

COVER SHEET FOR PROPOSAL TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT/SOLICITATION NO./DUE DATE NSF 22-526 01/23/2023		<input type="checkbox"/> Special Exception to Deadline Date Policy		FOR NSF USE ONLY NSF PROPOSAL NUMBER 2316205	
FOR CONSIDERATION BY NSF ORGANIZATION UNIT(S) (Indicate the most specific unit known, i.e. program, division, etc.) SMA - ER2-Ethical & Responsible Res					
DATE RECEIVED	NUMBER OF COPIES	DIVISION ASSIGNED	FUND CODE	UEI (Unique Entity Identifier)	FILE LOCATION
01/23/2023	1	04010000 SMA	129Y	Z3FGN9MF92U2	
EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN) OR TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (TIN) 464727800		SHOW PREVIOUS AWARD NO. IF THIS IS <input type="checkbox"/> A RENEWAL <input type="checkbox"/> AN ACCOMPLISHMENT-BASED RENEWAL		IS THIS PROPOSAL BEING SUBMITTED TO ANOTHER FEDERAL AGENCY? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IF YES, LIST ACRONYM(S)	
NAME OF ORGANIZATION TO WHICH AWARD SHOULD BE MADE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON			ADDRESS OF Awardee Organization, including 9 digit zip code 1585 E 13TH AVE EUGENE, OR 97403-1657 US		
AWARDEE ORGANIZATION CODE (IF KNOWN) 0032235000					
NAME OF PRIMARY PLACE OF PERF University of Oregon Eugene			ADDRESS OF PRIMARY PLACE OF PERF, INCLUDING 9 DIGIT ZIP CODE 1585 E 13TH AVE EUGENE, OR 97403-1657 US		
IS Awardee Organization (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> SMALL BUSINESS <input type="checkbox"/> MINORITY BUSINESS <input type="checkbox"/> IF THIS IS A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL THEN CHECK HERE <input type="checkbox"/> FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATION <input type="checkbox"/> WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESS					
TITLE OF PROPOSED PROJECT The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants: Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics					SHOW LETTER OF INTENT ID IF APPLICABLE
REQUESTED AMOUNT \$ 399,828	PROPOSED DURATION (1-60 MONTHS) 36 months	REQUESTED STARTING DATE 07/01/2023	SHOW RELATED PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL NO. IF APPLICABLE		
THIS PROPOSAL INCLUDES ANY OF THE ITEMS LISTED BELOW <input type="checkbox"/> BEGINNING INVESTIGATOR <input type="checkbox"/> HUMAN SUBJECTS Human Subjects Assurance Number _____ <input type="checkbox"/> DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES Exemption Subsection _____ or IRB App. Date _____ <input type="checkbox"/> PROPRIETARY & PRIVILEGED INFORMATION <input type="checkbox"/> FUNDING OF INT'L BRANCH CAMPUS OF U.S. IHE <input type="checkbox"/> HISTORIC PLACES <input type="checkbox"/> FUNDING OF FOREIGN ORGANIZATION OR FOREIGN INDIVIDUAL <input type="checkbox"/> VERTEBRATE ANIMALS IACUC App. Date _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES: COUNTRY/COUNTRIES INVOLVED PHS Animal Welfare Assurance Number _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TYPE OF PROPOSAL Research <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COLLABORATIVE STATUS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A collaborative proposal from one organization (PAPPG II.D.3.a)					
PI/PD DEPARTMENT Clark Honors College		PI/PD POSTAL ADDRESS 1293 University of Oregon			
PI/PD FAX NUMBER		Eugene, OR 97403 US			
NAMES (TYPED)	High Degree	Yr of Degree	Telephone Number	Email Address	
PI/PD NAME Melissa Graboyes	PhD	2010	850-346-6107	graboyes@uoregon.edu	
CO-PI/PD Edward A Miguel	PhD	2000	510-642-7162	emiguel@econ.berkeley.edu	
CO-PI/PD Alfredo Burlando	PhD	2010	850-586-3349	burlando@uoregon.edu	
CO-PI/PD					
CO-PI/PD					

CERTIFICATION PAGE**Certification for Authorized Organizational Representative (or Equivalent)**

By electronically signing and submitting this proposal, the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) is: (1) certifying that statements made herein are true and complete to the best of his/her knowledge; and (2) agreeing to accept the obligation to comply with NSF award terms and conditions if an award is made as a result of this application. Further, the applicant is hereby providing certifications regarding conflict of interest (when applicable), flood hazard insurance (when applicable), responsible conduct of research, and organizational support as set forth in the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG). Willful provision of false information in this application and its supporting documents or in reports required under an ensuing award is a criminal offense (U. S. Code, Title 18, §1001).

Certification Regarding Conflict of Interest

The AOR is required to complete certifications stating that the organization has implemented and is enforcing a written policy on conflicts of interest (COI), consistent with the provisions of PAPPG Chapter IXA; and that, to the best of his/her knowledge, all financial disclosures required by the conflict of interest policy were made; and that conflicts of interest, if any, were, or prior to the organizations expenditure of any funds under the award, will be, satisfactorily managed, reduced or eliminated in accordance with the organizations conflict of interest policy. Conflicts that cannot be satisfactorily managed, reduced or eliminated and research that proceeds without the imposition of conditions or restrictions when a conflict of interest exists, must be disclosed to NSF via use of the Notifications and Requests Module in FastLane.

Certification Regarding Flood Hazard Insurance

Two sections of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 USC §4012a and §4106) bar Federal agencies from giving financial assistance for acquisition or construction purposes in any area identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as having special flood hazards unless the:

- (1) community in which that area is located participates in the national flood insurance program; and
- (2) building (and any related equipment) is covered by adequate flood insurance.

By electronically signing the Certification Pages, the Authorized Organizational Representative (or equivalent) located in FEMA-designated special flood hazard areas is certifying that adequate flood insurance has been or will be obtained in the following situations:

- (1) for NSF grants for the construction of a building or facility, regardless of the dollar amount of the grant; and
- (2) for other NSF grants when more than \$25,000 has been budgeted in the proposal for repair, alteration or improvement (construction) of a building or facility.

Certification Regarding Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)

(This certification is not applicable to conference proposals.)

By electronically signing the Certification Pages, the Authorized Organizational Representative is certifying that, in accordance with the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide, Chapter IX.B., the institution has a plan in place to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students and postdoctoral researchers who will be supported by NSF to conduct research.

The AOR shall require that the language of this certification be included in any award documents for all subawards at all tiers.

Certification Regarding Organizational Support

By electronically signing the Certification Pages, the Authorized Organizational Representative (or equivalent) is certifying that there is organizational support for the proposal as required by Section 526 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010. This support extends to the portion of the proposal developed to satisfy the Broader Impacts Review Criterion as well as the Intellectual Merit Review Criterion, and any additional review criteria specified in the solicitation. Organizational support will be made available, as described in the proposal, in order to address the broader impacts and intellectual merit activities to be undertaken.

Certification Regarding Dual Use Research of Concern

By electronically signing the certification pages, the Authorized Organizational Representative is certifying that the organization will be or is in compliance with all aspects of the United States Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern.

Certification Regarding the Meeting Organizer's Written Policy or Code-of-Conduct that Addresses Sexual Harassment, Other Forms of Harassment, and Sexual Assault

(This certification is only applicable to travel proposals)

By electronically signing the Cover Sheet, the AOR is certifying that prior to the proposer's participation in the meeting, the proposer will assure that the meeting organizer has a written policy or code-of-conduct that addresses sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, and sexual assault, and that includes clear and accessible means of reporting violations of the policy or code-of-conduct. The policy or code-of-conduct must address the method for making a complaint as well as how any complaints received during the meeting will be resolved. The proposer is not required to submit the meeting organizer's policy or code-of-conduct for review by NSF.

Certification Regarding Family Leave Status (or equivalent)

(This certification is only applicable to career-life balance supplemental funding requests)

By electronically signing the certification pages, the Authorized Organizational Representative hereby certifies that the request for a technician (or equivalent) is because the (PI/co-PI/senior personnel/ NSF Graduate Research Fellow/postdoctoral researcher/graduate student) is, or will be, on family leave status (or equivalent) from the organization in accordance with the organization's policies. The Authorized Organizational Representative also affirms that the organization is able to fill the position for which funding is being requested, in an appropriate timeframe.

AUTHORIZED ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE		SIGNATURE	DATE
NAME Jennifer B Jacobs		Electronic Signature	Jan 23 2023 04:23 PM
TELEPHONE NUMBER 252-558-7044	EMAIL ADDRESS jjacobs7@uoregon.edu		FAX NUMBER

The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants: Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics

OVERVIEW

This proposal will result in a series of closely-linked research and educational/training outputs centered on changing the norms around dissemination of research results in the field of development economics. Findings from this interdisciplinary mixed-methods project will contribute to changing how results from Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are shared with participants on the African continent. The project will conduct research that includes: **Year 1** a systematic review of literature on the topic of dissemination; in **Year 2**, 400 surveys and 120 interviews with development economists and Africans participating in RCTs; and in **Year 3**, the production of Proposed Best Practices for Research Dissemination that will be widely shared to initiate a conversation about this important, yet neglected, area of the research encounter.

INTELLECTUAL MERIT

Our preliminary work on this topic has identified three research aims:

Aim 1: Establish Current Dissemination Practices in Economics and Related Disciplines. In Y1, the PI team will clearly document the norms of disseminating within the field of Economics, and adjacent fields such as Political Science, Sociology, Demography, and Anthropology. The PI team will conduct a systematic review of social science literatures, search publicly available protocols, and gather requirements from African Ethics Boards. Key questions include: How often do researchers report back to participants? What methods do they use? How have these practices evolved over time?

Aim 2: Gather Perspectives from Economists and African Participants. In Y2, the PI team will conduct 400 surveys (100 development economists; 300 African participants from 3 different RCTs in Kenya, Zambia, and Senegal) and 120 semi-structured interviews with economists and African participants in RCTs. We will gather qualitative and quantitative data about their experiences with disseminating and receiving results, their expectations of what should be shared and why, perceived challenges to sharing, and ideas of how sharing could occur successfully.

Aim 3: Develop Best Practices to Spur Conversation, Reflection, and Change. Y3 will focus on creating a Proposed Best Practices document, sharing results with all participants in our project, and receiving feedback on the Proposed Best Practices document from our two key demographic groups. We expect that the Proposed Best Practices will provide accessible, practical, and applicable recommendations that are responsive to the needs of both researchers and participants. It will be shared widely for feedback through a special issue of a journal and a conference on RCT Research Ethics, blog posts, published articles, and public meetings in the African communities where surveying and interviewing took place.

BROADER IMPACTS

As a research project investigating best practices about dissemination, we will be intentional and innovative in disseminating our own research results. Our Broader Impacts will focus on two areas:

Focus 1: Awareness of Importance of Dissemination/ Ethical Significance. We will work to establish a new norm for sharing results through: 5 published articles, 3 blog posts, 1 Executive Summary, 5 conference presentations, 1 special journal issue and 1 conference on RCT Research Ethics, and integrating new ethics content into 6 existing classes, enabling us to reach an estimated 900 students.

Focus 2: Training. We will offer practical trainings to build dissemination skills: 3 training sessions on the ethics of dissemination at CEGA Research Transparency and Reproducibility Trainings, and will offer trainings to both doctoral students and undergraduates at UC Berkeley and UO.

The **PI team** offers complimentary expertise in the fields of Economics, History, STS, African Studies, and Ethics and has decades of experience working on the African continent. They are supported by a strong institutional partnership with UC Berkeley's Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA), internationally respected for their leadership on social science research ethics and for their meaningful partnerships with African institutions. CEGA was established by co-PI Miguel, who has been a thought leader over the past 15 years around issues of Open Science, Transparency, and Research Ethics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

For font size and page formatting specifications, see PAPPG section II.B.2.

	Total No. of Pages	Page No.* (Optional)*
Cover Sheet for Proposal to the National Science Foundation		
Project Summary (not to exceed 1 page)	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
Table of Contents	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
Project Description (Including Results from Prior NSF Support) (not to exceed 15 pages) (Exceed only if allowed by a specific program announcement/solicitation or if approved in advance by the appropriate NSF Assistant Director or designee)	<u>15</u>	<u> </u>
References Cited	<u>7</u>	<u> </u>
Biographical Sketches (Not to exceed 3 pages each)	<u>9</u>	<u> </u>
Budget (Plus up to 5 pages of budget justification. For proposals that contain subaward(s), each subaward must include a separate budget justification of no more than 5 pages)	<u>16</u>	<u> </u>
Current and Pending Support	<u>22</u>	<u> </u>
Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources	<u>2</u>	<u> </u>
Special Information/Supplementary Documents (Data Management Plan, Mentoring Plan and Other Supplementary Documents)	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>
Appendix (List below.) (Include only if allowed by a specific program announcement/solicitation or if approved in advance by the appropriate NSF Assistant Director or designee)	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Appendix Items:		

*Proposers may select any numbering mechanism for the proposal. The entire proposal however, must be paginated. Complete both columns only if the proposal is numbered consecutively.

The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants: Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics

1. Introduction

In 2019, the Nobel prize in economics was awarded to the development economists Abhijit Banerjee, Esther Duflo, and Michael Kremer “for their experimental approach to alleviating global poverty.” The press release accompanying the award’s announcement noted, “In just two decades, their new experiment-based approach has transformed development economics...their experimental research methods now entirely dominate development economics” (Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences 2019). The document lays out how the Laureates introduced a new approach to answering questions about the best way to fight global poverty, and that their solution was carefully designed field experiments.

Development economics is a subfield of economics that focuses on social and economic development in low- and middle-income countries. Economists have long used a variety of experimental methods for their research, including laboratory experiments, field experiments, and more recently, randomized controlled trials (Roth 1993; Ferber and Hirsch 1978; Blomfield 2012). At its simplest, an RCT (randomized controlled trial) is a form of scientific experiment where researchers try to establish causality by controlling all elements except that being investigated. Initially adapted from the medical field, RCTs caught on among economists studying development in the late 1990s and early 2000s. The field has evolved rapidly: in just under two decades, RCTs became a commonly accepted tool. In 2014, it was estimated that hundreds of RCTs had been carried out in the prior decade (Miguel et al. 2014). As of January 1, 2023, the American Economic Association’s registry of RCT pre-analysis plans listed 6,637 studies with locations in 164 countries. Despite the widespread adoption of RCTs, there has been very limited discussion about the ethical questions they raise when implemented at large scale. This has been particularly true of the topic of local results dissemination, and whether (and to what extent) there is an ethical or practical need to return RCT results to participants, in addition to publishing academic papers, research briefs, conference presentations, and other outputs that are standard for the field.

This project aims to support the formation of new norms around local dissemination of research results at the end of randomized controlled trials and to advance new ethical standards for the sharing of research results to participants. Our team—led by a historian and a development economist at the University of Oregon, in close collaboration with the Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) headquartered at UC Berkeley—propose an interdisciplinary, mixed methods participatory-social justice design. This means that our research “requires collaboration with participants and calls for change in society or in communities as a result of the research” (Creswell and Plano Clark 2018). This research approach fits well with norms in STS and African Studies, that elicits and values the voices of African participants. This three year process consists of surveying the field, collecting feedback from development economists and African participants, highlighting current norms, and proposing and sharing Proposed Best Practices. This project has the potential to improve the field of development economics and foster greater integrity in the research enterprise. There are three research aims:

Aim 1: Establish Current Dissemination Practices in Economics and Related Disciplines

The first year’s objective is to document local dissemination norms within development economics. The PI team will conduct a review of published literature, publicly available protocols, and requirements from African Ethics Boards. Key questions include: How often do researchers report back to participants? What methods do they use? How have these practices evolved over time? How do practices in economics compare with related fields such as political science, sociology, demography, and anthropology?

Aim 2: Gather Perspectives from Economists and African Participants

The second year’s objective is to collect information from two key demographic groups: development economists running RCTs and Africans participating in RCTs. We will conduct 400 surveys (100 economists; 300 African participants from 3 different RCTs in Kenya, Zambia, and Senegal) and 120 semi-structured interviews with economists and African participants in RCTs. We will gather qualitative and quantitative data about their experiences with, and expectations of, dissemination of research results.

Aim 3: Develop Best Practices to Spur Conversation, Reflection, and Change. The final year will focus on creating a Proposed Best Practices document, sharing results with all participants, and receiving feedback on the Proposed Best Practices document from our two key demographic groups. We expect that our Proposed Best Practices will provide accessible, practical, and actionable recommendations that are responsive to the needs of both researchers and participants.

As a research project investigating best practices about dissemination, we will be intentional and innovative in disseminating our own research results, aiming to model best practices and new ideas, while also being committed to openly sharing outcomes. Our Broader Impacts will focus on two areas:

Broader Impact 1: Awareness of Importance of Dissemination/ Ethical Significance

Establishing a new norm for sharing results requires increasing awareness of the ethical significance of this topic among economists, social scientists, policymakers, practitioners, and students. We will do this through published articles, blog posts, executive summaries, conference presentations, organizing a special issue and conference on RCT Research Ethics, and integrating new ethics content into our existing classes, enabling us to directly reach an estimated 900 students at UO and UC Berkeley over the grant period (with many more reached indirectly through new ethics modules in CEGA affiliated courses).

Broader Impact 2: Training

Once our audience becomes aware of the ethical imperative to share results with participants, we will need to offer practical training to build skills on how to do this. We will offer formal trainings on RCT Research Ethics and the ethics of dissemination at CEGA Research Transparency and Reproducibility Trainings; will train 4-6 student research assistants to be involved in all stages of the research; and will offer trainings to both doctoral students and undergraduates at UC Berkeley, UO, and across the CEGA network, which would allow us to reach graduate students at more than 20 CEGA campuses.

This project speaks directly to two parts of the ER2 program solicitation. First, the solicitation asks for proposals that address the ethical challenges arising in “international contexts” and to consider the “ethical norms of indigenous and international STEM research.” Our proposal is firmly placed on the African continent, where a large proportion of development RCTs have taken place. This interdisciplinary project integrates Historical, Anthropological and African Studies approaches to considering how the continent’s history of coercive and extractive research encounters continues to shape contemporary Africans’ responses to research. This project centers the experiences and voices of Africans who are participants in research. Second, this proposal engages with “emerging areas of ethical research.” Although one might envision “emerging areas” as those involving new technologies, bioethics, or the ethics of big data, emerging areas can also be aspects of the research encounter that have been neglected and are only now emerging. To date, there has not been a great focus on the ethical imperative to return results to participants, especially not on the African continent. We argue that this should be an emerging area of research, with the potential to create more just and ethical research encounters in the future.

This project seeks to illuminate and analyze the ethical issues around the sharing of research results, and to examine the relationship more closely between researchers and participants. Specifically, there has been little to no attention paid to how RCTs changes/reinforces power inequities of the researcher-subject relationship, or how results of research should be disseminated back to participants. While other adjacent social science fields such as anthropology, political science, sociology, and Science and Technology Studies (STS) grappled with the ethics of the research encounter, the inequities built into international research in Africa, the challenges of using RCTs, and the ethical obligations of sharing results with participants, economists have largely remained silent. This is an area in need of attention and improvement. This lack of sharing about results is an important issue of research ethics, one that speaks to core principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. We have high hopes that this grant can help usher in new research norms around returning results to participants.

Even if one agrees new norms are needed, it’s fair to ask whether such change is possible. Luckily, there are concrete examples of improvement in the area of research ethics and changes in norms within the field of economics. One example is the debate and rapid change in the area of research transparency and reproducibility of RCTs through the adoption of study registration and pre-analysis plans (Olken 2015; Duflo et al. 2020; Miguel 2021). Our institutional partner, the Center for Effective

Global Action (CEGA), and co- PI Miguel, were instrumental in starting this conversation. Through CEGA's internal program BITSS (Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in the Social Sciences), they initiated a discipline-wide dialogue, which was inclusive, deliberative, iterative, and ultimately led to the creation of new norms. The first two papers with pre-analysis plans were published in 2012 (Finkelstein et al. 2012; Casey et al. 2012); a decade later, there are hundreds of papers that have adopted this practice (Miguel 2021). While pre-analysis plans remain controversial in the wider field of economics, a recent survey indicates that 80% of development economists view them favorably (Swanson et al. 2020).

This proposed project is unique because it offers the same potential for transformational change by drawing on an unusual and well-positioned PI team. Co-PI Ted Miguel is a thought leader in this field, and the organization he co-founded, CEGA (the Center for Effective Global Action) is a nationally recognized hub for research, training, and innovation headquartered at the University of California, Berkeley with over 160 affiliated faculty on 20 West Coast campuses. CEGA is internationally respected for their leadership in research ethics in the social sciences and for their meaningful partnerships with African institutions. Over the past decade, the organization's footprint and ability to affect change has only grown. Co-PI Alfredo Burlando is a CEGA affiliate and practicing development economist, with more than a decade of experience running RCTs in Africa. He will contribute an insider's perspective to current conditions, challenges, and the potential for change. Finally, PI Melissa Graboyes, as a historian of Africa and STS scholar with training in Ethics, offers two decades of critical and practical engagement with research, ethics, and history on the African continent. The PI team offers complementary skills, allowing this project to make important theoretical and practical contributions.

1.1 Context

There is currently a lack of standard procedures about how to manage end-of-trial obligations, and that includes missing guidance about how results should be reported to participants. That doesn't mean there is no guidance for human subjects research. Codes, declarations, reports, and laws including the 1947 Nuremberg Code, the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki, the 1978 Belmont Report, a variety of CIOMS guidelines (1982-2016), and the use of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) all help shape what it means to do "ethical" research (Beauchamp and Childress, 2001; Stark 2012; Schrag 2010). Many of these guidelines were developed in response to unethical medical research and were later, awkwardly, applied to social science. IRBs are especially challenged to adequately serve social scientists, often lacking the expertise and nuance needed to address the complex ethical challenges of international research. Based on our preliminary review of articles, blog posts, funder expectations, and field guide advice, the norm in development economics appears to be not to report back to participants at all. Current best practices are that there are no best practices. There is no imagining that participants might value such information, be deserving of such information, or that local dissemination of research results is an ethical issue at all.

Even among economists who are publicly writing about research ethics, there are multiple justifications given for why it's acceptable not to return results to participants. Most frequently, researchers indicate that this practice is inconvenient, expensive, and logistically complicated (Alderman, Das and Rao 2013). Also mentioned are that research results would be unwanted or misunderstood by participants; that it would be too challenging to explain complex research findings; and that returning research results would cause participants to behave in "undesired" ways (Karlan and Udry 2020). Practically, there are often long gaps in time between when research is conducted and when results are ready. Other economists have concerns about how funders or partner organizations will react to sharing.

This project recognizes that these obstacles seem valid and even insurmountable to current researchers. However, the PI team feels strongly that there is vast room for improvement in this area of the research encounter. Many of the justifications offered by researchers have paternalistic undertones, and many echo the logic and language of colonial-era researchers working on the African continent. This is striking and worrisome, as the colonial era is no model for ethical research relationships or encounters. Greater attention to the historical context in which contemporary research is conducted will lead to more sensitive, nuanced, and ethical research. Attention to these issues has the potential to create a shift in research practices—to create a more honest, transparent, and respectful ending to RCTs.

The sharing of research results with participants is an entirely overlooked topic. Economists running RCTs rarely consider that Africans would be interested in this information, understand it, or be entitled to it. As economists would say, the incentives are wrong. Delivering results to hundreds (or thousands) of participants in hard-to-reach locations in distant countries is not perceived to be worth the time or resources required, especially for researchers for whom time and resources are scarce. Academics prioritize dissemination of articles that count toward promotion. These disincentives are intensified by the fact that research participants are in a deeply inequitable relationship. Participants have no ability to “demand” anything of researchers; their “rights” within a research trial extend to their ability to withdraw, and compensation limited to token “gifts” of appreciation. There is no way to register a complaint, and many participants would have no viable way of even contacting an international researcher.

There are two key populations targeted by this grant: development economists carrying out RCTs in Africa, and Africans who are participating in RCTs. Our focus on these two different, but connected, demographics is meant to push for improved dissemination practices from two ends of the same relationship. On the one hand, we support change by targeting the researchers who plan, organize, and fund RCTs; on the other hand we encourage the adoption of new expectations by African research participants. At the end of this project, through a process of surveying and interviewing, we will have a better understanding of what African research participants want to know about research they’ve participated in, and how to best address the challenges perceived by development economists.

The focus on sub-Saharan Africa and RCTs carried out by economists takes advantage of the PI team’s research expertise, historical knowledge, and language skills. However, the implications of this study are likely to apply to more than just economists, RCTs, or the African continent.

Most broadly, this project is concerned with creating a more just scientific culture by improving the research encounter between researchers and participants, and taking serious obligations to share results with participants. A more just research encounter fully acknowledges and engages with histories of colonization, racism, and oppression and recognizes that past norms of non-dissemination, justified by benevolent paternalism, cannot continue. Disseminating information about current practices, asking questions about how it might be done better, shifting the tone of the conversation to be less paternalistic and more oriented around an equitable exchange with research participants would be a significant improvement. A framework of justice allows us to think not just about what’s convenient, cost effective, or the current norm, but to imagine what a fair, equitable and just research encounter could be.

2. Project Justification

This proposal is centered on better practices for sharing research results. What does meaningful and ethical local dissemination look like given the known challenges? While we expect to learn from surveys and interviews conducted in Y2, preliminary work by the PI team has identified some critical components a PI must commit in order to enable meaningful local dissemination. Those are: 1) time to consider what’s needed for dissemination; 2) a local dissemination plan appropriate to the context; and 3) appropriate resource allocation. This recipe doesn’t predetermine what the strategies will be. Potential methods for local dissemination could include: meetings with local leaders, public meetings, focus groups, public plays, posters, comic books, information sheets, videos, SMS text messages, websites, radio broadcasts, and audio phone recordings. We will explore each of these approaches and more in our proposed project.

2.1 Context: Limitations of Current Ethical Guidelines

For Americans conducting research with human subjects, the 1979 Belmont Report is often the starting point for considering ethical obligations. The Report was the result of a US National Commission on Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, and has become a touchstone document, offering three main principles to guide ethical research. The first principle is to show respect for persons, which is frequently understood to mean respecting autonomy. In this area, sharing results respects persons because it acknowledges a person’s right to know about the research they volunteered for. Ideally, this “right to know” and respect for persons should happen at two points in the research encounter: at the beginning, through the consent process (a right to know what *will* happen, what we *hope* to learn) and at

the end, through the dissemination process (a right to know what *did* happen, what *was* learned). Sharing results recognizes that it is reasonable for a participant to be told honest information about the results of what they volunteered for. The second principle is beneficence, largely understood as a commitment to maximizing benefits while minimizing harms. In this area, the sharing of results at the end of a project increases the likelihood that benefits will accrue to particular communities or society at large. Dissemination to participants recognizes that results of research results may be interpreted differently. The third principle is justice, or distributive justice, which compels us neither to over-burden nor orphan a population, excluding them from the potential benefits of research. Currently, Africans are being used for research but denied the possibility of reaping benefits beyond a hypothetical future improvement.

There is also a pragmatic justification for better local dissemination strategies: it may improve the research and provide additional benefits to the researcher. Sharing with participants can be one mechanism to receive feedback from study participants and improve the interpretation of study results. This will be particularly beneficial for studies whose results appear puzzling or contradictory, as participants' thoughts (shared through a focus group, for example) may provide clarification.

The Belmont Report provided a starting point for improving human subjects research ethics, but there are important shortcomings of this document that this project will speak to. It does not call for dissemination, does not draw attention to the need for equitable researcher-participant relationships, and is silent on the complexities of working in an international setting. A commitment to dissemination allows participants to be better informed and more discerning judges about their participation in the future. The Belmont Report is also only focused on the ethical principles of respect, beneficence, and justice. Yet anthropological and philosophical research has made clear that not all cultures or communities recognize these three principles as the key ones defining ethical research (Kresse and Marchand 2009; Murove 2009; Schücklenk and Ashcroft 2000). There is a small but lively literature discussing whether there is a uniquely African ethic (Gbadegesin 1993; Tangwa 1996; Tangwa 2017). Hinting at some of the differences in this area, reports of African understandings of research reveal large divides in the views of foreign researchers and African participants (Graboyes 2015; Graboyes et al. 2022). As just a few examples, African participants frequently want local leaders to consent to research projects on a community level before individuals consent; husbands often consent on behalf of wives; and research activities such as finger pricks to take blood are often assigned radically different levels of risks (Geissler 2005; Ijsselmuiden and Faden 1999; Leach et al. 1999; Molyneux et al. 2005; Tindana et al. 2006).

Many of the differences in what counts as ethical research or an ethical research encounter can be explained by Africa's colonial history, and the continent's history of extractive and coercive research encounters (Bado 2006; Graboyes 2015; Tilley 2011, 2016). Research efforts on the continent, especially in the area of medicine and health, have long been characterized by paternalism, hegemony, and mistreatment (Eckart 2002; Lachenal 2017; Lyons 2002; Webel 2019). It should come as no surprise that historical research encounters affect how communities respond to research in the present. Just as young African Americans today remain reluctant to participate in medical research due to the legacy of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, many African communities live with unease around research rooted in colonial-era activities (Jones 1992; Owens 2017; Reverby 2012; Rusert 2019; Washington 2006). A small group of economists working with historical data have begun to fully acknowledge and measure the influence of past encounters. Multiple papers have found a strong relationship between colonial-era interventions and Africans' trust and willingness to engage with specific health interventions or institutions in the present (Lowes and Montero 2021; Nunn and Wantchekon, 2011).

2.2. Context: Current Practical Constraints on Researchers & African Participants

Based on preliminary research the PI team has conducted on this topic, including an extensive review of blogs, World Bank working papers, funder requirements, and recently published articles, it is clear that there is currently no expectation that results be returned to participants. Across these diverse sources, there are few mentions of ethical obligations beyond gaining informed consent, minimizing harm and maximizing benefit. The Belmont Report and IRB requirements appear, but there is little space dedicated to discussing what ethical research might look like. There is no reference to the need to facilitate

equitable, just, or ethical research encounters between researchers and participants. Current research norms indicate a need for the work proposed in this grant.

Two online forums, the World Bank's Development Impact blog and Innovations for Poverty Action's (IPA) blog, have been the site of the most sustained discussion about research ethics. The World Bank post that is the most relevant to this project is quite disheartening. "Hurting People while Trying to Help?" describes an example of "reporting back" in a study that drew participants' blood to test for diseases. The study did *not* report back the disease status to participants "citing the high monetary cost of traveling back to physically visit each participant in sometimes remote villages in these developing countries" (Ozler 2011). The blog's author, a Bank economist, is incredulous. What is more startling is that the study's behaviors and justification are nearly identical to research practices 80 years ago. It was common in the 1940s for British colonial researchers to survey thousands of Africans for malaria, worms, sleeping sickness, and river blindness to produce detailed epidemiological maps, without ever returning results or offering treatment (Graboyes 2015). The continuation of such practices should give us pause. Research norms on the African continent may not have shifted as much as we would like to believe.

The most direct discussion of the ethics of sharing results comes from a 2020 post by leading development economists Dean Karlan and Chris Udry. On the IPA blog they suggest that social science researchers should voluntarily include a 14 question ethics appendix to all papers. One question asks:

"12. Feedback to Participants or Communities. Is there a plan for providing feedback on research results to participants or communities? If yes, what is the plan? If not, why not? *Engaging in post-study feedback is a way of acknowledging the agency of participants and communities, and is thus a desired practice. However, it may be impractical due to costs, timing, challenges communicating the results, or potential harms if such communication may itself change behavior in undesirable ways.*"

Their call for an ethics appendix is a good one, yet they offer no workable solutions. The authors provide four sample ethics appendixes based on research they conducted and published between 2006 and 2020. In all four cases, they provided no feedback to communities. They explained it "was not a norm at the time this study was conducted." They went on to state that even if it had been a norm, it "would not have been practical" because delivering the feedback would have been too expensive, too complicated, the results would be too hard to explain, and the researchers feared the results might shift peoples' behavior in "undesirable" ways. This logic veers into the paternalistic and sounds uncomfortably colonial. It's hard to argue that African adults consenting to participate in a research trial shouldn't be told the results. It's also deeply problematic to assume researchers can predict how people might change their behavior, or that international researchers should be the arbiters to determine what types of behaviors are "undesirable." Again, current practices echo colonial ones: it was common for researchers to argue that Africans were uninterested in research and couldn't understand research results (Biruk 2018, Graboyes 2015). Withholding this type of information does not meet the ethical standard of respect for autonomy.

These research norms have been established and reinforced through the training of graduate students, the content included in field guides, and funding norms. A review of 25 departments in the US and Canada that grant PhDs in agricultural, applied, environmental or resource economics (fields that similarly rely on RCTs) only two required a course in responsible conduct of research (Josephson and Michler 2018). Field guides are also critical in training future economists. Two of the most frequently used guides have few references to "ethics" and absolutely no mention of dissemination (Duflo et al. 2007; Gertler et al. 2016). A World Bank guide, "Conducting Ethical Economic Research," states that participants are "Generally expected to be informed of the results" (Alderman, Das, and Rao 2013). Furthermore, the sharing of results is only practical for focus groups, not for surveys since transport costs would be too expensive. A final recommendation on the topic is that "Rather than—or in addition to—sharing results, respondents can be compensated more directly with cash grants or small gifts in kind". But monetary compensation for participation is not a replacement for knowledge of research results. Both are necessary, but they have different values to participants and different ways they can be used (Biruk 2017; Geissler 2011). Funders also have considerable power to shape practices. Due to the high cost of running RCTs, most researchers are dependent on one or multiple funding sources. Researchers are

attentive to the requirements of funding agencies and create protocols that fulfill funder expectations. To our knowledge, funding agencies such as NSF, NIH and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation do not have expectations that research results should be shared back with participants. These various sources make clear that there is currently no expectation to share results with participants, and no framing of dissemination as an ethical issue. There is no imagining that African participants might understand and value the results of research, or even be deserving of such information. This presents rocky terrain for creating equitable or just research encounters.

3: Intellectual Merits

Objectives. Preliminary research on this topic including an initial literature review, informal discussions with development economists, and past interviewing with African participants on topics related to research ethics indicates it is a salient area with little formal attention. Our proposed project will include literature reviews of economics and adjacent fields such as political science, sociology, and STS; surveys and semi-structured interviews with development economists and African research participants; cleaning and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data; write up of research results; and dissemination via conference presentations, academic articles, blog posts, and direct to participants. Throughout the three years of the grant, students at the University of Oregon and UC Berkeley will be integrated into the project as research assistants and will receive content in classes taught by the PIs, with an estimated outreach of 800 undergraduates and 100 graduate students over the grant period.

Methods. This research has a mixed methods participatory social justice design, all stages of the research are meant to: 1) actively involve participants and stakeholders; 2) be collaborative; 3) and ultimately advocate for improving conditions in the future (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018). This approach is premised on the idea that the people who are most affected by the problem ought to be involved in the research process. Hence our focus on both development economists and African participants. This approach “provides an emphasis on bringing about change and involving participants” (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018). It also brings value-based and ideological perspectives into mixed methods approaches (Greene, 2007). The inclusion of different types of data (including from oral interviews) allows the PI team to amplify the voices of a marginalized group (African research participants) and analyze the dynamics and inequities of the researcher-subject relationships. Data collection in African communities will occur with the direct assistance of African research partners, and will be done in a way that respects local norms. Recruitment will occur with attention to inclusivity, especially in the realm of gender. This is a particularly appropriate research approach since it increases the likelihood change is possible due to the engagement of participants throughout, and the PI team’s commitment to producing results useful to participants. Once data has been collected, the qualitative survey and interview data will be analyzed in a convergent design, through identification of trends in responses.

Across the social sciences, there has been growing awareness that methods are not without values, can inadvertently replicate colonial practices, and that there is a need to consider what “decolonizing” research methods would mean (Torres and Nyaga 2021; Israel 2015; Quinless 2022; Nortje et al. 2019). To date, economists have been slow to engage in these discussions. Although we will work with a great deal of quantitative data, we will use it critically, cognizant of STS and critical anthropological approaches pointing out the pitfalls of over-reliance on quantitative data (Davis 2020; Biruk 2018; Jerven 2013; Adams 2016). We will model proposed best practices and behaviors, and plan to integrate strategies based on what we learned from our surveys and interviews. What is listed below is considered a minimum starting point for dissemination, and we expect to add outreach activities.

Broader Impacts

Africans--Africans participating in this project will be indirectly empowered by having their voices, concerns, desires shared back with researchers who would otherwise not have access to these perspectives. We center their perspectives and take their experiences as participants seriously.

Economists--Economists participating in this project will be offered multiple opportunities to pause and consider the subject of dissemination and their own practices: through the survey, the interview, and in responding to the Proposed Best Practices. In each case, we expect this to be a welcome opportunity in a field that does not currently engage with such considerations.

Students--4-6 Undergraduate students at UO and UC Berkeley will be involved as trained research assistants, and an estimated 900 will receive content about RCT Research Ethics and the importance of dissemination in classes taught by the PI team in Economics, History, African Studies, and Global Health.

Research Aim 1: Establish Current Dissemination Practices in Economics and Related Disciplines

1.1 Objectives. The first year's objective is to document the practices and norms around the dissemination of results to research participants, within the context of development economics and related disciplines. The PI team will conduct an extensive literature review. Key questions include: How often do researchers report back to participants? What methods do they employ for dissemination? To what extent are local and international IRBs compelling them to report back? How have these practices evolved over time? How do economics practices compare with political science, demography, and anthropology?

Since economists are not the only ones who use RCTs, or run field experiments, we will look to adjacent fields for precedents, to see if anyone has done this well. Preliminary research completed on this topic indicates that the medical field, global health, and demography are quite similar to economics, in lacking meaningful dissemination and clear disciplinary norms for sharing results. However, there are promising examples from political science, anthropology, and psychology deception studies. These precedents aren't exactly the same, but they will provide a starting point.

1.2 Outcomes. Y1 will produce 2 academic articles. One will focus on the current state of dissemination norms, targeting a high-visibility development economics journal such as *World Development*, *World Bank Economic Review*. The other article will discuss the history of RCTs in economics and social sciences, pitched toward a STS or History journal. 1 conference presentation at a CEQA event such as BITSS Annual Meeting; 1 blog post for CEQA describing the initial Y1 findings.

1.3 Methods. Our literature review will begin with a focus on published economics papers reporting on RCTs to determine what is publicly said about dissemination plans. Systematic keyword search of databases such as JSTOR, WorldCat, and PubMed to determine relevant articles; searching of public repositories; and gathering publicly available research plans. An element of the literature review will be historical, gathering reports from the earliest RCTs to the current era, obtained from appropriate research repositories as well as paper repositories, university archives, and private research archives. We will also review RCT reports and RCT protocols for a better sense of what researchers plan to do. We will contact local and international IRBs to obtain rules and regulations and identify reporting requirements. Finally, we will look for examples of research dissemination practices from affiliated disciplines that use RCTs such as sociology, political science, and global health, to compare the norms in development economics. Our methods of analyzing these published sources will be primarily historical and anthropological: identifying patterns over time in how RCTs and ethics are described, and how African research participants are discussed. These sources will be read critically, recognizing that published sources are created for public consumption, and thus may omit information. Another source of data will come from current IRB and ethics board regulations, both in the United States and in African countries.

Research Aim 2: Gather Perspectives from Economists and African Participants

2.1 Objectives. The second year's objective is to collect information from two key demographic groups: development economists running RCTs and Africans participating in RCTs. We will gather qualitative and quantitative data about their experiences with, and expectations of, local dissemination of research results.

2.2 Outcomes. During Y2, we will conduct 400 surveys (100 economists who are CEGA affiliates; 300 African participants from 3 different RCTs in Kenya, Zambia, and Senegal). We will also carry out an additional 120 semi-structured interviews (60 economists and 60 African participants in RCTs).

2.3 Methods

Recruitment. Recruitment of economists will occur through the CEGA network, which includes over 250 affiliated scholars globally (160 CEGA affiliates and 70 alumni of its fellowship program for African scholars). African research participants will be recruited from CEGA-supported studies in Kenya, Senegal, and Zambia. These three locations present geographic diversity, have historically been sites of international research, have RCTs occurring in large quantities, and build on the PI team's experience. Each RCT project will have a different thematic focus (education, health, finance). A representative sample of RCT participants will be drawn. Participants will self-select into interviewing after the survey. All interviews will follow best practices, using guidelines from the national Oral History Association.

Economists. 100 Surveys will be conducted online, collecting information about prior RCT experience and current practices about sharing research results with study participants. We will request participants to share materials from their own RCTs documenting practices of dissemination. We will target both African and American-based Economists. 60 Semi-Structured Interviews with a subsample of CEGA-affiliated researchers will be conducted by one of the PIs in person or over Zoom and recorded with permission. 30-45 minute Interviews will further probe researchers' ethics standards, relationships with study subjects, reporting standards, and perceived barriers to sharing results. We aim to interview 30 African development economists, and 30 development economists based in North America. We will aim for 40-50% of our sample to identify as women and strive for representation across academic rank and age. We anticipate the involvement of economist PIs will increase interviewees' comfort level, and increase the likelihood for open sharing (Berger 2015). Our PI team offers racial, cultural, linguistic, gender, and age diversity, and we will consider these factors when assigning interviewing responsibilities. Economists will give written consent, and will not be compensated.

African Participants. 300 Surveys will be conducted either orally in person or over the phone, and will be audio recorded with permission. The focus will be on their understanding of the research project they recently participated in, whether they received feedback about the results, their preferences for receiving results, and the preferred method of communication. Surveys will be conducted by trained African collaborators. 60 Semi-Structured Interviews will be conducted in person, at a location comfortable for the interviewee, and will also be recorded with permission. 30-45 minute Interviews will probe participants' expectations about sharing of results and their relationship with researchers. Depending on the languages required, interviews may be conducted by a PIs or an African collaborator who is a native speaker; in all cases an African collaborator will be present to assist. Verbal consent protocols will be used with all African participants. Each survey and interview participant will receive financial compensation of approximately 5 USD delivered in the form of sugar, phone air time, or cash.

Data Analysis. Interviews and Surveys will include both quantitative and qualitative data, with both closed and open-ended questions. Quantitative data will be used to determine the level of knowledge about the study results held by African participants; and quantify reporting behaviors and the spread of opinions held by researchers. The analysis will be based on descriptive statistics and correlational analysis using software programs such as *Stata* and *R*. Qualitative data. Transcription and translation of surveys and interviews will be completed by a native speakers, and text will be coded using the *Nvivo* software program, following a process of modified grounded theory relying on coding text for themes and then analyzing the themes for patterns, which is a common strategy used in Anthropology (Bernard 2017). This is an inductive approach where the coders are "grounded" in the data and themes emerge from a close study of the texts (Glaser and Strauss 2017). The PI team, assisted by trained students, will independently code the open-ended survey and interview responses, and then meet as a group to resolve discrepancies through discussion. We will develop codes iteratively and refine them over time.

Research Aim 3: Develop Best Practices to Spur Conversation, Reflection, and Change

3.1 Objectives. The final year will have more time spent on dissemination. The PI team will focus on creating a Proposed Best Practices document, sharing results with all participants, and receiving feedback on our results and the Proposed Best Practices document from our two key demographic groups. We expect that the content of our Proposed Best Practices will provide accessible, practical, and applicable recommendations that are responsive to the needs of both researchers and participants. We expect that the widespread sharing of the document among economists and African participants will be a starting point for a discipline-wide conversation, and that the Proposed Best Practices will initiate an iterative process of conversation, feedback, testing, sharing, and modification that will extend beyond this grant's lifecycle.

3.2 Outcomes. 1 Proposed Best Practices document integrating Y1 and Y2 findings, speaking practically to the challenges raised by researchers and participants. 3 academic articles: one reporting on African research participants' experience and views on research dissemination for an anthropology journal; one comparing the views of African participants and researchers on the need to share results for an African Studies journal, and a final one sharing our Proposed Best Practices as part of the special issue on RCT Research Ethics we will organize. 1 Executive Summary of project goals and outcomes, to be shared widely with African ethics boards and practitioners in the US and Africa. 3 Public Meetings with African participants where the Best Practices document is presented and feedback is elicited. 1 Special Issue of a journal on RCT Research Ethics that will include an international call for papers and where selected authors will be invited to present draft papers at the linked conference; targeted journals will include *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 1 conference on RCT Research Ethics, organized by CEGA that will include an international call for papers and a presentation by the PI team about the Proposed Best Practices. 1 blog post co-authored with students presenting the Proposed Best Practices.

3.3 Methods. All dissemination products will be developed collaboratively by the PI team.

Proposed Best Practices. This document will be compiled based on a careful review and analysis of all 400 surveys and 120 interviews collected in Y2 while also integrating findings from Y1 about dissemination norms in adjacent fields. The PI team will be using a mixed methods approach to directly integrating feedback from economists and participants and working to address challenges they identified.

Dissemination to Africans. All 300 of the African survey participants will be contacted about the results of this project, and will be asked for feedback on the Proposed Best Practices. Dissemination will include the following, though we expect to add activities based on findings from Y2: written info sheets in the appropriate language will be shared with all participants. 3 public meetings held in each community in Kenya, Zambia, and Senegal where we conducted surveys/interviews, which will include a presentation of the Proposed Best Practices led by trained African research partners, and the opportunity for verbal and written feedback. SMS text messages sent to all participants in the appropriate languages with links to a website; the creation of an informational website in Swahili, English, and French; an audio phone message in appropriate languages; visual posters displaying results to be distributed in all 3 communities.

Dissemination to Economists. All 100+ of the economist participating in our project will be contacted about the results of this project, and will specifically receive email communications sharing the Proposed Best Practices document, links to all published articles and blog posts, invitations to conferences and trainings, and invitations to provide feedback in person, via email, or via zoom.

1 Conference. The conference on RCT Research Ethics will be organized by CEGA, with a call for papers circulated internationally. Time will be built in to receive feedback on the Proposed Best Practices by all conference participants. A goal of the conference would be to begin work on a "consensus statement" article on best practice on sharing results with research participants, that could be completed after the end of the grant cycle and that would be appropriate for an outlet such as *Nature*, *Science*, or *PNAS*.

4. Broader Impacts

The project will advance new ethical standards for the sharing of results at the end of a RCT. Our Broader Impacts speak directly to the program solicitation, where it states projects are meant “to enable responsible and ethical conduct of research; and to instill this knowledge in faculty and students.” Activities meant to build awareness and provide training are focused on students at the UO and UC Berkeley, in addition to development economists, and practitioners.

Our Broader Impacts explicitly recognize that change in the discipline will come partially through a change in how we teach and train our current students, who will become future practitioners. Thus, we’ve elected to involve students at the UO and UC Berkeley at the undergraduate and graduate level as paid research assistants, and to integrate new ethics content into our African Studies, Economics, History, and Global Health courses so approximately 900 students will be exposed to this subject. Co-PI Miguel is particularly well positioned to impact future economists as he trains a large number of PhD students.

As a research project investigating best practices about dissemination, we will be intentional and innovative in considering how to disseminate our own research results, aiming to model best practices and new ideas, while also being committed to openly and transparently sharing outcomes. Although we have narrowed this grant’s focus to development economists conducting RCTs on the African continent, we expect our findings—and especially the Proposed Best Practices—to be relevant to a larger, broader audience. RCTs are frequently used in other fields of economics, in addition to political science, sociology, demography, global health, and medicine, and the potential audience is large. Furthermore, the ethical imperative to share results also applies to other forms of experiments and data collection that include epidemiological and sociological surveys and biological sampling.

Many of the dissemination activities leverage the global reach and stature that CEGA has in the field of economics. During the three years of the grant, they will provide expertise by coordinating all outreach to CEGA affiliates and fellows, recruiting North American and African scholars for surveys and interviews, and organizing and promoting events such as the conference on RCT Research Ethics.

BI 1: Awareness of Importance of Sharing/ Ethical Significance

Establishing a new norm for sharing results requires increasing awareness of the ethical significance of this topic among economists, social scientists, policymakers, practitioners, and students. One way we will accomplish this is through 5 peer reviewed articles, and 1 special issue on RCT Research Ethics. One article will discuss the current state of dissemination norms and will target a high-visibility development journal such as *World Development*. Another article where we will share our Proposed Best Practices will appear in the special issue on RCT Research Ethics, which will be pitched to a general interest journal such as the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. Articles three, four, and five will explore the history of RCTs in economics and social sciences; report on African research participants’ experience and views on research dissemination; and compare the views of African participants and researchers. These articles will be targeted at history, STS, African Studies, and anthropology journals such as the *Journal of History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, *Social Studies of Science*, and *Africa*. We will also write 1 Executive Summary to be shared widely, but with a target audience of IRBs and ethics organizations in the US and Africa, policymakers, and practitioners. 3 blog posts will be for CEGA, Institute for Poverty Action, and the World Bank and will be co-authored with students research assistants.

We will also increase awareness through 5 conference presentations at CEGA’s extensive set of events that target both US and Africa-based researchers and policymakers. These include the BITSS Annual Meeting; Evidence to Action; Africa Evidence Summit; Development Impact West Africa; and CEGA’s regional East Africa and West Africa Research Summit. Outside of CEGA, we will organize a panel on RCT Research Ethics for the American Economic Association’s annual meeting (ASSA). In Y3, the PI team will organize a Conference on RCT Research Ethics with an international call for papers. We will share our research findings with the Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science and look forward to participating in the NSF ER2 PI biennial conference.

In the classroom, we will integrate RCT Research Ethics content into 6 classes. Content will focus on the ethics of dissemination and will be added to undergraduate and graduate courses we

currently teach at the University of Oregon and UC Berkeley on the topics of Economics, History, African Studies, and Global Health. Based on current enrollments, approximately 800 undergraduates and 100 graduate students will receive this ethics-based content over the three years of the grant.

BI 2: Training

Once our audience becomes aware of the ethical imperative to share results with participants, we will need to offer practical training and education to build skills on how to do this. We will accomplish this through 3 RCT Dissemination trainings, which will be sessions offered at the existing CEGA Research Transparency and Reproducibility Training. These three-to-five-day workshops bring together students, postdocs, faculty, and research practitioners offering lectures and hands on sessions focused on research transparency. Based on the research from this project, the PIs will develop and offer sessions about the ethics of sharing results and dissemination.

We will continue our commitment to students also in the area of training. We will incorporate 4-6 student research assistants as fully involved members of the research team. These UO undergraduates will be selected, trained, and mentored by PI Graboyes with an eye toward their contributions to the project, but also toward their own skill development. Research assistants will be involved with literature reviews, developing tools, conducting interviews, data organization and cleaning, coding, and the writing of blog posts. Students will be integrated at all stages and in all tasks, and will ideally be hired as sophomores so they can participate in all three years of the grant. There will also be opportunities for undergraduates and graduates at the UO and UC Berkeley to receive more in-depth training on RCT Research Ethics or the ethics of dissemination. Training workshops will be offered by the PIs as part of: (1) PI Graboyes' weekly Global Health Research Group for UO undergraduate students; (2) co-PI Burlando's weekly development workshop for UO Economics doctoral students; (3) the North West Development Workshop, which is open to doctoral students in Economics and adjacent fields who are based in the Pacific Northwest. We estimate that an additional 100 students will receive new content about the ethics of dissemination in these venues. Finally, the PIs will continue to advise student research on all aspects of research ethics.

BI: Post Grant

There is the distinct possibility that broader impacts will accrue beyond the grant period. Future impacts could include the formal integration of dissemination ethics into the Economics courses taught by CEGA affiliated faculty, Responsible Conduct of Research training, or included in Human Subjects Research training. At the Y3 RCT Research Ethics conference, we will encourage the creation of a dissemination working group to continue after the grant concludes, and facilitate discussion about how to move from Proposed Best Practices to Proposed Guidelines that universities, journals, organizations, or individuals could sign on to. One model for this comes from past success in the area of research transparency, where TOP Guidelines (Transparency and Openness Promotion) were jointly created and adopted by journals, funders, and research organizations (Nosek et al. 2015). On a larger scale, the American Economic Association (the discipline's national body) could pick up the conversation, adopt the working group, or suggest or formally adopt guidelines in order to standardize practices across the discipline, which would indicate a national level commitment to change. Funding agencies such as CEGA, J-PAL, or the Gates Foundation may create new funding requirements that mandate the dissemination of research results to all participants in order to be eligible for funding and journals such as the *Journal of Development Economics* could adopt standards for local research dissemination as well.

5. Plan of Work

The three years of grant activities have a clear research aim for each year, and two broader impacts.

Research. Year 1 is oriented on documenting current practices in how results are disseminated to research participants within development economics and related disciplines. The PI team will conduct an extensive literature review of published materials to determine: How often do researchers report back to participants? What methods do they employ for dissemination? How have these practices evolved over

time? How do current practices in economics compare with related fields such as political science, sociology, demography, and anthropology? **Year 2** will be focused on conducting 400 surveys and 120 interviews with development economists running RCTs and Africans participating in RCTs. We will gather qualitative and quantitative data about their experiences with, and expectations of, dissemination of research results. **Year 3** will be primarily about dissemination. The PI team will focus on creating a Proposed Best Practices for dissemination document, sharing results with all 400 participants, and receiving feedback on results and the Proposed Best Practices document.

Broader Impacts. There are two broader impacts pursued throughout the three-year grant. First, we will increase Awareness of Importance of Sharing/ Ethical Significance by publishing 5 articles, organizing 1 special issue on the topic of RCT Research Ethics for an economics journal, write 3 blog posts, deliver 5 conference presentations, and organize 1 conference on RCT Research Ethics. The second broader impact is related to building better skills for economists to disseminate, which we will do by developing and offering Trainings. We will create modules on the ethics of dissemination at CEGA training events, graduate student trainings, and for undergraduate research groups. UO undergraduates are integrated as research assistants, and 900 students at the UO and UC Berkeley will receive course content related to the ethics of dissemination in courses taught by the PIs.

Table: 3 Year Plan of Activities

Outcomes/Activities	Y1	Y2	Y3	
Research: Data Collection and analysis				
Literature review of economics and related fields to establish current practices	X			IM
Survey & Interview of economists, African participants		X		IM
Interviews: transcription, translation, coding, analysis		X		IM
Dissemination				
Publications: academic journal articles, blog posts, special issue on RCT ethics	X	X	X	BI
Presentations: conferences, seminars, panel presentations, ER2 PI conference	X	X	X	BI
Public Meetings with African participants reporting results and soliciting feedback			X	BI
Production and sharing of "Best Practices in Research Dissemination" Document			X	BI
Education/Training				
Mentor undergraduates, PhD students on research ethics and dissemination	X	X	X	BI
Teach Social Science courses with Research Ethics, Ethics of Dissemination Content	X	X	X	BI
RCT Ethics Training sessions delivered at conferences		X	X	BI

Evaluation. The grant activities will be evaluated in multiple ways and summarized in an annual report. Forms of assessment will include a survey of CEGA network affiliates Y1 and Y3 about their awareness of the ethics of sharing results with research participants. One indicator of success will be the uptake level for development economists willing to be surveyed and interviewed in Y2. Another indicator will be the level of interest and participation in the Y3 conference organized by CEGA on RCT Research Ethics, and the response to an open call for papers for a special journal issue on the topic of RCT Research Ethics. Although the special issue will be published after the end of this grant's three-year lifespan, the level of readership, sharing, and citation of the special issue will also capture overall impact. The full project team (PIs, CEGA staff, student researcher assistants) will also engage in a yearly process of self-evaluation at the start of each academic year. This will involve a review of the prior year's project goals and discussion of whether they were met. Self-evaluations will provide feedback on the functioning of the group as a whole to identify any areas where workflow, team dynamics, supervision, or grant

priorities need to shift. A clear plan will also be made for the upcoming year, including a calendar laying out dates for article submissions, conference submissions, and training activities.

This project will apply for IRB approval through the University of Oregon, UC Berkeley, and the host African countries where surveys and interviews will take place. There are two stages of IRB approval. First, we will apply for our entire project to be reviewed through the University of Oregon and UC Berkeley IRB. Second, we will seek additional IRB approvals for the Y2-Y3 surveying and interviewing with African participants in RCTs. We will work with the PIs on those particular RCTs to have amendments to their original IRBs to allow for this additional round of interviewing. We will help facilitate the IRB amendment process in the host African country.

6. Competencies

This project leverages the collective knowledge of our interdisciplinary team. All three PIs have worked extensively in Africa and are sensitive to the nuances of research in international contexts. The PI team has a strong and functional working relationship, having formally partnered in the past on academic papers (Graboyes and Burlando), and on various CEGA programs and activities (Miguel and Burlando).

Melissa Graboyes, PI is Associate Professor of African History and Medical History at the University of Oregon. She is also the Director of the UO's African Studies Program. This proposal builds on 15 years of scholarship on research practices and ethics in Africa and her first book, *The Experiment Must Continue: Medical Research and Ethics in East Africa*. She has conducted historical and anthropological research on the African continent over 20 years and brings expertise with interviewing, integration of historical materials, and the mixed-methods research projects. Graboyes is currently in Y4 of NSF Career award and is on target to meet or exceed all grant expectations. She will be on sabbatical AY 2023-2024 and thus have sufficient time to begin this new project.

Alfredo Burlando, Co-PI is Associate Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Oregon, where he has taught since 2010, and is an affiliate of the Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) and J-PAL. His research in Africa employs RCTs to study the impacts of financial inclusion, including savings groups, digital forms of credit and payments, and microfinance. A particular focus of his work continues to be the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized populations, particularly in rural contexts. He has conducted field research in Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zambia, Uganda, Egypt, and Uganda, has been a lead PI on several RCTs, and has published in leading development economics journals.

Edward Miguel, Co-PI is Oxfam Professor of Environmental and Resource Economics and Faculty Director of (CEGA) at the University of California, Berkeley, where he has taught since 2000. Miguel's main research focus is African economic development. He has conducted field work in Kenya, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, and India. He is co-founder and Faculty Director of the Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in the Social Sciences (BITSS), which has changed the culture and landscape of research transparency norms and practices. Through the development of open science policies, protocols and platforms, and the provision of accessible educational resources such as his award-winning textbook, *Transparent and Reproducible Social Science Research* with Christensen and Freese, Miguel has demonstrated his commitment to research ethics and his position as a thought leader in this field.

The Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) is a nationally recognized hub for research, training, and innovation headquartered at the University of California, Berkeley, which was co-founded by co-PI Miguel. CEGA has experience delivering high quality events on topics related to research ethics, and are well prepared to recruit participants and manage logistics. CEGA outreach for its research transparency and reproducibility trainings in past years have resulted in a ten-to-one ratio of applicants to participants, and selection processes successfully balance group makeup in terms of gender identity, race and ethnicity, and levels of experience. CEGA will also be an important part of this project's dissemination activities-leveraging partnerships with organizations committed to research ethics including the Center for Open Science, 3iE, and Informing Change. They also have well-established relationships with universities and scholars throughout North America and West and East Africa, which we will leverage in our recruitment of study participants.

7. Results from Prior NSF Support

PI: Melissa Graboyes

- a) **NSF award number, amount and period of support:** 1844715; \$411,171 and \$29,766; 2019-2024
- b) **Title:** CAREER: A Case Study of Malaria Elimination Efforts with Relation to Vernacular Knowledge, Expertise, and Ethics
- c) **Intellectual Merit:** The grant supports new research focusing on a century of malaria elimination attempts in sub-Saharan Africa and on the island of Zanzibar. **Broader Impacts:** This project integrates African voices and the historical record into contemporary discussions about malaria eradication.
- d) **Publications.** 4 peer reviewed publications; 2 blog posts. *= student co-author
 - 1) Melissa Graboyes, Judith Meta, and Rhaine Clark*. “Mazingira and the Malady of Malaria: Perceptions of Malaria as an Environmental Disease in Contemporary Zanzibar.” With. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*. 95. 2022: 134-144. 2) Melissa Graboyes, Daphne Gallagher, and Jennifer Tappan. “Introduction to the Special Section: Histories of Global Health in Africa,” for *Health & Place*. 2022: 102863. 3) Melissa Graboyes and Judith Meta. “Rebounding Malaria and the Failures of Eradication: The World Health Organization campaign and the after effects, 1957-1985.” *Health & Place*. 2022: 102842. 4) Melissa Graboyes and Zainab Alidina*. “African Studies Keyword: Malaria.” *African Studies Review*. December 2021. 5) Melissa Graboyes and Mikala Capage*. Blog Post. “The World Celebrates the First Malaria Vaccine—But Don’t Expect Malaria to Disappear.” *Nursing Clio Blog*: November 29, 2021. 6) Melissa Graboyes. Blog Post. “We’re Succeeding in Our Fight Against Malaria—Now It’s Time to Plan for Failure.” *British Medical Journal Blog*. October 10, 2019.
- (e) No research products have yet been produced under this award. However, a website on reboundmalaria is in the process of being completed.

co-PI: Edward Andrew Miguel

- (a) **NSF award number, amount and period of support:** 8158709; \$631,767; 3/15/2022 – 2/28/2025
- (b) **Title:** Experimental Evidence on Intergenerational Transmission of Economic Status
- (c) **Intellectual Merit:** We propose to extend the Kenya Life Panel Survey (KLPS) -- which contains information on human capital, demographic, and economic preferences and outcomes for over 6,500 Kenyans during 1998-2021. **Broader Impacts:** We aim to make KLPS the premier intergenerational longitudinal dataset in Sub-Saharan Africa, with multiple uses for academic research.
- (d) Research is ongoing and no publications have yet been produced under this award.
- (e) Research is ongoing and no research products have yet been produced under this award.
- (a) **NSF award number, amount and period of support:** 1824412; \$277,330; 8/1/2018–7/31/2021
- (b) **Title:** Collaborative Research: Long-term Effects of Unconditional Cash Transfers to the Poor
- (c) **Intellectual Merit:** The project is a follow-up survey to assess the long-term effects of the unconditional cash transfer (UCT) program operated by GiveDirectly. **Broader Impacts:** A central broader impact of the research is in policy engagement of cash transfer programs.
- (d) No publications have yet been produced under this award, but one working paper has been written.
- (e) No research products have yet been produced under this award.
- (a) **NSF award number, amount and period of support:** 1956318; \$30,000; 12/1/2019-11/30/2020
- (b) **Title:** Designing a System for Improved Null Results Tracking: Berkeley, CA - December 2019
- (c) **Intellectual Merit:** This workshop aimed to address publication bias and the “file drawer problem” by convening a network of interdisciplinary stakeholders to lead the design of a system to better track outputs. **Broader Impacts:** This workshop has catalyzed the design of a sustainable, integrated, multi-stakeholder system for accessing and monitoring the outputs of all funded research.
- (d) **Publications:** Laitin, David, Edward Miguel, Ala’ Alrababa’h, Aleksandar Bogdanoski, Sean Grant, Katherine Hoeberling, Cecilia Mo, Don A. Moore, Simine Vazire, Jeremy Weinstein, Scott Williamson. (2021). “Reporting All Results Efficiently: A RARE Proposal to Open up the File Drawer”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
- (e) materials from the workshop, including an agenda and video recordings are on the BITSS website.

References

- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J.A. (2001). "The colonial origins of comparative development: an Empirical investigation." *American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1369–1401.
- Adams, V. (2016). *Metrics: What Counts in Global Health*. Duke University Press.
- Alderman, H., Das, J., & Rao, V. (2013). Conducting ethical economic research: complications from the field. *World Bank Policy Research Paper No. 6446*.
- Anderson, R.G., & Kichkha, A. (2017). Replication, meta-analysis, and research synthesis in economics. *American Economic Review*, 107 (5), 56–59.
- Asiedu, E., Karlan, D., Lambon-Quayefio, M., & Udry, C. (2021). A Call for Structured Ethics Appendices in Social Science Papers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(29).
- Araali, B.B. (2011). Perceptions of research assistants on how their research participants view informed consent and its documentation in Africa. *Research Ethics* 7(2), 39–50.
- Bado, J.-P. (Ed.). (2006). *Les conquêtes de la médecine moderne en Afrique*. Karthala.
- Banerjee, A.V., & Duflo, E. (2009). The experimental approach to development economics. *Annual Review of Economics* 1, 151-178.
- Barrett, C.B., & Carter, M.R. (2010). The power and pitfalls of experiments in development economics: some non-random reflections. *Applied Economic Perspectives Policy* 32(4), 515–548.
- Beauchamp, T.L., & Childress, J.F. (2001). Principles of biomedical ethics. In *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. Oxford University Press.
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qual. Res.* 15, 219–234.
- Bernard, H.R. (2017). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Biruk, C. (2017). Ethical gifts?: An analysis of soap for data transactions in Malawian survey research worlds. *Medical anthropology quarterly*, 31(3), pp.365-384
- Biruk, C., (2018). *Cooking data: Culture and politics in an African research world*. Duke University Press.
- Blee, K.M. & Currier, A. (2011). Ethics beyond the IRB: an introductory essay. *Qualitative Sociology* 34, 401–413.
- Boettke, P.J., & O'Donnell, K.W. (2016). The social responsibility of economists. In DeMartino, G.F., & McCloskey, D.N. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Professional Economic Ethics* (pp. 116–136). Oxford University Press.

- Bond, T. (2012). Ethical imperialism or ethical mindfulness? Rethinking ethical review for social sciences. *Research Ethics* 8(2), 97–112.
- Bothwell, L.E., Greene, J.A., Podolsky, S.H. & Jones, D.S. (2016). Assessing the gold standard—lessons from the history of RCTs. *New England Journal of Medicine* 374(22), 2175–2181.
- Caballero, B. (2002). Ethical issues for collaborative research in developing countries. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 76(4), 717–720.
- Cartwright, N. (2007a). Are RCTs the Gold Standard?. *Biosocieties*, 2(1), 11–20.
- Casey, K, Glennerster, R., & Miguel, E. (2012). Reshaping institutions: Evidence on aid impacts using a pre-analysis plan. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127(4): 1755–1812.
- Chang, A.C., & Li, P. (2017). A preanalysis plan to replicate sixty economics research papers that worked half of the time. *American Economic Review* 107(5), 60–64.
- Childress, J.F., Meslin, E.M., & Shaprio, H.T. (Eds.). (2005). *Belmont Revisited*. Georgetown University Press.
- Comstock, G. (2013). *Research ethics: A philosophical guide to the responsible conduct of research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS). (1982). *Proposed international ethical guidelines for biomedical research involving human subjects*.
- Creswell, J.W. and Clark, V.L.P., 2018. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
- Davis, S.L. (2020). *The uncounted: Politics of data in global health*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deaton, A. (2010). Instruments, randomization, and learning about development. *Journal of Economic Literature* 48(2), 424–455.
- Desposato, S. (2018). Subjects’ and scholars’ views on the ethics of political science field experiments. *Perspectives on Politics* 16(3), 739–750.
- Desposato, S. (2023). The ethical challenges of political science field experiments. In Iltis, A.S. & MacKay, D.P. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of research ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kremer, M. (2008). Using randomization in development economics research: A toolkit. In Schultz, T.P. & Strauss, J. (Eds.). *Handbook of development economics: Volume 4* (pp. 3895–3962). Elsevier.
- Duflo, E., & Banerjee, A.V. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of field experiments*. North Holland.
- Duflo, E., Banerjee, A.V., Finkelstein, A., Katz, L.F., Olken, B.A., & Sautmann, A. (2020). In praise of moderation: Suggestions for the scope and use of pre-analysis plans for RCTs in economics. *NBER Working Paper* 26993.

- Eckart, W.U. (2002). The colony as laboratory: German sleeping sickness campaigns in German East Africa and in Togo, 1900–1914. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 24 (1), 69–89.
- Ehmke, M., & Shogren, J.F. (2010). The experimental mindset within development economics: Proper use and handling are everything. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 32(4), 549–563.
- Freimuth, V.S., Quinn, S.C., Thomas, S.B., Cole, G., Zook, E., & Duncan, T. (2001). African Americans' views on research and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study. *Social Science and Medicine* 52(5), 797–808.
- Gbadegesin, S. (1993). Bioethics and culture: An African perspective. *Bioethics* 7(2-3), 257–262.
- Geissler, P.W. (2005). Kachinja are coming! Encounters around medical research work in a Kenyan village.” *Africa* 2, 173-202.
- Geissler, P.W. & Pool, R. (2006). Popular concerns about medical research projects in sub-Saharan Africa: A critical voice in debates about medical research ethics. *Tropical Medicine International Health* 11(7), 976.
- Geissler, P.W. (2011). ‘TRANSPORT TO WHERE?’ Reflections on the problem of value and time à propos an awkward practice in medical research. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 4(1), 45-64.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (2017). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Glennerster, R. (2017). The practicalities of running randomized evaluations: Partnerships, measurements, ethics, and transparency. In Duflo, E., & A. Banerjee, A.V. (Eds.). *Handbook of Field Experiments*. North Holland.
- Graboyes, M., Meta, J., Clarke, R. (2022). “Perceptions of Malaria as an Environmental Disease in Contemporary Zanzibar.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, Part C*.
- Graboyes, M. (2015). *The experiment must continue: Medical research and ethics in East Africa, 1940–2014*. Ohio University Press.
- Graboyes, M. (2014). ‘The malaria imbroglio’: Ethics, eradication, and endings in Pare Taveta, East Africa, 1959–1960. *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 47(3), 445–471.
- Graboyes, M. (2010). “Fines, orders, fear...and consent? Medical research in East Africa, c. 1950s.” *Developing World Bioethics* 10(1), 34-41.
- Greene, J.C., (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoeyer, K., Dahlager, L. & Lynøe, N. (2005). Conflicting notions of research ethics: The mutually challenging traditions of social scientists and medical researchers. *Social Science and Medicine* 61, 1741–1749.
- Hyder A.A., Wali, S.A., Khan, A.N., Teoh, N.B., Kass, N.E., & Dawson, L. (2004). Ethical review of health research: A perspective from developing country researchers. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 30, 68–72.

Ijsselmuiden, C., & Faden, R. (1999). Research and informed consent in Africa – Another look. In Mann, J. M., Gruskin, S., Grodin M. A., & Annas. (Eds.). *Health and Human Rights: A Reader* (pp. 363–372). Routledge.

Israel, M. (2015). *Research ethics and integrity for social scientists: Beyond regulatory compliance*. SAGE Publications.

Israel, M., & Hay, I. (2014). *Research Ethics for Social Scientists*. SAGE Publications.

Janzen, S.A., & Michler, J.D. (2021). Ulysses' pact or Ulysses' raft: Using pre-analysis plans in experimental and nonexperimental research. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 43(4), 1286-1304.

Jerven, M. (2013). *Poor Numbers*. Cornell University Press.

Jones, J.H., (1992). The Tuskegee legacy AIDS and the Black community. *The Hastings Center Report*, 22(6), pp.38-40.

Jones, D.S., & Podolsky, S.H. (2015). The history and fate of the gold standard. *The Lancet* 385(9977), 1502-1503.

Josephson, A., & Michler, J.D. (2018). Beasts of the Field? Ethics in Agricultural and Applied Economics. *Food Policy* 79, 1–11.

Karlan, D., & Udry, C. (2020). *A Call for Structured Ethics Appendices in Social Science Papers*. Innovations for Poverty Action. November 12, 2020.

Kingori, P. (2013). Experiencing everyday ethics in context: Frontline data collectors perspectives and practices of bioethics. *Social Science and Medicine* 98, 361–370.

Klitzman, R. (2012). US IRBs confronting research in the developing world. *Developing World Bioethics* 12(2), 63–73.

Lachenal, G. (2017). *The Lomidine Files: The untold story of a medical disaster in colonial Africa*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Leach, A., Hilton, S., Greenwood, B.M., Manneh, E., Dibba, B., Wilkins, A., & Mulholland, E.K. (1999). An evaluation of the informed consent procedure used during a trial of a *Haemophilus influenzae* type B conjugate vaccine undertaken in The Gambia, West Africa. *Social science & medicine*, 48(2), 139-148.

List, J.A., Sadoff, S., & Wagner, M. (2010). *So you want to run an experiment, now what? Some simple rules of thumb for optimal experimental design*. National Bureau for Economic Research Working Paper 15701.

London, L. (2002). Ethical oversight of public health research: Can rules and IRBs make a difference in developing countries? *American Journal of Public Health* 92(7), 1079–1084.

Lowes, S. & Montero, E. (2021). The legacy of colonial medicine in Central Africa. *American Economic Review* 111(4), 1284–1314.

- Miguel, E. (2021). Evidence on research transparency in economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 35(3), 193-214.
- Miguel, E., & Kremer, M. (2004). Worms: Identifying impacts on education and health in the presence of treatment externalities. *Econometrica* 72(1), 159–217.
- Miguel, E., Camerer, C., Casey, K., Cohen, J., Esterling, K. M., Gerber, A., ... & Van der Laan, M. (2014). Promoting transparency in social science research. *Science* 343(6166), 30-31.
- Molyneux, C.S., Wassenaar, D.R., Peshu, N., & Marsh, K. (2005). ‘Even if they ask you to stand by a tree all day, you will have to do it (laughter)...!’: community voices on the notion and practice of informed consent for biomedical research in developing countries. *Social science & medicine* 61(2), 443-454.
- Molyneux, C.S. & Geissler, P.W. (2008). Ethics and the ethnography of medical research in Africa. *Social Science and Medicine* 67, 685–695.
- Mumford, M.D., Connelly, S., Brown, R.P., Murphy, S.T., Hill, J.H., Antes, A.L., Waples, E.P., & Devenport, L.D. (2008). A sensemaking approach to ethics training for scientists: Preliminary evidence of training effectiveness. *Ethics & Behavior* 18, 315–39.
- Murove, M.F. (2009). *African ethics: an anthology for comparative and applied ethics*. University of KwaZulu Natal Press.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Reproducibility and Replicability in Science*. The National Academies Press.
- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guideline for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research Office*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC). (2001). *Ethical and Policy Issues in International Research: Clinical Trials in Developing Countries*.
- Ndebele, P., & Musesengwa, R. (2012). Ethical dilemmas in malaria vector research in Africa: Making the difficult choice between mosquito, science and humans. *Malawi Medical Journal* 24(3), 65–68.
- Nortjé, N., Visagie, R., & Wessels, J. S. (Eds.). (2019). *Social science research ethics in Africa*. Springer International Publishing.
- Nosek, B.A., Alter, G., Banks, G.C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S.D., Breckler, S.J., Buck, S., Chambers, C.D., Chin, G., Christensen, G. & Contestabile, M. (2015). Promoting an open research culture. *Science* 348(6242),1422-1425.
- Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2002) *The Ethics of Research Related to Healthcare in Developing Countries*. Nuffield Council on Bioethics.
- Nunn, N., & Wantchekon, L. (2011). The slave trade and the origins of mistrust in Africa. *American Economic Review* 101(7), 3221–52.
- Olken, B.A. (2015). Promises and perils of pre-analysis plans. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29(3), 61–80.

- Owens, D.C. (2017). *Medical bondage: Race, gender, and the origins of American gynecology*. University of Georgia Press.
- Özler, B. (2011). *Hurting people while trying to help?* The World Bank. June 24, 2011. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/hurting-people-while-trying-to-help>
- Quinless, J. M. (2022). *Decolonizing Data: Unsettling Conversations about Social Research Methods*. University of Toronto Press.
- Reverby, S.M. (Ed.). (2012). *Tuskegee's truths: Rethinking the Tuskegee syphilis study*. UNC Press Books.
- Rodrik, D. (2009). The new development economics: We shall experiment, but how shall we learn? In ed. Cohen, J., & Easterly, W. (Eds.). *What works in development? Thinking big and thinking small*, 24–47. Brookings Institution Press.
- Roth, A.E. (1993). The early history of experimental economics. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 15(2): 184-209.
- Rousu, M.C., Colson, G., Corrigan, J.R., Grebitus, C., Loureiro, M.L. (2015). Deception in experiments: Towards guidelines on use in applied economics research. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 37(3), 524–536.
- Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (2019) *Press Release: The Prize in Economic Sciences 2019*.
- Rusert, B. (2019). Naturalizing coercion: The Tuskegee experiments and the laboratory life of the plantation. In *Captivating Technology* (pp. 25-49). Duke University Press.
- Schrag, Z.M. (2010). *Ethical imperialism: Institutional review boards and the social sciences 1965–2009*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schücklenk, U. & Ashcroft, R. (2000). International research ethics. *Bioethics* 14(2), 158-172.
- Sims, C.A. (2010). But economics is not an experimental science. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 24(2), 59–68.
- Stark, L. (2012). *Behind closed doors: IRBs and the making of ethical research*. University of Chicago Press.
- Sukhtankar, S. (2017). Replications in development economics. *American Economic Review* 107(5), 32–36.
- Sugarman, J. & Participants in the Partnership for Enhancing Human Research Protections Durban Workshop. (2007). Ethical oversight of multinational collaborative research: Lessons from Africa for building capacity and for policy. *Research Ethics* 3(3), 84–86.
- Sultana, F. (2007). Reflexivity, positionality and participatory ethics: Negotiating fieldwork dilemmas in international research, *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 6(3), 374–385.

Swanson, N., Christensen, G., Littman, R., Birke, D., Miguel, E., Paluck, E.L., & Wang, Z. (2020). Research transparency is on the rise in economics. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 110, 61–65.

Tan-Torres, E.T. (1999). North-South research partnerships: The ethics of carrying out research in developing countries. *British Medical Journal* 319, 438–441.

Tangwa, G.B. (1996). Bioethics: an African perspective. *Bioethics* 10(3), 183–200.

Tangwa, G.B. (2017). Giving voice to African thought in medical research ethics. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 38(2), 101–110.

Teele, D. L. (2014). Reflections on the ethics of field experiments. *Field experiments and their critics: Essays on the uses and abuses of experimentation in the social sciences*, 115–40.

Tilley, H. (2011). *Africa as a living laboratory: Empire, development, and the problem of scientific knowledge, 1870-1950*. University of Chicago Press.

Tilley, H. (2016). Medicine, empires, and ethics in colonial Africa. *American Medical Association Journal of Ethics* 18(7), 743–753.

Tindana, P.O., Kass, N., & Akweongo, P. (2006). The informed consent process in a rural African setting: A case study of the Kassena-Nankana District of Northern Ghana. *National Institute of Health: IRB* 28(3): 1–6.

Torres, R.A., & Nyaga, D. (2021). *Critical research methodologies: ethics and responsibilities*.

Washington, H.A. (2006). *Medical apartheid: The dark history of medical experimentation on Black Americans from colonial times to the present*. Doubleday Books.

Webel, M. (2019). *The politics of disease control: Sleeping sickness in Eastern Africa, 1890- 1920*. Ohio University Press.

World Medical Association. (1964). Human experimentation. Code of ethics of the World Medical Association. Declaration of Helsinki. *British medical journal* 2(5402), 177.

Yalcintas, A., & Wible, J.R. (2016). Scientific misconduct and research ethics in economics: an introduction. *Review of Social Economy* 74 (1), 1–6.

Effective 10/04/2021

NSF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OMB-3145-0058

NAME: Melissa Graboyes

POSITION TITLE & INSTITUTION: Associate Professor, History Department, University of Oregon

A. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(a\)](#))

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	MAJOR/AREA OF STUDY	DEGREE (if applicable)	YEAR (YYYY)
University of California	Davis, California	History	B.A	2002
Boston University	Boston, MA	History	M.A.	2007
Boston University	Boston, MA	Public Health	M.P.H.	2007
Boston University	Boston, MA	History	Ph.D.	2010

B. APPOINTMENTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(b\)](#))

From - To	Position Title, Organization and Location
2021-present	Associate Professor, History Department, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2020-present	Director, African Studies Program, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2019-2021	Associate Professor, Clark Honors College, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2016 – 2019	Assistant Professor, Clark Honors College, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2012-2015	Assistant Director, African Studies Program, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2011-2014	Faculty Fellow, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
2007	Lecturer, Boston University, Boston, MA
2003-2004	Rural Reach Coordinator, Population Services International, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

C. PRODUCTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(c\)](#)) Products Most Closely Related to the Proposed Project

Melissa Graboyes and Hannah Carr. “Institutional Memory, Institutional Capacity: Narratives of Failed Biomedical Encounters in East Africa.” *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, vol. 51, no. 1, 2017, pp. 361-377.

Melissa Graboyes. *The Experiment Must Continue: Medical Research and Ethics in East Africa, 1940-2014*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2015.

Melissa Graboyes. “‘The Malaria Imbroglia:’ Ethics, Eradication, and Endings in Pare Taveta, East Africa, 1959-1960.” Special Issue on the History of Medicine in East Africa. *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2014, pp. 445-472.

Melissa Graboyes. “Incorporating Medical Research Into the History of Medicine in East Africa.” Introduction to Special Issue on the History of Medicine in East Africa. *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2014, pp. 379-398.

Melissa Graboyes. “Fines, Orders, Fear...and Consent? Medical Research in East Africa, c. 1950s.” *Journal of Developing World Bioethics*, vol. 10, Apr. 2010, pp. 34-41.

Other Significant Products, Whether or Not Related to the Proposed Project

Melissa Graboyes, Judith Meta, and Rhaine Clarke. "Mazingira and the Malady of Malaria: Perceptions of Malaria as an Environmental Disease in Contemporary Zanzibar." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*. 95. 2022: 134-144.

Melissa Graboyes, Daphne Gallagher and Jennifer Tappan. "Introduction to the Special Section: Histories of Global Health in Africa," with. Introduction to special section, "Historical Perspectives on Contemporary Problems of Global Health in Africa" for *Health & Place*. 2022: 102863.

Melissa Graboyes and Judith Meta. "Rebounding Malaria and the Failures of Eradication: The World Health Organization campaign and the after effects, 1957-1985." *Health & Place*. 2022: 102842.

Melissa Graboyes and Zainab Alidina. "African Studies Keyword: Malaria." *African Studies Review*. December 2021.

Melissa Graboyes, Kemi Balogun, Lisa Gilman, Habib Iddrisu, eds. *Africa Every Day: Fun, Leisure, and Expressive Culture on the Continent*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, November 2019.

D. SYNERGISTIC ACTIVITIES - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f\(i\)\(d\)](#))

Melissa Graboyes. Co-Director, Center for Global Health. University of Oregon. 2016-2018.

Melissa Graboyes. Executive Committee Member, African Studies Program. University of Oregon. 2016-2018.

Melissa Graboyes. Faculty Leader, Undergraduate Global Health Research Group. University of Oregon. 2016-present.

Melissa Graboyes and Mokaya Bosire, Co-Directors, "Intensive Swahili in Zanzibar" 8-week summer study abroad program. 2014-2018.

Melissa Graboyes. "Catalog to Historical Materials Housed at Amani Station, Tanzania. National Institute of Medical Research." 2008.

Effective 10/04/2021

NSF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OMB-3145-0058

NAME: Alfredo Burlando

POSITION TITLE & INSTITUTION: Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Oregon

A. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(a\)](#))

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	MAJOR/AREA OF STUDY	DEGREE (if applicable)	YEAR (YYYY)
University of California	Davis, CA	Economics	B.A.	2003
University of California	Davis, CA	Economics	M.A.	2003
Boston University	Boston, MA	Economics	Ph.D.	2010

B. APPOINTMENTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(b\)](#))

From - To	Position Title, Organization and Location
2017-present	Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Oregon
2010-2017	Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Oregon
2019-2020	Visiting Professor, Dept. Economics, Bocconi University, Italy
2020-present	Associate Editor, Oxford Open Economics

C. PRODUCTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f\(i\)\(c\)](#)) Products Most Closely Related to the Proposed Project

Burlando, A, Chintagunta, P., Goldberg, J., Graboyes, M, Hangoma, P., Karlan, D., Macis, M., and Prina, S. (2022). Adaptation of Incentivized Peer Outreach: From Tuberculosis in India to COVID-19 in Zambia. NBER Working Paper #30414, under review at Management Science.

Burlando, A., Goldberg, J., and Etcheverry, L. (2022). Banking the Group: The Impact of Credit and Banking Linkages. Working paper.

Burlando, A., & Canidio, A. (2017). Does Group Inclusion Hurt Financial Inclusion? Evidence from Ultra-Poor Members of Ugandan Savings Groups, *Journal of Development Economics*, 128, 24-48.

Burlando, A. (2014). Transitory Shocks and Birth Weights: Evidence from a Blackout in Zanzibar. *Journal of Development Economics* 108, p. 154-168.

Burlando, A. (2014). Power Outages, Power Externalities, and Baby Booms. *Demography* 51(4), p. 1477-1500.

Other Significant Products, Whether or Not Related to the Proposed Project

Burlando, A., Prina, S. and Kuhn, M. (2022). Too Fast, Too Furious? Digital Credit, Repayments and Default Rates. CECA Working Paper #151, resubmitted to the Review of Economics and Statistics.

Burlando, A., Bbaale, E. (2022). Fertility Responses to Schooling Costs: Evidence from Uganda's Universal Primary Education Policy, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 70 (3) 1017-1039.

Burlando, A., Canidio, A., and Selby, R. (2021). The Economics of Savings Groups, *International Economic Review*, 62(4) 1569-1598.

Burlando, A. & Motta, A. (2016). Legalize, Tax, and Deter: Optimal Enforcement Policies for Corruptible Officials, *Journal of Development Economics*, 118, 207-215.

Burlando, A. (2015). The Disease Environment, Schooling, and Development Outcomes: Evidence from Ethiopia, *Journal of Development Studies*, 51(12), 1563-1584.

D. SYNERGISTIC ACTIVITIES - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(d\)](#))

2018-present Affiliate, CECA

2021-present Affiliate, J-PAL

2016-present Director of Master's Program in Economics, Department of Economics, University of Oregon

2019-present Faculty leader of Graduate Development Research Group, Department of Economics, University of Oregon

2012-present Scientific Committee, NorthWest Development Workshop

Effective 10/04/2021

NSF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OMB-3145-0058

NAME: Edward Miguel

POSITION TITLE & INSTITUTION: Professor of Economics, University of California, Berkeley

A. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(a\)](#))

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	MAJOR/AREA OF STUDY	DEGREE (if applicable)	YEAR (YYYY)
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Cambridge, MA	Mathematics	Bachelor of Science	1996
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Cambridge, MA	Economics	Bachelor of Science	1996
Harvard University	Cambridge, MA	Economics	Master of Arts	1998
Harvard University	Cambridge, MA	Economics	Doctor of Philosophy	2000

B. APPOINTMENTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(b\)](#))

From - To	Position Title, Organization and Location
2012-Present	Oxfam Professor in Environmental and Resource Economics, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley
2009-2012	Professor, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley
2005-2009	Associate Professor (tenured), Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley
2000-2005	Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley

BS-1 of 3

C. PRODUCTS - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(c\)](#)) Products Most Closely Related to the Proposed Project

1. Nosek, B.A., E. Miguel, et al., (2015). “Promoting an Open Research Culture: Author guidelines for journals could help to promote transparency, openness, and reproducibility” *Science*, 10.1126/science.aab2374.
2. Mobarak, A.M., E. Miguel, A. Ahuja, G. Kang, G. S. Gonsalves, S. B. Omer, A. Kharel, S. Warren, J. Dzansi, N. Meriggi, D. Garrett, M. Kremer, H. Rees, B. Salako, F. Qadri, W. Wiecek, A. Banerjee, M. Alsan, E. Breza, A. G. Chandrasekhar, E. Duflo, P. Goldsmith-Pinkham, B. A. Olken, J. Abaluck, M. M. Hossain, A. Jakubowski, C. Nekesa. (2022). “End COVID-19 in low- and middle-income countries” *Science*, doi: 10.1126/science.abo4089.
3. Miguel, E., C. Camerer, K. Casey, et al. (2014). “Promoting transparency in social science research” *Science*, 10.1126/science.1245317.
4. Christensen, G., J. Freese, E. Miguel. (2019). *Transparent and Reproducible Social Science Research*, UC Press.
5. Miguel, E. (2021). “Evidence on Research Transparency in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35 (3): 193-214.

Other Significant Products, Whether or Not Related to the Proposed Project

1. Egger, D., J. Haushofer, E. Miguel, P. Niehaus, M. Walker. (2022). “General Equilibrium Effects of Cash Transfers: Experimental Evidence from Kenya”, *Econometrica*, 10.3982/ECTA17945.
2. Hamory, J, E. Miguel, M. Walker, M. Kremer, S. Baird. (2021). “Twenty Year Economic Impacts of Deworming,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(14), 10.1073/pnas.2023185118.
3. Lee, K. C. Wolfram, E. Miguel. (2020). “Experimental Evidence on the Economics of Rural Electrification,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(4): 1523-1565, 10.1086/705417.
4. Hsiang, S., M. Burke, E. Miguel. (2013). “Quantifying the Influence of Climate on Human Conflict,” *Science*, 10.1126/science.1235367.
5. K. Casey, R. Glennerster, E. Miguel. (2012). “Reshaping Institutions: Evidence on Aid Impacts Using a Pre-Analysis Plan,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(4), 1755-1812.

D. SYNERGISTIC ACTIVITIES - (see [PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.f.\(i\)\(d\)](#))

1. Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA), University of California Berkeley, Faculty Director, 2006-present
2. Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in the Social Sciences (BITSS), Faculty Director, 2013-present
3. East African Social Science Training Collaborative (EASST), Faculty Director, 2011-present
4. Working Group in African Political Economy (WGAPE), Co-Organizer, 2002-present
5. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Advisory Committee Member, Development Economics Program, 2022-present

Other Personnel Biographical Information

Data Not Available

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 1

ORGANIZATION University of Oregon Eugene				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR Melissa Graboyes				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Melissa Graboyes - Principal Inv				1.8			18,024
2. Alfredo Burlando				0.72			11,596
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (2) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				2.52			29,620
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (0) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				0.0			0
3. (0) GRADUATE STUDENTS							0
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							29,620
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							9,627
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							39,247
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							0
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISSEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							49,997
6. OTHER							0
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							49,997
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							89,244
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of Oregon F&A (Rate: 30.7, Base:39247.0) (Cont. on Comments Page)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							19,724
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							108,968
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							108,968
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME Melissa Graboyes				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
ORG. REP. NAME* Jennifer B Jacobs				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET COMMENTS - 1

** I- Indirect Costs

UO F&A on Subaward (first \$25K) (Rate: 30.7, Base: 25,000)

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 2

ORGANIZATION University of Oregon Eugene				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR Melissa Graboyes				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Melissa Graboyes - Principal Inv				1.8			18,384
2. Alfredo Burlando				0.73			11,828
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (2) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				2.53			30,212
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (0) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				0.0			0
3. (5) GRADUATE STUDENTS							8,000
4. (5) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							7,200
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							45,412
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							12,233
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							57,645
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							3,050
2. INTERNATIONAL							4,750
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISSEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							36,000
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							49,997
6. OTHER							0
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							85,997
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							151,442
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of Oregon F&A (Rate: 30.7, Base:101445.0) (Cont. on Comments Page)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							31,144
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							182,586
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							182,586
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME Melissa Graboyes				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
ORG. REP. NAME* Jennifer B Jacobs				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET COMMENTS - 2

** I- Indirect Costs

UO F&A on Subaward (first \$25K) (Rate: 0.0, Base: 0)

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 3

ORGANIZATION University of Oregon Eugene				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR Melissa Graboyes				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Melissa Graboyes - Principal Inv				0.9			9,376
2. Alfredo Burlando				0.37			6,032
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (2) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				1.27			15,408
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (0) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				0.0			0
3. (5) GRADUATE STUDENTS							5,200
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							20,608
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							7,228
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							27,836
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							4,750
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISEMINATION							12,000
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							50,000
6. OTHER							0
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							62,000
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							94,586
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of Oregon F&A (Rate: 30.7, Base:44586.0) (Cont. on Comments Page)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							13,688
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							108,274
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							108,274
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME Melissa Graboyes				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
ORG. REP. NAME* Jennifer B Jacobs				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET COMMENTS - 3

** I- Indirect Costs

UO F&A on Subaward (first \$25K) (Rate: 0.0, Base: 0)

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

Cumulative

ORGANIZATION University of Oregon Eugene				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR Melissa Graboyes				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Melissa Graboyes - Principal Inv				4.5			45,784
2. Alfredo Burlando				1.82			29,456
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)							
7. (2) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				6.32			75,240
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (0) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				0.0			0
3. (10) GRADUATE STUDENTS							13,200
4. (5) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							7,200
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							95,640
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							29,088
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							124,728
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							3,050
2. INTERNATIONAL							9,500
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISSEMINATION							12,000
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							36,000
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							149,994
6. OTHER							0
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							197,994
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							335,272
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							64,556
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							399,828
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							399,828
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME Melissa Graboyes				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
ORG. REP. NAME* Jennifer B Jacobs				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

NSF Budget Justification

The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants: Establishing Best Practices in
Development Economics

University of Oregon PI: Melissa Graboyes
University of Oregon Co-PI: Alfredo Burlando

A. Senior Personnel [\$75,240]

Principal Investigator Melissa Graboyes (PI). In Years 1 and 2, the PI will commit 2 summer months and 1 month, respectively, to the project. These summers will be spent conducting the Y1 review of the field and developing the survey and interview tools to be used in Y2. The total amount of summer salary requested is \$18,024 in Year 1 and \$9,192 in Year 2. The PI also requests one course reduction for Years 2 and 3. The course release will cost \$9,192 in Year 2 and \$9,376 in Year 3.

The PI requests a one course reduction for Y 2-3 due to the PI's heavy teaching load of 5 courses per year. During these years, the PI will manage the project, take the lead on writing peer review articles and blog posts, and training and supervise 4-6 undergraduate research assistants, in addition to developing new teaching modules around RCT Research Ethics for her existing courses.

The University of Oregon defines a "year" as one 12-month period. Annual salary cost of living increases are estimated at 2.0%.

Co-Principal Investigator Alfredo Burlando (Co-PI). The Co-PI will commit .80 of one summer month in Years 1 and 2 and .04 of one summer month in Year 3 to the project. The total amount of summer salary requested is \$11,596 in Year 1, \$11,828 in Year 2, and \$6,032 in Year 3. These summers will be spent assisting in the Y1 review of the field, the Y2 development of the survey and interview tools, and the Y3 analysis of survey and interview data.

The requested salary includes a 2% annual Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) rate based on the State of Oregon's Bureau of Labor.

B. Other Personnel [\$20,400]

Student Research Assistants. Funding is requested in Years 2 and 3 for undergraduate and graduate student research assistants, budgeted at \$16/hour for 950 hours in Year 2 and \$16/hour for 325 hours in Year 3, for an annual cost of \$15,200 and \$5,200, respectively. Students will contribute to the research in the form of assisting with interviews, coding data, conducting literature reviews, co-authoring blog posts, and presenting at conferences as a way for them to develop the independent skills necessary for them to complete their own theses.

C. Fringe Benefits [\$29,088]

University of Oregon employee fringe benefit costs encompass the following items for UO employees, all of which are required: (a) FICA, (b) retirement, (c) health insurance, (d) workmen's compensation/SAIF, (e) unemployment insurance, (f) employee liability

insurance, (g) life insurance, (h) graduate teaching fellows' fringe benefits including health insurance and fees, and (i) leave as appropriate. For the purpose of estimating and budgeting proposal costs, fringe benefit rates are based on employee classification (EClass) in accordance with the University's federally-negotiated fringe benefit rate proposal submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Please note that when leave is taken by an employee, it is charged directly to a central fund and not charged to the sponsored project. The Fringe Benefit expenses total \$9,627 in Year 1, \$12,233 in Year 2, and \$7,228 in Year 3.

D. Travel [\$12,550]

PI Travel to San Francisco, Washington, D.C. and Africa is vital for the completion of proposed research and dissemination of results. All travel costs are outlined below.

- a) 1 trip to San Francisco in Year 2 to attend UC Berkeley's CECA events. Costs include \$350 for airfare and \$200/day x 6 days for per diem, for a total of \$1550.
- b) 1 trip to Washington, D.C. in Year 2 for presentation at the NSF ER2 PI biennial conference. Costs include \$750 for airfare and \$250/day x 3 days for per diem, for a total of \$1500.
- c) 1 trip to Africa in both Year 2 and Year 3 to conduct 300 surveys and 60 interviews (Y2); and to disseminate research results and collect feedback to 300 participants through public meetings (Y3). Costs include \$2,500 for airfare and \$225/day x 10 days for per diem, for a total of \$9,500.

E. Other Direct Costs [\$48,000]

Funds are requested to pay three international organizations to survey those who have recently participated in Randomized Controlled Trials in Africa. Three different RCTs study sites will be selected, located in three different countries, each one focusing on a different topic (such as health, financial technologies, and education). We anticipate needing support for 3 surveys at \$12,000 each, for a total of \$36,000. In addition, we request funds to help disseminate our grant findings at a cost of \$12,000.

F. Subaward to University of California, Berkeley [\$149,994]

A subaward will be given to the University of California at Berkeley's Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA). The will support the UO by 1) helping to carry out literature reviews within economics, global health, and adjacent fields such as Science and Technology Studies/medical anthropology; 2) facilitating written surveys with CEGA and NIERA affiliates working in Africa; 3) facilitating in-depth, semi-structured interviews with CEGA and NIERA affiliates, as well as African research participants; 4) facilitating observations in the field of end-of-trial reporting and dissemination activities carried out by CEGA and NIERA affiliates; and 5) hosting a convening/workshop to disseminate best practices and guidelines for end-of-trial reporting for the development economics research community.

G. Indirect Costs [\$64,556]

Facilities and Administrative costs are calculated at the on-campus rate of 30.7% of MTDC in all project years. Modified total direct costs exclude equipment, capital expenditures, charges for patient care, student tuition remission, rental costs of off-site facilities, scholarships, and

fellowships, participant support costs and the portion of each subgrant and subcontract in excess of \$25,000. The University of Oregon's current indirect cost rate agreement has been negotiated with the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services and is dated June 29, 2022.

L. Total Request for this Project: [\$399,828]

Year 1: \$108,968

Year 2: \$182,586

Year 3: \$108,571

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 1

ORGANIZATION University of California-Berkeley				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PI, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Edward Miguel				0.2			4,100
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (1) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				0.2			4,100
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (3) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				2.2			17,568
3. (0) GRADUATE STUDENTS							0
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							21,668
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							8,970
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							30,638
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							0
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							0
6. OTHER							513
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							513
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							31,151
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of California Berkeley (Rate: 60.5, Base:31151.0)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							18,846
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							49,997
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							49,997
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PI NAME				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
ORG. REP. NAME*				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	
Jennifer B Jacobs							

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 2

ORGANIZATION University of California-Berkeley				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PI, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Edward Miguel				0.1			4,264
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (1) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				0.1			4,264
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (3) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				2.09			17,413
3. (0) GRADUATE STUDENTS							0
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							21,677
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							8,961
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							30,638
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							0
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							0
6. OTHER							513
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							513
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							31,151
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of California Berkeley (Rate: 60.5, Base:31151.0)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							18,846
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							49,997
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							49,997
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
ORG. REP. NAME*				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	
Jennifer B Jacobs							

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

YEAR 3

ORGANIZATION University of California-Berkeley				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PI, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Edward Miguel				0.0			0
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)				0.0			0
7. (1) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				0.0			0
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (2) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				1.4			11,278
3. (0) GRADUATE STUDENTS							0
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							11,278
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							4,827
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							16,105
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							0
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							0
6. OTHER							15,048
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							15,048
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							31,153
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE) University of California Berkeley (Rate: 60.5, Base:31152.0)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							18,847
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							50,000
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							50,000
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
ORG. REP. NAME*				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	
Jennifer B Jacobs							

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

Cumulative

ORGANIZATION University of California-Berkeley				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				PROPOSAL NO. 2316205	DURATION (months)		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / PROJECT DIRECTOR				AWARD NO.	Proposed	Granted	
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-PI's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates (List each separately with title, A.7. show number in brackets)				NSF Funded Person-months		Funds Requested By proposer	Funds granted by NSF (if different)
				CAL	ACAD	SUMR	
1. Edward Miguel				0.3			8,364
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE)							
7. (1) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1 - 6)				0.3			8,364
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)							
1. (0) POST DOCTORAL SCHOLARS				0.0			0
2. (8) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)				5.6899999999999995			46,259
3. (0) GRADUATE STUDENTS							0
4. (0) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS							0
5. (0) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)							0
6. (0) OTHER							0
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)							54,623
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)							22,758
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)							77,381
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000.)							
TOTAL EQUIPMENT							0
E. TRAVEL 1. DOMESTIC (INCL. U.S. POSSESSIONS)							0
2. INTERNATIONAL							0
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS							
1. STIPENDS \$ 0							0
2. TRAVEL 0							0
3. SUBSISTENCE 0							0
4. OTHER 0							0
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (0) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS							0
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS							
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES							0
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISSEMINATION							0
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES							0
4. COMPUTER SERVICES							0
5. SUBAWARDS							0
6. OTHER							16,074
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS							16,074
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)							93,455
I. INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)(SPECIFY RATE AND BASE)							
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (F&A)							56,539
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)							149,994
K. FEE							0
L. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST (J) OR (J MINUS K)							149,994
M. COST SHARING PROPOSED LEVEL \$ 0				AGREED LEVEL IF DIFFERENT \$			
PI/PD NAME				FOR NSF USE ONLY			
				INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			
ORG. REP. NAME*				Date Checked	Date Of Rate Sheet	Initials - ORG	
Jennifer B Jacobs							

*ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR REVISED BUDGET

NSF BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants: Establishing Best Practices in
Development Economics

UC Berkeley PI: Edward Miguel

A. SENIOR PERSONNEL [\$8,364]

A.1. Principal Investigator (Edward Miguel): Prof. Miguel will provide overall direction and oversight of the research. They will commit 0.10 summer month per year during years one and two. Responsibilities include data analysis and interpretation, drafting and dissemination of results, designing course material based on the techniques and results from the research project. In addition to overall project responsibility, the PI will co-supervise one Graduate Student Researcher (GSR) working on the project.

B. OTHER PERSONNEL [\$47,208]

B.1. Executive Director: CEGA's Executive Director will commit 0.2 calendar months per year, in years one and two. They will provide executive and cross-cutting program leadership.

B.2. Program Manager: A Program Manager will commit 1.5 calendar months in year one, 1.39 calendar months in year two and 1.2 calendar months in year three. They will provide overall project management, financial management, partner liaising, monitoring, evaluation of activities and outputs, sponsor reporting, and supervision of knowledge management and research dissemination activities (event planning and coordination), particularly in Y3.

B.3. Program Administrator: CEGA's Program Administrator will commit 0.5 calendar months in years one and two and 0.2 calendar months in year three. They will provide critical operational support to the program including human resources support (recruitment, hiring, reappointments, management systems, etc.); contract administration, financial management and fund disbursement; monitoring, evaluation, and reporting systems; events and communications support, allowing technical staff to focus on core, programmatic responsibilities.

Salaries are based on current actual salaries and are projected to include a 3% annual cost-of-living adjustment (and merit, if applicable) effective each year. For the purposes of determining NSF's 2-month annual effort limit on senior personnel compensation, UC Berkeley defines a "year" as the organization's fiscal year that spans from July 1 – June 30.

C. FRINGE BENEFITS [\$23,166]

The University of California, Berkeley Composite Benefit Rates (CBR) have been reviewed and federally approved by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for use by all fund sources for FY21. Rates beyond June 30, 2021 are estimates and are provided for planning purposes only. Future CBRs are subject to review and approval by DHHS on an annual or bi-annual basis. Fringe benefits are assessed as a percentage of the respective employee's salary. The benefit rates are as follows:

	<i>Submitted, Pending Federal Approval</i>		<i>Projections for Planning Purposes -></i>		
CBR Rate Group	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FY26
Academic	35.9%	35.4%	35.4%	35.4%	35.4%
Staff	43.8%	42.8%	42.8%	42.8%	42.8%
Limited	14.4%	14.0%	14.0%	14.0%	14.0%
Employees with No Benefit Eligibility	4.2%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%
Students	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%

For more information, please see: <https://cfo.berkeley.edu/about-us/financial-planning-analysis/central-resource-management/composite-benefit-rates-cbr>

D. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:

D.1. Other: Funds are also requested in the amount of \$14,717 to support a convening event.

E. INDIRECT COSTS: [\$56,541]

Indirect costs are based on University negotiated rates with the cognizant federal authority and are applied at a rate of 60.5%. Indirect costs are applied using the Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) formula, per rate agreement dated June 25, 2020. Modified total direct costs exclude equipment, capital expenditures, charges for patient care, student tuition remission, rental costs of off-site facilities, scholarships, and fellowships, participant support costs and the portion of each subgrant and subcontract in excess of \$25,000. For more information, please see: <http://www.spo.berkeley.edu/policy/fa.html>. The rates after July 1, 2022 are provisional and subject to change based upon our updated federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement

Effective 10/04/2021 NSF CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT**OMB-3145-0058**

***PI/co-PI/Senior Personnel Name:** Melissa Graboyes

***Required fields**

Note: NSF has provided 15 project/proposal and 10 in-kind contribution entries for users to populate. Please leave any unused entries blank.

Project/Proposal Section:

Current and Pending Support includes all resources made available to an individual in support of and/or related to all of his/her research efforts, regardless of whether or not they have monetary value.^[1] Information must be provided about all current and pending support, including this project, for ongoing projects, and for any proposals currently under consideration from whatever source, irrespective of whether such support is provided through the proposing organization or is provided directly to the individual. This includes, for example, Federal, State, local, foreign, public or private foundations, non-profit organizations, industrial or other commercial organizations, or internal funds allocated toward specific projects. Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review by NSF, if disclosed.^[2]

^[1] If the time commitment or dollar value is not readily ascertainable, reasonable estimates should be provided.

^[2] The Biological Sciences Directorate exception to this policy is delineated in PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.

Projects/Proposals

1. *Project/Proposal Title : CAREER: A Case Study of Malaria Elimination Efforts with Relation to Vernacular Knowledge, Expertise, and Ethics

*Status of Support : ☒ Current ☐ Pending ☐ Submission Planned ☐ Transfer of Support

Proposal/Award Number (if available): 1844715

*Source of Support: National Science Foundation

*Primary Place of Performance : University of Oregon

Project/Proposal Start Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2019

Project/Proposal End Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2024

*Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$ 411,171

*Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project

*Year (YYYY)	*Person Months (##.##)	Year (YYYY)	Person Months (##.##)
1. 2019	2.85	4. 2022	0.09
2. 2020	2.85	5. 2023	0.09
3. 2021	0.09		

*Overall Objectives : Intellectual Merit: The grant supports new research focusing on a century of malaria elimination attempts in sub-Saharan Africa and on the island of Zanzibar. Broader Impacts: This project integrates African voices and the historical record into contemporary discussions about malaria eradication.

*Statement of Potential Overlap : None

Projects/Proposals

2.*Project/Proposal Title : CAREER: A Case Study of Malaria Elimination Efforts with Relation to Vernacular Knowledge, Expertise, and Ethics SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

***Status of Support :** ☒ Current ☐ Pending ☐ Submission Planned ☐ Transfer of Support

Proposal/Award Number (if available): 1844715;

***Source of Support:** National Science Foundation

***Primary Place of Performance :** University of Oregon

Project/Proposal Start Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2019

Project/Proposal End Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2024

***Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs):** \$ 29,766

***Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project**

*Year (YYYY)	*Person Months (##.##)	Year (YYYY)	Person Months (##.##)
1. 2019	0.00	4. 2022	0.00
2. 2020	0.00	5. 2023	0.00
3. 2021	0.00		

***Overall Objectives :** Intellectual Merit: The grant supports new research focusing on a century of malaria elimination attempts in sub-Saharan Africa and on the island of Zanzibar. Broader Impacts: This project integrates African voices and the historical record into contemporary discussions about malaria eradication.

***Statement of Potential Overlap :** None

Projects/Proposals

3.*Project/Proposal Title : The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants:
Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics

***Status of Support :** ☐ Current ☒ Pending ☐ Submission Planned ☐ Transfer of Support

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

***Source of Support:** National Science Foundation

***Primary Place of Performance :** University of Oregon

Project/Proposal Start Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2023

Project/Proposal End Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 08/2026

***Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$** 399,828

***Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project**

*Year (YYYY)	*Person Months (##.##)	Year (YYYY)	Person Months (##.##)
1. 2023	1.80	4.	
2. 2024	1.80	5.	
3. 2025	0.09		

***Overall Objectives :** This proposal will result in a series of closely-linked research and educational/training outputs centered on changing the norms around dissemination of research results in the field of development economics. Findings from this interdisciplinary mixed-methods project will contribute to changing how results from Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are shared with participants on the African continent.

***Statement of Potential Overlap :** None

Effective 10/04/2021 NSF CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

OMB-3145-0058

*PI/co-PI/Senior Personnel Name: Alfredo Burlando

***Required fields**

Note: NSF has provided 15 project/proposal and 10 in-kind contribution entries for users to populate. Please leave any unused entries blank.

Project/Proposal Section:

Current and Pending Support includes all resources made available to an individual in support of and/or related to all of his/her research efforts, regardless of whether or not they have monetary value.^[1] Information must be provided about all current and pending support, including this project, for ongoing projects, and for any proposals currently under consideration from whatever source, irrespective of whether such support is provided through the proposing organization or is provided directly to the individual. This includes, for example, Federal, State, local, foreign, public or private foundations, non-profit organizations, industrial or other commercial organizations, or internal funds allocated toward specific projects. Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review by NSF, if disclosed.^[2]

^[1] If the time commitment or dollar value is not readily ascertainable, reasonable estimates should be provided.

^[2] The Biological Sciences Directorate exception to this policy is delineated in PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.

Projects/Proposals

3.*Project/Proposal Title : The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants:
Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics

***Status of Support :** ☐ Current ☒ Pending ☐ Submission Planned ☐ Transfer of Support

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

***Source of Support:** National Science Foundation

***Primary Place of Performance :** University of Oregon

Project/Proposal Start Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 09/2023

Project/Proposal End Date (MM/YYYY) (if available) : 08/2026

***Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs):** \$ 399,828

***Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project**

*Year (YYYY)	*Person Months (##.##)	Year (YYYY)	Person Months (##.##)
1. 2023	0.72	4.	
2. 2024	0.73	5.	
3. 2025	0.37		

***Overall Objectives :** This proposal will result in a series of closely-linked research and educational/training outputs centered on changing the norms around dissemination of research results in the field of development economics. Findings from this interdisciplinary mixed-methods project will contribute to changing how results from Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are shared with participants on the African continent.

***Statement of Potential Overlap :** None

Effective 10/04/2021 NSF CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

OMB-3145-0058

PI/co-PI/Senior Personnel: Miguel, Edward

PROJECT/PROPOSAL CURRENT SUPPORT

1. Project/Proposal Title: Collaboration between NHH Norwegian School of Economics and BITSS in the Centre for Experimental Research on Fairness, Inequality and Rationality (FAIR)

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Norwegian School of Economics

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 09/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 08/2025

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$876,911

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01

Overall Objectives: The major goal of this project is to partner with FAIR to (i) establish qualitycontrol protocols for maximizing internal and external transparency of FAIR-funded and disseminated research, (ii) lead high quality, high profile research that drives the research integrity field forward, (iii) provide on-demand training support to FAIR staff and researchers,

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

2. Project/Proposal Title: Challenges faced by Children of Sex Workers

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Innovations for Poverty Action

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 07/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 06/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$16,695

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

3. Project/Proposal Title: Exploring Inclusion in Global Development Research: A joint initiative

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 11/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 11/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$575,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: A review paper on inclusion in global development research, as a supplement to the East Africa Social Science Translation Collaborative.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

4. Project/Proposal Title: Long-Run Enterprise Responses to Redistribution: Experimental Evidence from Kenya

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Centre for Economic Policy Research

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 10/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 12/2022

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$343,383

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Involves research of the long-run enterprise responses to redistribution in Kenya.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

5. Project/Proposal Title: African Researcher Fellowships and Research on Costing

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Wellspring Philanthropic Fund, Inc.

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 08/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 07/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$420,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Involves fellowship opportunities for African researchers studying costing transparency.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

6. Project/Proposal Title: Center for Effective Global Action's General Tax-exempt Activities

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Wellspring Philanthropic Fund, Inc.

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 06/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 05/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$1,350,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
-------------	---

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	0.01

Overall Objectives: Includes core support for the Center for Effective Global Action to build a stronger presence in low and middle-income countries, institutionalize organizational inclusion efforts, and pursue strategic initiatives that will affect evidence-based policy change.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

7. Project/Proposal Title: Working Group on African Political Economy

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 03/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 02/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$25,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	0.01
2022	0.01
2023	0.01

Overall Objectives: The Working Group in African Political Economy (WGAPE) is a network of researchers who meet annually to discuss new research in the political economy of African development. Meetings featured discussions of in-progress research by faculty and graduate students in Economics, Political Science, and closely related disciplines

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

8. Project/Proposal Title: Impact Evaluation Evidence to guide policy Decisions (IEED)

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Makerere University

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 10/2020

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 04/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$110,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	0.01
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: The aims of this project are to support curriculum development in impact evaluation for statistics and public health; adapt and refine training tools and materials; facilitate trainings on impact evaluation; help to facilitate new collaborations between likeminded researchers in the Makerere and CEGA networks; and participate in Makerere's identified flagship studies.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

9. Project/Proposal Title: East Africa Social Science Translation Collaborative (EASST)

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 05/2020

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 06/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$1,255,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2020	0.01
2021	0.01
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Includes support for East Africa Social Science Translation (EASST) Network, which includes a semester-long fellowship program and related research.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

10. Project/Proposal Title: Syrian Refugee Life Study

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Innovations for Poverty Action

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 10/2018

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 12/2022

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$559,796

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	0.01
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: The Syrian Refugee Life Study (S-RLS) will be among the first systematic efforts to survey a large, representative refugee sample (based on UNHCR data on the universe of registered refugees) and follow that sample over time. The sample includes both those refugees residing in camps and those settled in host communities.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

11. Project/Proposal Title: Infectious Disease in East Africa: A Behavioral and Economic Research Collaborative (IDEA-BERC)

Proposal/Award Number (if available): D43TW010529

Source of Support: NIH - Fogarty International Center

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 04/2018

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 02/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$1,208,881

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	0.3
2022	0.3
2023	0.01

Overall Objectives: The major goal of this project is to offer rigorous individualized training for East African researchers to address social, behavioral, and economic dimensions of infectious disease using sophisticated tools and methods from implementation science research.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

12. Project/Proposal Title: Intergenerational Impacts of Health Investments

Proposal/Award Number (if available): R01HD090118

Source of Support: NIH - NICHD

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 09/2017

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 04/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$2,859,342

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2021	1.5
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: The major goal of this project is to estimate the long-run and intergenerational impacts of youth health and educational investments on life outcomes in rural Kenya by utilizing two randomized experiments.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

13. Project/Proposal Title: BRAC-CEGA Collaborative Scale-up

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Stichting BRAC International

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 04/2017

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 12/2022

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$382,774

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2018	0.01
2019	0.01

Year	Person-months per year committed
2020	0.01
2021	0.01
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Involves a partnership between the Center for Effective Global Action and BRAC International to support capacity-building for BRAC to build BRAC's capacity to generate new research on livelihoods for women and youth amongst the poorest of the poor.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

14. Project/Proposal Title: Expanding the Reach of Impact Evaluation

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: University of Notre Dame

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 05/2016

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 09/2025

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$139,879

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

PROJECT/PROPOSAL PENDING SUPPORT

1. Project/Proposal Title: Desperate Talents: Hiring Frictions and Employment Agencies in Ethiopia

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: The London School of Economics and Political Science

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 02/2023

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 01/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$66,652

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2023	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

2. Project/Proposal Title: Making Refugees Visible: Enabling more effective refugee support with new panel data

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Conrad N. Hilton

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 11/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 10/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$1,000,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

3. Project/Proposal Title: Getting to truth: standards and tools for credible, evidence-based decision making

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: FTX Markets Ltd.

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 10/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 09/2025

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$2,000,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

4. Project/Proposal Title: Experimental Evidence on Long-run and Intergenerational Impacts of Child Health Investments in the Kenya Life Panel Survey (KLPS)

Proposal/Award Number (if available): 1018236

Source of Support: NIH - NICHD

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 09/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 08/2027

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$3,045,077

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	1.5
2023	1.5
2024	1.5
2025	1.5
2026	1.5

Overall Objectives: The major goals of this project is to study the long-term effects of a child health program on recipients' living standards, labor supply, health, marriage and fertility and other life outcomes

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

5. Project/Proposal Title: Weiss Predoc Research

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: University of Chicago

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 09/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 02/2025

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$140,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01
2025	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

6. Project/Proposal Title: Hiring Frictions and Employment Agencies in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: MIT Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 08/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 07/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$49,720

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

7. Project/Proposal Title: NSF INCLUDES Alliance for Inclusive Economics

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: National Science Foundation (NSF)

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 08/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 07/2027

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$3,678,630

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01
2025	0.01
2026	0.01

Overall Objectives: Involves support for capacity-building and research activities using the Social Science Prediction Platform and Social Science Reproduction Platform as means of improving inclusion in economics research.

Statement of Potential Overlap: This project involves support for further development of the Social Science Reproduction Platform, which is also part of the “Computational Reproducibility and Responsible Conduct of Research” project.

8. Project/Proposal Title: Research Transparency and Reproducibility Training (RT2)

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: NIH National Institute on Aging

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 08/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 04/2027

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$750,600

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Organize annual Research Transparency and Reproducibility Trainings (RT2).

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

9. Project/Proposal Title: Development Impact West Africa

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 07/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 06/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$262,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01
2024	0.01

Overall Objectives: Establishes a new impact evaluation in West Africa.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

10. Project/Proposal Title: Improving energy access and conditions for peace

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: MIT Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Primary Place of Performance: University of California, Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 06/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 03/2024

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$49,913

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01
2023	0.01

Overall Objectives: TBN

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

11. Project/Proposal Title: The Syrian Refugee Life Study: Third Panel Round

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: Innovations for Poverty Action

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 06/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 12/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$149,854

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Extends a detailed matched parent-child panel dataset to understand the long-run and intergenerational returns to child health investments, along with leading mechanisms for the transmission of economic status to children

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

12. Project/Proposal Title: Measurement and Analysis of Aging, Cognition and Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementia (ADRD) Risk Factors at Midlife in the Kenya Life Panel Survey (KLPS)

Proposal/Award Number (if available): 1018232

Source of Support: NIH - NIA

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 05/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 04/2027

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$5,167,922

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	1.5
2023	1.5
2024	1.5
2025	1.5
2026	1.5

Overall Objectives: This project proposes an additional field interview in the KLPS Round 5 Aging Module (KLPS-5A) to collect detailed “midlife baseline” cognition and aging-related health data, as well as information on AD/ADRD risk factors, among participants, who will be 35 to 43 years old at the time of survey

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

13. **Project/Proposal Title:** Experimental Evidence on Intergenerational Transmission of Economic Status using 25 Years of the Kenya Life Panel Survey (KLPS)

Proposal/Award Number (if available): 8158709

Source of Support: National Science Foundation (NSF)

Primary Place of Performance: University of California Berkeley

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 03/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 02/2025

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$631,767

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.5
2023	0.5
2024	0.5

Overall Objectives: The major goals of this provide experimental evidence on the long-run and intergenerational returns to child health investments, by combining randomized interventions with a longitudinal dataset spanning 26 years containing detailed information on both program participants, who were aged 8-15 years old at the start of data collection, and their children.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

14. Project/Proposal Title: Testing the Function of Labor Intermediaries: Evidence from Ethiopia

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: The London School of Economics and Political Science

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 02/2022

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 01/2023

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$24,400

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: Evaluates the effect of job brokerage on workers' informality status.

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

15. Project/Proposal Title: Exploring Inclusion in Global Development: A Review Paper

Proposal/Award Number (if available):

Source of Support: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Primary Place of Performance: The Regents of the University of California

Project/Proposal Support Start Date (if available): 10/2021

Project/Proposal Support End Date (if available): 12/2022

Total Award Amount (including Indirect Costs): \$75,000

Person-Month(s) (or Partial Person-Months) Per Year Committed to the Project:

Year	Person-months per year committed
2022	0.01

Overall Objectives: A review paper on inclusion in global development research, as a supplement to the East Africa Social Science Translation Collaborative

Statement of Potential Overlap: None

FACILITIES AND OTHER RESOURCES

University of Oregon

The University of Oregon (UO) is a comprehensive research university with a long history of success in targeted areas of research and scholarship. For over a century our faculty have created groundbreaking new lines of inquiry in fields ranging from algebra to zebrafish. We focus on basic research and training in the core arts, humanities, and sciences, which is enhanced by deep integration with strong graduate programs and professional schools. Innovative, high-impact scholarship results from this partnership. The UO is one of only two AAU institutions in the Pacific Northwest.

The UO provides comprehensive instructional, research, and public service programs that advance scientific and humanistic knowledge. These include units that provide direct support for contracts and grants administration, research compliance, and grant proposal submission. Research programs serve the educational, cultural, and economic needs of the region and the nation. Administrative units provide direct oversight and support for graduate programs, grant proposal submission, research compliance, contracts and grant administration, and research initiatives. UO has collaborative research-based relationships with every school district in the state and in many other states in the United States. The facilities at UO will contribute substantially to the success of the proposed research.

Scientific Environment

UO provides strong support for synergistic and multidisciplinary collaborations across departments, research centers, and institutes. The office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation supports some 20 interdisciplinary research institutes/centers and promotes innovative research programs through financial programming, administrative support, and advocacy. Recently the UO launched an ambitious new effort: the Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact. The initiative is specifically designed to fast-track scientific discoveries and the process of turning those discoveries into innovations that improve the quality of life for people in Oregon, the nation and beyond.

Computer and Technology Support

UO operates a centralized data and authentication system. All faculty and staff have accounts and have direct access on campus or via VPN from off campus. Internet access is provided at no cost. Data access and transfer capacity are excellent. Computer support is available from the university's Computing Center and from in-house IT staff at PSI. The Computing Center also employs statistical and computer consultants to assist faculty with other computer needs.

Data Consultation Services staff offer faculty a wide range of support on managing their data and completing their analyses. Staff consult on qualitative and quantitative software programs (e.g., R, Python, Stata), support faculty in implementing best practices across the data lifecycle from creation to publication and offer several free workshops every quarter. Regular workshops feature training on R, research management, and data visualization.

Research Advanced Computing Services supports faculty with large-scale and special computing requirements. It houses Talapas, a heterogeneous supercomputing cluster capable of performing over 250 trillion calculations per second and providing 1.5 petabytes of high performance, parallel data storage. In addition to offering support for programming tools and computation techniques, Research Advanced Computing Services also helps faculty manage sensitive and restricted data to help ensure compliance and data security.

Additional University Resources

The PI has additional institutional supports in the form of annual research support from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Research Development Services provides faculty with resources to maximize their research productivity and support their extramural work. RDS has several internal funding mechanisms to provide seed funding for future research, offers proposal writing guidance, and provides targeted searches to help faculty identify external funding opportunities. In addition to regular workshops on data management planning and other relevant topics, research development officers also work with faculty to facilitate inter-institutional collaborations as they seek to build robust research teams.

Data Management Plan

1. Expected Data

The proposed research will primarily collect and then analyze data from four different sources:

1) Literature Review

All literature collected are publicly accessible through online databases, libraries, and research repositories and contain no sensitive data or intellectual property.

2) 400 Surveys

Verbal or written informed consent will be elicited from all participants, which includes the possibility of refusing the survey or stopping the survey at any point. Surveys will be conducted by the PIs or local collaborators, and will take place via email, or verbally in person. Data will be collected/stored in a software program such as *Nvivo*, *SurveyCTO*, and will be analyzed using *Stata*, or *R*. Data will be stored on password protected machines.

3) 120 Semi-Structured Interviews

Verbal or written informed consent will be elicited from all participants, which includes the possibility of refusing the interview or stopping the interview at any point. With permission, interviews will be audio recorded. Interviews will be conducted by the PIs or local collaborators and will take place in person. Interviews will be collected in line with guidelines from the Oral History Association's "Principles and Best Practices."

2. Data Format

Data from the literature reviews, consisting of previously published sources, will be stored electronically as PDFs and as typed notes in Microsoft Word .doc files, google docs, or Scrivener (a research management software which stores proprietary .scriv files). Audio recorded interviews and focus groups will be saved in MPEG-4 High Profile (.mp4) file format, as outlined in the University of Oregon's "Best Practices" for data management (<https://library.uoregon.edu/research-data-management/best-practices>). Survey database files will be stored in *SurveyCTO* as sql files.

3. Access to Data and Data Sharing Practices

Data Sharing and Access Managed by the PI

Internal data sharing. Data shared with PIs, students, research assistant, or co-authors is considered to be shared internally. Selected data files (images of document pages, photos, select interview transcripts) will be posted on the PI's research group's Canvas page, which is available only to undergraduates currently enrolled in the Global Health Research Group. PIs, Research Assistants, and co-authors will have access to all files relevant for the project they are working on.

External data sharing. Data requests outside of the PI group or working group will be shared according to the following policy. The primary method of data sharing and access will be by providing bibliographical references. Bibliographic references will be posted on the PI's official website so users can find the sources themselves.

- **Interview audio or transcript files, interview notes.** I consider all documents pertaining to subjects surveyed or interviewed to be confidential. I will not make those files available for sharing.
- **Survey files.** Data will be anonymized and will be posted in a data repository, maintained by institutional partner, CEGA at UC Berkeley as stata or Excel files. I consider all

documents pertaining to subjects surveyed or interviewed to be confidential. I will not make those files available for sharing.

Data and Metadata Standards

In line with common oral history practices and the University of Oregon's Scholars' Bank (see below), the project will apply the Dublin Core standard to metadata in consultation with the University of Oregon library. This will be primarily for the oral data because other data will be notes the PI writes from published materials consulted, rather than original data.

Protection of Privacy

Privacy and confidentiality of the collected oral histories will be maintained following the best practices of the Oral History Association (see above). Before research begins, this project will be reviewed and approved by the University of Oregon IRB, UC Berkeley IRB, and the IRB/Ethics Boards in the African countries in which this research will take place. Other data collected from databases and libraries are publicly available and not subject to privacy or confidentiality concerns.

4. Storage and Archiving of Data

All data will be stored on password-protected hard drives and University of Oregon or UC Berkeley secure network server space. Data will also be archived in line with guidance from the University of Oregon Libraries "stewardship and Archiving of Research Data," and in accordance with the IRB protocol. It will be archived and preserved in the University of Oregon's Scholars' Bank, a repository for the intellectual work of faculty that is maintained by the university library. Data in this Scholars' Bank is preserved according to the "digital preservation standards enacted by the Libraries for all digital collections" (<https://library.uoregon.edu/research-data-management/best-practices>). Scholars' Bank will ensure that services such as format conversion or data migration will be performed if/when necessary.

To ensure the security of research subjects, all data will be fully anonymized and stripped of identifying information. All efforts will be made to ensure that written products derived from this data (blog posts, op-eds, journal articles, etc.) will be open access, so as to ensure the widest possible dissemination.

5. Roles and responsibilities

Research will be conducted by myself (Melissa Graboyes) and two Co-PIs on this grant, (Alfredo Burlando and Ted Miguel). We will be jointly responsible for collection, storage, and sharing of all the data discussed in this document. All PIs have undergone CITI Human Subjects certification.

Other Supplementary Documents

Data Not Available

Table 1

1	Your Name:	Your Organizational Affiliation(s), last 12 mo	Last Active Date
	Graboyes, Melissa	University of Oregon	

Table 2

2	Name:	Type of Relationship	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
R				

Table 3

3	Advisor/Advisee Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)
G	McCann, James C.	Boston University	mccann@bu.edu
T			

Table 4

4	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
A	Tappan, Jennifer	Portland State University	jtappan@pdx.edu	
A	Gallagher, Daphne	University of Oregon	daphne@uoregon.edu	06/01/22
A	Meta, Judith	Independent Scholar, Tanzania	judmeta@gmail.com	
A	Clarke, Rhaine	Independent Scholar	rhaine.clarke@gmail.com	
A	Alidina, Zainab	Oregon State University	alidinaz@oregonstate.edu	12/01/21
A	Capage, Mikala	MIT	mcapage@uoregon.edu	12/01/21
A	Conner, Rachel	Independent Scholar	rachelconner2017@gmail.com	01/01/22
A	Hansberger, Dayna	Independent Scholar	dayna.hansberger@gmail.com	01/01/22
A	Goldberg, Jessica	University of Maryland	goldberg@econ.umd.edu	
A	Karlan, Dean	Northwestern University	karlan@northwestern.edu	
A	Macis, Mario	Johns Hopkins University	mmacis@jhu.edu	
A	Hangoma, Peter	University of Zambia	peterhangoma555@gmail.com	
A	Prina, Silvia	Northeastern University	s.prina@northeastern.edu	
A	Cioffi, Camille	University of Oregon	ccioffi@uoregon.edu	
A	Kosty, Derek	University of Oregon	dkosty@uoregon.edu	
A	Hardin, Blake	Independent Scholar	bhardin@uoregon.edu	
A	Bjorkman, Anders	Karolinska Institut	anders.bjorkman@ki.se	
A	Ali, Abdullah	Ministry of Health, Zanzibar	busudi@gmail.com	
A	Abbas, Faiza	Independent Scholar, Zanzibar	faizaabbas@yahoo.com	
A	Msellem, Mwinyi	Ministry of Health, Zanzibar	mmwinyi@hotmail.com	

A	Lefevre, David	University of Oregon	dlefevr2@uoregon.edu	
A	Minu- Sepehr, Ava	University of Oregon	aminusep@uoregon.edu	
A	Nouboussi, Nelly	Oregon Health and Science University	noubousn@ohsu.edu	
A	Fellman, Dimitra	Independent Scholar	dimitrasf99@gmail.com	
A	Odell, Marlee	Independent Scholar	marleeo@uoregon.edu	
A	McCann, Lily	University of Oregon	lmccann@uoregon.edu	
A	Bird, Margaret	University of Oregon	mbird@uoregon.edu	

Table 5

5	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Journal/Collection	Last Active Date
E	Pearce, Jamie	University of Edinburgh	Health and Place	06/01/22
E				

Table 1

1	Your Name:	Your Organizational Affiliation(s), last 12 mo	Last Active Date
	Burlando, Alfredo	University of Oregon	

Table 2

2	Name:	Type of Relationship	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
R				

Table 3

3	Advisor/Advisee Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)
G	Mookherjee, Dilip	Boston University	
G	Lang, Kevin	Boston University	
G	Ellis, Randall P.	Boston University	
T	Mitchell, Joe	Oregon Health Authority	
T	Javed, Amna	World Bank	
T	Etcheverry Hernandez, Luciana	Inter American Development Bank	
T	Kopriva, Mary	University of Alaska, Anchorage	
T	Nakato, Linda	Agder University (Norway)	
T	Jerman, Michael	Oregon State University	
T	Khalid, Ayesha	Independent Scholar	
T	Gonzales, Ronaldo Manuel	Agder University (Norway)	
T	Selby, Rebekah	Emporia State University	
T	Fitch-Fleischmann, Benjamin	Northwestern Energy	
T	Wilson, Kyle	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory	

Table 4

4	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
A	Boso, Richard	Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration	rboso@gimpa.edu.gh	
A	Abdul-Ramadhan, Adam	Ghana Ministry of Monitoring and Evaluation		
A	Goldberg, Jessica	University of Maryland	goldberg@econ.umd.edu	
A	Karlan, Dean	Northwestern University	karlan@northwestern.edu	
A	Macis, Mario	Johns Hopkins University	mmacis@jhu.edu	
A	Hangoma, Peter	University of Zambia	peterhangoma555@gmail.com	

A	Prina, Silvia	Northeastern University	s.prina@northeastern.edu	
A	Kuhn, Michael	University of Oregon	mkuhn@uoregon.edu	
A	Bbaale, Edward	Makerere University		01/04/21
A	Canidio, Andrea	IMT School of Advanced Studies, Lucca	andrea.canidio@imtlucca.it	01/03/21
A	Zia, Bilal	Microsoft		
C	Kerwin, Jason	University of Minnesota		
C	Ritzk, Reham	University of Cairo		

Table 5

5	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Journal/Collection	Last Active Date
E	Maitra, Pushkar	Monash University	Oxford Open Economics	06/01/22

Table 1

1	Your Name:	Your Organizational Affiliation(s), last 12 mo	Last Active Date
	Miguel, Edward	University of California, Berkeley	
		Center for Effective Global Action	

Table 2

2	Name:	Type of Relationship	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
R				

Table 3

3	Advisor/Advisee Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)
G	Kremer, Michael	Harvard University	
G	Alesina, Alberto	Harvard University	
G	Banerjee, Abhijit	MIT	
G	Katz, Lawrence	Harvard University	
T	Baysan, Ceren	Essex University	
T	Poertner, Mathias	EGAP	
T	Ramirez Ritchie, Elizabeth	Airbnb	
T	Schoenholzer, David	Stockholm University	
T	Walker, Michael	Center for Effective Global Action	
T	Berger, David	Northwestern University	
T	Falcao Bergquist, Lauren	University of Chicago	
T	Wilkes Burlig, Fiona	University of Chicago	
T	Carpena, Fenella	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	
T	Collins, Elliott	Kiva	
T	Gonzalez, Felipe	PUC-Chile	
T	Hersokvitz, Sylvan	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	
T	Hoces, Fernando	UC Berkeley-BITSS	
T	Bachas, Pierre	World Bank Development Economics Research Group	
T	de Figueiredo, Miguel	University of Connecticut	
T	Galle, Simon	BI Norwegian Business School	
T	Lee, Kenneth	University of Chicago - EPIC-India	
T	Letouze, Emmanuel	MIT Media Lab	
T	Rezaee, Arman	University of California, Davis	
T	Brodeur, Abel	University of Ottawa	
T	Chaidez, Lilia	US Government Accountability Office	

T	Crane-Droesch, Andrew	Georgetown University	
T	Cheng, Yiwen Eva	Amazon	
T	Ghani, Tarek	Washington University	
T	Gracner, Tadeja	RAND	
T	Kleemans, Marieke	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	
T	Maldonado, Stanislao	Universidad del Rosario	
T	McCasland, Jamie	University of British Columbia	
T	Newman, Sara	Harvard University - Kennedy School of Government	
T	Sinaia Urrusti Frenk, Luz Ma	Colegio de Mexico	
T	Bai, Liang	University of Edinburgh	
T	Barron, Manuel	IFPRI	
T	Burke, Marshall	Stanford University	
T	Emerick, Kyle	Tufts University	
T	Huet-Vaughn, Emiliano	Middlebury College	
T	Rao, Gautam	Harvard University	
T	Stumpner, Sebastian	University of Montreal	
T	Almunia, Miguel	University of Warwick	
T	Friedman, Willa	University of Houston	
T	Gerard, Francois	Columbia University	
T	Nakagawa, Hideyuki	Akita International University	
T	Toledo, Chantal	Berkeley Environmental Biosciences Institute	
T	Rosenberg, Mark	GeoQuant	
T	Blumenstock, Joshua	University of California, Berkeley	
T	Cai, Jing	University of Maryland	
T	Hjort, Jonas	Columbia University	
T	Larrain, Mauricio	Columbia University	
T	Leon, Gianmarco	Universidad Pompeu Fabre	
T	Rothenberg, Alexander	RAND	
T	Song, Changcheng	National University of Singapore	
T	Ajayi, Kehinde	Boston University	
T	Casey, Katherine	Stanford University	
T	Christensen, Garret	UC Berkeley-BITSS	
T	Crost, Benjamin	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	
T	Gong, Erick	Middlebury College	
T	Hsiang, Solomon	University of California, Berkeley	
T	Li, Nicholas	University of Toronto	
T	Polimeni, Rachel	University of California, Berkeley	

T	Sanga, Sarath	Northwestern Pritzker School of Law	
T	Sy, Abdoulaye	World Bank	
T	Vivalt, Eva	Australian National University	
T	Zhang, Jane Yiqin	Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	
T	Egel, Daniel	RAND	
T	Eifert, Benjamin	QVR Advisors	
T	Ghobadi, Negar		
T	McCauley, John	University of Maryland	
T	Ozier, Owen	World Bank	
T	Ramos, Alvaro	INCAE Business School, Costa Rica	
T	Arceo, Eva	CIDE-Mexico City	
T	Bellows, John	Western Asset	
T	Diagne, Mame-Fatou	World Bank	
T	Espinosa, Adriana	City College of New York	
T	Hicks, Joan Hamory	University of Oklahoma	
T	Hicks, Daniel	University of Oklahoma	
T	Null, Claire	Mathematica Policy Research	
T	Oliva, Paulina	University of Southern California	
T	Scholl, Brian	Securities and Exchange Commission	
T	Aker, Jenny	Tufts University	
T	Chaney, Eric	Harvard University	
T	Conover, Emily	Hamilton College	
T	Jakiela, Pamela	University of Maryland	
T	Knox, Melissa	University of Washington	
T	LeBrun, Anne	Harvard University	
T	Leino, Jessica	Stanford Center on Global Poverty and Development	
T	Naidu, Suresh	Columbia University	
T	Tandon, Sharad	US Department of Agriculture	
T	Aisbett, Emma	University of Hamburg	
T	Arunachalam, Raj	Bates White	
T	Baird, Sarah	George Washington University	
T	Blattman, Christopher	University of Chicago - Harris School of Public Policy	
T	Pathania, Vikram	University of Sussex	
T	Toro, Harold	University of Notre Dame	
T	Yeh, Ethan	Stripe	
T	Green, Tina	Cornerstone Research	
T	Shah, Manisha	UCLA	

T	Uwaifo Oyelere, Ruth	Morehouse College	
T	Bobonis, Gustavo	University of Toronto	
T	Martine, Sebastian	Inter-American Development Bank	
T	Signoret, Jose	US International Trade Commission	
T	Udomsaph, Charles	Georgetown University - School of Foreign Service	
T	Urdinola, Piedad	Harvard University	
T	Macours, Karen	Paris School of Economics	
T	Araujo, Maria C.	Inter-American Development Bank	
T	Pecenco, Matthew	Brown University	
T	Birke, David	University of Sydney	
T	Kumar, Tanu	College of William and Mary	
T	Wang, Zenan	JD.com	
T	Tungodden, Jonas	Pandora	
T	Londono-Velez, Juliana	UCLA	
T	Kelley, Erin	World Bank	
T	Karing, Anne	Princeton University	
T	Boudreau, Laura	Columbia University	
T	Zhang, Kelly	MIT Governance Lab	
T	Rom, Adina	Policy Analytics Switzerland	
T	On, Robert	Chan Zuckerberg Initiative	
T	Schoenholzer, David	Stockholm University	
T	Huang, Yue L.	Waymo	
T	Leone, Samuel	McKinsey and Company	
T	Cohen, Isabelle	University of Washington	
T	Brown, Christina	University of Chicago	
T	Khan, Yasir	University of Pittsburgh	
T	Vial, Felipe	Uber	
T	Bonds, Stephanie	Center for Global Development	
T	Hsu, Erick	Yale University	
T	Mueller, Maximilian	University of Toulouse	
T	Galeano, Arlen G.	World Bank	
T	Egger, Dennis	Oxford University	
T	Dias, Marina	Amazon	
T	Duhon, Madeline	UC Berkeley	
T	Trachtman, Carly	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	

Table 4

4	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Optional (email, Department)	Last Active Date
A	Abedin, Jaynal	National University of Ireland Galway		
A	Ahuja, Amrita	Square		
A	Almas, Ingvid	Stockholm University		
A	Arnold, Benjamin F.	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Aufhammer, Max	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Bai, Liang	University of Edinburgh		
A	Baird, Sarah	George Washington University		
A	Baysan, Ceren	University of Essex		
A	Benjamin-Chung, Jade	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Berens, Jeff	Stealth Startup		
A	Berge, Lars Ivar Oppedal	Norwegian School of Economics		
A	Berger, David	Northwestern University		
A	Birke, David	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Bjorvatn, Kjetil	Norwegian School of Economics		
A	Bold, Tessa	Institute for International Economic Studies		
A	Bolliger, Ian	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Bouguen, Adrien	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Brown, Christina			
A	Burke, Marshall	Stanford University		
A	Cane, Mark A.	Columbia University		
A	Casey, Katherine	Stanford University		
A	Christensen, Garret	US Census Bureau		
A	Clark, Ashley	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Cohen, Isabelle			
A	Colford Jr., John M.	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Croke, Kevin	Harvard University		
A	Dafoe, Allan	University of Oxford		
A	Dembo, Aluma	University of Oxford		
A	Dupas, Pascaline	Stanford University		
A	Egger, Dennis	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Falcao Bergquist, Lauren	University of Michigan		
A	Freese, Jeremy	Stanford University		
A	Galle, Simon	BI Norwegian Business School		
A	Glennerster, Rachel	DFID		
A	Gonzalez, Felipe	PUC-Chile		

A	Handel, Benjamin	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Haushofer, Johannes	Princeton University		
A	Hicks, Joan Hamory	University of Oklahoma		
A	Hsiang, Solomon	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Hsu, Eric	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Huang, Yue	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Hubbard, Alan E.	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Jimenez, Veronica	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Johnson-Hanks, Jenna	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Khan, Yasir			
A	Kitamura, Shuhei	Stockholm University		
A	Kleemans, Marieke	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign		
A	Konagaya, Eugene	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Kramon, Eric	George Washington University		
A	Krause, Benjamin			
A	Kremer, Michael	Harvard University		
A	Lee, Kenneth	University of Chicago - EPIC-India		
A	León, Gianmarco	Universitat Pompeu Fabra		
A	Levy Paluck, Elizabeth	Princeton University		
A	Li, Nicholas	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Littman, Rebecca	MIT		
A	Luby, Stephen P.	Stanford University		
A	Meng, Kyle C.	University of California, Santa Barbara		
A	Moore, Don A.	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Mueller, Maximilian	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Niehaus, Paul	University of California, San Diego		
A	Null, Clair	Mathematica Policy Research		
A	Pickmans, Robert	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Posner, Daniel	University of California, Los Angeles		
A	Rao, Gautam	Harvard University		
A	Rose, Andrew K.	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Swanson, Nicholas	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Tran, Diana	University of California, San Francisco		
A	Tungodden, Bertil	Norwegian School of Economics		
A	Vernon, Jessica	Maisha Meds		
A	Voors, Maarten	Wageningen University		
A	Walker, Michael	University of California, Berkeley		

A	Wang, Zenan	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Wolfram, Catherine	University of California, Berkeley		
A	Zhang, Kelly	MIT GOV/LAB		
A	Zwane, Alix	Global Innovation Fund		

Table 5

5	Name:	Organizational Affiliation	Journal/Collection	Last Active Date
B	Foster, Andy	Brown University	Journal of Development Economics	
B	Karlan, Dean	Northwestern University	Journal of Development Economics	
E	Rai, Tage	MIT	Science	

**The Ethics of Sharing Results with Research Participants:
Establishing Best Practices for Development Economics**

Suggested Reviewers

Vicanne Adams. University of California San Francisco. vincanne.adams@ucsf.edu

Kathleen Beegle. World Bank. kbeegle@worldbank.org

Michael Clemens. Center for Global Development. mclemens@cgdev.org

Johanna Crane. Albany Medical Center. cranejl@amc.edu

Scott Desposato. University of California San Diego. swd@ucsd.edu

Andrew Dillon. Northwestern. andrew.dillon@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Kim yi Dionne. University of California Riverside. kim.dionne@ucr.edu

David Evans. World Bank. devans2@worldbank.org

Paul Wenzel Geissler. University of Norway. p.w.geissler@sai.uio.no

René Gerrets. University of Amsterdam. r.p.m.gerrets@uva.nl

Yonatan Gez. The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies
yonatan.gez@graduateinstitute.ch

Tamara Giles-Vernick. Institut Pasteur. tamara.giles-vernick@pasteur.fr

Morten Jerven. Norwegian University of Life Sciences. morten.jerven@nmbu.no

Arthur Lupia. University of Michigan. lupia@umich.edu

Jonathan Morduch. NYU. jonathan.morduch@nyu.edu

Brian Nosek. University of Virginia. ban2b@virginia.edu

Berk Özler. World Bank. bozler@worldbank.org

Jennifer Sturdy. California Labor & Workforce Development Agency. jensturdy@gmail.com

Claire Wendland. University of Madison, Wisconsin. cwendland@wisc.edu

List of Reviewers Not to Include

Data Not Available