

Vote Selling in the United States: Introducing Support Vector Machine Methods to Analyzing Conjoint Experimental Data

HÉCTOR BAHAMONDE ^{*1} and
CRISTOBAL QUININAO ^{†2}

¹Assistant Professor, Instituto de Ciencias Sociales, O'Higgins University

²Assistant Professor, Instituto de Ciencias de la Ingeniería O'Higgins University

January 18, 2021

Abstract

This paper explains that democracy has been theorized as a multidimensional concept. Yet, the quantitative study of clientelism—as a democracy failure—has been studied almost exclusively from a unidimensional perspective. For instance, list experiments usually study one aspect at a time by manipulating a word, a sentence or a framing. We argue that to better understand clientelism quantitative studies should situate the phenomena within the multidimensionality of democracy. This paper makes both methodological and substantive contributions to the literature by leveraging a conjoint experiment on hypothetical vote selling in a consolidated democracy. Conjoint designs ask respondents to choose from hypothetical profiles that combine multiple attributes. To study which democratic dimension(s) should fail to produce clientelism, we presented subjects two hypothetical candidates that supported (or not) every policy (attribute). Using machine learning techniques, we identify which dimensions should “fail” to produce likely vote-sellers.

Please consider downloading the last version of the paper [here](#).

Keywords— conjoint designs; vector support machines; support for democracy; United States.

^{*}hector.bahamonde@uoh.cl; www.HectorBahamonde.com.

[†]cristobal.quininao@uoh.cl; [PAGINA AQUÍ](#).

This project was funded by the Center for at . We both thank Richard Lau and David Redlawsk for their comments and suggestions.

I. TOWARD A MULTIDIMENSIONAL STUDY OF CLIENTELISM

Democracy has been theorized as a multidimensional concept. Specifically referring to *polyarchies*, Dahl (1971, p. 3) explains that full democracies should satisfy a number of dimensions which speak to certain institutional guarantees that create opportunities to (1) formulate political and social preferences, (2) signify those preferences, and (3) have preferences weighted equally when conducting a government.

Yet, clientelism—as a democracy failure—has been studied almost exclusively from a unidimensional perspective. We believe that there exists a methodological and conceptual alignment—one that biases our inferences. On the one hand, qualitative, historical and/or ethnographically-based contributions describe clientelist transactions as complex and multidimensional. Leveraging qualitative techniques, researchers are able to provide “thick descriptions” (Goertz 1973) of the phenomena at hand (Posada-Carbó 1996; Sabato 2001; Auyero 2000; Szwarcberg 2013; Borges 2019). On the other hand, statistical, survey, and/or experimentally based work mostly explores singular aspects related to clientelism—typically, the effect of a single variable (or treatment) on the probability of clientelism.¹ For example, using a field experiment in Benin, Wantchekon (2003) stresses the role of “incumbency” on vote buying, while Jensen and Justesen (2014, p. 227) focus on the impact of “poverty” on vote buying. While the quantitative literature on clientelism has advanced on a number of important questions, most studies concentrate their efforts on a single variable which (when possible) is manipulated in an experimental or quasi-experimental design (Corstange 2012; Imai, Park, and Greene 2015; Nichter and Peress 2017; Hicken et al. 2015; Hicken et al. 2018; Michael and Thachil 2018; Bratton 2008; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson 2014; Bahamonde 2018; Bahamonde 2020; Oliveros 2016). Since the approach (i.e. unicausal/multicausal) is correlated with the method (quantitative/qualitative), we believe this methodological and conceptual alignment represents an important gap in the literature.

Substantively, we argue that to better understand the motivations behind clientelism and the micro-dynamics that drive it, studies should situate the phenomena within the *multidimensionality of democracy*. In other words, What are the *causes* of clientelism? Which *dimensions* of democracy should fail to produce clientelism? While qualitative researchers are better equipped to properly answer these questions, there are some quantitative techniques that might provide broader explanations

¹Quantitative scholars then usually focus on the “effects of causes” rather than on the “causes of effects” (Pearl 2015).

for the causes of clientelism. We do not argue that these quantitative tools might give us the kind of rich explanations ethnographies provide. However, we hope this paper provides multidimensional answers to a multidimensional concept within the quantitative framework. Ultimately, this paper tries to provide a multidimensional explanation for clientelism within the “effects of causes” approach (Pearl 2015). Exploiting a novel conjoint dataset, this paper developed an experimental design which sought to answer *which of the three democratic dimensions explained by Dahl (1971) should fail to produce clientelism?*

Since the vote-buying literature mostly considers developing countries and describes vote sellers as poor (Weitz-Shapiro 2014, p. 12), uneducated (González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson 2014), and undemocratic (Carlin and Moseley 2015), the willingness to sell votes in the United States should be low, making it a difficult case study on vote selling (however see Bahamonde (2020)). And such, this study follows a “least-likely” design presenting the United States as a “crucial case.” As Levy (2008, p. 12) explains, “[i]nferential leverage from a least likely case is enhanced if our theoretical priors for the leading alternative explanation make it a most likely case for that theory.” However, the evidence that this paper presents may be associated with a probable erosion of American democracy (Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018). Foa and Mounk (2016, p. 7) document a deep “crisis of democratic legitimacy [that] extends across a [...] wider set of indicators” in the United States. They find that 26% of millennials declare that it is “unimportant” in a democracy for people to “choose their leaders in free elections” (Foa and Mounk (2016, p. 10) and Foa and Mounk (2017)). Our study aims to contribute to this debate by presenting experimental evidence that links the democratic theory literature with the clientelism literature.

The methodological contribution of this paper is twofolds. First, this paper contributes to the literature by leveraging a conjoint experiment on hypothetical vote selling in a consolidated democracy. First, most quantitative studies have been conducted in developing countries, seriously narrowing the scope of our inferences. In part, this is because the clientelism literature usually focuses on realized behaviors only—that is, actual clientelist transactions. Unfortunately, by ignoring attitudes of potential vote sellers, particularly when it comes to the willingness to sell, selection bias seriously threatens causal inferences. Geddes (1990, p. 131) explains the well-known selection issues of studying “only cases that have achieved the outcome of interest.” Thus, and following the lead of González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson (2014) and Bahamonde (2020), this paper presents experimental evidence of hypothetical willingness to sell the vote in the United States.

Second, we introduce machine learning techniques, particularly support vector machine analyses (SVM) for analyzing conjoint datasets.

The paper continue as follows. **First** we explain the logic of conjoint analyses and their main contribution to political science. **Second** we introduce a novel dataset of U.S. voters representative at the country level. In this section we analyze our conjoint dataset exploiting the traditional approach and explain its shortcomings. **Third** we introduce the support vector machine approach to analyzing conjoint data, and proceed to explaining its main advantages. We also provide **Matlab** routines to replicate the data analyses. **The final section** concludes.

II. TRADITIONAL CONJOINT ANALYSES

Conjoint designs ask respondents to choose from hypothetical profiles that combine multiple attributes, “enabling researchers to estimate the relative influence of each attribute value on the resulting choice or rating” (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, p. 2). Typically, survey participants are given a number of “tasks” where they have to make a number of choices between—usually—two set of profiles. It is generally accepted that Luce and Tukey (1964) started the conjoint design (Green and Srinivasan 1978; Franchino and Zucchini 2015).

This methodology has been widely used in marketing research to measure “consumer trade-offs among multi-attributed products and services” (Lenk et al. 1996, p. 174). Typically, researchers in that field would assign arbitrary utilities to investigate “how much difference each attribute could make in the total utility of a product” (Orme 2010, p. 79). Utilities were assigned according to general expectations, for instance, a “respondent generally prefers higher gas mileage to lower gas mileage” (Green and Srinivasan 1978, p. 107). At the time this seemed particularly interesting given the impossibility to truly randomize the set of attributes. Hence, the analyst needed to set the utilities associated with every attribute in advance, usually building a small number of attribute profiles or “combinations” (Lenk et al. 1996, p. 175). Much research was done arguing how ranked attributes or attribute ratings were better than using assigned utilities (Carmone, Green, and Jain 1978, p. 301). For instance, Louviere, Flynn, and Carson (2010, p. 60) criticize the use of arbitrary utilities assigned to every attribute, making traditional conjoint analyses incompatible with economic theory. Since early conjoint methods exploited the “additive measurements” of the utilities associated with the respective attribute (Luce and Tukey 1964, p. 2), some times that led to non-accounted-for

qc: one paragraph explain why SVM are “good”. 1 paragraph

hb: summarize methods, findings and contribution, the paper continues as follows. 1 paragraph

qc: a sentence on the shortcomings

qn:?

nonlinearities.

A number of topics have been studied, such as preferences for health care (Ryan 2000), vaccine decision making (Seanehia et al. 2017), preferences for energy-saving measures (Poortinga et al. 2003), preferences toward different food packagings (Silayoi and Speece 2007), consumer demand for fair trade (Hainmueller, Hiscox, and Sequeira 2015), evaluations of teaching performance (Kuzmanovic et al. 2013), roommate choice (Shafranek 2019) and renter behavior (Hankinson 2018). Just to name a few examples in political science, conjoint designs have been used to study attitudes toward immigrants (Hainmueller and Hopkins 2015), preferences toward political candidates (Franchino and Zucchini 2015; Horiuchi, Smith, and Yamamoto 2017; Horiuchi, Smith, and Yamamoto 2020; Mares and Visconti 2020), the role of candidate sex on voter choice (Ono and Burden 2019) and the role of the information environment in partisan voting (Peterson 2017).

Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014) “introduced conjoint analysis to political science as a survey experimental method for causal inference” (Horiuchi, Markovich, and Yamamoto 2020, p. 1), particularly making conjoint designs compatible with the potential outcomes framework of causal inference (Rubin 1974). Since then, a number of important studies have been published, making a very common tool for causal inference in political science (Cuesta, Egami, and Imai 2020). In part, this is due to the simplicity of the main quantity of interest developed by Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 3)—the *average marginal component effect* (AMCE).² The quantity equals the counterfactual probability where a specific characteristic would be chosen if the value of that characteristic is absent (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, p. 11).³ Since the AMCE does not rely on arbitrary utility assignments nor does resort to functional form assumptions (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, p. 3), it has become a very common quantity of interest in political science, specially, because it also avoids “unnecessary statistical assumptions” at the same time that improves “internal validity than the more model-dependent procedures” (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, pp. 2–3).⁴ Importantly, they show that “when attribute levels are randomized independently from one another, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates of the coefficients

²Due to space concerns, we are not deriving the AMCE here. The AMCE has been well explained and widely used before. See Equation 5 in Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 11). In addition to that, see Egami and Imai (2019), who have introduced another quantity of interest, the average marginal interaction effect (AMIE).

³Importantly, Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley (2020, p. 6) explain that arbitrary choice of reference category when computing the AMCE might introduce “highly distorted descriptive interpretations of preferences among subgroups of respondents.”

⁴Yet, some necessary assumptions need to be made. For instance, in order to make statistical inferences, the AMCE depends on (clustered) standard errors, which in turn rely on the central limit theorem. See Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 17).

from the linear regression of the choice indicator on the set of dummy variables for the levels of the attributes provide unbiased and consistent estimates of the AMCEs” (Horiuchi, Smith, and Yamamoto 2017, p. 14).⁵ Others have argued that when attribute levels are randomized, the design “reduces social desirability bias by providing many potential reasons for supporting or opposing a proposed [attribute]” (Hankinson 2018, p. 7),⁶ while others offer guidance regarding the number of attributes by developing a two-stage conjoint design (Bansak et al. 2019).

III. STUDYING CLIENTELISM MULTIDimensionALLY VIA CONJOINT DESIGNS

Our multidimensional approach toward the study of vote selling is novel in the quantitative literature. Quantitative contributions on vote buying, vote selling and clientelism in general, are usually unidimensional. Survey experiments have been widely used to study this phenomena. For instance, Bahamonde (2020), González-Ocantos, Jonge, et al. (2012), González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson (2014), and González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson (2015) use list experiments to study the effect of selling prices or specific issues related to norms and legitimacy on the probability of vote selling. While these and other studies have advanced a number of important questions in the discipline, unfortunately, they are able to study one aspect at a time, mainly, by manipulating a word, a sentence, a framing or a price. As Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 2) point out, these designs “have an important limitation for analyzing multidimensional decision making.” We fill this gap by introducing a multidimensional conjoint-based approach to studying vote-selling in the United States.

Our contribution builds directly on Carlin and Singer (2011), Carlin and Moseley (2015), and Carlin (2018). Using survey data, they build a series of multidimensional indexes to measure—in Dahlian terms—attitudes towards democracy. Particularly, using the Q-Method and cluster analyses, they account for the multifaceted views towards a democracy. Considering their operationalization strategy of Dahl’s conceptualization of democracy, but also leveraging the Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014) approach to designing conjoint experiments, we implemented a conjoint design aimed to studying the multidimensionality of conditions that make vote selling most likely. Particularly, we are interested in specifying which of the three democracy dimensions of Dahl ought

⁵Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 15) show that OLS estimators have “identical” properties to the subclassification estimators, and therefore this “implies that the linear regression estimator is fully nonparametric.”

⁶However, see Horiuchi, Markovich, and Yamamoto (2020).

Dalh's Polyarchy Dimension	Dalh's Requirements for a Democracy	Experimental Operationalization for Conjoint Design
Formulate preferences	Freedom of expression	Media can confront the government
	Alternative sources of information	Media can confront the government
	Right of political leaders to compete for support	President cannot rule without Congress
	Right to vote	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Freedom to form and join organizations	Citizens can associate with others and form groups
Signify preferences	Freedom of expression	Media can confront the government
	Alternative sources of information	Media can confront the Government
	Right of political leaders to compete for support	President cannot rule without Congress
	Right to vote	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Free and fair elections	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Eligibility for public office	Citizens can run for office for the next two elections
	Freedom to form and join organizations	Citizens can associate with others and form groups
Preferences are weighted equally in conduct of government	Freedom of expression	Media can confront the government
	Alternative sources of information	Media can confront the Government
	Right of political leaders to compete for support/votes	President cannot rule without Congress
	Right to vote	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Free and fair elections	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Institutions for making government policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference	Citizens can vote in the next two elections
	Eligibility for public office	Citizens can run for office for the next two elections
	Freedom to form and join organizations	Citizens can associate with others and form groups

Table 1: Dimensions of Democracy (Dahl 1971) and Their Corresponding Experimental Operationalizations.

Note: Dahl (1971) specifies three general dimensions that should be satisfied for a country to be considered democratic. Every dimension has a number of requirements. In order to operationalize these requirements for the conjoint experiment, we devised five attributes that reflected these requirements (third column). As Table 2 shows, all participants were asked to choose between hypothetical candidates that either supported or rejected each of these five attributes.

to fail to make vote selling most likely.

Conjoint designs are suitable tools to “determine which components of the manipulation produce the observed effect” (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, p. 2). Table 1 specifies three general dimensions that should be satisfied for a country to be considered a democracy (Dahl 1971). Every dimension has a number of requirements. In order to operationalize Dahl (1971)’s requirements, we devised for the conjoint experiment five attributes that reflected these requirements: (1) *media can confront the government*, (2) *president cannot rule without congress*, (3) *citizens can vote in the next two elections*, (4) *citizens can run for office for the next two elections* and (5) *citizens can associate with others and form groups*. Given that conjoint designs are able “to identify the causal effects of various components of a treatment in survey experiments” (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014, p. 2), we claim that this is an appropriate tool to shed some light on the multi-causal study of clientelism.

To study which democratic dimension(s) should fail to produce clientelism, we presented subjects (as in Table 2) two hypothetical candidates that supported (or not) every policy (attribute)—as operationalized in Table 1. We recognize that the resulting candidate profiles are highly unlikely. Unlikely profiles (such as doctors with no education) have been a big concern in the conjoint literature. So far the suggestion has been to delete them before hand by restricting randomization of certain unlikely profiles (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014) or by marginalizing “factors over the target population distribution” via the population AMCE (Cuesta, Egami, and Imai 2020, p. 12). While acknowledging the advantages of both approaches, our goal is identifying a set of democratic attributes that, when absent, make clientelism more likely. In fact, external validity seems to be the trade-off when building a case study according to the *least*-likely case design (Levy 2008). In addition, one of the methodological contributions of this paper is to overcome selection bias by studying *hypothetical* behaviors, specially the ones where the outcome of interest has not been produced (Geddes 1990). And finally, there are several survey experiments that have fielded hypothetical questions, mostly putting respondents in experimental conditions that do not necessarily mimic reality. For instance, Bahamonde (2020) finds that a big portion of U.S. voters would be willing to sell their vote to an hypothetical candidate in exchange for money, while Ballard-Rosa, Martin, and Scheve (2017) examine a number of tax proposals “that are infeasible in the real world politics” (Cuesta, Egami, and Imai 2020, p. 5). Nonetheless, in order to minimize possible concerns of external validity, survey participants were asked to choose *which candidate represented the lesser*

<p>In the next section you will see 10 different candidates presented in pairs. Each candidate supports different policies. Some candidates might or might not share some similarities/differences. You might not like any of them, but we want to know which candidate represents the lesser of the two evils for you. You might want to focus your attention on the issues that you care about the most.</p>	
Candidate 1	Candidate 2
Media CAN confront the government	Media CANNOT confront the government
President CANNOT rule without Congress	President CAN rule without Congress
Citizens CANNOT vote in the next two elections	Citizens CANNOT vote in the next two elections
Citizens CAN run for office for the next two elections	Citizens CAN run for office for the next two elections
Citizens CAN associate with others and form groups	Citizens CANNOT associate with others and form groups
<p>Which of these candidates represents the lesser of the two evils for you?</p>	
Candidate 1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Candidate 2 <input type="checkbox"/>

Table 2: A Multidimensional Approach to Studying Clientelism: A Conjoint Design (example).

Note: Participants were asked to choose between two hypothetical candidates (*Candidate 1* and *Candidate 2*). Every entry was filled at random according to the five different attributes explained in *Table 1*. In practice, every subject chose between two unique hypothetical candidates. Note that in order to highlight the differences between the two candidates, the can and cannot were capitalized. The idea was to minimize experimental fatigue.

of the two evils for them.

Table 2 shows one possible realization of the experiment. It is important to note that every attribute was randomly assigned, and consequently, every participant in practice chose between two unique hypothetical candidates. Also, in order to minimize experimental fatigue, the *can* and *cannot* were capitalized.

The study considered a **direct question** about the intention to sell the vote. As a whole, the conjoint experiment was framed as a study about crime in the United States, not as a study about clientelism. Participants were asked to read **an excerpt** mentioning a number of crimes. All were formatted as news pieces. The idea was to explain “vote selling” to “newsreaders.” To further prevent bias, the direct question stated that there was the hypothetical possibility of doing one of the illegal things mentioned in the excerpt. And that this possibility would be randomly assigned. However, all participants were directly asked whether they would be interested in selling their vote. Following Bahamonde (2020), to capture the willingness to sell without the potential costs, participants were asked whether they would be willing to accept the offer, assuming they would not go to jail. After answering the conjoint portion of the study, participants were asked to answer a battery of socio-demographic and political questions.

Ultimately, our design will allow a series of hypotheses tests between every of the five democracy dimensions and the vote-selling question. Typical conjoint analyses offer descriptive associations between hypothetical attributes. While these analyses have advanced a number of important research avenues, they do not permit statistical associations between the selected profiles and the respondents attitudes or preferences. By introducing support vector machine techniques to analyzing conjoint experiments, we are able to do so. As we explain later, this approach improves our causal inferences by permitting statistical correlations between the selected conjoint profiles (democracy) and the respondents attitudes (vote selling). We also are able to control for other observables (the socio-demographic battery). Next section presents our novel dataset and analyzes it first leveraging the traditional conjoint approach.

I. Classic Conjoint Data Approach




Figure 1: Geographical Distribution of Survey Respondents by Party Identification.

Note: The data ($N=1,108$) were collected by Research Now SSI between March 2 and March 6 2016 and are representative at the national level. Survey respondents belong to the online panel owned and administered by SSI.

Collected in 2016, the data ($N=1,108$) are representative at the national level.⁷ Figure 1 shows the geographical distribution of survey respondents grouped by party identification. Following Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014), we computed the AMCE via the OLS estimator using clustered standard errors. In this section we present a classic conjoint analysis. Particularly, we show the hypothetical candidates' attributes that were selected by survey respondents.

⁷1,108 respondents, everyone answering 5 tasks with 2 candidates each. Research Now SSI collected the data between March 2 and March 6 2016. Survey respondents belong to the online panel owned and administered by SSI. Notice of IRB exemption Protocol #E16-292 is kept on file at the Office of Research and Regulatory Affairs of University.




Figure 2: Classic AMCE Analysis: Candidate Selection and Dahl's Democratic Dimensions.

Note: Following Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014), the figure shows the corresponding AMCEs for every of the attributes explained in Table 1. All attributes are based on Dahl (1971). All reference categories were omitted—all of them are at the 0 vertical line and represent the opposite of the attribute shown in the plot. For substantive reasons, all categories displayed in the figure represent non-democratic attributes. The figure strongly suggests that respondents systematically preferred hypothetical candidates who supported democratic policies.

Figure 2 suggests that respondents systematically preferred hypothetical candidates who supported democratic policies. Authoritarian candidates that can rule without Congress, or political systems in which there is controlled mass media, or where citizens are not allowed to vote, run for office or associate with others, are systematically rejected by the nationally represented pool of respondents. These analyses are not surprising as they conform with our theoretical priors, i.e. the United States has been (traditionally) considered a strong democracy.

While classic conjoint analyses provide consistent causal estimates, they unfortunately overlook respondent's preferences. As Figure 2 suggests, the analyst can causally *describe* aggregate behaviors but cannot observe the relationship between the respondent's preferences and attribute choices. We argue that the descriptive nature of the classic conjoint design (for instance, via the AMCE) might (wrongly) suggest that democratic values scored high in the United States. After all, Figure 2 strongly indicates that non-democratic candidate attributes are systematically rejected (i.e. all coefficients are negative). And as a consequence, that might imply that the intention to sell the

vote should be low.

Next section introduces support vector machine methods that allow analyzing conjoint data considering subject preferences and/or attitudes. The ability to introduce covariates, such as the intention to sell the vote, might shed some light about how healthy or broken democratic values were at the time were the data were collected (which coincides with the campaign period that gave Donald Trump the U.S. presidency). We claim this is an exceptional opportunity to study democracy, and particularly, the democratic attitudes that when broken predict vote selling.

IV. INTRODUCING SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINES TECHNIQUES

I. Analyzing The Conjoint Data via Support Vector Machines

Based on Table A2, Figure 3 shows **PENDING**.⁸

⁸Table A1 shows summary statistics.

cq: motivate
why SVM
are better.




Figure 3: SVM Analysis: Vote Selling and Dahl (1971)'s Democracy Dimensions.
Note: The figure shows OLS models where PENDING. Table A2 shows the respective regression tables.

hb:

V. CONCLUSION

hb: to do

REFERENCES

- Auyero, Javier (2000). “The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account.” In: *Latin American Research Review* 35.3, pp. 55–81.
- Bahamonde, Hector (2018). “Aiming Right at You: Group versus Individual Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil.” In: *Journal of Politics in Latin America* 10.2, pp. 41–76.
- Bahamonde, Hector (2020). “Still for Sale: The Micro-Dynamics of Vote Selling in the United States, Evidence from a List Experiment.” In: *Acta Politica*.
- Ballard-Rosa, Cameron, Lucy Martin, and Kenneth Scheve (2017). “The Structure of American Income Tax Policy Preferences.” In: *Journal of Politics* 79.1, pp. 1–16.
- Bansak, Kirk et al. (May 2019). “Beyond the Breaking Point? Survey Satisficing in Conjoint Experiments.” In: *Political Science Research and Methods*, pp. 1–19.
- Borges, Mariana (2019). “When Voters Help Politicians: Understanding Elections, Vote Buying, and Voting Behavior through the Voters’ Point of View.”
- Bratton, Michael (Dec. 2008). “Vote Buying and Violence in Nigerian Election Campaigns.” In: *Electoral Studies* 27.4, pp. 621–632.
- Carlin, Ryan (Apr. 2018). “Sorting Out Support for Democracy: A Q-Method Study.” In: *Political Psychology* 39.2, pp. 399–422.
- Carlin, Ryan and Mason Moseley (2015). “Good Democrats, Bad Targets: Democratic Values and Clientelistic Vote Buying.” In: *The Journal of Politics* 1.77, pp. 14–26.
- Carlin, Ryan and Matthew Singer (2011). “Support for Polyarchy in the Americas.” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 44.11, pp. 1500–1526.
- Carmone, Frank, Paul Green, and Arun Jain (May 1978). “Robustness of Conjoint Analysis: Some Monte Carlo Results.” In: *Journal of Marketing Research* 15.2, pp. 300–303.
- Corstange, Daniel (2012). “Vote Trafficking in Lebanon.” In: *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 44.3, pp. 483–505.
- Cuesta, Brando de la, Naoki Egami, and Kosuke Imai (Jan. 2020). “Improving the External Validity of Conjoint Analysis: The Essential Role of Profile Distribution.” In: *Political Analysis*.
- Dahl, Robert (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale University Press.
- Egami, Naoki and Kosuke Imai (Apr. 2019). “Causal Interaction in Factorial Experiments: Application to Conjoint Analysis.” In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 114.526, pp. 529–540.

- Foa, Roberto and Yascha Mounk (2016). "The Danger of Deconsolidation: The Democratic Disconnect." In: *Journal of Democracy* 27.3, pp. 5–17.
- Foa, Roberto and Yascha Mounk (2017). "The Signs of Deconsolidation." In: *Journal of Democracy* 28.1, pp. 5–15.
- Franchino, Fabio and Francesco Zucchini (May 2015). "Voting in a Multi-dimensional Space: A Conjoint Analysis Employing Valence and Ideology Attributes of Candidates." In: *Political Science Research and Methods* 3.2, pp. 221–241.
- Geddes, Barbara (1990). "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." In: *Political Analysis* 2.1, pp. 131–150.
- Goertz, Gary (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad de Jonge, et al. (Jan. 2012). "Vote Buying and Social Desirability Bias: Experimental Evidence from Nicaragua." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 56.1, pp. 202–217.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David Nickerson (Jan. 2014). "The Conditionality of Vote-Buying Norms: Experimental Evidence from Latin America." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 58.1, pp. 197–211.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David Nickerson (2015). "Legitimacy Buying: The Dynamics of Clientelism in the Face of Legitimacy Challenges." In: *Comparative Political Studies*.
- Green, Paul and V. Srinivasan (Sept. 1978). "Conjoint Analysis in Consumer Research: Issues and Outlook." In: *Journal of Consumer Research* 5.2, pp. 103–123.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Michael Hiscox, and Sandra Sequeira (2015). "Consumer Demand for Fair Trade: Evidence from a Multistore Field Experiment." In: *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97.2, pp. 242–256.
- Hainmueller, Jens and Daniel Hopkins (July 2015). "The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 59.3, pp. 529–548.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto (Jan. 2014). "Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments." In: *Political Analysis* 22.1, pp. 1–30.

- Hankinson, Michael (2018). “When Do Renters Behave Like Homeowners? High Rent, Price Anxiety, and NIMBYism.” In: *American Political Science Review* 112.3, pp. 473–493.
- Hicken, Allen et al. (May 2015). “Measuring Vote-Selling: Field Evidence from the Philippines.” In: *American Economic Review* 105.5, pp. 352–356.
- Hicken, Allen et al. (Mar. 2018). “Temptation in Vote-Selling: Evidence from a Field Experiment in the Philippines.” In: *Journal of Development Economics* 131, pp. 1–14.
- Horiuchi, Yusaku, Zachary Markovich, and Teppei Yamamoto (2020). “Can Conjoint Analysis Mitigate Social Desirability Bias?”
- Horiuchi, Yusaku, Daniel Smith, and Teppei Yamamoto (2017). “Identifying Multidimensional Policy Preferences of Voters in Representative Democracies: A Conjoint Field Experiment in Japan.” In: *SSRN Electronic Journal* 26.2, pp. 190–209.
- Horiuchi, Yusaku, Daniel Smith, and Teppei Yamamoto (Jan. 2020). “Identifying Voter Preferences for Politicians’ Personal Attributes: A Conjoint Experiment in Japan.” In: *Political Science Research and Methods* 8.1, pp. 75–91.
- Imai, Kosuke, Bethany Park, and Kenneth Greene (Jan. 2015). “Using the Predicted Responses from List Experiments as Explanatory Variables in Regression Models.” In: *Political Analysis* 23.02, pp. 180–196.
- Jensen, Peter Sandholt and Mogens Justesen (July 2014). “Poverty and Vote Buying: Survey-based Evidence from Africa.” In: *Electoral Studies* 33, pp. 220–232.
- Kuzmanovic, Marija et al. (2013). “A Conjoint-based approach to student evaluations of teaching performance.” In: *Expert Systems with Applications* 40.10, pp. 4083–4089.
- Leeper, Thomas, Sara Hobolt, and James Tilley (Apr. 2020). “Measuring Subgroup Preferences in Conjoint Experiments.” In: *Political Analysis* 28.2, pp. 207–221.
- Lenk, Peter et al. (May 1996). “Hierarchical Bayes Conjoint Analysis: Recovery of Partworth Heterogeneity from Reduced Experimental Designs.” In: *Marketing Science* 15.2, pp. 173–191.
- Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown.
- Levy, Jack (Feb. 2008). “Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference.” In: *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25.1, pp. 1–18. arXiv: [arXiv:1011.1669v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1669v3).
- Louviere, Jordan, Terry Flynn, and Richard Carson (2010). “Discrete Choice Experiments Are Not Conjoint Analysis.” In: *Journal of Choice Modelling* 3.3, pp. 57–72.

- Luce, R. Duncan and John W. Tukey (Jan. 1964). “Simultaneous conjoint measurement: A new type of fundamental measurement.” In: *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 1.1, pp. 1–27.
- Mares, Isabela and Giancarlo Visconti (Apr. 2020). “Voting for the Lesser Evil: Evidence from a Conjoint Experiment in Romania.” In: *Political Science Research and Methods* 8.2, pp. 315–328.
- Michael, Adam and Tariq Thachil (Nov. 2018). “How Clients Select Brokers: Competition and Choice in India’s Slums.” In: *American Political Science Review* 112.4, pp. 775–791.
- Nichter, Simeon and Michael Peress (July 2017). “Request Fulfilling: When Citizens Demand Clientelist Benefits.” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 50.8, pp. 1086–1117.
- Oliveros, Virginia (2016). “Making it Personal: Clientelism, Favors, and Public Administration in Argentina.” In: *Comparative Politics* 48.3, pp. 373–391.
- Ono, Yoshikuni and Barry Burden (2019). “The Contingent Effects of Candidate Sex on Voter Choice.” In: *Political Behavior* 41.3, pp. 583–607.
- Orme, Bryan (2010). *Getting Started with Conjoint Analysis: Strategies for Product Design and Pricing Research*. 2nd. Research Publishers LLC, pp. 77–88.
- Pearl, Judea (Feb. 2015). “Causes of Effects and Effects of Causes.” In: *Sociological Methods & Research* 44.1, pp. 149–164.
- Peterson, Erik (2017). “The Role of the Information Environment in Partisan Voting.” In: *Journal of Politics* 79.4, pp. 1191–1204.
- Poortinga, Wouter et al. (Feb. 2003). “Household Preferences for Energy-Saving Measures: A Conjoint Analysis.” In: *Journal of Economic Psychology* 24.1, pp. 49–64.
- Posada-Carbó, Eduardo (1996). *Elections before Democracy: The History of Elections in Europe and Latin America*. Eduardo Posada-Carbó. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rubin, Donald (1974). “Estimating Causal Effects of Treatments in Randomized and Nonrandomized Studies.” In: *Journal of Educational Psychology* 66.5, pp. 688–701.
- Ryan, Mandy (June 2000). “Using Conjoint Analysis to Elicit Preferences for Health Care.” In: *British Medical Journal* 320.7248, pp. 1530–1533.
- Sabato, Hilda (Oct. 2001). “On Political Citizenship in Nineteenth-Century Latin America.” In: *The American Historical Review* 106.4, p. 1290.
- Seanehia, Joy et al. (May 2017). “Quantifying Population Preferences Around Vaccination Against Severe but Rare Diseases: A Conjoint Analysis Among French University Students, 2016.” In: *Vaccine* 35.20, pp. 2676–2684.

- Shafranek, Richard (June 2019). "Political Considerations in Nonpolitical Decisions: A Conjoint Analysis of Roommate Choice." In: *Political Behavior* 0123456789.
- Silayoi, Pinya and Mark Speece (Nov. 2007). "The Importance of Packaging Attributes: A Conjoint Analysis Approach." In: *European Journal of Marketing* 41.11/12, pp. 1495–1517.
- Szwarcberg, Mariela (2013). "The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism. Lessons from the Argentine Case." In: *Latin American Research Review* 48.2, pp. 32–54.
- Wantchekon, Leonard (2003). "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." In: *World Politics* 55.April, pp. 399–422.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca (2012). "What Wins Votes: Why Some Politicians Opt Out of Clientelism." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 56.3, pp. 568–583.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca (2014). *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina: Politics, Poverty, and Social Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

..... **Word count: 3,624**

VI. APPENDIX

I. Experimental Manipulations and Vignettes

Distractor Paragraph. The next paragraph was used to distract subjects from the main purpose of the study, and also to define vote selling. After reading the excerpt, participants were told about the hypothetical possibility of doing one of the illegal things mentioned in the excerpt. And that this possibility would be randomly assigned. However, all participants were directly asked whether they would be interested in selling their vote (as seen on [Direct Question](#)).

Washington , D.C.— A department store downtown had a robbery incident last week , reporting several missing iPods from their inventory . Authorities also inform that a group of local residents are trying to ``sell '' their votes to political candidates ahead of a local election for city council . Residents approached some of the candidates running for office and offered to vote for that candidate in return for monetary compensation . In a different subject matter , the local police station released a report on driving habits and behaviors in the Capitol district last week . Finally , cyber—crime has become an increasingly serious issue in the area in the past few year .

Direct Question. All subjects read the next paragraph, and then *all* answered the direct question:

Now you will be entered into a random lottery for the opportunity to do ONE of the illegal things you just read before. This means that you might be randomly offered to hypothetically do ANY of the activities mentioned before.

After a random assignment, you have been selected for the opportunity to hypothetically sell your vote. This means that you will have the hypothetical opportunity to accept money from a candidate for your vote. Would you be willing to accept the offer, assuming you would not go to jail? By selecting ``Yes,''' you could earn up to \$ 1,000.

II. Summary Statistics

Table A1

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
Right to Run for Office	1,108	0.167	0.558	−1.467	−0.196	0.583	1.500
Right to Associate	1,108	0.219	0.573	−1.500	−0.143	0.645	1.625
Free Media	1,108	0.264	0.599	−1.821	−0.083	0.725	1.524
Presidential Autonomy	1,108	−0.213	0.674	−1.571	−0.770	0.249	1.600
Right to Vote	1,108	0.331	0.602	−1.397	−0.004	0.817	1.552
Woman	1,108	1.568	0.496	1	1	2	2
Ideology	1,108	2.943	1.114	1	2	4	5
Registered to Vote	1,108	1.094	0.292	1	1	1	2
Trust in Federal Gov.	1,108	2.639	1.140	1	2	3	5
Income	1,108	7.029	3.803	1	4	10	14
Education	1,108	4.830	1.701	1	4	6	7
Political Knowledge	1,108	0.664	0.381	0.000	0.398	0.883	2.491
Sell Vote	1,108	0.172	0.378	0	0	0	1

III. Regression Table: OLS Analyses using the SVM Approach to Analyzing Conjoint Data

Es nuestro approach causal inference? Al menos si cumple con 3 assumptions en Hainmueller2014a. Estas son dadas por el diseno del experimento.

	Free Media	Presidential Autonomy	Right to Vote	Right to Run for Office	Right to Associate
'Sell Vote'	-0.07 (0.05)	0.16** (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.05)	-0.11* (0.05)
Woman	0.02 (0.04)	-0.08* (0.04)	0.14*** (0.04)	0.04 (0.03)	0.00 (0.04)
'Party Id.'Democrat	-0.03 (0.05)	0.19*** (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.08 (0.04)
'Party Id.'Republican	-0.06 (0.05)	0.01 (0.06)	0.05 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)
'Party Id.'Other	0.21* (0.10)	0.14 (0.10)	-0.10 (0.10)	0.04 (0.09)	-0.13 (0.09)
Ideology	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.06*** (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	-0.04* (0.02)
Education	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)
'Political Knowledge'	0.00 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.10* (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.08 (0.05)
'Registered to Vote'	0.13* (0.06)	0.11 (0.07)	-0.06 (0.06)	-0.08 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)
'Trust in Federal Gov.'	-0.04* (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.04* (0.02)
Income	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
R ²	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.03
Adj. R ²	0.03	0.08	0.03	-0.00	0.02
Num. obs.	1108	1108	1108	1108	1108

Every column represents each of Dahl (1971) democracy dimensions. All models OLS. Intercept omitted.

Table A2: *Statistical models*