status-seeking agenda.” *International Relations of the Asia-pacific* 19(1):147–176.

Xu, J. 2021. “The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank: Its Birth, Mandates, and Infrastructure Financing.” *Regional Development Banks in the World Economy* pp. 194–220.

Zaum, Dominik. 2013. International Organizations, Legitimacy, and Legitimation. In *Legitimating International Organizations*, ed. Dominik Zaum. Oxford University Press pp. 3–10.

Attention Checks

We care about the quality of our survey data. For us to get the most accurate measure of your opinions, it is important that you provide thoughtful answers to each question in this survey.

Do you commit to providing thoughtful answers to the questions in this survey?

- Yes, I will
- No, I will not
- I can't promise either way

The following question is to verify that you are a real person. Which of the following is a vegetable?

- Salmon
- Pizza
- Broccoli
- Milk
- Shrimp

Are you a voting-age (18+ year old) citizen of the Philippines?

- Yes
- No

Pre-treatment: issues and economy

In our society, there are groups which tend to be towards the top and groups which tend to be towards the bottom. Below is a scale that runs from the top to the bottom. Where would you put yourself on this



First, we would like to ask your opinion about what you feel are the important issues facing the Philippines. For each of the following issues, can you tell me if you think it is a (a) very important, (b) somewhat important, (c) somewhat unimportant, or (d) very unimportant issue?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
Poverty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Economic Inequality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supply of Energy / Electricity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Health Care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crime	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
Corruption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conflict and Wars	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In general, how would you describe...

	Very good	Fairly good	Fairly bad	Very bad
... the current state of the economy in the Philippines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... your family's present living conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... what you think the economy in the Philippines will be like in one year	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... what you think your family's living conditions will be like in one year	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How satisfied are you with the current state of the Philippine economy?

- Very unsatisfied
- Unsatisfied
- Neither
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied

Pre-treatment: perceptions

Asian countries have a significant positive impact on the global economy.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

Would you say U.S. influence in the world in recent years has been getting stronger, getting weaker or staying about the same?

- Getting stronger
- Staying about the same
- Getting weaker

Would you say Chinese influence in the world in recent years has been getting stronger, getting weaker or staying about the same?

- Getting stronger
- Staying about the same
- Getting weaker

Would you say UK influence in the world in recent years has been getting stronger, getting weaker or staying about the same?

- Getting stronger
- Staying about the same
- Getting weaker

Would you say Russian influence in the world in recent years has been getting stronger, getting weaker or staying about the same?

- Getting stronger
- Staying about the same
- Getting weaker

How familiar are you with the World Bank?

- Very unfamiliar
- Somewhat unfamiliar
- Somewhat familiar
- Very familiar

How familiar are you with the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank?

- Very unfamiliar

- Somewhat unfamiliar
- Somewhat familiar
- Very familiar

Of the many foreign countries or development organizations that provide aid to the Philippines, how familiar are you with them?

	Very familiar	Somewhat familiar	Only know a little	Never heard of them
China	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
World Bank	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Asian Development Bank	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
United States	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Russia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

open_text

The news article on the following page will describe international organizations. Please read the description carefully because you will be asked to recall information about it at the end of the study.

Control

A multilateral development bank aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

This institution has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

How effective do you think the multilateral development bank will be in achieving its project objectives related to environmental and social sustainability in the Philippines?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

How much confidence do you have in the multilateral development bank to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Neither confident nor unconfident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Very unconfident

Multilateral development banks such as the World Bank are aiming to collectively improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries. The United States is the largest shareholder of the World Bank. It has contributed \$3.5 billion in paid-in capital to the World Bank to fund projects in developing countries. Do you support the US's continued funding of the World Bank?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank is another multilateral development bank that aims to collectively improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries. Do you agree that the Asian Infrastructure Bank and

the World Bank are working together to achieve common aims?

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

T1_WB



The World Bank is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

The World Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its

proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

How effective do you think the World Bank will be in achieving its project objectives related to environmental and social sustainability in the Philippines?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

How much confidence do you have in the World Bank to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Neither confident nor unconfident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Very unconfident

Multilateral development banks such as the World Bank are aiming to collectively improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries. The United States is the largest shareholder of the World Bank. It has contributed \$3.5 billion in paid-in capital to the World Bank to fund projects in developing countries. Do you support the US's continued funding of the World Bank?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

T2_AIIB



The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects.

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

How effective do you think the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) will be in achieving its project objectives related to environmental and social sustainability in the Philippines?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

How much confidence do you have in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Neither confident nor unconfident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Very unconfident

T3_AIIB_China



The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects. **The current President of the AIIB is Jin Liqun, a Chinese national.**

The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

How effective do you think the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) will be in achieving its project objectives related to environmental and social sustainability in the Philippines?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

How much confidence do you have in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Neither confident nor unconfident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Very unconfident

T4_WB_US



The World Bank is a multilateral development bank that aims to reduce poverty and build shared prosperity in developing countries. Its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) supports environmentally and socially sustainable infrastructure projects. **The current president of the World Bank is Ajay Banga, a U.S. national.**

The World Bank has approved funding to the Philippines for its proposed project that aims to enhance flood resilience and management. The project involves constructing and upgrading infrastructure to reduce flood risks, improving drainage systems, and strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of governmental agencies.

How effective do you think the World Bank will be in achieving its project objectives related to environmental and social sustainability in the Philippines?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Very ineffective

How much confidence do you have in the World Bank to improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries?

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Neither confident nor unconfident
- Somewhat unconfident
- Very unconfident

DVs

Both the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and the World Bank (WB) are multilateral development banks that aim to collectively improve economic and social outcomes in developing countries. Do you agree that the Asian

Infrastructure Bank (AIIB) and the World Bank (WB) should work together to achieve common aims?

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

manipulation checks

Could you please tell us which bank you read about earlier in this survey?

- World Bank
- Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
- Asian Development Bank

Could you please tell us which bank you read about earlier in this survey?

- World Bank
- Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank
- Asian Development Bank

Could you please tell us where the headquarters of the bank

you read about earlier in this survey is located?

- Washington D.C.
- Beijing
- Manila

Could you please tell us where the headquarters of the bank you read about earlier in this survey is located?

- Washington D.C.
- Beijing
- Manila

Could you please tell us which bank you read about earlier in this survey?

- A multilateral development bank
- Philippine National Bank
- BDO Unibank

demo1

Please indicate which of the following groups or groups you consider yourself to belong to?

- Bicol
- Ifugao

- Igorot
- Ilocano
- Ilonggo
- Cebuano
- Chinese
- Japanese
- Maguindanao
- Maranao
- Spanish
- Tagalog
- Tausug
- Yakan
- Masbateño
- Waray
- Sorsoganon
- Others

Which political party in the Philippines do you most closely identify with or support?

- PDP–Laban (Partido Demokratiko Pilipino–Lakas ng Bayan)
- Nacionalista Party
- Liberal Party
- Lakas–CMD (Lakas–Christian Muslim Democrats)
- Nationalist People's Coalition (NPC)
- Aksyon Demokratiko
- United Nationalist Alliance (UNA)
- Makabayan Bloc
- Hugpong ng Pagbabago
- Kilusang Bagong Lipunan (KBL)

Other

Would you describe the place where you live as

- A big city
- The suburbs or outskirts of a big city
- A small city or town
- A country or town
- A country village
- A farm or home in the country

Which of the following best describes your current employment situation?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Unemployed looking for work
- Unemployed not looking for work
- Pensioner
- Student
- Homemaker
- Unable to work due to disability

What is your highest level of education?

- No formal schooling

- Informal schooling only (including Koranic schooling)
- Some primary schooling
- Primary school completed
- Intermediate school or some secondary school/ high school
- Secondary school/ high school completed
- Post-secondary qualifications other than university, e.g. a diploma or degree from a polytechnic or college
- Some university
- University completed
- Post-graduate

Which of the following best describes you?

- Male
- Female
- Other

How old are you?

- Under 18
- 18-24 years old
- 25-34 years old
- 35-44 years old
- 45-54 years old
- 55-64 years old
- 65+ years old

How would you describe your racial or ethnic background?

- Filipino
- Indigenous Peoples (e.g., Aeta, Igorot, Lumad, Mangyan, etc.)
- Chinese-Filipino (Chinoy)
- Spanish or Hispanic descent
- Mixed race (e.g., Mestizo/a)
- Other Asian descent
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married or living with a partner
- Divorced / separated / widowed
- Other [Please specify]

What is your main occupation?

- Unemployed
- Student
- Housewife / homemaker
- Agriculture / farming / fishing / forestry
- Trader / hawker / vendor
- Retail / shop
- Unskilled manual worker (e.g., cleaner, laborer, domestic help, unskilled manufacturing worker)

- Artisan or skilled manual worker (e.g., trades like electrician, mechanic, machinist or skilled manufacturing worker)
- Clerical or secretarial
- Supervisor / Foreman / Senior Manager
- Security services (police, army, private security)
- Mid-level professional (e.g., teacher, nurse, mid-level government officer)
- Upper-level professional (e.g., banker/finance, doctor, lawyer, engineer, accountant, professor, senior-)
- Other

Before taxes and other deductions, what on average is YOUR OWN total monthly income? (In Pesos)

- Less than ₱10,000
- ₱10,000 - ₱19,999
- ₱20,000 - ₱39,999
- ₱40,000 - ₱59,999
- ₱60,000 - ₱99,999
- ₱100,000 and above
- Prefer not to answer

Do you belong to a religion and, if yes, which religion do you belong to?

- No religion
- Roman Catholic
- Protestant
- Orthodox
- Iglesia Ni Cristo

- Aglipayan
- Jewish
- Islam
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Others

How would you describe your political ideology?

- Very liberal
- Somewhat liberal
- Neither liberal or conservative
- Somewhat conservative
- Very conservative