B Appendix B - Supporting Tables for IV Specification

Instrument: Threshold Dummy Variable

Table B1: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects for Lab-in-the-Field Games Outcomes.

	(1) Trust	(2) Trustworthiness	(3) Cooperation	(4) Altruism
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	0.119	-0.588	-0.053	0.005
	(0.218)	(0.393)	(0.044)	(0.220)
Observations	800	788	800	800
Wald F-statistic	3.724	3.437	3.724	3.724
Control Mean	0.356	0.717	0.106	0.396
Control SD	0.228	0.625	0.052	0.233
Adj. R^2	-0.040	-0.009	-0.117	0.002
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	-0.521	-0.702	0.026	-0.246
	(0.327)	(0.448)	(0.029)	(0.276)
Observations	796	773	796	796
Wald F-statistic	3.756	4.043	3.756	3.756
Control Mean	0.395	0.682	0.089	0.385
Control SD	0.244	0.644	0.048	0.216
Adj. R^2	-0.952	-0.275	0.010	-0.404

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled by the randomization variable used to assign treatment in Sunaula Hazar Din and a Risk Aversion measure. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. Trust accounts for the amount sent by the sender in a Trust Game as a fraction of their endowment. Trustworthiness reports the amount returned by the receiver in a Trust Game as a fraction of what they were sent. Cooperation reports the proportion of cards put in the public pot from the player's endowment. Altruism is the amount of money sent by the player in a Dictatorship game. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B2: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part I.

	People	People for the village			Group Trust	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			Would take	Would not pay		
	General Trust	General Trust	advantage	when lend money	In-Trust	Out-Trust

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.472	-0.058	-0.692**	-0.496*	-0.253*	-0.278
	(0.419)	(0.215)	(0.349)	(0.282)	(0.149)	(0.209)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	3.785	2.590	3.585	3.025	4.319	3.557
Control Mean	0.715	0.803	0.803	0.820	0.803	0.723
Control SD	0.452	0.229	0.225	0.214	0.204	0.280
Adj. R^2	-0.255	0.005	-0.781	-0.324	-0.047	-0.092

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	-0.234	0.189	0.075	-0.398	-0.101	0.182
	(0.532)	(0.241)	(0.093)	(0.260)	(0.083)	(0.162)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	3.790	2.587	3.591	3.045	4.370	3.560
Control Mean	0.487	0.231	0.251	0.263	0.274	0.314
Control SD	0.500	0.183	0.179	0.173	0.158	0.176
Adj. R^2	-0.176	-0.316	-0.011	-0.657	0.047	-0.223

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. Columns (1) and (2) are dummy variables that account for whether the respondent trusts people in general and people from their village. Column (3) accounts for the likeliness of believing people from their village would take advantage of them if given a chance. Column (4) reports the likelihood of people from the village **not** paying back a loan. Columns (5) and (6) report the respondents' belief in whether people from the same or different ethnic or linguistic groups/race/caste/tribe as themselves can be trusted, respectively. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B3: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part II.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| | | Local | Central | | | Nurses | |
	Shopkeepers	government	government	Police	Teachers	& Doctors	Foreigners
				Level of trust on			

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	0.203	-0.124	-0.253	0.062	-0.558	-0.372	-0.347
	(0.200)	(0.171)	(0.216)	(0.253)	(0.379)	(0.244)	(0.518)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	4.741	6.526	5.284	3.533	2.366	3.134	1.121
Control Mean	0.751	0.692	0.676	0.623	0.905	0.892	0.550
Control SD	0.223	0.245	0.268	0.298	0.173	0.187	0.288
Adj. R^2	-0.227	-0.038	-0.072	0.007	-0.899	-0.324	-0.176

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	-0.084	0.131	0.413**	0.135	-0.092	-0.099	1.823
	(0.092)	(0.106)	(0.166)	(0.150)	(0.145)	(0.117)	(1.678)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	4.766	6.818	5.429	3.572	2.327	3.154	1.144
Control Mean	0.303	0.289	0.290	0.303	0.117	0.117	0.391
Control SD	0.194	0.190	0.218	0.277	0.190	0.188	0.242
Adj. R^2	0.029	-0.074	-0.217	-0.027	-0.020	-0.002	-6.508

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. All columns account for the level of trust on each label. The variables can take values 0 (Trustful to a very small extent), 0.33 (Trustful to a small extent), 0.66 (Trustful to a great extent), or 1 (Trustful to a very great extent). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B4: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Public Goods Outcomes.

	Likelihood that people for the village			Last Election
	(1) Willing to help	(2) Punish for not participating	(3) Cooperation to solve problems	(4) Voted

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	-0.268	-0.262	0.083	-0.333
	(0.192)	(0.272)	(0.182)	(0.350)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1912
Wald F-statistic	3.596	3.893	4.171	3.322
Control Mean	0.788	0.663	0.792	0.884
Control SD	0.215	0.325	0.224	0.320
Adj. R^2	-0.220	0.049	-0.017	-0.073

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	-0.041	0.601*	-0.143	1.325
	(0.100)	(0.313)	(0.111)	(0.923)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2601
Wald F-statistic	3.618	3.886	4.111	2.829
Control Mean	0.284	0.251	0.284	0.679
Control SD	0.177	0.213	0.206	0.467
Adj. R^2	0.028	-0.920	0.045	-1.724

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. Columns (1) – (3) report how likely the respondent considers that people from their village will perform the action stated in the label. Column (4) is a dummy variable that signals whether or not the respondent voted in the last election. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B5: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Interpersonal Relations Outcomes.

	Meeting people in the last month		
	(1) In a public place	(2) In your home	(3) In their home

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	3.116	-3.226	-5.010
	(4.082)	(3.297)	(4.017)
Observations	1376	1422	1378
Wald F-statistic	3.833	7.087	6.045
Control Mean	1.364	2.566	2.389
Control SD	3.240	4.649	4.030
Adj. R^2	0.021	0.445	0.476

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	2.792	8.275*	11.560*
	(2.032)	(5.014)	(6.040)
Observations	2192	2266	2195
Wald F-statistic	3.960	7.147	6.155
Control Mean	2.162	5.113	4.178
Control SD	3.022	4.988	4.453
Adj. R^2	0.107	-0.266	-0.416

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. Columns (1) – (3) report the number of visits in the last month the respondent has had in the different places stated on the label. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B6: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Aggregated Index Outcomes by group.

	Anderson Index		
	(1) Trust	(2) Public Goods	(3) Interpersonal
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	-0.076	-0.502	0.220
	(0.459)	(0.481)	(0.514)
Observations	1482	1482	1437
Wald F-statistic	2.890	4.219	9.177
Control Mean	0.503	0.855	-0.352
Control SD	0.531	0.588	0.698
Adj. R^2	0.028	-0.033	0.252
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	0.935*	0.615	0.891**
	(0.504)	(0.392)	(0.387)
Observations	2360	2360	2289
Wald F-statistic	2.875	4.200	9.235
Control Mean	-0.387	-0.581	-0.060
Control SD	0.422	0.373	0.636
Adj. R^2	-0.313	-0.437	-0.041

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was: the dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 when the VDC is closer than 200Km to the epicenter and 0 otherwise. Columns (1) account for the summary index for all the outcomes in Table 4 and Table 5. Column (2) is the summary index for columns (1) – (3) of Table 6. Column (3) reports the summary index for the variables in Table 7. All indexes were calculated following Anderson (2008). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Instrument: Distance from Epicenter (Continous)

Table B7: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects for Lab-in-the-Field Games Outcomes.

	(1) Trust	(2) Trustworthiness	(3) Cooperation	(4) Altruism
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	0.438	-0.457	0.033	0.361
	(0.337)	(0.309)	(0.034)	(0.331)
Observations	800	788	800	800
Wald F-statistic	2.988	2.864	2.988	2.988
Control Mean	0.356	0.717	0.106	0.396
Control SD	0.228	0.625	0.052	0.233
Adj. R^2	-0.490	0.016	-0.095	-0.330
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	-0.634	-0.706	0.043	-0.405
	(0.418)	(0.500)	(0.033)	(0.367)
Observations	796	773	796	796
Wald F-statistic	3.000	3.512	3.000	3.000
Control Mean	0.395	0.682	0.089	0.385
Control SD	0.244	0.644	0.048	0.216
Adj. R^2	-1.370	-0.278	-0.028	-0.845

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled by the randomization variable used to assign treatment in Sunaula Hazar Din and a Risk Aversion measure. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. Trust accounts for the amount sent by the sender in a Trust Game as a fraction of their endowment. Trustworthiness reports the amount returned by the receiver in a Trust Game as a fraction of what they were sent. Cooperation reports the proportion of cards put in the public pot from the player's endowment. Altruism is the amount of money sent by the player in a Dictatorship game. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B8: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part I.

	People	People for the village			Group Trust	
	(1)	(2)	(3) Would take advantage	(4) Would not pay when lend money	(5)	(6)
	General Trust	General Trust			In-Trust	Out-Trust

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.709	0.366	-0.253	-0.239	-0.008	0.166
	(0.590)	(0.398)	(0.259)	(0.264)	(0.175)	(0.249)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	2.796	1.726	2.906	2.063	3.402	2.796
Control Mean	0.715	0.803	0.803	0.820	0.803	0.723
Control SD	0.452	0.229	0.225	0.214	0.204	0.280
Adj. R^2	-0.531	-0.447	-0.015	0.029	0.023	-0.118

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.183	0.092	-0.060	-0.542	-0.125	0.171
	(0.409)	(0.235)	(0.089)	(0.406)	(0.082)	(0.144)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	2.756	1.728	2.888	2.049	3.417	2.770
Control Mean	0.487	0.231	0.251	0.263	0.274	0.314
Control SD	0.500	0.183	0.179	0.173	0.158	0.176
Adj. R^2	0.089	-0.116	-0.025	-1.177	0.042	-0.201

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. Columns (1) and (2) are dummy variables that account for whether the respondent trusts people in general and people from their village. Column (3) accounts for the likeliness of believing people from their village would take advantage of them if given a chance. Column (4) reports the likelihood of people from the village **not** paying back a loan. Columns (5) and (6) report the respondents' belief in whether people from the same or different ethnic or linguistic groups/race/caste/tribe as themselves can be trusted, respectively. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B9: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part II.

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
	Level of trust on						

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	0.104	0.133	0.022	1.105	-0.536	-0.422	0.139
	(0.176)	(0.193)	(0.215)	(0.845)	(0.505)	(0.330)	(0.427)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	3.655	5.697	3.984	1.703	1.058	2.186	0.745
Control Mean	0.751	0.692	0.676	0.623	0.905	0.892	0.550
Control SD	0.223	0.245	0.268	0.298	0.173	0.187	0.288
Adj. R^2	-0.082	-0.023	0.022	-1.408	-0.822	-0.449	0.051

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	-0.214*	0.015	0.434**	-0.083	-0.409	-0.315	1.774
	(0.116)	(0.105)	(0.203)	(0.189)	(0.492)	(0.246)	(2.164)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	3.632	5.878	4.018	1.661	0.996	2.163	0.742
Control Mean	0.303	0.289	0.290	0.303	0.117	0.117	0.391
Control SD	0.194	0.190	0.218	0.277	0.190	0.188	0.242
Adj. R^2	-0.026	-0.004	-0.253	-0.008	-0.572	-0.303	-6.157

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. All columns account for the level of trust on each label. The variables can take values 0 (Trustful to a very small extent), 0.33 (Trustful to a small extent), 0.66 (Trustful to a great extent), or 1 (Trustful to a very great extent). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B10: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Public Goods Outcomes.

	Likelihood that people for the village			Last Election
	(1) Willing to help	(2) Punish for not participating	(3) Cooperation to solve problems	(4) Voted

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.039	-0.205	0.274	0.004
	(0.184)	(0.266)	(0.255)	(0.364)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1912
Wald F-statistic	2.990	2.936	3.398	1.732
Control Mean	0.788	0.663	0.792	0.884
Control SD	0.215	0.325	0.224	0.320
Adj. R^2	-0.003	0.069	-0.277	0.019

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	-0.136	0.786*	0.031	2.519
	(0.107)	(0.433)	(0.121)	(2.403)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2601
Wald F-statistic	2.986	2.899	3.332	1.239
Control Mean	0.284	0.251	0.284	0.679
Control SD	0.177	0.213	0.206	0.467
Adj. R^2	0.037	-1.662	-0.024	-5.661

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. Columns (1) – (3) report how likely the respondent considers that people from their village will perform the action stated in the label. Column (4) is a dummy variable that signals whether or not the respondent voted in the last election. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B11: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Interpersonal Relations Outcomes.

	Meeting people in the last month		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	In a public place	In your home	In their home

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	2.997	-1.371	-2.523
	(2.760)	(4.208)	(5.570)
Observations	1376	1422	1378
Wald F-statistic	3.502	4.195	3.123
Control Mean	1.364	2.566	2.389
Control SD	3.240	4.649	4.030
Adj. R^2	0.024	0.468	0.527

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	8.563**	14.345	20.359
	(3.512)	(9.534)	(13.486)
Observations	2192	2266	2195
Wald F-statistic	3.613	4.250	3.166
Control Mean	2.162	5.113	4.178
Control SD	3.022	4.988	4.453
Adj. R^2	-0.416	-0.821	-1.375

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. Columns (1) – (3) report the number of visits in the last month the respondent has had in the different places stated on the label. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B12: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Aggregated Index Outcomes by group.

	Anderson Index		
	(1) Trust	(2) Public Goods	(3) Interpersonal
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	1.213	-0.021	0.278
	(0.908)	(0.432)	(0.452)
Observations	1482	1482	1437
Wald F-statistic	2.258	3.439	7.088
Control Mean	0.503	0.855	-0.352
Control SD	0.531	0.588	0.698
Adj. R^2	-0.897	0.014	0.253
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	0.937	0.819	1.831***
	(0.624)	(0.524)	(0.689)
Observations	2360	2360	2289
Wald F-statistic	2.220	3.399	7.134
Control Mean	-0.387	-0.581	-0.060
Control SD	0.422	0.373	0.636
Adj. R^2	-0.315	-0.722	-0.575

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter. Columns (1) account for the summary index for all the outcomes in Table 4 and Table 5. Column (2) is the summary index for columns (1) – (3) of Table 6. Column (3) reports the summary index for the variables in Table 7. All indexes were calculated following Anderson (2008). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Instrument: Distance from Epicenter (Continous) and Squared Distance

Table B13: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects for Lab-in-the-Field Games Outcomes.

	(1) Trust	(2) Trustworthiness	(3) Cooperation	(4) Altruism
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	0.257	-0.431**	0.006	0.137
	(0.179)	(0.188)	(0.020)	(0.175)
Observations	800	788	800	800
Wald F-statistic	3.526	3.405	3.526	3.526
Control Mean	0.356	0.717	0.106	0.396
Control SD	0.228	0.625	0.052	0.233
Adj. R^2	-0.175	0.019	-0.006	-0.049
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)				
Was affected	-0.274	-0.354	0.006	-0.299
	(0.185)	(0.258)	(0.016)	(0.229)
Observations	796	773	796	796
Wald F-statistic	3.571	4.089	3.571	3.571
Control Mean	0.395	0.682	0.089	0.385
Control SD	0.244	0.644	0.048	0.216
Adj. R^2	-0.298	-0.070	0.009	-0.537

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled by the randomization variable used to assign treatment in Sunaula Hazar Din and a Risk Aversion measure. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. Trust accounts for the amount sent by the sender in a Trust Game as a fraction of their endowment. Trustworthiness reports the amount returned by the receiver in a Trust Game as a fraction of what they were sent. Cooperation reports the proportion of cards put in the public pot from the player's endowment. Altruism is the amount of money sent by the player in a Dictatorship game.
* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B14: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part I.

	People	People for the village			Group Trust	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			Would take	Would not pay		
	General Trust	General Trust	advantage	when lend money	In-Trust	Out-Trust

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Was affected	0.305	0.145	0.284*	0.180	0.105	0.183
	(0.215)	(0.117)	(0.164)	(0.124)	(0.096)	(0.119)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	3.381	4.091	3.166	3.618	3.375	3.129
Control Mean	0.715	0.803	0.803	0.820	0.803	0.723
Control SD	0.452	0.229	0.225	0.214	0.204	0.280
Adj. R^2	-0.118	-0.090	-0.236	-0.191	-0.088	-0.137

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Was affected	-0.332	0.089	-0.027	-0.249*	-0.040	0.267
	(0.516)	(0.154)	(0.072)	(0.143)	(0.068)	(0.166)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	3.203	3.874	2.988	3.437	3.211	2.946
Control Mean	0.487	0.231	0.251	0.263	0.274	0.314
Control SD	0.500	0.183	0.179	0.173	0.158	0.176
Adj. R^2	-0.270	-0.110	-0.008	-0.277	0.034	-0.428

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. Columns (1) and (2) are dummy variables that account for whether the respondent trusts people in general and people from their village. Column (3) accounts for the likeliness of believing people from their village would take advantage of them if given a chance. Column (4) reports the likelihood of people from the village **not** paying back a loan. Columns (5) and (6) report the respondents' belief in whether people from the same or different ethnic or linguistic groups/race/caste/tribe as themselves can be trusted, respectively. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B15: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Trust Outcomes - Part II.

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
			Level of trust on				

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	0.159	0.247	0.514**	0.736**	-0.130	-0.337	0.315
	(0.119)	(0.157)	(0.223)	(0.341)	(0.144)	(0.215)	(0.260)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482	1482
Wald F-statistic	3.795	6.018	4.588	3.076	3.610	3.051	1.070
Control Mean	0.751	0.692	0.676	0.623	0.905	0.892	0.550
Control SD	0.223	0.245	0.268	0.298	0.173	0.187	0.288
Adj. R^2	-0.155	-0.095	-0.450	-0.586	-0.020	-0.247	-0.061

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

	(1) Shopkeepers	(2) Local government	(3) Central government	(4) Police	(5) Teachers	(6) Nurses & Doctors	(7) Foreigners
Was affected	-0.168**	-0.047	0.444***	-0.256*	0.086	0.022	0.430
	(0.073)	(0.089)	(0.165)	(0.152)	(0.094)	(0.061)	(0.431)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360	2360
Wald F-statistic	3.550	5.692	4.254	2.820	3.324	2.871	0.991
Control Mean	0.303	0.289	0.290	0.303	0.117	0.117	0.391
Control SD	0.194	0.190	0.218	0.277	0.190	0.188	0.242
Adj. R^2	0.006	0.003	-0.272	-0.106	-0.041	-0.009	-0.342

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. All columns account for the level of trust on each label. The variables can take values 0 (Trustful to a very small extent), 0.33 (Trustful to a small extent), 0.66 (Trustful to a great extent), or 1 (Trustful to a very great extent). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B16: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Public Goods Outcomes.

	Likelihood that people for the village			Last Election
	(1) Willing to help	(2) Punish for not participating	(3) Cooperation to solve problems	(4) Voted

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.177*	-0.135	-0.026	0.251
	(0.105)	(0.214)	(0.097)	(0.192)
Observations	1482	1482	1482	1912
Wald F-statistic	4.108	3.029	3.414	3.371
Control Mean	0.788	0.663	0.792	0.884
Control SD	0.215	0.325	0.224	0.320
Adj. R^2	-0.098	0.083	0.036	-0.064

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	-0.048	0.569**	0.070	0.612
	(0.093)	(0.256)	(0.117)	(0.450)
Observations	2360	2360	2360	2601
Wald F-statistic	3.860	2.887	3.263	2.330
Control Mean	0.284	0.251	0.284	0.679
Control SD	0.177	0.213	0.206	0.467
Adj. R^2	0.031	-0.813	-0.065	-0.449

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. Columns (1) – (3) report how likely the respondent considers that people from their village will perform the action stated in the label. Column (4) is a dummy variable that signals whether or not the respondent voted in the last election. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B17: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Interpersonal Relations Outcomes.

	Meeting people in the last month		
	(1) In a public place	(2) In your home	(3) In their home
Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	-0.550	-1.997	-2.049
	(2.153)	(4.672)	(5.753)
Observations	1376	1422	1378
Wald F-statistic	4.373	2.685	2.670
Control Mean	1.364	2.566	2.389
Control SD	3.240	4.649	4.030
Adj. R^2	-0.002	0.462	0.534
Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)			
Was affected	7.581***	17.073	18.778
	(1.933)	(10.718)	(11.639)
Observations	2192	2266	2195
Wald F-statistic	4.209	2.644	2.588
Control Mean	2.162	5.113	4.178
Control SD	3.022	4.988	4.453
Adj. R^2	-0.261	-1.153	-1.165

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. Columns (1) – (3) report the number of visits in the last month the respondent has had in the different places stated on the label. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.

Table B18: Robustness Check – IV Earthquake Effects on Aggregated Index Outcomes by group.

	Anderson Index		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Trust	Public Goods	Interpersonal

Panel A: Midline (5 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	1.233**	-0.181	0.020
	(0.608)	(0.390)	(0.458)
Observations	1482	1482	1437
Wald F-statistic	2.557	3.245	5.389
Control Mean	0.503	0.855	-0.352
Control SD	0.531	0.588	0.698
Adj. R^2	-0.927	0.023	0.236

Panel B: Endline (24 months after Earthquake)

Was affected	0.080	0.670	1.996***
	(0.194)	(0.425)	(0.646)
Observations	2360	2360	2289
Wald F-statistic	2.369	3.085	5.207
Control Mean	-0.387	-0.581	-0.060
Control SD	0.422	0.373	0.636
Adj. R^2	0.034	-0.507	-0.718

Note: Coefficients are IV estimates controlled for the mean outcome at baseline and the randomization variable used to assign Sunaula Hazar Din treatment status. I report clustered standard errors at the VDC Level in parentheses. The instrument used was the distance between the centroid of the VDC and the earthquake's epicenter and the distance squared. Columns (1) account for the summary index for all the outcomes in Table 4 and Table 5. Column (2) is the summary index for columns (1) – (3) of Table 6. Column (3) reports the summary index for the variables in Table 7. All indexes were calculated following Anderson (2008). * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, ***, $p < 0.01$.