

Research Portfolio

Hector Bahamonde

September 10, 2020

Contents

- 1 Research Statement
 - 2 Published Paper 1 (Journal of Politics In Latin America 2018): Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil
 - 3 Published Paper 2 (Acta Politica forthcoming): Vote Selling in the US A List Experiment
 - 4 Published Paper 3 (Regional Science Policy and Practice forthcoming): COVID Effects An Application of the Translog Function
 - 5 Additional Paper 1 (European Journal of Political Economy Under Review): Inclusive Institutions Unequal Outcomes: Democracy State Infrastructural Power and Inequality 1970-2015
 - 6 Additional Paper 2 (fielding experiment now): Vote Selling An Experimental Economics Approach
 - 7 Additional Paper 3 (work in progress): Vote Selling Conjoint Experiments and Machine Learning Methods
 - 8 Additional Paper 4 (work in progress): Introducing GVAR Methods into International Relations
-



Hector Bahamonde, PhD

Assistant Professor

Social Sciences Institute

O'Higgins University

Rancagua, Chile

p: +1(504) 941-9131

e: hector.bahamonde@uoh.cl

w: www.HectorBahamonde.com

September 10, 2020, download latest version [here](#)

Research Statement

Within comparative politics, my research explores the intersection between inequality and political development, from a political economy perspective.

I have published a paper (*Bahamonde, H. (2018). Aiming Right at You: Group versus Individual Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil*. Journal of Politics in Latin America, 10(2), pp. 41-76.)

 on vote buying in Brazil. For this paper I used **matching techniques** for observational data. Do parties target individuals or groups? This is a question fundamental to understanding clientelism, yet the literature does not offer an answer. This paper argues that depending on certain conditions, brokers target individuals when they are identifiable and groups when brokers need to rely on the spillover effects of clientelism. Both identifiability and spillovers depend on individual poverty, group poverty, and political competition. Though the theory I outline focuses on targeting, the paper also argues that structural factors, such as the density of the poor, should be considered in the vote-buying literature. Structural factors are one of the few observables upon which brokers can base their decision regarding investment in clientelism. Using survey and census data from Brazil, the paper exploits variations in personal incomes within contexts of differing levels of poverty. I find that political parties engage in segmented or ad-hoc strategies, targeting individuals when identifiability is high, and groups when there are economies of scale. Importantly, non-poor individuals can also be offered clientelism.

In addition to that, and with the support of a generous grant, I designed in Qualtrics two experiments in the U.S. out of a series of experiments to be fielded in Latin America for further comparison. In the paper (*Bahamonde, H. Still for Sale: The Micro-Dynamics of Vote Selling in the United States, Evidence From a List Experiment*. Acta Politica, forthcoming.), I looked at the tipping points at which a sample of U.S. citizens (N = 1,479) prefer a monetary incentive rather than keeping their right to choose whom to vote for. In nineteenth-century United States politics, vote buying was commonplace. Nowadays, vote buying seems to have declined. The quantitative empirical literature emphasizes vote buying, ignoring the micro-dynamics of vote selling. We seem to know that vote buyers can no longer afford this strategy; however, we do not know what American voters would do if offered the chance to sell their vote. Would they sell, and at what price, or would they consistently opt out of vote selling? A novel experimental dataset representative at the national level comprises 1,479 U.S. voters who participated in an online list experiment in 2016, and the results are striking: Approximately 25% would sell their vote for a minimum payment of \$418. Democrats and Liberals are more likely to sell, while education or income levels do not seem to impact the likelihood of vote selling.

The second experiment is a **conjoint experiment** and it is being analyzed in a separate paper ("Vote Selling in the United States: Introducing Machine Learning Methods to Analyzing Conjoint Experimental Data," *data analyses*). My coauthor and myself are developing a new methodology to analyzing conjoint

experiments via **machine learning** techniques, particularly, **support vector machines**.

Finally, and within the same project, I am currently designing an **economic experiment** in the lab. The literature asserts that Chilean parties no longer buy votes. While those are good news, the bad news are that we are rather ignorants about a number of other interesting, and yet, unanswered questions. First and foremost, the approach used by most quantitative scholars focuses exclusively on vote-buying. That is, parties offering to buy votes, completely ignoring the ones who sell their votes (i.e. voters). This is a rather important distinction. What would voters do if offered the chance to sell their votes? Would voters still sell their votes to their own party of preference? We developed an experiment within the experimental economics tradition. Exploiting these novel data we shed some light on these questions.

My book manuscript entitled “*Structural Transformations in Latin America: State Building and Elite Competition 1850-2010*” explains that the economic structural transformation in Latin America—the secular decline of agriculture and substantial expansion of manufacturing—imposed tight constraints on the way politics was run by the incumbent landowning class. This was a major change due to the advantage the landed elites enjoyed since colonial times. Where the expansion of the industrial sector was weak, post-colonial norms persisted due to institutional inertia, perpetuating the advantaged position of the agricultural class. Leveraging economic sectoral outputs dating back to 1900 until 2010, for a sample of Latin American countries, I use panel data **methods** (particularly, Cox-proportional hazard models), time series analyses (VAR models, impulse response functions, and Granger-causality tests), and fine-grained qualitative data to support my argument. **Another major contribution of the book** is in measurement. One of the biggest gaps in the literature is the lack of a measurement of state capacities able to capture variations of *stateness* over time. Using a novel dataset, the book proposes measuring state capacities using earthquake data. The rationale is very intuitive: the capacity to enforce quake-sensitive building codes throughout the territory is a *reflection* of the overall (*in*)capacity of states of solving both logistic and political limitations at the subnational level. *Why does a 7.0 magnitude earthquake flatten Haiti, leaving at least 100,000 deaths, while a 8.8 earthquake in Chile in the same year leaves just 525 deaths?* By exploiting variations on earthquake death-tolls and local population to weight the number of deaths since 1900, I measure state capacities over time. Keeping magnitudes constant, casualty differentials should be attributed to the *lack of state capacities*. The paper version of the paper (*in preparation*) can be downloaded [here](#).

In one of the **sections of the book**, I explain that the structural transformation required both sectors to grow in a *balanced* fashion, *leveling both elites in their relative political, economic, and military capacities*. Leveraging the dual sector model of economic growth, I sketch a theory of political and economic development that stresses the structural economic dependence of both sectors. The agricultural sector supplied labor and cheap foodstuff—which the industrial sector demanded, promoting balanced economic development of both sectors. The political consequence of balanced economic growth was the mutual political dependence and the need of inter-elite compromises that fostered both economic and political development in the long-run. The paper version of the chapter (currently *in preparation*) can be downloaded [here](#). In another section of the book, I explain how the emergence of a strong industrial sector accelerated the implementation of fiscal institutions. From a fiscal sociology standpoint, I consider this to be an important critical juncture that set countries in a path of political development. The paper version of the chapter (currently *in preparation*) can be downloaded [here](#).

Summary and Future Research In summation, my book manuscript, job market paper and working papers on vote buying and experiments on vote selling work toward exploring the effects of inequality in political development from a comparative perspective. I use a broad methodological approach, historical comparisons, time series analyses and experimental and quasi-experimental methodologies. My goal is to use this toolkit to keep asking “big” questions that are fundamental to our discipline. My future research will seek to study the connection between elite competition and democratic regimes, exploring the connection between state building and democratic institutions. Please check my [teaching portfolio](#) and see how my **research and teaching interests match**.

More information, [syllabi](#), my [research](#), [teaching](#) and [diversity](#) statements, as well as other [papers](#) are available on my website: www.HectorBahamonde.com. Thank you for considering my application. I look forward to hearing from you.



Journal of Politics in Latin America

Bahamonde, Héctor (2018),
Aiming Right at You: Group versus Individual Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil, in:
Journal of Politics in Latin America, 10, 2, 41–76.

URN: <http://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:18-4-11211>

ISSN: 1868-4890 (online), ISSN: 1866-802X (print)

The online version of this article can be found at: <www.jpla.org>

Published by
GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Institute of Latin American Studies
and Hamburg University Press.

The *Journal of Politics in Latin America* is an Open Access publication.
It may be read, copied and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.

To subscribe to the print edition: <ilas@giga-hamburg.de>
For an e-mail alert please register at: <www.jpla.org>

The *Journal of Politics in Latin America* is part of the GIGA Journal Family, which also
includes *Africa Spectrum*, *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* and *Journal of Current
Southeast Asian Affairs*: <www.giga-journal-family.org>.



Aiming Right at You: Group versus Individual Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil

Héctor Bahamonde

Abstract: Do parties target individuals or groups? Although this question is fundamental to understanding clientelism, the literature does not offer an answer. This paper argues that, depending on certain conditions, brokers target individuals when they are identifiable, and groups when brokers need to rely on the spillover effects of clientelism. Both identifiability and spillovers depend on individual poverty, group poverty, and political competition. Though the theory I outline focuses on targeting, I also argue that structural factors, such as the density of the poor, should be considered in the vote-buying literature. Structural factors are one of the few observables upon which brokers can base their decision regarding investing in clientelism. Using survey and census data from Brazil, the paper exploits variations in personal incomes within contexts of differing levels of municipal poverty. I find that political parties engage in segmented or ad-hoc strategies, targeting individuals when identifiability is high, and groups when there are economies of scale. Importantly, non-poor individuals can also be offered clientelism.

■ Manuscript received 18 June 2017; accepted 29 June 2018

Keywords: Brazil, clientelism, vote-buying

Héctor Bahamonde is an assistant professor at O’Higgins University (Rancagua, Chile). In 2017 he received his PhD in Political Science from Rutgers University (New Brunswick, NJ). Then, he served one year as a post-doctoral fellow at CIPR, Tulane University (New Orleans, LA). His current research focuses on clientelism, the political economy of taxation, state formation, and Latin American politics. Personal website: <www.hectorbahamonde.com>

E-mail: <hector.bahamonde@uoh.cl>

There is no agreement on when, how, and why parties choose to aim clientelist practices at individuals or groups.¹ The distributive politics and vote-buying literatures have traditionally pursued one of two approaches. The former has mostly focused on group targeting, usually districts or provinces (Dixit and Londregan 1996; Khemani 2015; and Calvo and Murillo 2004), showing that incumbent parties deliver public-sector jobs or construction projects contingent on the support of groups of people. The latter has typically focused on individuals and their characteristics, such as their socio-economic or electoral profiles. Substantively, however, it is not clear when or why clientelist brokers use either strategy.

In fact, the decision to investigate group-based and/or individual-based targeting seems to be attributable to distinct research designs and agendas, rather than theory. For example, ethnographers generally focus on individuals, while others have traditionally focused on groups (Scott 1972; Auyero 2000; Szwarcberg 2013; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; and González-Ocantos et al. 2012).²

What is most concerning, however, is that it is relatively assumed or implied that individual and group clientelist targeting strategies are interchangeable, when they are clearly not. Individuals pertaining to groups and individuals by themselves have different incentives to defect to the incumbent. For instance, individuals belonging to larger groups have greater incentives to defect (Stokes 2005), while individuals who are personally targeted have fewer incentives to defect (Auyero 2000). Anticipating this, brokers adjust their strategies accordingly. In the first instance, brokers deal with low-informational environments that increase principal-agent problems. In the second instance, brokers – who know their clients better – are able to leverage this knowledge, reducing the probability of defection. However, these differences have not been sys-

1 I am grateful to Robert Kaufman, Daniel Kelemen, Richard Lau, Paul Poast, Geoffrey Wallace, Douglas Jones, Ezequiel González-Ocantos, Juan Pablo Luna, Jorge Bravo, Eric Davis, Adam Cohon, Edwin Camp, Luciana Oliveira Ramos, Giancarlo Visconti, William Young, Johannes Karreth, and the reviewers and editor of *JPLA*. I also thank participants of the Latin American Studies Association 2014 conference, the Southern Political Science Association 2015 meeting, the Western Political Science Association 2015 meeting, and the 2014 Graduate Conference at the Political Science Department, Rutgers University. Any errors that remain, of course, are my responsibility. This work was partially funded by the Center for Latin American Studies at Rutgers University. I am grateful to the School of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Political Science for their travel grants.

2 I wish to thank Ezequiel González-Ocantos for this suggestion.

tematized in the literature. In the present paper, I propose a framework that explains when it is more efficient to target groups or individuals.

Particularly, by focusing on brokers, the paper advances an argument about the decision process regarding whom to target. The crux of the argument is that this decision is a function of three factors: individuals' discount factors explained by income levels, the incentives of clientelist brokers to rely on spillover effects caused by the nesting structure of individuals (that is, whether individuals are nested in poor or non-poor contexts), and brokers' incentives to engage in clientelism explained by higher electoral pressures and political competition.

Overall, I share Carlin and Moseley's (2015: 14) opinion that "[e]xisting research looks almost exclusively at individuals' socio-economic and, specially, electoral profiles [and] [y]et our knowledge of who parties target remains incomplete." The present paper seeks to contribute to this issue by incorporating both structural and individual factors that foster clientelism in the same theory. Analytically, the structure of the argument (and the empirics) allows for disentangling the effects of "being poor" and "living in a poor area." Another important implication of the argument is that I am able to suggest why parties that adopt clientelism as a strategy, target their resources to both poor and non-poor individuals, an empirical regularity that, to the best of my knowledge, has been unexplored so far.

Perhaps the area in which there is the most agreement among scholars is on the relationship between poverty and vote-buying (Calvo and Murillo 2004; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; Kitschelt 2000; and Kitschelt and Altamirano 2015). For example, Brusco, Nazareno, and Stokes (2004), Stokes et al. (2013), and Nazareno, Brusco, and Stokes (2008) explained that since the poor derive more utility from immediate transfers than the uncertain returns associated with future policy packages, clientelist political parties only target the poor. In fact, Weitz-Shapiro explained that "[a]lmost universally, scholars of clientelism treat and analyze [this] practice as an exchange between politicians and their poor clients" (Weitz-Shapiro 2014: 12; my emphasis).

However, this canonical predictor has recently been contested (Hicken 2007: 55). Szwarcberg (2013: 32) "challenges the assumption [that brokers] with access to material benefits will always distribute goods to low-income voters in exchange for electoral support," while González-Ocantos et al. (2012) and Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015) found that income (measured at the individual level) had little or no effect on vote-buying. In fact, Figure 1 shows that non-poor individuals in Brazil did receive clientelist offerings. *Why would brokers target non-poor individuals?*

And relatedly, *why does contemporary scholarly work report null findings for poverty, traditionally the most important predictor of vote-buying?* I present an argument where individual income alone is not relevant (similarly, see Weitz-Shapiro 2012: 568). What matters is how noticeable individuals are. Wealthier individuals living in poor contexts and poor individuals living in non-poor contexts are more identifiable, increasing their respective probabilities of being targeted. I also contend in this article that, in low-information environments, brokers use these kinds of observables to reduce the probability of defection of their clientele.

Another often-considered contextual factor in the literature is the size of the community in which clientelism takes place. Large-sized communities impose severe principal-agent problems. Stokes (2005: 323) explained that the “community structure” mediates the incentives to defect. Large communities make voters more anonymous, increasing their probability of defection. In fact, Rueda (2017: 164) found that in Colombia vote buying is more effective in contexts of small polling places.

Figure 1. Individual Wealth and Vote-Buying in Brazil



Note: Following the advice of Córdova (2008) and Córdova and Seligson (2009, 2010), different socio-economic variables in The Latin American Public Opinion Project (2010) dataset were used to construct a relative wealth index (RWI). With this information, in addition to the frequency of clientelism question (*clien1*), the figure shows that clientelist brokers target individuals at all levels of income.

Several scholars have then argued that brokers prefer smaller groups because individuals nested in small communities should defect less (Brusco, Nazareno, and Stokes 2004; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2006: 10; and Magaloni 2008: 67. See also Bratton 2008, for Nigeria, and Gingerich and Medina 2013: 456, for Brazil). Yet, even when brokers might prefer to target small communities (with fewer voters relative to large communities), it is not clear how political parties gain enough electoral returns, especially considering that clientelism is expensive.

Vote-buying is an expensive strategy (Zarazaga 2014: 35), and more so when clients are individually targeted.³ Stokes (2005: 317) argued that brokers develop skills that allow them to infer whether individual clients in small-sized communities voted for their party by looking at them in the eyes. Gay (1993, 1998) documented similar findings for the Brazilian case. This strategy requires brokers to sustain close relationships over time with their clients in a personal and individualized way. Knowing the clients' needs, delivering them benefits, monitoring their political behavior (and punishing them in case of defection), all in an individualized fashion, makes this strategy an extremely expensive choice – and it becomes even more expensive as more individuals are added to the broker's portfolio.

The cost of individual targeting increases linearly with the size of the targeted population (Hicken 2007: 56). This intuition is important because the brokers' production-possibility frontier cannot be shifted upwards either. Since the number of brokers is a depletable resource, at some point party machines run out of brokers, implying that monitoring capacities are bounded. In fact, Auyero (2000: 74) explained that the capacity brokers have to deliver benefits is "finite," and "only for a restricted number of people." However, and despite this constraint, brokers still have incentives to secure a large number of votes. Yet, the literature explains that clientelism should decrease in large communities. However, it is hard to conceive that brokers will stop being clientelist just because the size of the population is large. *A priori*, it seems a missed opportunity for brokers to let go of a large number of votes. In fact, survey data for the Brazilian case indicate that inhabitants of large, medium, and small municipalities are targeted in virtually the same proportion (Speck and Abramo 2001: 2). This article explains that when

3 Dixit and Londregan (1996: 1147) explained that brokers track "constituents' likes and dislikes, *compulsively* participating in a spectrum of events [such as] baptisms and bar mitzvahs, weddings and funerals [and even, holding] *daily* meetings with constituencies [even] *after* nine o'clock [hearing] what anyone wished to tell [them]" (My emphasis).

brokers need to secure large amounts of electoral support, especially when political competition is high, they turn to group-targeting strategies, relying on the spillover effects of clientelism. In these contexts, clientelism mobilizes electoral support from “actual” and “potential” beneficiaries, minimizing the costs of clientelist targeting while maximizing electoral benefits, a mechanism that I explain later on in the paper.

Civic associations might help solve some of the challenges large-sized groups present to brokers. As low-information environments prevent brokers from really observing individual electoral behavior (Zarazaga 2014: 35), they usually resort to alternative methods that allow them to make safer inferences. For example, Schaffer and Baker (2015: 1094) argued that clientelism is “socially multiplied” as party machines target individuals “who are opinion-leading epicenters” in informal situations, or “partisan networks” (Calvo and Murillo 2013), in what has been called “organization buying” (Stokes et al. 2013: 250–251).⁴ If parties buy “turnout” (Nichter 2008), then they will most probably target associations too, as “citizens immersed in clientelist networks [...] have a higher probability of voting than the rest” (Carreras and Castaneda-Angarita 2014: 7). I acknowledge the positive relationship between group membership and clientelism. However, what has not been explored yet is whether clientelism is explained by association membership itself, or by the fact that poor individuals usually address their problems as a *group*, since otherwise it would be too costly to solve them individually. If this is the case, group membership should be spuriously related to clientelism. While I find that group membership does have a positive effect on clientelism, I find that structural contexts that foster group-targeting have even more explanatory power.⁵

Moving forward, Weitz-Shapiro’s (2012) important paper found that in several Argentine municipalities, higher levels of political competition and low socioeconomic levels fostered higher levels of clientelism. In her paper, losses are conceptualized in terms of “moral costs.” Evidence for these types of costs has been presented in the literature very recently. For example, Carlin and Moseley (2015) argued that citizens

4 Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015: 16) explained that when “parties lack their own brokerage networks [they seek] to capitalize on organizational networks instead.” Similarly, Rueda (2015: 13) argued that parties tend to target very specific civic associations of “seniors and associations of single mothers, organizing trips to recreational centers outside the city where all their expenses are covered.” Paradoxically, the stronger the civic society (that is, the more organized it is), the more clientelism there is.

5 These results are presented in Figure A4.

endowed with more democratic values feel more “moral repugnance” to clientelism. Vicente (2014) showed that vote-buying practices have an “immoral/illegal connotation,” while González-Ocantos et al. (2012) found that individuals wanting to avoid social stigma usually do not give truthful answers when asked directly about clientelism. Building on this literature, I contend that when political competition is high, clientelism will be higher in contexts where poor individuals live in poor economic contexts.

When Do Parties Target Individuals and When Groups?

Table 1 presents four ideal types in four quadrants; cases where individuals are highly identifiable; that is, non-poor individuals living in poor areas (Q1), and poor individuals living in non-poor areas (Q4). Identifiability in these cases reduces the cost of defection, permitting clientelist brokers to closely target individuals. While individual targeting is more expensive, it is also safer (compared to group targeting). The table also shows cases where individuals are hard to identify; that is, poor individuals living in poor areas (Q2), and non-poor individuals living in non-poor areas (Q3). In these cases, voters are more anonymous, making direct individual-based targeting and monitoring more costly. Since brokers still have incentives to seek electoral support, they engage in group targeting by relying on the spillover effects of clientelism. In these cases, the effects of vote-buying disseminates by mobilizing targeted voters and latent untargeted (but potential) clients. This form of targeting is cheaper but more uncertain.

Table 1. Strategy Set: Group versus Individual Targeting

	Non-Poor Individuals	Poor Individuals
High Competition	Poor Areas, identifiable, individual targeting.	Poor Areas, spillover effects, group targeting, cheap vote-buying.
Low Competition	Non-Poor Areas, group targeting, expensive vote-buying, lack of checks and balances, embezzlement.	Non-Poor Areas, identifiable, individual targeting.

Source: Author's compilation.

Individual Targeting

This is the safest bet a broker can make, but also the most expensive one, as it requires brokers to have sustained closed relationships with their clients. For instance, Zarazaga (2014: 26) stated that “brokers have detailed information about their neighborhood and clients’ needs.” Keeping track of every single client (and their respective needs) is an expensive strategy. After all, as Auyero (2000: 73) put it, brokers are “problem solvers.” Importantly, the kind of care given ranges from material needs to symbolic and immaterial necessities, making clientelism a relationship based on “trust, solidarity, reciprocity, caring, and hope.” Such broker-client symbiosis is both material and personal-intensive, making it very costly. As an investment, however, it pays off electorally. The same detailed information brokers have about their clients’ needs is then used to infer coercively (or know directly) the electoral behavior of their respective clientele, administering punishments or rewards accordingly (Stokes 2005: 317).

The transaction costs of clientelism are reduced by targeting identifiable clients. In 2009, Luna et al. (2011) made extensive participant observations in several campaigns, accompanying a number of candidates for several months in their campaigns for the legislative election in Santiago de Chile. With one incumbent, we spent considerable time on the ground, traveling in her district. On several times, as we drove throughout the district in her personal car, the candidate was able to recall who the head of household was (including his/her name), what her district office had contributed to solve their needs, and whether the household members were on good terms with her.⁶ Importantly, the economic diversity of the district provided a number of useful observables. In non-poor areas, poor houses with an unpainted wall, a rusty front yard fence, a two-story house with a bodega market on the first, a household with a broken window, or a junk diesel truck aground in the front yard, among others, provided distinctive points of reference. Identifiability, as an observable, made these receivers less anonymous, raising their cost of defection and making them more prone to cooperate. Table 1 portraits individuals living in these heterogenous contexts in Q4.

Households in Q4, being more noticeable, stand out in their respective contexts, making it easier for brokers to notice whether they need construction materials, whether there are wakes to which they could contribute flowers or birthday parties to which they could bring cakes. In

6 The actual gender of the candidate might have been changed for confidentiality purposes.

addition, it makes their possible defection more obvious and memorable for the brokers. In summary, higher levels of visibility supply brokers with good-quality information about their clients.⁷ In addition, when political contestation is low, the demand for votes is less astringent, shaping brokers' incentives to target in a more accurate, less massive fashion, identifiable and particularized individuals, not groups.

The capacity brokers have to identify potential clients not only comes from third-party sources, as the "organization buying" proponents explain (Holland and Palmer-Rubin 2015; Rueda 2015 and Stokes et al. 2013). In a similar account, others have pointed out that brokers are also "reliable neighbors" (Zarazaga 2014: 38); that is, members of the same community of targeted individuals. Acknowledging this approach, the argument presented in this article contends that brokers have incentives to expand their immediate local networks by colonizing visible targets outside of their own proximate neighborhood. By conceptualizing brokers as active political entrepreneurs who seek new supporters outside of their immediate context, the proposed framework complements other accounts, as presented in Szwarcberg (2013: 32) or Zarazaga (2016: 681), where brokers are neighborhood party agents. Clientelist entrepreneurship can be performed directly or indirectly. For instance, Auyero (2000: 65–66) described the situation of Cholo, a member of the inner circle of one of the brokers in Buenos Aires, Argentina, who visited "other poor neighborhoods of the area adjacent to" the place where the broker (and himself) lived, to spread news about some government plan, the governor, and the Peronist party, but importantly, also reporting to the broker any unattended material needs he had noticed. This illustrates how, via different channels, brokers expand their client portfolio outside of their immediate community.

An important implication is that individual poverty does not play a role by itself. Non-poor individuals living in poor areas (Q1) are also noticeable, and consequently, possible targets as well. Political competition shifts the demand for votes upwards. As elections become more contested, brokers need to secure even higher levels of electoral support. Since newly elected representatives are more likely to bring new people to their machines, brokers are also interested in seeing their candidates elected. Consequently, brokers will have even more incentives to engage in clientelism when political competition is high. In these cases, political competition is high enough to even mobilize non-poor individuals in a

7 Importantly, poor households do not need to be close to each other, but visible enough.

clientelist way. Since these votes are more expensive to purchase (given decreasing marginal utility from income, see Stokes 2005: 321), this strategy is less preferred. However, costly clientelism is worth the investment given the risk of losing the election.

Group Targeting

This is the least accurate targeting strategy, but also the cheapest one available to brokers. It leverages the spillover effects provided by larger concentrations of individuals who share the same socio-economic backgrounds. This strategy is less accurate because it mobilizes electoral support from “actual” clients (individuals who have actually been targeted), and “potential” clients (individuals who have not received benefits yet). It is preferred when poor individuals are nested in poor areas (Q2), or vice-versa (Q3). In these cases, individuals are masked by their environments, which means that identifiability is hard to achieve. As explained before, identifiability facilitates individual targeting, an important factor in reducing the probability of defection of targeted clients. When individuals are hard to identify, however, individual targeting becomes prohibitively expensive. Yet, brokers who still need to secure electoral support do not opt out of clientelism and instead turn to group targeting.

Auyero (2000: 65) described the case of Alfonsina in Argentina. Alfonsina was part of the broker’s inner circle and got a job as a cleaning lady in a public school. As the broker explained to her, before getting the job, Alfonsina had to be *patient* because as a member of “the circle,” she was in the pool of potential beneficiaries; it was only a “matter of time” until she could get the job. The idea of expectations and hope are important. Auyero explained that the

hope of a job serves as important glue within the inner circle. Although not everyone is employed at the municipality, the fact that someone gets [a] job has an important *demonstration* effect. (Auyero 2000: 65; my emphasis)

Building on this intuition, two ideal types are suggested: actual and potential beneficiaries. The former receive particularistic benefits “today” and vote for the broker’s candidate “tomorrow,” while the latter do not receive benefits “today” (in the expectation of receiving them in the future) but still vote for the broker’s candidate “tomorrow.”

Group targeting is cost-effective because it mobilizes two types of voters at the cost of investing in just one (i.e. the “actual”). Actual beneficiaries want to remain actual beneficiaries since they want to keep re-

ceiving benefits; thus, they keep supporting the broker's candidate. In turn, potential beneficiaries want to become actual beneficiaries, but are uncertain when that might happen; as a result, they also support the broker's candidate. In this sense, from the broker's perspective, this strategy reduces the sunk costs by half, multiplying the gross benefits by two. In other words, the broker's reputation of a "problem solver" disseminates twice as fast relative to individual targeting. It is in this sense that this is a massive (but less precise) form of clientelist targeting.

Given that potential clients support the broker's candidate in the absence of current inducements, brokers need to effectively calibrate the timing when potential beneficiaries become actual beneficiaries. In other words, brokers need to infer the discount factors of their potential clients, making it expensive for them to defect. Reputation, as a form of capital, is fundamental for brokers since "voters prefer to support [brokers] with a reputation for delivering because they are a more reliable source of future rewards" (Zarazaga 2014: 24). However, potential clients are also interested in investing in their reputation. From their perspective, they know that the flow of resources is dependent on the brokers' electoral success. Also, they do not know whether new brokers might have access to fewer resources or distribute them to other people. For them, the cost of switching brokers (or defecting) is very high since it also involves building relationships of confidence with another broker from scratch, which is costly. Hence, the incentives are for the broker to deliver benefits before it is too late, while the incentives for the potential client are to support the broker's candidate.

Since it does not matter what type an individual is, both actual and potential beneficiaries keep voting for the broker's candidate. While cost-effective, group targeting is less accurate since brokers hope to mobilize potential beneficiaries only indirectly; that is, by targeting actual beneficiaries. This makes this strategy a fragile one. However, besides the reputation costs described above, low-income voters have additional incentives to support the broker's candidate. This is described in Q2. Given that the poor are risk-averse, potential beneficiaries are better-off waiting (and voting for the broker's candidate) than defecting. In the same vein, but on a slightly different subject, Magaloni (2008: 20) posited that the Mexican PRI lasted as long as it did not because of electoral fraud but because voters supported the "known devil." Economic underdevelopment played a fundamental role in this equilibrium as well. Finally, higher levels of electoral contestation force brokers to engage in this less accurate, but massive form of clientelist targeting, leveraging (1) the incentive structure of potential clients to support the candidate even in the ab-

sence of current inducements, and (2) the higher levels of risk aversion poor individuals have.

Importantly, vote-buying is also targeted to non-poor individuals nested in non-poor groups (Q3). Vote-buying has decreasing returns to scale in non-poor individuals. That is, wealthier individuals derive fewer advantages from a bag of rice relative to poorer individuals (Kitschelt 2000). Anticipating this, brokers will not offer the same benefits to wealthy individuals, but will customize the type of offerings. This distinction is important, since most of the literature assumes that clientelist practices decrease when individual incomes rise. However, that approach does not explain the counterintuitive empirical regularity depicted in Figure 1; that is, non-poor individuals get targeted too. *Why are non-poor individuals targeted?* This article seeks to contribute to the literature by explaining that brokers make their offers more attractive to non-poor individuals by offering goods that are relatively more expensive. This is more likely when districts are wealthier.

While buying votes from non-poor individuals costs more, brokers in non-poor areas have more resources to spend. Along the same lines, Hicken (2007: 55) questioned the implicit assumption that the broker's vote buying funds remain fixed; stating that "a candidate's capacity to buy votes increases commensurate with increases in average incomes." In other words, higher levels of economic development not only raise personal incomes, but also shifts the broker's vote-buying capacities upwards. Similar evidence has been found in the Philippines (Schaffer 2004). The link between higher incomes and vote buying is particularly relevant for Brazil, since its electoral laws allows political parties to get *unlimited* funds (Abramo and Speck 2001: 14), enabling brokers greater capacities to buy more expensive votes.

Besides having more resources to spend, brokers in politically uncontested districts have fewer political constraints, facilitating the spending of expensive clientelism. In Q3 it is suggested that lower levels of political contestation allow brokers to spend on more expensive means of clientelism. Uncompetitive districts lack proper *de facto* mechanisms of checks and balances, giving local incumbents more "room to move," allowing them to divert local resources into more expensive means of targeting. I call this "embezzlement clientelism." Given these relatively more expensive costs, however, I expect this form of clientelism to be less frequent. In a dynamic similar to Q2, potential clients also support the broker's candidate, hoping to become actual beneficiaries. However – and unlike poor clients in Q2 – non-poor clients in Q3 (both actual and potential) have smaller discount factors. That is, non-poor individ-

als – given their relatively higher incomes – have more “patience.” This is especially important for brokers. In practice, potential clients’ timing constraints are more elastic, putting less pressure on brokers to deliver benefits in the short run.

Case Selection, Research Design, and Data Analyses

I. Data

This section empirically tests the theoretical proposition stated in Table 1 – that is, the combined effects of individual income, of being nested in poor/non-poor communities, and being exposed to different levels of political competition – on receiving clientelist benefits. Brazil is a good case because its poverty structure is such that it is possible to find low-income individuals nested in non-poor areas (and vice versa). This case is also interesting from an institutional perspective. The Brazilian electoral system incentivizes clientelism. Several factors such as multimember districts with open lists, and the institution of the *candidato nato*,⁸ “clearly [makes] Brazil one of the most personalistic systems of democratic governance” (Kitschelt and Altamirano 2015: 257), which might foster higher levels of clientelism. In fact, Gingerich (2014: 290) found that vote-buying drastically changed electoral results, concluding that “[v]ote brokerage can still pay electoral dividends in contemporary Brazil.”


To test this hypothesis, I use survey data from 2010 from The Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) (2010).⁹ Though the LAPOP survey provides a question for income, people who are somewhat better off than their neighbors but live in poor areas may not “feel” poor. If this is the case, it could confound the results. Additionally, when answering the questioner, individuals might not want to reveal their true incomes (either because they are too low or too high). Following the advice of Córdova (2008) and Córdova and Seligson (2009, 2010), a

8 “[R]ule that removed parties’ control over the nominations process and let an electoral legislator decide to run on any party ticket.” See Kitschelt and Altamirano (2015: 257).

9 “I thank the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) and its major supporters (the United States Agency for International Development, the United Nations Development Program, the Inter-American Development Bank, and Vanderbilt University) for making the data available.” The sample consists of five strata representing the five main geographical regions of Brazil. Each stratum was further sub-stratified by urban and rural areas.

relative wealth index (RWI) was constructed (see also Santos and Villatoro 2018). Using principal component analyses, the index measures wealth based on actual assets weighted by how common these assets are. Different indices were constructed for urban and rural contexts. Figure 1 plots the distribution of the index.

Figure 2. Distribution of the Density of the Poor



Note: Employing Brazilian census data from the IBGE (2010), the figure shows the percentage of individuals who live on less than half of the minimum wage in a given municipality. While individual income is measured using the relative wealth index (in Figure 1), the variable plotted here is used to measure economic development at the group level. Due to statistical reasons explained in this paper, the variable had to be dichotomized at its median (29 percent). However, in separate statistical analyses shown in Table A3 (weighted model), the variable is used without dichotomizing it, showing the same results.

II. Main Variables of Interest

To measure economic development at the group level, I constructed a variable that I call “the density of the poor” following a strategy similar to that of Weitz-Shapiro (2012). The variable, which is plotted in Figure 2, measures the degree of poverty at the municipal level. Using information from the 2010 Brazilian census,¹⁰ a semi-continuous variable was constructed to measure the percentage of individuals who live on less than half of the minimum wage in a given municipality. Given that the

¹⁰ Official data comes from the Bureau of Statistics of Brazil IBGE.

municipality of residence for each individual in the LAPOP survey is recorded, I was able to merge the census percentage with the LAPOP dataset. It is important to stress that the unit of analysis is the individual, and that this variable captures the economic context in which each individual lives. Just like other scholars in the past have tested the effect of being nested in rural areas,¹¹ this paper focuses on another class of contextual variable. Although the density of the poor group was originally a semi-continuous variable (that is, a percentage), it had to be dichotomized at the median (29 percent) to be able to construct a matched sample, which I justify and explain below. Figure 2 shows the continuous distribution dichotomized at the median (dotted line).

Finally, to measure political competition, I again follow Weitz-Shapiro (2012). Using official electoral data from the 2008 municipal elections,¹² I constructed a variable that measures the percentage of seats that are not controlled by the mayor's party in a given municipal council.

III. Matched Design

There is a built-in lack of relationship between “being poor” and “living in a poor municipality,” confirming that Brazil is in fact a good case to test this theory. Figure A1 in the Appendix shows that the unmatched/raw dataset already has embedded low levels of correlation between these two variables ($r = -0.44$).¹³

I was able to break this relationship down further using matching methods. Matching is a two-stage process. In the first stage, the analyst “preprocesses” the data, seeking to break any systematic relationship between, in this case, the density of the poor and the relative wealth index RWI (Ho et al. 2011). Matching does so by deleting observations for which similar observations cannot be found.¹⁴ The idea is to obtain a good covariate balance, as in Figure A3 (in the Appendix), to then estimate any appropriated statistical model.¹⁵ From a statistical standpoint,

11 See, for example, Brusco, Nazareno, and Stokes (2004) and Stokes (2005). Both studies used the log of population, which is a proxy for urban/rural.

12 Data from the Tribunal Superior Eleitoral.

13 The figure shows that, for both the matched and raw datasets, “being poor” and “living in a poor municipality” are not confounded, as it is possible to find poor individuals living in non-poor areas, and vice versa.

14 The final procedure matched 761 individuals living in the low-density poverty condition with 676 individuals living in the high-density poverty condition.

15 The idea is that the propensity of being exposed to the “high” density of the poor condition (or “propensity score”) has a similar distribution in both “treat-


preprocessed datasets are less model-dependent (Ho et al. 2007),¹⁶ and prevent analysts from making extreme counterfactuals.¹⁷ The preprocessed data used in the matching approach has 54 municipalities, while the raw data used in the generalized propensity score (GPS) approach (which I explain below) also has 54. Figure 3 lists the municipalities and shows which ones are considered “high” or “low” in terms of the density of the poor after the dichotomization process. The figure also shows that there is considerable variance in income/RWI in both high- and low-poverty density conditions (bubbles).¹⁸

One could argue that dichotomizing the density of the poor variable at the median is an arbitrary decision. While there have been theoretical advances regarding general treatment effects regimes for continuous or semi-continuous response doses (Imai and Dyk 2004; and Hirano and Imbens 2004), algorithms with the ability to match on continuous treatment variables are not common. In order to obtain covariate balance in a non-parametric way (as matching does) but without dichotomizing the density of the poor, I also use the original (that is, continuous) density of the poor variable to construct a generalized propensity score GPS (Imbens 2004; Guardabascio and Ventura 2014; and Imai and Ratkovic 2014).¹⁹ The score is used to weight each observation in the model.²⁰

ed” and “control” groups. It is important to note that, despite the language, I do not claim any causal relationship in this paper.

- 16 Table A2 and Table A1 in the Appendix provide summary statistics for both the matched and raw datasets. Tables were generated using the *stargazer* R package. See Hlavac (2015).
- 17 King and Zeng (2005). The matching routine used was the *full* matching routine (Hansen 2004; Rosenbaum 2010), via the *MatchIt* R package (Ho et al. 2011).
- 18 Figure A2 in the Appendix shows the frequency of individuals by municipality in both raw and matched datasets.
- 19 To generate the weighting vector, I used the *CBPS* R package (Fong et al. 2018).
- 20 Besides matching on and weighting by the RWI index, I also included the following variables to match on/weighting by: municipal opposition, municipal population and individual involvement in civic associations.

Figure 3. Distribution of Observations by Municipality, Wealth Index and Density of the Poor



Note: The figure shows the municipalities in the analyses (matched set). For every municipality, the figure shows (1) the number of inhabitants (Y-axis), and (2) whether the municipality is considered having a high or low density of the poor. High-density municipalities have more than half of their inhabitants living on less than half of the minimum wage. The figure also shows (3) individual wealth indexes (bubbles).

IV. Model Specification

The dependent variable is clientelism. To measure it, I use the question that asks if a candidate or someone from a political party offered the respondent something, like a favor, food, or any other benefit or thing in return for her/his vote or support. Subjects could answer that this had happened often, sometimes, or never. Carreras and Irepoğlu (2013) and Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015) used the same dataset and outcome variable. As they explained, the question did not ask whether respondents took the offer, hence it should not be an important source of social desirability bias (González-Ocantos et al. 2012). For statistical and substantive reasons, I dichotomized this variable, combining the alternatives often ($n = 91$) and sometimes ($n = 150$), leaving never ($n = 1,196$) unchanged.²¹

The following control variables were considered in the statistical analyses. Perception of corruption was included to hold constant the effect of respondents who declared clientelist activity when in reality they were referring to corruption scandals.²² Brokers usually target civic associations. Following Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015: 28), an additive index to measure civic participation (Political Involvement) was created.²³ Some studies have also found group size to be important (Stokes et al. 2013). A variable to measure population size at the municipal level was constructed using Brazilian census data.

Following the convention in statistical studies of clientelism, an urban/rural dummy was also included. Some have argued that parties target their own supporters (Dixit and Londregan 1996, and Cox and McCubbins 1986), moderate opposers (Stokes 2005), or unmobilized supporters (Nichter 2008). To keep these effects constant, a variable to capture party identification (Political Id.) was included. Higher levels of democratic support should be negatively associated with clientelism. To control for that, a variable measuring democratic support was included. González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson (2014) found that schooling plays a negative role on clientelism; hence, I control for education too.

21 These numbers come from the matched dataset.

22 I thank Cesar Zucco for this suggestion.

23 This variable was constructed by adding the frequency of attendance at religious meetings, community improvement meetings, and political party meetings (variables $\phi 6$, $\phi 8$ and $\phi 13$, respectively).

V. Functional Form

Observations are clustered on a number of important factors such as levels of municipal political competition, municipal poverty, and municipal population size. In order to account for these clustering effects, I use a “generalized estimating equations” approach. GEE were introduced by Liang and Zeger (1986) to fit clustered, repeated (that is, correlated), and panel data. This method is especially efficient when the data are binary (Hanley et al. 2003). GEE models are similar to random effects models (Gardiner, Luo, and Roman, 2009), in that they allow observations to be nested in hierarchical structures. This method requires analysts to parameterize the working correlation matrix. While Hedeker and Gibbons (2006: 139) stated that “the GEE is robust to misspecification of the correlation structure,”²⁴ Hardin and Hilbe (2013: 166) pointed out that “[i]f the observations are clustered (not collected over time), then [...] the exchangeable correlation structure” is the most appropriate working correlation matrix. Given that the data do not follow a panel but rather a clustered structure, the “exchangeable” correlation matrix was specified in all models.

While this method is very flexible, GEE estimates remain uninterpretable in practice (Carlin et al. 2001), making regression tables useless from a substantive standpoint. In this case, the problem is even more severe due to the interactive nature of the hypothesis being tested in this paper, which is a parameter for the multiplicative term between the variables wealth index, political competition, and density of the poor.²⁵ Methodologists agree about “not interpret[ing] the coefficients on the constitutive terms,” as they lack substantive meaning (Brambor, Clark, and Golder 2006: 77). These problems become more complex when it comes to generalized models, as a number of challenges arise.²⁶ Given that cross-partial derivatives are not advisable either, simulation methods

24 Carlin et al. (2001: 402) argued that “[r]elatively minor differences in estimates may arise depending on how the estimating equations are weighted, in particular within the generalized estimating equation (GEE) framework.” Westgate and Burchett (2017) and Gardiner, Luo, and Roman (2009, 227) made the same point.

25 Brambor, Clark, and Golder (2006: 74) offer the same advice.

26 As Ai and Norton (2003) explained, “(1) the interaction effect could be non-zero, even when the estimation says it is zero, (2) the statistical significance of the interaction effect cannot be tested with a simple t-test on the coefficient of the interaction term, (3) the interaction effect is conditional on the independent variables, [...] and (4) the interaction effect may have different signs for different values of covariates.”

are required (Zelner 2009). In particular, I follow the simulation approach introduced in King, Tomz, and Wittenberg (2000). This procedure samples via simulation from the point estimates, generating a new and larger distribution. In more detail, taking the single estimated parameters (that is, the regression coefficients), I constructed a distribution of estimated values for each coefficient. Relying on the central limit theorem, with enough sampling draws, the new simulated distribution is a transformation that approximates with a great degree of precision the (uninterpretable) coefficients. Subsequently, means and uncertainty measures can be constructed for each of these distributions. From a substantive standpoint, simulation methods also allow for the sampling of new distributions at different values of the independent variables. This will be important in simulating the expected value of clientelism for different “profiles,” such as non-poor individuals nested in high-poor dense municipalities in contexts of high political competition, among other profiles.

Since it is “impossible to evaluate conditional hypotheses using only the information provided in traditional results tables” (Brambor, Clark, and Golder 2006: 76), I have focused instead on the substantive results from the simulation methods. However, I still present the raw results in Table A3 in the Appendix.²⁷ Analogous to Table 1, in Figure 4 I simulate the predicted probabilities of being targeted using both the matched and weighted/GPS models. The horizontal panel depicts simulations for the “upper” (“non-poor,” 75 percent) and “lower” (“poor,” 25 percent) quartiles of the wealth index. In turn, the vertical panel shows the simulated values for the maximum (100 percent) and minimum (43 percent) values of the municipal opposition index. Each quadrant shows simulations for individuals nested in poor municipalities (high density of the poor), and non-poor municipalities (low density of the poor). Each profile shows two simulated probability distributions (with 95 percent confidence intervals): one for the matched sample, and one for the weighted/GPS model.²⁸ The idea is to show that the decision of dichotomizing the density of the poor variable at its median gives substantively

27 Table generated via the *texreg* R package. The first column shows the estimates for the matched dataset, while the second column shows the results for the GPS-weighted model. Virtually all coefficients have the same size and sign.

28 In the case of the weighted/GPS model, which does not use the dichotomized variable, I use the continuous version of the size of the poor variable, where “low density” represents the lower quartile while “high density” represents the upper quartile.

exact results than using the continuous version of that variable via the GPS analysis.

VI. Results

All quadrants in Figure 4, regardless of the approach used,²⁹ suggest that brokers engage in individual targeting when individuals are identifiable, and in group targeting when brokers need to rely on the spillover effects of clientelism.

In Q1, clientelism is more likely (with a 26 percent probability) in situations where non-poor individuals are nested in poor groups (i.e. where the density of the poor is “high”)³⁰ and living in electorally contested municipalities. As I have argued, these types of individuals are still targeted because they are more identifiable. For instance, a similar individual (same quadrant) who is nested in a non-poor group (“low” density of the poor), and consequently harder to identify, has a much lower probability of being targeted (7 percent). Similarly, individuals in Q4, such as poor individuals nested in non-poor areas (“low” density of the poor), and living in lowly contested municipalities, are more likely to be targeted (13 percent) relative to harder-to-identify individuals who live in poor areas (11 percent). In Q1, higher levels of electoral competition put heavier pressure on brokers to mobilize more expensive ways of clientelism. These pressures decay when incumbents face lower levels of electoral contestation (Q4).


Figure 4 shows in Q2 that clientelism is more likely (25 percent) in situations where poor individuals are nested in poor groups (“high” density of the poor). As I have argued here, brokers will have incentives to engage in group targeting, taking advantage of the spillover effects of clientelism, leveraging the electoral support of potential clients by mobilizing actual clients. This is especially the case when the incumbent is seriously contested. Individuals that are similar (same quadrant), but nested in a non-poor group (“low” density of the poor), have a much lower probability of being targeted (12 percent). Individuals in Q3, who are non-poor individuals nested in non-poor areas (“low” density of the poor), and those living in lowly contested municipalities, are more likely to be targeted (24 percent) than similar individuals nested in non-poor areas (5 percent). Areas with higher levels of economic development also allow brokers to have more resources to distribute in what it was called

29 Although there are statistical differences, the differences across datasets are proportional.

30 Matched sample.

“embezzlement clientelism.” Lowly contested municipalities give brokers and political incumbents more room to allocate and distribute more expensive goods. However, and as theoretically expected, given that the net costs of this form of clientelism are higher, this is the least likely form of clientelism (reflected in the lower probabilities).

Figure 4. Simulated Expected Values of Clientelism



Note: After fitting the models shown in Table A3, this figure shows the predicted probabilities of being targeted under different scenarios, with 95 percent confidence intervals. Substantively, the figure emulates the theoretical predictions shown in Table 1. Clientelism is higher when non-poor individuals are nested in poor groups (“high” density of the poor) in highly contested municipalities (Q1), when non-poor individuals are nested in non-poor groups (“low” density of the poor) in scarcely contested municipalities (Q3), when poor individuals are nested in poor areas in highly contested municipalities (Q2), and when poor individuals are nested in non-poor areas in scarcely contested municipalities (Q4). For every quadrant, estimates from both the matched and weighted datasets are shown. The idea is to show that the decision to dichotomize the density of the poor variable at its median (as shown in Figure 2) gives substantively exact results than using the continuous version of that variable via the GPS analysis.

Discussion

This paper has argued that when poor individuals live in poor areas, brokers engage in group targeting relying on the spillover effects of clientelism. This strategy mobilizes targeted and untargeted clients by disseminating the broker's reputation of delivering benefits among potential beneficiaries. In a similar way, non-poor individuals clustered in non-poor areas are also targeted. In these cases, higher levels of economic development not only raise personal incomes, but also shift the broker's vote-buying capacities upwards. Lower levels of political contestation allow these more expensive forms of clientelism. However, in heterogeneous areas, brokers adapt their strategies and execute clientelism in a different way, relying on how identifiable individuals are. Identifiability raises the cost of defection by making their households more memorable, making receivers more likely to cooperate.

Incentives to offer or take clientelist offerings are not guided solely by structural or individual factors. This paper has suggested that both are necessary to understand clientelism better. Clearly, pressures to partake in clientelism, an expensive and uncertain strategy, rise as political competition raises (from 18 percent to 25 percent).³¹ However, the outcomes of this strategy differ largely depending on whether brokers face homogeneous or heterogeneous groups of individuals. Each one provides a different cost/benefit structure for both clients and brokers. Finally, I hope that the literature considers that groups and individuals provide different incentives to both brokers and clients, and hence, this distinction should be incorporated to better understand clientelism.

References

- Abramo, Claudio, and Bruno Speck (2001), *Report on Brazil*, paper presented to the Global Forum II on Fighting Corruption.
- Ai, Chunrong, and Edward Norton (2003), Interaction Terms in Logit and Probit Models, in: *Economics Letters*, 80, 1, 123–129.
- Auyero, Javier (2000), The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account, in: *Latin American Research Review*, 35, 3, 55–81.
- Bratton, Michael (2008), Vote Buying and Violence in Nigerian Election Campaigns, in: *Electoral Studies*, 27, 4, 621–632.
- Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan Stokes (2004), Vote Buying in Argentina, in: *Latin American Research Review*, 39, 2, 66–88.

31 Grand mean considering the most likely scenarios only.

- Calvo, Ernesto, and María Victoria Murillo (2013), When Parties Meet Voters: Assessing Political Linkages Through Partisan Networks and Distributive Expectations in Argentina and Chile, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 46, 7, 851–882.
- Calvo, Ernesto, and María Victoria Murillo (2004), Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 48, 4, 742–757.
- Carlin, John, Rory Wolfe, C. Hendricks Brown, and Andrew Gelman (2001), A Case Study on the Choice, Interpretation and Checking of Multilevel Models for Longitudinal Binary Outcomes, in: *Biostatistics*, 2, 4, 397–416.
- Carlin, Ryan, and Mason Moseley (2015), Good Democrats, Bad Targets: Democratic Values and Clientelistic Vote Buying, in: *The Journal of Politics*, 77, 1, 14–26.
- Carreras, Miguel, and Néstor Castaneda-Angarita (2014), Who Votes in Latin America? A Test of Three Theoretical Perspectives, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 47, 8, 1079–1104.
- Carreras, Miguel, and Yasemin Irepoglu (2013), Trust in Elections, Vote Buying, and Turnout in Latin America, in: *Electoral Studies*, 32, 4, 609–619.
- Córdova, Abby (2008), Methodological Note: Measuring Relative Wealth Using Household Asset Indicators, in: *AmericasBarometer Insights*, 6, 1–9.
- Córdova, Abby, and Mitchell Seligson (2010), Economic Shocks and Democratic Vulnerabilities in Latin America and the Caribbean, in: *Latin American Politics and Society*, 52, 02, 1–35.
- Córdova, Abby, and Mitchell Seligson (2009), Economic Crisis and Democracy in Latin America, in: *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42, 04, 673–678.
- Cox, Gary, and Mathew McCubbins (1986), Electoral Politics and Redistributive Game, in: *The Journal of Politics*, 48, 2, 370–389.
- Dixit, Avinash, and John Londregan (1996), The Determinants of Success of Special Interests in Redistributive Politics, in: *The Journal of Politics*, 58, 4, 1132–1155.
- Fong, Christian, Marc Ratkovic, Kosuke Imai, and Xiaolin Yang (2018), *CBPS: Covariate Balancing Propensity Score (CBPS) Estimation*, R Package version 2.15.0.
- Gardiner, Joseph, Zhehui Luo, and Lee Anne Roman (2009), Fixed Effects, Random Effects and GEE: What Are the Differences?, in: *Statistics in Medicine*, 28, 2, 221–239.

- Gay, Robert (1998), Rethinking Clientelism: Demands, Discourses and Practices in Contemporary Brazil, in: *Luso-Brazilian Review*, 36, December, 7–24.
- Gay, Robert (1993), *Popular Organization and Democracy in Rio De Janeiro: A Tale of Two Favelas*, Temple University Press.
- Gingerich, Daniel (2014), Brokered Politics in Brazil: An Empirical Analysis, in: *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 9, 3, 269–300.
- Gingerich, Daniel, and Luis Fernando Medina (2013), The Endurance and Eclipse of the Controlled Vote: A Formal Model of Vote Brokerage Under the Secret Ballot, in: *Economics & Politics*, 25, 3, 453–480.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David Nickerson (2014), The Conditionality of Vote-Buying Norms: Experimental Evidence from Latin America, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 58, 1, 197–211.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad de Jonge, Carlos Meléndez, Javier Osorio, and David Nickerson (2012), Vote Buying and Social Desirability Bias: Experimental Evidence from Nicaragua, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 56, 1, 202–217.
- Guardabascio, Barbara, and Marco Ventura (2014), Estimating the Dose-Response Function through a Generalized Linear Model Approach, in: *The Stata Journal*, 14, 1, 141–158.
- Hanley, James, Abdissa Negassa, Michael Edwardes, and Janet Forrester (2003), Statistical Analysis of Correlated Data Using Generalized Estimating Equations: An Orientation, in: *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 157, 4, 364–375.
- Hansen, Ben (2004), Full Matching in an Observational Study of Coaching for the SAT, in: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99, 467, 609–618.
- Hardin, James, and Joseph Hilbe (2013²), *Generalized Estimating Equations*, Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Hedeker, Donald, and Robert Gibbons (2006), *Longitudinal Data Analysis*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hicken, Allen (2007), How Do Rules and Institutions Encourage Vote Buying? (Chapter 4), in: Frederic Schaffer (ed.), *Elections for Sale: The Causes and Consequences of Vote Buying*, Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Pub., 47–60.
- Hirano, Keisuke, and Guido Imbens (2004), The Propensity Score with Continuous Treatments, in: Andrew Gelman and Xiao-Li Meng

- (eds), *Applied Bayesian Modeling and Causal Inference from Incomplete-Data Perspectives*, Wiley, 73–84.
- Hlavac, Marek (2015), *stargazer: Well-Formatted Regression and Summary Statistics Tables*, R package version 5.2.
- Ho, Daniel, Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Elizabeth Stuart (2011), MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing for Parametric Causal Inference, in: *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42, 8, 1–28.
- Ho, Daniel, Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Elizabeth Stuart (2007), Matching as Nonparametric Preprocessing for Reducing Model Dependence in Parametric Causal Inference, in: *Political Analysis*, 15, 3, 199–236.
- Holland, A. C., and Brian Palmer-Rubin (2015), Beyond the Machine: Clientelist Brokers and Interest Organizations in Latin America, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 48, 9, 1186–1223.
- Imai, Kosuke, and David van Dyk (2004), Causal Inference With General Treatment Regimes: Generalizing the Propensity Score, in: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99, 467, 854–866.
- Imai, Kosuke, and Marc Ratkovic (2014), Covariate Balancing Propensity Score, in: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 76, 1, 243–263.
- Imbens, Guido (2004), Nonparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects under Exogeneity: A Review, in: *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86, 1, 4–29.
- Khemani, Stuti (2015), Buying Votes Versus Supplying Public Services: Political Incentives to Under-Invest in Pro-Poor Policies, in: *Journal of Development Economics*, 117, 84–93.
- King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg (2000), Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 44, 2, 341–355.
- King, Gary, and Langche Zeng (2005), The Dangers of Extreme Counterfactuals, in: *Political Analysis*, 14, 131–159.
- Kitschelt, Herbert (2000), Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 33, 6-7, 845–879.
- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Melina Altamirano (2015), Clientelism in Latin America Effort and Effectiveness, in: Ryan Carlin and Matthew Singer (eds), *The Latin American Voter: Pursuing Representation and Accountability in Challenging Contexts*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 10.
- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Steven Wilkinson (eds) (2006), *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Liang, Kung-Yee, and Scott Zeger (1986), Longitudinal Data Analysis Using Generalized Linear Models, in: *Biometrika*, 73, 1, 13–22.
- Luna, Juan Pablo, Pilar Giannini, Héctor Bahamonde, Rodolfo López, Martín Ordóñez, and Gonzalo Recart (2011), El Secreto de mi Éxito: Parte II. Los Caminos a Vaparaíso en 2009, in: *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 31, 2, 285–310.
- Magaloni, Beatriz (2008), *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and its Demise in Mexico*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nazareno, Marcelo, Valeria Brusco, and Susan Stokes (2008), *Why Do Clientelist Parties Target the Poor?*, online: <http://paperroom.ipspa.org/papers/paper_2443.pdf> (11 July 2018).
- Nichter, Simeon (2014), Conceptualizing Vote Buying, in: *Electoral Studies*, 35, 315–327.
- Nichter, Simeon (2008), Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot, in: *American Political Science Review*, 102, 01, 19–31.
- Rosenbaum, Paul (2010²), *Design of Observational Studies*, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer.
- Rueda, Miguel (2015), Buying Votes with Imperfect Local Knowledge and a Secret Ballot, in: *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 27, 3, 428–456.
- Rueda, Miguel (2017), Small Aggregates, Big Manipulation: Vote Buying Enforcement and Collective Monitoring, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 61, 1, 163–177.
- Santos, Maria Emma, and Pablo Villatoro (2018), A Multidimensional Poverty Index for Latin America, in: *Review of Income and Wealth*, 64, 1, 52–82.
- Schaffer, Joby, and Andy Baker (2015), Clientelism as Persuasion-Buying, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 48, 9, 1093–1126.
- Schaffer, Frederic (2004), *Vote Buying in East Asia*, Unpublished Manuscript.
- Scott, James (1972), Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia, in: *The American Political Science Review*, 66, 1, 91–113.
- Speck, Bruno, and Claudio Abramo (2001), Transparency Brasil/IBOPE Survey - Summary Report, in: *Transparency Brasil*, 1–6.
- Stokes, Susan (2005), Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina, in: *American Political Science Review*, 99, 3, 315–325.
- Stokes, Susan, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco (2013), *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Szwarcberg, Mariela (2013), The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism. Lessons from the Argentine Case, in: *Latin American Research Review*, 48, 2, 32–54.
- The Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) (2010), *The AmericasBarometer*.
- Vicente, Pedro (2014), Is Vote Buying Effective? Evidence from a Field Experiment in West Africa, in: *The Economic Journal*, 124, 574, F356–F387.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca (2014), *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina: Politics, Poverty, and Social Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca (2012), What Wins Votes: Why Some Politicians Opt Out of Clientelism, in: *American Journal of Political Science*, 56, 3, 568–583.
- Westgate, Philip, and Woodrow Burchett (2017), A Comparison of Correlation Structure Selection Penalties for Generalized Estimating Equations, in: *The American Statistician*, 71, 4, 344–353.
- Zarazaga, Rodrigo (2016), Party Machines and Voter-Customized Rewards Strategies, in: *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 28, 4, 678–701.
- Zarazaga, Rodrigo (2014), Brokers Beyond Clientelism: A New Perspective Through the Argentine Case, in: *Latin American Politics and Society*, 56, 03, 23–45.
- Zelner, Bennet (2009), Research Notes and Commentaries: Using Simulation to Interpret Results from Logit, Probit, and other Nonlinear Models, in: *Strategic Management Journal*, 30, 12, 1335–1348.

Appendix

Table A1. Summary Statistics: Raw Sample

	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
Clientelism	1,483	0.171	0.376	0	0	0	1
Wealth Index	1,483	-1.543	0.846	-3.05	-2.261	-0.843	0.899
Municipal Opposition	1,483	81.761	11.821	43	75	89	100
Density of the Poor	1,483	2.435	1.12	1	1	3	4
Municipal Population	1,483	5.393	2.841	1	3	8	10
Urban	1,483	0.86	0.347	0	1	1	1
Political Involvement Index	1,483	1.792	1.619	0	0	3	9
Support for Democracy	1,483	5.426	1.682	1	4	7	7
Party Id.	1,483	5.939	1.15	1	6	6	12
Perception of Corruption	1,483	2.027	1.003	0	1	3	3
Years of Education	1,483	9.398	3.857	1	6	12	18

Table A2. Summary Statistics: Matched Sample

	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
Clientelism	1,437	0.168	0.374	0	0	0	1
Wealth Index	1,437	-1.557	0.811	-3.05	-2.261	-0.866	0.899
Municipal Opposition	1,437	81.912	11.749	43	75	89	100
High Density of the Poor	1,437	0.47	0.499	0	0	1	1
Municipal Population	1,437	5.384	2.792	1	3	8	10
Urban	1,437	0.86	0.347	0	1	1	1
Political Involvement Index	1,437	1.784	1.613	0	0	3	9
Support for Democracy	1,437	5.417	1.684	1	4	7	7
Party Id.	1,437	5.934	1.16	1	6	6	12
Perception of Corruption	1,437	2.029	1	0	1	3	3
Years of Education	1,437	9.359	3.843	1	6	12	18

Table A3. Generalized Estimating Logistic Equations: Clientelism

	Matched	Weighted
(Intercept)	1.404 (1.968)	2.958 (2.691)
Wealth Index	1.374 (0.990)	1.320 (1.209)
Municipal Opposition	-0.040 (0.025)	-0.061 (0.032)
High Poor Density	-6.550** (2.399)	
Municipal Population	-0.115* (0.048)	-0.101 (0.053)
Urban	-0.091 (0.401)	-0.077 (0.416)
Political Involvement	0.046 (0.055)	0.047 (0.055)
Support for Democracy	-0.056 (0.046)	-0.051 (0.048)
Party Id.	-0.082 (0.053)	-0.087 (0.052)
Perception of Corruption	0.240** (0.088)	0.267** (0.089)
Years of Education	0.051* (0.021)	0.054** (0.020)
Wealth Index * Municipal Opposition	-0.018 (0.013)	-0.013 (0.015)
Wealth Index * High Poor Density	-2.509 (1.319)	
Municipal Opposition * High Poor Density	0.085** (0.030)	
Wealth Index * Municipal Opposition * High Poor Density	0.029 (0.016)	
Density of the Poor		-1.992* (0.921)
Wealth Index * Density of the Poor		-0.555 (0.372)
Municipal Opposition * Density of the Poor		0.024* (0.011)
Wealth Index * Municipal Opposition * Density of the Poor		0.005 (0.004)
Num. obs.	1,437	1,483
Num. clust.	54	54

Note: *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05. Clustered standard errors at the municipality level. First column shows the estimates using the matched dataset. Second column shows the estimates of the weighted model (the generalized propensity score was omitted in the table). Both models are logit GEE.

Figure A1. Distribution of Pre- and Post-Matching Observations by Wealth Index and Density of the Poor



Figure A2. Frequency of Individuals by Municipality, Pre- and Post-Matching Deletion




Figure A3. Pre- and Post-Matching Balance: Distribution of Propensity Scores





Figure A4. Simulated Expected Probability of Being Targeted: Political Involvement and Population Size



Note: Using the estimations in Table A3, the figure shows the probability of being targeted at different values of political involvement (**a**) and population size at the municipal level (**b**). The figure suggests that being nested in high-poor density areas contributes substantially more to explaining clientelism.

Figure A4 shows a plot divided in two panels. Panel **a** shows the simulated expected probabilities (with 95 percent confidence intervals) of being targeted at different levels of political involvement. As the blue lines suggests, individuals who participate in civic associations have higher probabilities of being targeted. This is in line with findings in previous research (Schaffer and Baker 2015; Carreras and Castaneda-Angarita 2014: 7; Calvo and Murillo 2013; Holland and Palmer-Rubin 2015: 16; and Rueda 2015). However, once I decompose these effects, being nested in high-poor density areas contributes substantially more to the model. These differences are statistically significant. Panel **b** shows the probability (with 95 percent confidence intervals) of being targeted at different increments of the size of the population. In line with the literature, I also see that this relationship is negative (Stokes 2005: 323; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2006: 10; Magaloni 2008: 67; Rueda 2017; Bratton 2008; and Gingerich and Medina 2013: 456). However, the effect of being nested in high-poor density municipalities outperforms the effect of population size, suggesting spillover effects.

Apuntando Justo a Ti/Ustedes: Blancos Clientelares Grupales e Individuales en Brasil

Resumen: ¿Los partidos apuntan a grupos o individuos? Aunque esta pregunta es fundamental para entender el clientelismo, la literatura no ofrece una respuesta clara. Este trabajo argumenta que, dependiendo de ciertas condiciones, los compradores de votos apuntan a individuos cuando pueden identificar a sus blancos, y a grupos cuando necesitan utilizar los efectos indirectos que provee la lógica del clientelismo. Tanto la identificación individual como los efectos indirectos del clientelismo grupal, dependen de los niveles de pobreza individual, pobreza grupal, y los niveles de competencia partidista. Aunque la teoría de este trabajo se concentra en los blancos clientelares (grupales e individuales), también argumenta que factores estructurales, como la densidad de pobreza, deberían ser considerados en la literatura acerca de la venta de votos. Estos factores estructurales son de los pocos observables sobre los cuales los compradores de votos basan su decisión acerca de si invertir en clientelismo o no. Usando datos de opinión pública y censos de Brasil, el trabajo examina las variaciones en rentas individuales dentro de diferentes contextos de pobreza a nivel municipal. Los resultados sugieren que los partidos políticos emplean estrategias segmentadas o ad-hoc, apuntando a individuos cuando son altamente identificables, y a grupos cuando se presentan situaciones de economías de escala. Además, individuos que no están en situación de pobreza también pueden recibir ofertas clientelares.

Palabras clave: Brasil, clientelismo, venta de votos



Still for sale: the micro-dynamics of vote selling in the United States, evidence from a list experiment

Héctor Bahamonde¹

© Springer Nature Limited 2020

Abstract

In nineteenth-century United States politics, vote buying was commonplace. Nowadays, vote buying seems to have declined. The quantitative empirical literature emphasizes vote buying, ignoring the micro-dynamics of vote selling. We seem to know that vote buyers can no longer afford this strategy; however, we do not know what American voters would do if offered the chance to sell their vote. Would they sell, and at what price, or would they consistently opt out of vote selling? A novel experimental dataset representative at the national level comprises 1479 US voters who participated in an online list experiment in 2016, and the results are striking: Approximately 25% would sell their vote for a minimum payment of \$418. Democrats and Liberals are more likely to sell, while education or income levels do not seem to impact the likelihood of vote selling.

Keywords Vote buying · Vote selling · Clientelism · List experiments · United States

Vote sellers and vote buyers

Prior research on clientelism usually focuses on whether parties have attempted to buy votes (Vicente and Wantchekon 2009; Vicente 2014; Rueda 2015, 2017; Reynolds 1980; Nichter 2014; de Jonge 2015; Finan and Schechter 2012; González-Ocantos et al. 2014; Diaz-Cayeros et al. 2012; Brusco et al. 2004). Unfortunately, while this is an important question, it overlooks the conditions under which citizens would sell their vote. In fact, Nichter and Peress (2017) explain that studies continue to view clientelism typically as a top-down process, generally overlooking citizens'

✉ Héctor Bahamonde
hector.bahamonde@uoh.cl
<https://www.HectorBahamonde.com>

¹ Instituto de Ciencias Sociales, O'Higgins University, Rancagua, Chile






Fig. 1 Frequency of clientelism in the United States (2010). Note figure shows the frequency of survey respondents, $N = 755$. Source: LAPOP, 2010 wave for the United States. Question is clien1: “In recent years and thinking about election campaigns, has a candidate or someone from a political party offered you something, like a favor, food, or any other benefit or object in return for your vote or support? Has this happened often, sometimes, or never?”

demands. Since several questions pertaining to vote sellers remain unanswered, a bottom-up reconceptualization is necessary. For instance: *What would voters do if offered the chance to sell their vote? Would they sell it? And at what price?*¹

To illustrate the issue at hand, Fig. 1 shows responses of US citizens asked whether a candidate or a member of a political party has offered something in exchange for their vote, completely ignoring voters’ preferences. The figure begs the question of whether survey respondents who answered “never” *would* still be willing to sell their votes.

It seems that whether studies focus on vote buying or vote selling depends partly on methodological rather than theoretical decisions.² On the one hand, historical and/or ethnographically based contributions describe clientelist transactions from the point of view of voters, focusing on the conditions that make vote selling most likely (Posada-Carbó 1996; Sabato 2001; Auyero 2000; Szwarcberg 2013; Borges 2019). On the other hand, statistical, survey, and/or experimentally based work mostly explores issues related to vote buying. For example, using a field experiment in Benin, Wantchekon (2003) stresses the role of incumbency on vote buying. Jensen and Justesen (2014, p. 227) focus on the impact of “poverty on vote buying,” while Khemani (2015, p. 84) shows that “vote buying in poor democracies is associated with lower [public] investments.” Hence, and except for several important quantitative studies (Corstange 2012; Imai et al. 2015; Nicther and Peress 2017; Hicken et al. 2015, 2018; Michael and Thachil 2018), the emphasis of statistical studies remains on studying vote buying. Importantly, other statistically based studies have explored attitudes toward vote buying (Bratton 2008; Weitz-Shapiro 2012).

¹ It is important to note that clientelism as a practice involves more than just buying or selling votes. Other goods might be involved in the clientelist transaction—for instance, public jobs or public infrastructure, e.g., see for example Dixit and Londregan (1996), Calvo and Murillo (2004), and Khemani (2015). However, this paper’s focus is on just vote buying and vote selling.

² I thank one of the anonymous reviewers for this comment.



They suggest that a strong stigma is attached to vote buying, which might make voters unwilling to sell their vote. For instance, González-Ocantos et al. (2014, p. 208) designed a list experiment to study attitudes toward vote buying in Latin America. They conclude that most respondents find vote buying “unacceptable when provided with a hypothetical example.”

While the quantitative literature has advanced several important avenues of research, it has overlooked many important questions. The wording of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) question illustrates part of the issue. By focusing on vote buying, it gives the falsely optimistic impression that US voters systematically “oppose” vote buying, “thus” rarely engaging in clientelism (as Fig. 1 strongly suggests). Furthermore, most quantitative studies were conducted primarily 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.

This paper makes both methodological and substantive contributions to the literature by leveraging a list experiment on hypothetical vote selling in a consolidated democracy. We believe that studying hypothetical behaviors—such as the willingness to sell—is a valuable exercise. Geddes (1990, p. 131) explains the well-known selection issues of studying “only cases that have achieved the outcome of interest.” Hence, if we are interested in understanding the micro-dynamics of clientelism—particularly as a supply-and-demand issue—we should incorporate the preferences of both sellers and buyers, potential and/or actual. Since the focus of this paper is on the willingness to sell, we believe that we can also learn from *unrealized* clientelist transactions. Following the lead of González-Ocantos et al. (2014), this paper presents experimental evidence of hypothetical vote selling in the United States.

In 2016, a novel dataset representative at the national level was collected. A total of 1479 US voters participated in a list experiment between March 2 and March 6. This experiment made possible both the identification of the demographic factors that would make US voters more likely to sell their vote, and at what price, and the investigation of whether they would systematically lie about selling their vote. The results are striking. The data suggest that a sizable portion of US voters are willing to sell their vote (approximately 25%), would sell it for at least \$418, and would systematically lie about it (approximately 8%). Given that these data are representative at the national level (i.e., this is not a convenient sample), these findings are surprising. Democrats and Liberals are systematically more likely to sell than Republicans. Education and income levels do not seem to have a systematic impact on the willingness to sell.

While this paper essentially describes the phenomenon, it leaves for future research further consideration of the causes of hypothetical vote selling in the United States. Ultimately, this paper attempts to bring voters back into the quantitative study of clientelism, particularly by studying their willingness to sell.



The United States as a case

At first, many advanced democracies were clientelist political systems. For instance, Stokes et al. (2013, p. 200) explain that in the nineteenth-century United States, “vote buying was commonplace” and “the major urban political institution in the late nineteenth century” (Erie 1990, p. 2). In Chicago, New York City, Newark, and other large American cities, votes were exchanged for “cash, food, alcohol, health care, poverty relief, and myriad other benefits” (Stokes et al. 2013, p. 200). The street price of the right to vote freely was low. Bensel explains that “[voters] handed in a party ticket in return for a shot of whiskey, a pair of boots, or a small amount of money” (Stokes et al. 2013, p. 227). In general, students of American political development have analyzed vote buying in detail, confirming both its early development and its generalized practice (Bensel 2004; Campbell 2005).³

However, vote buying currently seems to have declined considerably, for two competing reasons. Stokes et al. (2013, p. 201) show that industrialization drove up the electorate’s median income, making vote buying more expensive for party machines. However, Kitschelt and Wilkinson (2006, p. 320) disregard the industrialization hypothesis, focusing on the lower levels of “[s]tate involvement in the public sector.”

Regardless, clientelist linkages are now rare. Figure 1 suggests that 93.6% of US respondents have never received a clientelist offer from a political party. While only a very small percentage (4.8%) report receiving such an offer from a political party, we do not know whether survey respondents *would* sell their votes. This paper presents systematic evidence that they would. Consequently, the counterintuitive results presented in this paper make our descriptive efforts worth pursuing. Representing the United States as a “crucial case,” both the narrative and the findings follow a “least-likely” design approach. 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.” The vote-buying literature mostly considers developing countries and describes vote sellers as poor (Weitz-Shapiro 2014, p. 12), uneducated (González-Ocantos et al. 2014), and undemocratic (Carlin and Moseley 2015). Thus, previous literature implies that the willingness to sell votes in the United States should be low, making it a difficult case study on vote selling.

The evidence that this paper presents may be associated with a probable erosion of American democracy.⁴ In a highly controversial pair of articles, 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). These findings raise many (unanswered) questions regarding the actual value that American electoral institutions hold for citizens, possibly undermining the legitimacy of

³ For the British case during the Victorian era see Kam (2017).

⁴ Relatedly, see Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018).



the integrity of voting. Is voting unimportant enough to lead US citizens to sell their votes if offered the possibility?

The next section gives a historical account of vote buying and vote selling in the United States. The section also attempts to situate both within a historical context. It particularly shows how vote buying and vote selling transitioned from their status as an important institution in American elections to a scarcely practiced electoral method. The following section explains the experimental design. Immediately thereafter, the paper presents the statistical analyses of the experimental data. The last section offers some working hypotheses and possible lines for future research.

Vote selling and patronage in the United States: a brief historical account

While all US states made bribery of voters illegal early in US history, these laws were purposely ignored. Well before the Gilded Age (1877–1896), several norms aimed to prohibit bribery, clientelism, and patronage. For instance, as early as 1725, the New Jersey legislature had already outlawed many electoral malpractices (Bensel 2004, p. 59). However, these restrictions were systematically bypassed. To circumvent property qualifications, for instance, office-seekers (and their supporters) commonly bought “freeholds for landless men in return for their vote” (Campbell 2005, p. 6), a practice known as “fagot voting.” Since it was a coercive bribe, after “the election, the land was simply returned to the original owner” (p. 6).

Weak institutions, poor bureaucracies, and bad-quality record-keeping helped to foster electoral malpractice.⁵ First, most states did not have actual registration laws, making voter eligibility difficult to determine (Argersinger 1985, p. 672). Historians frequently report that judges at polling places had a hard time determining not only the age of the potential voter,⁶ but also whether the prospective voter was a US citizen, especially in cases that involved newly naturalized immigrants with strong foreign accents (Bensel 2004, p. 20). Consequently, it was often up to the judge’s discretion whether to let prospective voters cast a ballot. Since judges were party appointees (Argersinger 1985, p. 672), their discretionary powers were systematically used to shape electoral outcomes.

Low literacy levels also helped to sustain vote selling in the United States. For example, in Kentucky and Missouri, the law required voters to verbally announce their choices at the polling places, instead of using party tickets (Bensel 2004, p. 54). Of course, the *viva voce* method was convenient for party workers who usually swarmed around the polling places. However, the ticket system eventually supplanted this method.

⁵ The U.S. Bureau of the Census did not exist. Consequently, it was relatively easy to invent names, “repeat,” or use any other subterfuge to “stuff the ballot box.” In fact, “a St. Louis politician admitted registry fraud but argued that there was no proof that the names he copied into the registry were of real people and, therefore, no crime had been committed” (Argersinger 1985, p. 680).

⁶ Judges used as a rough proxy whether the prospective voter had the ability to grow a beard (Bensel 2004, p. 20).



The “party strip” or “unofficial” ballot system also permitted all sorts of fraudulent election practices. The parties themselves produced party tickets. Since tickets varied by size and color, it made “the voter’s choice of party a public act and rendered voters susceptible to various forms of intimidation and influence while facilitating vote buying” (Argersinger 1985, p. 672). Similarly, Rusk (1970, p. 1221) explains that distinctive ticket colors and shapes “assured instant recognition of the ballot by the voters [and] party workers.” Reynolds and McCormick (1986, p. 836) present similar evidence. Consequently, party workers hired to monitor the voting window (Argersinger 1985, p. 672) had ample opportunity to punish or reward voters accordingly.

The ticket system required very strong party machines, which, in turn, required considerable economic resources to make the system work. However, political machines were oiled not only with money. On the one hand, many “ticket peddlers” (Argersinger 1985, p. 672) were volunteers (Bensel 2004, p. 17), saving some of the costs needed to maintain the machine. Most of these volunteers “enjoyed the patronage of elected party officials by holding government jobs, drawing public pensions, servicing government contracts, or enjoying special licensing privileges” (Bensel 2004, p. 17). On the other hand, political appointees “from janitor to secretary of state” and some corporations donated annually part of their salaries and revenues (Reynolds 1980, p. 197). Thus, parties amassed huge amounts of money.

With all these resources flooding the polls on election day, voting was truly an interesting spectacle. On that day, party agents would offer voters plenty of liquor as an incentive to vote the party ticket. Hence, “the street or square outside the voting window frequently became a kind of alcoholic festival in which many men were clearly and spectacularly drunk [to the point that] some could not remember whether or not they had voted” (Bensel 2004, p. 20). Even before the Gilded Age, American elections were engineered according to these “principles.” When running for the Virginia House, a young George Washington “spent nearly 40 pounds—a considerable sum for the day—on gallons of rum, wine, brandy, and beer; all used to win over the votes of his neighbors” (Campbell 2005, p. 5).⁷

The Australian ballot system significantly reduced the frequency of most of this malpractice (Rusk 1970, p. 1221). However, as vote selling and vote buying were so embedded in what was considered normal, the immediate effect of the Australian system was to reduce turnout (Reynolds and McCormick 1986, p. 851).

Today, the modus operandi of clientelism has changed, and both the frequency of vote buying/selling and the importance of party machines have declined. Scholars have pointed out that “party machines are a thing of the past” (Stokes et al. 2013, p. 230). However, some contemporary accounts remain of vote buying and selling in American elections. For instance, Campbell (2005, pp. 243–244) explains how a Democratic leader in Logan County, West Virginia, accepted \$35,000 in cash to support Senator Kennedy. As the Democratic leader explained, “this money was for one purpose: ‘We bought votes with it [...] that’s the way real politics works.’ ” Other examples are the famous primary election in March 1972 in Chicago (p. 262)

⁷ \$1250 in 2017 US dollars. Conversion based on Williamson (2018).



and the elections in the coal-rich Appalachian Mountains during the 1980s (p. 275). Similarly, nonacademic sources find that during the 2010 elections, “selling votes [was a] common type of election fraud” (Fahrenthold 2012). Others find that “[v]ote-buying is extremely common in *developed* [...] countries” (Leight et al. 2016, p. 1). If vote buying is “a thing of the past,” why do we still see it? How common is vote selling? The next two sections attempt to quantify—in an unbiased way—the willingness to sell votes among a representative sample of US voters.

Experimental design

The study of individual preferences depends on truthful answers. However, under certain circumstances, individuals might not want to answer truthfully, due to social pressure. For instance, to avoid having the interviewer judge them, individuals might not want to reveal having done something illegal, such as selling one’s vote. Failing to consider this systematic source of bias will pose threats to causal inference.

Since list experiments administer two lists of items (one to the control group, one to the treated group), list experiments are well suited to eliciting truthful answers (Blair 2015). Both lists look identical (e.g., each containing the same three items); however, the treatment list traditionally includes a fourth item, the sensitive item related to some socially condemned behavior. Respondents are asked how many items on the list they would endorse, not which ones. For instance, if an experimental subject answers “2,” the interviewer will not know whether that number includes the sensitive item. Consequently, if the survey respondent wants to endorse the sensitive item, the answer will be “masked” by the other items in the list. This concealment makes this technique suitable for studying socially condemned behaviors, such as vote buying (Corstange 2008; González-Ocantos et al. 2012; Corstange 2012; Blair and Imai 2012), drug use (Druckman et al. 2015), sexual preferences (LaBrie and Earleywine 2000), and attitudes toward race (Kuklinski et al. 1997; Redlawsk et al. 2010).

Given that both lists are assigned randomly, the mean number of nonsensitive activities that respondents endorse should be equal across the two lists. However, if there are any differences in means between the two groups, the differences should be attributed only to the presence of the sensitive item.

Blair and Imai (2012) and Imai et al. (2015) provide a statistical framework to analyze list data efficiently.⁸ They formalize two assumptions, namely, that there are (1) “no design effects” (i.e., the inclusion of a sensitive item has no effect on respondents’ answers to control items), and (2) “no liars” (i.e., respondents give truthful answers for the sensitive item). When the two assumptions hold and the item counts for types $y = 0$ and 4 are fully observed,⁹ experimental subjects with

⁸ While list experiments are common, researchers unfortunately “[utilize] only a difference in means estimator, and [do] not provide a measure of the sensitive item for each respondent” (Glynn 2013, p. 159).

⁹ For a hypothetical treatment list of four items.



item-count types $y = 1, 2$, and 3 can be inferred using multivariate techniques that allow for inferring who answered “yes” to the sensitive item. In addition, the statistical analyses permit studying the relationship between preferences over the sensitive item (i.e., vote selling) and an individual’s characteristics, such as income and party identification. Also, the design includes a “direct” question on the sensitive item, also making possible an estimation of the amount of social-desirability bias.

Collected in 2016, the data ($N = 1479$) are representative at the national level.¹⁰ Figure 6 shows the geographical distribution of survey respondents, grouped by party identification. The experiment was framed as a study about crime in the United States, not as a study about vote selling.¹¹ While pretesting the study, it was decided that the experiment needed to mask a very serious felony (selling one’s vote) among other equally serious felonies (such as stealing) and other less serious crimes (such as speeding or downloading music illegally from the Internet). Otherwise, the vote-selling item would have stood out among the other items, making it seem totally negative and undoable, and/or making the true purpose of the study obvious.

Before splitting the subject pool into the subjects’ respective experimental conditions, participants were asked to read an excerpt describing four illegal activities (including vote selling).¹² All were formatted as news pieces. The idea was to explain “vote selling” to “newsreaders.”

As Fig. 2 suggests, to prevent possible priming effects,¹³ the order in which experimental subjects answered the direct question¹⁴ and the list experiment were randomly assigned. To be sure, all subjects answered both the direct question and the list experiment. To further prevent the possibility of biased answers when asking the direct question to individuals in the treated group, the direct question stated that the hypothetical possibility of doing one of the illegal things mentioned previously in the excerpt would be randomly assigned. However, all participants were directly asked whether they would be interested in selling their vote. Direct answers were then used to estimate the proportion of “liars.”

As a follow-up, subjects answering “yes” to the direct question answered a pricing test that asked them to indirectly put a price on their votes. Following standard practice in marketing research, participants slid a handle indicating which price was considered “too cheap” for one’s vote. The slide ranged from \$0 to \$1000, in one-dollar increments. The idea was to capture the respondent’s willingness to sell. The pricing test particularly measures the lowest bound at which the participant would perceive the least economic benefit that was still enough to make selling his/her vote interesting. Moving forward, the list experiment contemplated one control and two

¹⁰ Research Now SSI collected the data between March 2 and March 6. 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 Rutgers University.

¹¹ To isolate the risks and costs associated with engaging in any illegal activity, the next phrase was included: “assuming you would not go to jail.”

¹² See “Appendix” for wording.

¹³ Blair and Imai (2012, p. 54) explain that asking the direct question to individuals in the treated group might bias the results.

¹⁴ See “Appendix” for wording.



possible treatments, each with different vote-selling prices. Since pricing a vote is difficult and based on several pretests, an arbitrarily low (\$100) or an arbitrarily high (\$500) price appeared. Participants randomly assigned to the treatment condition answered only one of these two treatments. More than hard-pricing tests, these two treatments account for possible different elasticities that might have interacted with individual socioeconomic backgrounds, mainly defined by income.¹⁵

Subjects randomly assigned to the control condition answered the following question:

Now, you will have to type HOW MANY, if any, of the following illegal activities you might engage in, assuming you would not go to jail.

(1) steal an iPod from a large department store
 (2) speed on the highway because you're late for work/school
 (3) download your favorite music from the internet illegally

Type in HOW MANY (NOT WHICH), if any, of these things you would do.

In turn, subjects randomly assigned to the treatment condition answered one of the following two treatments. Subjects assigned to the “low” price condition read the same vignette, but the next line was added in the third place: (3) sell your vote to a candidate for \$100. Those assigned to the “high” price condition read the following line: (3) sell your vote to a candidate for \$500.¹⁶

Figure 3 shows the distinct frequencies of participants declaring how many (if any) illegal things they would do. Notice that the figure shows the total number of items, not which ones. For instance, a frequency of “3” does not mean the frequency of the third item, but describes the total number of individuals answering that they would do three of the illegal activities described in the vignette.¹⁷ The order of the items was not randomized, to avoid violating the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA).¹⁸

Showing that the probability of being assigned to any condition is not associated with individual covariates is important. Table 1 shows a multinomial logistic model. The dependent variable is the treatment condition (high treatment, low treatment, and control). The independent variables are observable characteristics captured

¹⁵ Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015, p. 1189) explain that “the poor are thought to be more susceptible to vote buying.”

¹⁶ Since one of the two sentences was added, item (3) download your favorite music from the Internet illegally was moved to the fourth place.

¹⁷ The experimental design passes the standard tests for design effects (floor and ceiling effects). See Table 3.

¹⁸ Morton and Williams (2010, p. 98) explain that the treatment should be invariant or “stable.”






Fig. 2 Experimental flow of the list design. Note this figure shows the flow of the list experiment. Notice that (1) the order in which experimental subjects answered both the direct question and the list experiment was randomized; (2) there are two treatments, one with a selling price of \$100 (“low”) and one with a selling price of \$500 (“high”)

by a short questionnaire included in the study. Four variables were used: income, education, party identification, and political ideology. These were the same set of variables used when estimating likely vote sellers (below). Conveniently, the base category in the multinomial logistic regression is the control condition. The coefficients in the table are all zeros (and statistically nonsignificant). Consequently, these results show no observable differences between the “high” treatment condition and the control group. The same applies to the “low” condition.¹⁹

The paper acknowledges that considerable friction and transaction costs in the real world might mean that creating a market for vote selling would not be easy. For instance, party identification might increase (or decrease) the cost of selling one’s vote, presumably preventing (or fostering) the transaction. If the party of both sellers and buyers should match, fostering vote selling might represent a win–win situation for both. This experimental design does not consider blocking on party identification, as that might have increased considerably the number of cells.

Statistical analyses

Would US citizens sell their vote?

Table 2 shows a simple difference-in-means analysis between each treated group and the control group. On average, the control group would do 1.116 things on the list. Subjects treated under the “low” condition (\$100) would do 1.182 things on the list, while subjects in the “high” condition (\$500) would do 1.189 things.

Three important points characterize this bivariate analysis. First, the mean differences between treated groups (i.e., “low” and “high” treatments) are statistically zero, implying that neither treatment should introduce design bias into the experiment. Second, while treated subjects do have slightly higher means when compared to the control group (indicating some vote-selling propensity), these differences are not statistically significant. Third, while not statistically significant, $0.066 \times 100 = 6.6\%$ of subjects would sell their vote under the “low”

¹⁹ I thank the anonymous reviewer at *Acta Politica* for this suggestion.






Fig. 3 Frequency and percentages of subjects declaring how many (if any) illegal things they would do. Note notice that the X-axis denotes the number of items, not which ones. Percentages show proportions per condition

Table 1 Covariate balance: multinomial logistic regression for both treatment conditions

	High	Low
Ideology	0.019 (0.068)	-0.031 (0.067)
Party Id.	-0.125 (0.083)	0.022 (0.080)
Income	-0.021 (0.022)	0.006 (0.021)
Education	0.049 (0.048)	-0.008 (0.047)
AIC	2449.471	2449.471
BIC	2499.583	2499.583
Log likelihood	-1214.736	-1214.736

The table shows a multinomial logistic regression. The dependent variable is the treatment condition (high, low, control). In both models, the base category is the control condition. The independent variables are observable characteristics captured by a short questionnaire included in the study. This set of covariates is the same as the one used in the statistical analyses of the list experiment. Since all estimated coefficients are close to zero and statistically nonsignificant, we can safely assume that the randomization mechanism worked as expected, i.e., there are no observable differences across the different treatment conditions. Reference category is control condition. Intercept was excluded from the table. $N = 1479$

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

condition, while $0.073 \times 100 = 7.3\%$ of subjects would sell their vote under the “high” condition. While these estimations score substantially under what is found through the multivariate approach used in this study, as shown below, they are also highly inefficient.

Bivariate calculations are statistically inefficient; hence, the data should be analyzed using multivariate techniques instead. Following the advice of Blair and Imai



Table 2 Differences in means between Treatments (high and low) and the Control group

Condition	Mean	Difference with control condition	Confidence intervals	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i> value
Low (\$100)	1.182	1.182–1.116 = 6.6%	[−9%, 22%]	0.846	748	0.398
High (\$500)	1.189	1.189–1.116 = 7.3%	[−8%, 23%]	0.913	700	0.361

The table shows two-tailed *t* tests between each experimental treated unit (“low” and “high” conditions) and the control group. The table shows that $0.066 \times 100 = 6.6\%$ of subjects would sell their vote under the “low” condition, while $0.073 \times 100 = 7.3\%$ of subjects would sell their vote under the “high” condition. Also, 95% confidence intervals are shown. It is evident that they are quite wide and not statistically significant

(2012) and Blair (2015), we took a statistical multivariate approach.²⁰ Exploiting the “low” and “high” treatments, we estimated two identical statistical models. In both models, the outcome variable is the item count of things that subjects would do. The idea is to estimate what we cannot observe (i.e., vote selling), using information that we do observe (i.e., socioeconomic and political variables captured by the questionnaire). The model considers the most common covariates studied in the vote-buying literature (Calvo and Murillo 2004; Stokes 2005; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2006; Nazareno et al. 2008; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; González-Ocantos et al. 2014; Oliveros 2016; Bahamonde 2018)—that is, income, education, party identification, and political ideology.

Leveraging this multivariate approach makes estimating the proportion of hypothetical vote sellers possible. For both the “low” and “high” treatments, Fig. 4 shows the proportions of declared vote sellers (“Direct Question”), predicted vote sellers (“List Experiment”), and the difference between the two (“Social Desirability”).²¹ Substantively, the figure suggests that after combining the estimates of the “low” and “high” treatments, approximately 25% of the nationally representative sample would be willing to sell their vote.²² While a considerable proportion answered the direct question affirmatively (18%),²³ the analyses still suggest that survey respondents systematically underreported their true answers—that is, approximately 8% of the nationally representative sample would have lied.²⁴

The difference-in-means approach in Table 2 suggests that between 6.6 and 7.3% would be willing to sell their votes. However, the multivariate approach in Fig. 4 suggests that 25% would be willing to do so. While at first these differences might seem huge, they are not. As the literature suggests, multivariate approaches to analyzing list experiment data are far more efficient (Blair and Imai 2012; Blair 2015).

²⁰ The R package `list` was used (Blair 2015). The estimation method used was the “ml” and the maximum number of iterations was 200,000. The remaining arguments of the package were left at their default values.

²¹ Since the estimated quantities do not vary across the different treatments (“low” and “high”), it is reasonable to think that there are no specific concerns associated with the (arbitrarily) chosen prices.

²² This number was calculated averaging over the “high” (27%) and “low” (23%) estimates.

²³ This number was calculated averaging over the “high” (19%) and “low” (17%) estimates.

²⁴ This number was calculated averaging over the “high” (8%) and “low” (7%) estimates.






Fig. 4 List experiment data: declared and predicted vote sellers. Note figure summarizes Table 2 by showing the simple difference in means (without covariates). It also shows the proportion of declared (“Direct Question”) and predicted (“List Experiment”) hypothetical vote sellers, and the difference (“Social Desirability”). The three sets of main estimates were obtained via a multivariate procedure (including covariates). Combining both “low” and “high” treatments, 25% would be willing to sell their votes. And of those who answered affirmatively when asked directly (18%) an estimated additional 8% lied about it. “Liars” answer the direct question negatively, but they are likely sellers. The figure shows 95% confidence intervals. There are two arbitrarily “low” and “high” vote-selling prices. The reason for having both was to control for possible price elasticities. The figure suggests some small differences that are not statistically significant. Consequently, these arbitrary pricing decisions do not threaten the experimental design

Within the framework of regression analysis, the difference-in-means approach is just a bivariate lineal model.²⁵ Instead, the multivariate approach is also a lineal model, but it incorporates covariates. We claim that due to the multivariate’s greater efficiency than that of the difference-in-means approach, the former is a far better approach than the latter. One way of showing the efficiency of a statistical model is by examining its standard errors (King 1986, p. 676): the worse the data’s fit is, the greater the standard errors are, the more imprecise the model is, and the wider are the confidence intervals. Considering the statistical uncertainty of both methods (depicted in Fig. 4), it is easy to see that the multivariate approach is far more efficient than the difference-in-means approach. Since it uses more information when fitting the data (the covariates), it gives more precise estimates (narrower confidence intervals). Furthermore, going beyond efficiency issues, the estimates of both methods are statistically indistinguishable. Since the confidence intervals of

²⁵ With just a constant 1 on the right-hand side of the equation.



both approaches overlap, it is not possible to say that the estimated 7.3% and 6.6% are “smaller” than the estimated 25%.²⁶

Moving forward, the estimated proportion of vote sellers—“List Experiment” in Fig. 4—is calculated using information from subjects with fully observable preferences, i.e., subjects with an item count of 0 or 4. We know that the former would not do anything, and the latter would do all things mentioned in the list (including the sensitive item). Using the identified covariates (income, education, party identification, and political ideology), a model is fitted to predict all subjects with 0’s and 4’s on the left-hand side. Using this information makes obtaining individual-level vote-selling predictions possible, i.e., participants who would do 1, 2, or 3 things on the list (shown in Fig. 7 in the “[Appendix](#)”). Then, these individual-level predictions are compared with the direct question that all experimental subjects answered. If a subject is a predicted vote seller but answers the direct question negatively, it is inferred that due to concerns of social desirability, she might have chosen to lie.

What is the price for which US citizens would sell their vote?

Participants were also asked to declare which price they considered “too cheap” for their vote. The intention was to capture the respondent’s willingness to sell. The test measures the lowest bound at which participants would perceive the least possible economic benefit but enough to make them sell. Since it is the lowest threshold, the understanding is that a higher price will still be economically attractive.

The results indicate that the average survey respondent would sell his/her vote for \$418 ($N = 189$), a very expensive price. These results are not unrealistic. While the selling price is very high, it matches what others have found. Bahamonde (2018, p. 52) finds that clientelist political parties in Brazil do target affluent voters at considerably higher prices. Part of the argument is that higher levels of economic development not only raise personal income, but also shift the broker’s vote-buying capacity upward.²⁷ That is, higher income does not necessarily stop vote buying; it just makes it more expensive.²⁸

Stokes et al. (2013) analyze the (im)possibility of expensive vote selling. Industrialization has driven up the median income of the electorate, increasing the selling price while turning vote buying into an increasingly expensive strategy for winning elections. Thus, from the demand-side (parties), vote buying is no longer an efficient mass strategy for party machines. Evidently, with the selling price so expensive, political parties cannot catch up with the supply-side, making vote buying in the United States a rare event (as Fig. 1 suggests). This situation has forced party machines to turn to other, less prohibitively costly alternatives. Thus, these results suggest that from the supply-side (i.e., voters), the vote is still up for sale, only for a very high price that party machines cannot afford.

²⁶ I thank the two anonymous reviewers of *Acta Politica* for stimulating this discussion.

²⁷ Similarly, see Abramo and Speck (2001, p. 14). For the Philippine case, see Schaffer (2004).

²⁸ In fact, there is some anecdotal evidence suggesting that a broker purchased one man’s vote for \$800 during the 2010 elections in eastern Kentucky (Shawn 2012, p. 6).



Since the pricing test is based on the direct question, its results require a word of caution. The list experiment does suggest that some respondents lied when directly asked if they would sell their vote. Consequently, we should expect the pricing test to be biased to some degree. Also, only a small proportion of respondents answered the direct question affirmatively. In addition, prices are the product of supply-and-demand dynamics. In this context, prices result from the interaction between parties (buyers) and voters (sellers). This research design observes only the sellers' side. Hence, we limit our inferences even more by thinking about these results as only suggestive of some willingness to sell. Hence, more than acting as definitive and final pricing tests, these findings do seem to suggest that the vote-selling price is high enough to deter political parties from engaging in vote selling. Finally, future research should design and conduct more complex studies where the design incorporates supply-and-demand dynamics.

Who are the most-likely vote sellers?

The proportion of likely vote sellers was estimated using a multivariate approach. The variables used were the most common explanatory factors studied in the clientelism literature. Ultimately, this procedure allows for profiling participants into likely vote sellers. Figure 5 shows estimated vote-selling probabilities at different levels of all variables used in the multivariate approach.

The analyses suggest that Democrats and Liberals are more likely to sell. These findings are in line with research that studies the different constitutive values of Liberals and Conservatives. Political psychologists have found that compared with Conservatives, Liberals construct their moral systems primarily upon narrower psychological foundations. Particularly, Liberals consider less important both the authority/respect and the purity/sanctity dyads (Graham et al. 2009, p. 1029). This might lead Liberals to engage more frequently in behaviors that might be considered “wrong,” such as vote selling. In fact, Gray et al. (2014, p. 7) explain that Conservatives “see impure violations as relatively more wrong.”

Unlike the conventional wisdom (Kitschelt 2000; Calvo and Murillo 2004; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; Carlin et al. 2015), Fig. 5 shows that education and income levels do not make vote selling more likely. Poverty has long been associated with vote selling. Brusco et al. (2004), Stokes et al. (2013), and Nazareno et al. (2008) explain that since the poor derive more utility from immediate transfers relative to returns associated with future (and uncertain) policy packages, clientelist political parties only target the poor. For instance, Weitz-Shapiro (2014, p. 12) explains that “[a]lmost *universally*, scholars of clientelism treat and analyze [this] practice as an exchange between politicians and their poor clients.”²⁹ The evidence presented in this paper aligns with that of others who have recently questioned the importance of this canonical predictor. Szwarcberg (2013) “challenges the assumption [that brokers] will always distribute goods to low-income voters in exchange for electoral

²⁹ My emphasis.






Fig. 5 List experiment: covariates used to estimate likely vote sellers. Note these variables were used in the multivariate statistical model to estimate individual-level probabilities of vote selling. The figure shows the predicted probabilities and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals for income, education, party identification, and ideology. Since the vote-selling prices were set arbitrarily, the reason for two experimental conditions (“low” and “high”) was to control for possible price elasticities. While there are some perceptible changes, they are not statistically significant. Consequently, these arbitrary decisions do not threaten the identification strategy

support,” while González-Ocantos et al. (2012) and Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015) find that income had little or no effect on vote buying.³⁰ Notably, Bahamonde (2018) explains that brokers target individuals when they are identifiable and groups when brokers need to rely on the spillover effects of clientelism. Both mechanisms occur regardless of individual levels of income.

There do seem to be important substantive differences between the “low” and “high” vote-selling treatments. That is, factors that heavily determine economic status (income and education) seem to be more elastic to marginal increments in the buying price. As Fig. 5 shows, low-income and less-educated individuals are willing to sell their votes in a similar proportion to wealthier and more-educated respondents. However, poorer and uneducated individuals are more willing to sell their votes, conditional on higher prices. This might indicate that for them, behaving

³⁰ Relatedly, González-Ocantos et al. (2014, p. 205) and Corstange (2012, p. 494) also find very weak results for education in Peru and Nicaragua, and in Lebanon, respectively.



illegally is worthwhile but only when the payoff is “large enough.” These results are in line with those of experimental and applied economists who argue that “risk aversion decreases as one rises above the poverty level and decreases significantly for the very wealthy” (Riley and Chow 1992, p. 32). In other words, less-educated and low-income individuals, who are more fragile and precarious, tend to avoid risks and, hence, illegal activities. On the contrary, higher-income and more-educated individuals seem unaffected by the different stimuli and sell their vote in the same proportion, regardless of the price. For instance, highly educated individuals (graduate school level) sell their vote in the same proportion, under both the “low” (26%) and “high” (26%) conditions.

General discussion

Two conflicting pictures emerge. On the one hand, leaving aside concerns about social-desirability bias, we “know”—using nonexperimental data—that most people have never been offered the possibility to sell their vote (as per Fig. 1). On the other hand, the results presented here strongly suggest that they *would*. While buyers (e.g., parties) are not buying, a large proportion of latent vote sellers is willing to sell their vote.

While vote buying/selling in the United States was commonplace during the nineteenth century, higher median incomes have increased the cost of this strategy as a feasible tool to win elections, in turn, making vote buying rare in the United States. The paper confirms this hypothesis by suggesting that an important estimated proportion of US voters—25%—is very much willing to sell their vote, but for an estimated very expensive price—\$418. Overall, these results are striking, and the author is not aware of any other experimental design in which subjects in an industrialized democracy are asked whether they would sell their votes, and, moreover, which produces positive results. The paper began by establishing the tension between supply and demand sides within a clientelist relationship and noting that qualitative research usually focuses on vote selling, while quantitative studies usually focuses on vote buying. Furthermore, most of the literature concentrates its efforts on studying developing countries, mostly paying attention to realized clientelist transactions. As discussed, both aspects pose threats of selection bias to our inferences. This paper tries to fill these gaps by studying hypothetical vote selling via an experimental design implemented in an advanced democracy.

While the paper is rather descriptive, the author believes that the exercise was worth pursuing. The experimental evidence of a large critical mass willing to sell their votes in a developed country is novel. It is hoped that the paper sets the stage for future research and encourages other scholars to field the experimental design presented here in a comparative setting, to include both developed and developing countries. Future research should also consider different values placed on different offices.³¹ It is reasonable to think that presidential, Senate, House, state-legislature,

³¹ I owe this point to Christopher Chambers-Ju.



mayoral, and city-council elections produce different incentives and constraints regarding buying and selling votes. Also, future research should consider blocking party identification—for example, designing a more complex experiment, in which not only the price varies but also the vote-selling treatment is partisan.

Acknowledgements I thank Virginia Oliveros, Richard Lau, David Redlawsk, Christopher Chambers-Ju, Jessica Price, Maria Akchurin, the 2016 Experimental Research Group in Political Psychology at Rutgers University—New Brunswick, the Social Sciences Seminar at O’Higgins University, and the two anonymous reviewers at *Acta Politica* for their comments. This project was funded by the Center for the Experimental Study of Psychology and Politics at Rutgers University—New Brunswick. Bastián Garrido provided excellent research assistance. Usual caveats apply.

Appendix

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.

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 years.

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.

Testing for design effects

See Table 3.

Table 3 Test for list experiment design effects

Respondent types	Low condition		High condition	
	Estimate	Standard error	Estimate	Standard error
(y = 0, t = 1)	0.0031	0.0346	0.0183	0.0351
(y = 1, t = 1)	-0.0063	0.0349	-0.0345	0.0353
(y = 2, t = 1)	0.0169	0.0226	0.0299	0.0237
(y = 3, t = 1)	0.0519	0.0113	0.0593	0.0126
(y = 0, t = 0)	0.3429	0.0242	0.3277	0.0249
(y = 1, t = 0)	0.2982	0.0347	0.3264	0.0351
(y = 2, t = 0)	0.2453	0.0299	0.2322	0.0307
(y = 3, t = 0)	0.0481	0.0193	0.0407	0.02

Since the Bonferroni-corrected p values of the *low* (0.8567) and *high* (0.3298) conditions are above the specified α (0.05), I fail to reject the null of no design effects

Geographical distribution of survey respondents

See Fig. 6.






Fig. 6 Geographical distribution of survey respondents by party identification

Individual predictions

The vertical axis of Fig. 7 shows the estimated probabilities of the entire experimental sample, sorted across the horizontal axis. The figure is relevant as it openly shows the amount of uncertainty of the statistical estimates. Ultimately, these individual-specific predictions will be used to profile likely vote sellers.




Fig. 7 Individual estimated probabilities of vote selling. Note figure shows the individual probabilities of vote selling ($N = 1479$) under the "low" and "high" conditions. After fitting the model, and following the advice of Blair and Imai (2012) and Imai et al. (2015), individual probabilities of vote selling under the "low" and "high" conditions were estimated. The figure also shows 95% confidence intervals



Still for sale: the micro-dynamics of vote selling in the United...

References

- Abramo, Claudio, and Bruno Speck. 2001. *Report on Brazil*. Technical report.
- Argersinger, Peter. 1985. New Perspectives on Election Fraud in the Gilded Age. *Political Science Quarterly* 100 (4): 669–687.
- Auyero, Javier. 2000. The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account. *Latin American Research Review* 35 (3): 55–81.
- Bahamonde, Hector. 2018. Aiming Right at You: Group Versus Individual Clientelistic Targeting in Brazil. *Journal of Politics in Latin America* 10 (2): 41–76.
- Bensel, Richard. 2004. *The American Ballot Box in the Mid-nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blair, Graeme. 2015. Survey Methods for Sensitive Topics. *Comparative Newsletter* 12: 12–16.
- Blair, Graeme, and Kosuke Imai. 2012. Statistical Analysis of List Experiments. *Political Analysis* 20 (1): 47–77.
- Borges, Mariana. 2019. *When Voters Help Politicians: Understanding Elections, Vote Buying, and Voting Behavior Through the Voters' Point of View*. Evanston: Northwestern University.
- Bratton, Michael. 2008. Vote Buying and Violence in Nigerian Election Campaigns. *Electoral Studies* 27 (4): 621–632.
- Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan Stokes. 2004. Vote Buying in Argentina. *Latin American Research Review* 39 (2): 66–88.
- Calvo, Ernesto, and María Victoria Murillo. 2004. Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market. *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4): 742–757.
- Campbell, Tracy. 2005. *Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, an American Political Tradition: 1742–2004*. New York: Carroll and Graf.
- Carlin, Ryan, and Mason Moseley. 2015. Good Democrats, Bad Targets: Democratic Values and Clientelistic Vote Buying. *The Journal of Politics* 1 (77): 14–26.
- Carlin, Ryan, Matthew Singer, and Elizabeth Zechmeister (eds.). 2015. *The Latin American Voter: Pursuing Representation and Accountability in Challenging Contexts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Corstange, Daniel. 2008. Sensitive Questions, Truthful Answers? Modeling the List Experiment with LISTIT. *Political Analysis* 17 (1): 45–63.
- Corstange, Daniel. 2012. Vote Trafficking in Lebanon. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 44 (3): 483–505.
- Díaz-Cayeros, Alberto, Federico Estévez, and Beatriz Magaloni. 2012. Strategies of Vote Buying: Democracy, Clientelism, and Poverty Relief in Mexico: 1–381.
- Dixit, Avinash, and John Londregan. 1996. The Determinants of Success of Special Interests in Redistributive Politics. *The Journal of Politics* 58 (4): 1132–1155.
- Druckman, James, Mauro Gilli, Samara Klar, and Joshua Robison. 2015. Measuring Drug and Alcohol Use Among College Student-Athletes. *Social Science Quarterly* 96 (2): 369–380.
- Erie, Steven. 1990. *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840–1985*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fahrenthold, David. 2012. Selling Votes is Common Type of Election Fraud. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/selling-votes-is-common-type-of-election-fraud/2012/10/01/f8f5045a-071d-11e2-81ba-ffe35a7b6542_story.html.
- Finan, Rederico, and Aura Schechter. 2012. Vote-Buying and Reciprocity. *Econometrica* 80 (2): 863–881.
- Foa, Roberto, and Yascha Mounk. 2016. The Danger of Deconsolidation: The Democratic Disconnect. *Journal of Democracy* 27 (3): 5–17.
- Foa, Roberto, and Yascha Mounk. 2017. The Signs of Deconsolidation. *Journal of Democracy* 28 (1): 5–15.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis* 2 (1): 131–150.
- Glynn, Adam. 2013. What Can We Learn with Statistical Truth Serum? Design and Analysis of the List Experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77 (S1): 159–172.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad de Jonge, Carlos Meléndez, Javier Osorio, and David Nickerson. 2012. Vote Buying and Social Desirability Bias: Experimental Evidence from Nicaragua. *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (1): 202–217.



- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, Chad Kiewiet de Jonge, and David Nickerson. 2014. The Conditionality of Vote-Buying Norms: Experimental Evidence from Latin America. *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (1): 197–211.
- Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek. 2009. Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96 (5): 1029–1046.
- Gray, Kurt, Chelsea Schein, and Adrian Ward. 2014. The Myth of Harmless Wrongs in Moral Cognition: Automatic Dyadic Completion from Sin to Suffering. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 143 (4): 1600–1615.
- Hicken, Allen, Stephen Leider, Nico Ravanilla, and Dean Yang. 2015. Measuring Vote-Selling: Field Evidence from the Philippines. *American Economic Review* 105 (5): 352–356.
- Hicken, Allen, Stephen Leider, Nico Ravanilla, and Dean Yang. 2018. Temptation in Vote-Selling: Evidence from a Field Experiment in the Philippines. *Journal of Development Economics* 131: 1–14.
- Holland, Alisha, and Brian Palmer-Rubin. 2015. Beyond the Machine: Clientelist Brokers and Interest Organizations in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies* 48 (9): 1186–1223.
- Imai, Kosuke, Bethany Park, and Kenneth Greene. 2015. Using the Predicted Responses from List Experiments as Explanatory Variables in Regression Models. *Political Analysis* 23 (02): 180–196.
- Jensen, Peter Sandholt, and Mogens Justesen. 2014. Poverty and Vote Buying: Survey-Based Evidence from Africa. *Electoral Studies* 33: 220–232.
- Kam, Christopher. 2017. The Secret Ballot and the Market for Votes at 19th-Century British Elections. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (5): 594–635.
- Khemani, Stuti. 2015. Buying Votes Versus Supplying Public Services: Political Incentives to Under-invest in Pro-poor Policies. *Journal of Development Economics* 117: 84–93.
- de Jonge, Chad Kiewiet. 2015. Who Lies About Electoral Gifts? *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79 (3): 710–739.
- King, Gary. 1986. How Not to Lie with Statistics: Avoiding Common Mistakes in Quantitative Political Science. *American Journal of Political Science* 30 (3): 666–687.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. Linkages Between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6–7): 845–879.
- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Steven Wilkinson (eds.). 2006. *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, vol. 392. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuklinski, James, Paul Sniderman, Kathleen Knight, Thomas Piazza, Tetlock Philip, Gordon Lawrence, and Barbara Mellors. 1997. Racial Prejudice and Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action. *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (2): 402–419.
- LaBrie, Joseph, and Mitchell Earleywine. 2000. Sexual Risk Behaviors and Alcohol: Higher Base Rates Revealed Using the Unmatched-Count Technique. *Journal of Sex Research* 37 (4): 321–326.
- Leight, Jessica, Rohini Pande, and Laura Ralston. 2016. *Value for Money in Purchasing Votes? Vote-Buying and Voter Behavior in the Laboratory*.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2018. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown.
- Levy, Jack. 2008. Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25 (1): 1–18.
- Michael, Adam, and Tariq Thachil. 2018. How Clients Select Brokers: Competition and Choice in India's Slums. *American Political Science Review* 112 (4): 775–791.
- Morton, Rebecca, and Kenneth Williams. 2010. *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality: From Nature to the Lab*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nazareno, Marcelo, Valeria Brusco, and Susan Stokes. 2008. *Why Do Clientelist Parties Target the Poor?*.
- Nichter, Simeon. 2014. Conceptualizing Vote Buying. *Electoral Studies* 35: 315–327.
- Nichter, Simeon, and Michael Peress. 2017. Request Fulfilling: When Citizens Demand Clientelist Benefits. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (8): 1086–1117.
- Oliveros, Virginia. 2016. Making it Personal: Clientelism, Favors, and Public Administration in Argentina. *Comparative Politics* 48 (3): 373–391.
- Posada-Carbó, Eduardo. 1996. *Elections Before Democracy: The History of Elections in Europe and Latin America*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Redlawsk, David, Caroline Tolbert, and William Franko. 2010. Voters, Emotions, and Race in 2008: Obama as the First Black President. *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (4): 875–889.
- Reynolds, John. 1980. The Silent Dollar': Vote Buying in New Jersey. *New Jersey History* 98 (3): 191–211.



Still for sale: the micro-dynamics of vote selling in the United...

- Reynolds, John, and Richard McCormick. 1986. Outlawing 'Treachery': Split Tickets and Ballot Laws in New York and New Jersey, 1880–1910. *The Journal of American History* 72 (4): 835–858.
- Riley, William, and Victor Chow. 1992. Asset Allocation and Individual Risk Aversion. *Financial Analysts Journal* 48 (6): 32–37.
- Rueda, Miguel. 2015. Buying Votes with Imperfect Local Knowledge and a Secret Ballot. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 27 (3): 428–456.
- Rueda, Miguel. 2017. Small Aggregates, Big Manipulation: Vote Buying Enforcement and Collective Monitoring. *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (1): 163–177.
- Rusk, Jerrold. 1970. The Effect of the Australian Ballot Reform on Split Ticket Voting: 1876–1908. *The American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1220–1238.
- Sabato, Hilda. 2001. On Political Citizenship in Nineteenth-Century Latin America. *The American Historical Review* 106 (4): 1290.
- Schaffer, Schaffer. 2004. Vote Buying in East Asia. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Shawn, Eric. 2012. Drug Money Funds Voter Fraud in Kentucky. *Fox News* 1–9.
- Stokes, Susan. 2005. Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina. *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 315–325.
- Stokes, Susan, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco. 2013. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szwarcberg, Mariela. 2013. The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism. Lessons from the Argentine Case. *Latin American Research Review* 48 (2): 32–54.
- Vicente, Pedro. 2014. Is Vote Buying Effective? Evidence from a Field Experiment in West Africa. *The Economic Journal* 124 (574): F356–F387.
- Vicente, Pedro, and Leonard Wantchekon. 2009. Clientelism and Vote Buying: Lessons from Field Experiments in African Elections. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 25 (2): 292–305.
- Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin. *World Politics* 55 (April): 399–422.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2012. What Wins Votes: Why Some Politicians Opt Out of Clientelism. *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (3): 568–583.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2014. *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina: Politics, Poverty, and Social Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, Samuel. 2018. Seven Ways to Compute the Relative Value of a U.S. Dollar Amount, 1774 to Present. MeasuringWorth.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen. Please attend to these matters and return this form with your proof.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query References	Query	Remarks
Q1	AUTHOR: Please verify that the linked ORCID identifiers are correct for each author.	
Q2	AUTHOR: Please confirm that forenames/given names (blue) and surnames/family names (vermilion) have been identified correctly.	
Q3	AUTHOR: “Chilean National Agency of Research and Development (ANID)” was identified as funder in the supplied metadata, however, this funder was not mentioned in the acknowledgments or funding information section. Please insert the appropriate text for this funder, or confirm that this is to be deleted from the funders list.	
Q4	AUTHOR: “Ryan and Wales, 2000” is cited in text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide details in the list or delete the citation from the text.	
Q5	AUTHOR: “Blanchard et al, 1990” has not been cited in the text. Please indicate where it should be cited or delete from the Reference List.	
Q6	AUTHOR: Hussain, J., & Bernard, J. T. (2018). - please provide chapter page numbers.	

Funding Info Query Form

Please confirm that the funding sponsor list below was correctly extracted from your article: that it includes all funders and that the text has been matched to the correct FundRef Registry organization names. If no FundRef Registry organization name has been identified, it may be that the funder was not found in the FundRef registry, or there are multiple funders matched in the FundRef registry. If a name was not found in the FundRef registry, it may not be the canonical name form, it may be a program name rather than an organization name, or it may be an organization not yet included in FundRef Registry. If you know of another name form or a parent organization name for a “not found” item on this list below, please share that information.

Funding Agency	FundRef Organization Name
Chilean National Agency of Research and Development (ANID)	“Not Found”;
Institute for Research in Market Imperfections and Public Policy	“Not Found”;
FONDECYT Postdoctoral	“Not Found”;
FONDECYT Initiation in Research Fund 2019	“Not Found”

**ORIGINAL ARTICLE**

Employment effects of COVID-19 across Chilean regions: An application of the translog cost function

Félix Modrego¹ | Andrea Canales^{1,2} | Héctor Bahamonde¹

¹Institute of Social Sciences, Universidad de O'Higgins, Rancagua, Chile

²Instituto de Economía, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Correspondence

Félix Modrego, Institute of Social Sciences, Universidad de O'Higgins, Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins 611, Rancagua 2820000, Chile.

Email: felix.modrego@uoh.cl

Funding information

Chilean National Agency of Research and Development (ANID); Institute for Research in Market Imperfections and Public Policy, Grant/Award Number: MIPP, ICM IS130002; FONDECYT Postdoctoral, Grant/Award Number: 3200650; FONDECYT Initiation in Research Fund 2019, Grant/Award Number: 11190112

Abstract

Estimating an aggregated translog cost function for the period 2013–2018, and using alternative scenarios of product fall based on expert projections, this article provides a preliminary forecast of the regional employment effects of COVID-19 across Chilean regions. The total estimated loss in the average scenario is around 705,000 jobs (577,000 in the optimistic and 870,000 in the pessimistic scenarios). Relative impacts are spatially heterogeneous, ranging from 1.5% (Antofagasta Region) to 13.6% (Los Lagos Region) of total regional jobs in the average scenario. Estimated impacts may inform regionally-targeted social protection and economic stimulus policies at a time in which the virus has not fully spread and total regional employment impacts have not been realized. In any region and scenario, estimated losses are sizeable and call for a rapid and spread implementation of job and production protection initiatives recently passed and others still being discussed in the congress.

KEY WORDS

Chile, COVID-19, forecasting, regional employment, translog cost function

JEL CLASSIFICATION

I15; J23; R11

Q1	Article ID 12337	Dispatch: 05-SEP-20 CE: No. of Pages: 17 ME:
----	---------------------	---





1 | INTRODUCTION

2
3 COVID-19 is considered the greatest threat to world health since the Spanish Flu of 1918,¹ and the economic
4 impacts are expected to be of a magnitude only comparable to those of the 1929 Great Depression (IMF, 2020).
5 Strict policies have been implemented by most governments to contain the spread of the disease during what has
6 been called the “Great Lockdown” (IMF, 2020). As a result, around half of the world population is currently under
7 confinement.² Restrictions to production, consumption and trade start striking harshly at the global and national
8 economies. Just to mention a few examples, the US Federal reserve reported a fall of 4.8% of the GDP in the first tri-
9 mester of 2020. China, shrank by 6.8%, a performance unseen in 40 years. Italy and France fell into technical reces-
10 sion in the first months of this year. International trade is expected to decrease between 13 to 32% in 2020
11 (WTO, 2020). Consequently, the global employment impacts of COVID-19 are expected to be around 195 million
12 jobs lost (UN News, 2020).

13 Several studies have documented that economic recessions are usually characterized by high rates of job
14 destruction (Darby, Haltiwanger, & Plant, 1985, 1986; Davis & Haltiwanger, 1990, 1992). However, the COVID-
15 19 crisis is showing some peculiarities in the way economic impacts unfold, with the risk of turning a shock of a
16 transitory nature into one with relatively permanent consequences. Guerrieri, Lorenzoni, Straub, and Wer-
17 ning (2020) point out that in the case of COVID-19, the demand may overreact to the supply shock, as the shock
18 can be amplified by mechanisms such as firms' closures and job destruction, thus aggravating the recession. In this
19 context, standard fiscal stimulus may be less effective, which warrants the implementation of large-scale social
20 protection policies. As these market adjustments mechanism may operate differently (or at least at a different
21 pace) across regions, it is important to have estimations of regional job losses in order to inform regional support
22 strategies. However, the economic effects of the pandemic are still ongoing and there are still very little estima-
23 tion of its sub-national economic effects. This paper contributes filling this gap by estimating the employment
24 effects of COVID-19 in Chile, one of the upper middle-income economies in Latin America but having large
25 regional inequalities.

26 Chile is an interesting case to estimate the employment effects of COVID-19 from a regional point of view.
27 Chile is currently organized administratively in 16 regions, 56 provinces and 346 municipalities (*comunas*). Chilean
28 regions are arranged one on top of each other from north to south (Figure 1). In this paper, we consider the
29 15 regions existing up to the end of 2018.³ The population is highly concentrated in the metropolitan region of
30 Santiago, Chile's capital city (around 40% of the national population) and the economic and political core of the
31 country. Yet, Chile is a country with very heterogeneous labour markets. Although in all Chilean regions most
32 jobs are related to retail and unsophisticated services, there are significant variations in the relative importance
33 of the different industries, differences which are directly related to Chile's physical geography. In the sparsely
34 populated regions of the north, for instance, a large percentage of employees work in mining and the mining-
35 related services. In the more densely populated regions in the centre and south of the country, on the contrary,
36 agriculture and the agri-food industry account for a relatively large share of the labour force (Olfert et al., 2014).
37 The metropolitan region of Santiago is a largely urban economy, oriented to services and with an industrial struc-
38 ture which is far more diversified. We approach such heterogeneity by exploiting a regional approach to the esti-
39 mation of unemployment effects of COVID-19.

40 The estimation is based on fitting an aggregated cost function using data of the Chilean regions for the period
41 2013–2018. We use a flexible functional form (translog) fitted using regional data from several official sources. In
42 spite of data limitations, the estimation results are largely consistent with theory. Estimated (region-specific)
43
44


45 ¹See <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/03/06/coronavirus-poses-serious-threat-public-health-since-spanish/>

46 ²See: <https://www.euronews.com/2020/04/02/coronavirus-in-europe-spain-s-death-toll-hits-10-000-after-record-950-new-deaths-in-24-hou>

47 ³Being the region of Ñuble officially established in September 2018. In all calculations, Ñuble was treated as part of the former region of Biobio from which
it originates.



FIGURE 1 Chilean regions



elasticities were used to forecast the employment impacts of product losses due to COVID-19 on employment across Chilean regions, using available expert forecasts to define three scenarios of national product fall. Results indicate a total loss of around 705,000 jobs in the average scenario. In the optimistic scenario, the estimated loss is around 577,000, and 870,000 in the pessimistic scenario. The approach followed here is based on dual production theory and is similar to that used by Aníquez and López (2007) to study the employment and wage effects of agricultural expansion in Chile during the decade of the 1990s. This approach is grounded on well-established results in micro-economics, and is not particularly data-intensive. However, in spite of its strengths and applicability, we are unaware of its use for the study of regional employment impacts of COVID-19 (or other sanitary shocks), so this method may provide an econometric alternative to early estimations based on assessments of occupations at risk (e.g. Lund, Ellingrud, Hancock, Manyika, & Dua, 2020; Muro, Maxim, & Whiton, 2020).

As expected, the bulk (32%) of predicted job losses is estimated in the metropolitan region of Santiago. However, this is not the region where the largest relative impacts are estimated. The results indicate that the relative losses range from around 1.5% of regional jobs in the region of Antofagasta (mining region in the north) to around 13.6% in the region of Los Lagos (a region in the centre-south, mainly oriented to agriculture, aquaculture and downstream agri-food industry). In any scenario and region, estimated impacts are considerable and, therefore, the

implementation of determined and widespread policies for the protection of employment and production is well-warranted.

Despite that the scope of this paper is admittedly limited, as it does not provide answers to questions related to the mechanisms by which COVID-19 impacts regional labour markets nor does it compare our forecasts against others obtained by alternative methods, this paper contributes to the literature on economic impacts of COVID-19 in several ways. First, it proposes a theory-grounded, regression-based method to account for the employment effects of the disease, which is feasible to implement with regional data usually at hand. Second, it provides statistical inferences at the subnational level, which we think are useful for Chilean regional scientists and national and regional decision makers concerned with the labour impacts of the pandemic. Third, in assessing our estimations, we observe that in the first months of the pandemic in Chile, massive job losses coincide with many workers (and many of them informal) becoming inactive. We think that this phenomenon is itself intellectually interesting and politically relevant. While skilled workers are likely to cope better with the pandemic, for instance, by offering their services from home, unskilled workers are lacking what has been a traditional unemployment-buffer mechanism. This is a phenomenon to monitor in the different regions of the country. To the best of our knowledge, we are unaware of previous work noting this adjustment in Chilean labour markets in the present COVID-19 context.

The following section presents the method for estimating the employment effects of COVID-19 in Chilean Regions. Section 3 presents the results and the final section concludes.

2 | METHOD

The method for estimating the employment impacts of COVID-19 across Chilean regions is based on dual production theory (e.g., Chambers, 1988; Diewert, 1974). We fit a system of equations comprised of an aggregated cost function and the corresponding factor demand equations, using aggregated data of Chilean regions for the period 2013–2018. Estimated output elasticities are used to calculate job losses in alternative scenarios. The scenarios are defined according to expert forecasts of product fall for the Chilean economy due to COVID-19. Product losses are allocated to regions using initial sectorial impacts in the metropolitan region of Santiago and the regional shares in each sector.

The econometric model uses a translog specification, a flexible functional form which is a second-order approximation of an arbitrary cost function. The properties of the translog cost function are described in the literature (e.g., Berndt, 1991; Christensen, Jorgenson, & Lau, 1971). The use of a flexible functional form has the advantage of, first, acknowledging the substitution relationships among production factors while imposing minimum restrictions to the underlying production technology. Second, it allows imposing parametric restrictions which are consistent with standard production theory. While the econometric approach proposed here has several advantages, it also has some limitations. The translog cost function is based on a local approximation (i.e., within the neighbourhood of a point), and does not guarantee good “regional” (i.e., in a wider region of the factor price space) approximations, nor global satisfaction of the regularity conditions (Pollak, Sickles, & Wales, 1984). Moreover, at the cost of flexibility, many parameters have to be estimated, which may reduce statistical power when doing inference in small samples like ours (Finch & Finch, 2017). Yet, we believe this method is functional to the problem at hand, particularly considering the still limited information available on the regional labour impacts of the pandemic.

The starting point is the following translog specification with technological change proposed by Diewert and Wales (1987):

$$\begin{aligned} \ln C(p, y, t) = & \alpha + \sum_i \alpha_i \ln p_i + \gamma_i \ln y + \beta_i (t - t^*) + \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \sum_i \sum_j \alpha_{ij} \ln p_i \ln p_j + \sum_i \alpha_{iy} \ln p_i \ln y \\ & + \sum_i \alpha_{it} (t - t^*) \ln p_i + \gamma_{it} (t - t^*) \ln y + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{tt} (t - t^*)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$



where C is the production cost, i,j index factors, p is the factor's price, y the output, t the period and t^* a reference year, such that $t-t^*$ is a measure of technological change. Homogeneity of degree one in factor prices is imposed through the following parametric restrictions in Equation 1 (Ryan & Wales, 2000):

$$\sum_i i = 1; \sum_i iy = 0; \sum_i it = 0; \sum_j ij = 0 \text{ for the } i = 1, \dots, n \text{ factors.} \quad (2)$$

By Shepard's Lemma, one arrives at the conditioned factor demands, as cost shares (s), differentiating 1 with respect to factor prices. For each factor i :

$$s_i(p, y, t) = i + \sum_j ij \ln p_j + iy \ln y + it(t - t^*), \quad \forall i. \quad (3)$$

The theoretical restriction of symmetry of the second-order derivatives of the cost function (Young's theorem) is imposed by means of the following restrictions to the cross-price coefficients in the n factor share of Equation 3:

$$ij = ji, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (4)$$

Despite that Equation 1 contains all the parameters in 3, the systems 1–3 (with parametric restrictions 2 and 4) is jointly estimated, in order to increase the statistical efficiency of the estimates (Hussain & Bernard, 2018). Considering the available data, our estimation includes three factors: labour, machinery, and constructions. However, of the three share equations in 3, we estimate the labour and machinery equations only, to avoid a singularity problem. Systems 1–3 is estimated using Zellner's (1962) seemingly unrelated regressions in its iterative version (IT-SUR), which ensures that the arbitrary decision of which equation to exclude carries no consequences in the estimation results (Baum & Linz, 2009).

A check of global concavity of the cost function in each sample point is performed using the approach by Diewert and Wales (1987), implemented in the Stata software by Baum and Linz (2009). Diewert and Wales (1987) show that the cost function will be (quasi)concave as long as the matrix M :

$$M = H - S^k + SS', \quad (5)$$

is negative (semi)definite. This will depend on all the eigenvalues () being (non-negative) positive. In 5, H is the Hessian matrix, S is the shares matrix and S^k is a diagonal matrix of shares, all of order $k \times k$, being k the number of factors in the cost function.

Estimated coefficients of systems 1–3 are used to calculate changes in total costs associated with changes in output. Total labour costs (average wages times the number of workers) (C_l) equals to:

$$C_l = C * s_l. \quad (6)$$

Taking logarithms in 6 and differentiating both sides with respect to the output, after some manipulations, the change in total labour cost (dC_l) in region r as a function of estimated coefficients is:

$$dC_{lr} = C_{lr} * d\ln y_r (c_{yr} + s_{ly} / s_{lr}), \quad (7)$$

where $c_{yr} \equiv \left(\frac{d\ln C}{d\ln y} \right)_r$ is the output elasticity of total costs obtained from the estimation of 1, and $s_{ly} \equiv \frac{ds_l}{d\ln y} \equiv a_{ly}$ is the output semi-elasticity of the labour share in total costs. It worth noting that being dependent on the values of the covariates, the output elasticity of total cost (c_{yr}) in Equation 9 is specific for each observation while the output

TABLE 1 The data

Variable in the model	Empirical variable	Source
y (output)	Regional GDP (thousands of millions Ch.\$)	Central Bank of Chile
p_l (price of labour)	Average income of employed people in the region as an index (base 100 = metropolitan region in 2013)	National Institute of Statistics, national employment survey (ENE), (Nov.-Jan. moving trimester).
p_k (price of machinery)	Capital goods imports price index (national) (base 100 = 2013)	Central Bank of Chile
p_c (price of constructions)	Deflator of fixed capital consumption in the construction sector (national) (base 100 = 2013)	Central Bank of Chile
C_l (labour costs)	$C_l = p_l \times$ number of employed people in the region (thousands of millions Ch.\$)	Employed people: National Institute of Statistics, national employment survey (ENE), (Nov-Jan. moving trimester).
C_k (machinery costs)	Fixed capital consumption in machinery and equipment (thousands of millions Ch.\$). Allocated to regions using the share of each region in total capital.	Fixed capital consumption in machinery and equipment: Central Bank of Chile. Regional share in total capital estimated by Cerda (2018).
C_c (construction costs)	Fixed capital consumption in construction (housing plus rest of construction) (thousands of millions Ch.\$). Allocated to regions using the share of each region in total construction workers each year.	Fixed capital consumption in construction (housing plus rest of construction): Central Bank of Chile. Regional share o in total construction workers each year.: National Institute of Statistics, national employment survey (ENE), (Nov.-Jan. moving trimester).
C (total cost)	$C_l + C_k + C_c$	
s_i	Share of factor i in total cost: $s_i = C_i/C$	

elasticity of the labour share (η_{ly}) is constant across the entire sample space. From Equation 7 it is clear that the change in labour triggered by a change in output includes the effect of output changes on total regional cost (η_{cy}) and factor substitution effects due to changes in the production scale (η_{sy}).

Changes in total labour costs due to changes in output are then converted into changes in jobs (dl) using average incomes of workers in each region (p_{lr}):

$$dl_r = \frac{dC_{lr}}{p_{lr}}. \quad (8)$$

The systems 1–3 are fitted using annual data of the 15 Chilean regions existing up to 2018 and for the period 2013–2018. Regional GDP as chained volume (based on the 2013 Chilean input–output matrix) in thousands of millions Ch.\$ (variable y) is reported by the national accounts system managed by the Chilean Central Bank. Fixed capital consumption in machinery (in thousands of millions Ch.\$) proxies machinery costs (C_k). It was retrieved from the same source. The fixed capital consumption in machinery was allocated to regions using regional shares in total capital calculated by Cerda (2018). We proxied the price of machinery (p_k) with the price index of capital goods imports (base 2013 = 100), also reported by the Chilean Central Bank. This price index does not have regional variation, which can introduce some measurement errors. However, as argued by Anríquez and López (2007), mobility of capital goods across regions is subject to little frictions due to a well-integrated capital market in Chile, so prices should not have major regional differences. Fixed capital consumption in construction (housing plus rest of construction, in

1 **TABLE 2** Expert forecasts of product growth for the Chilean economy in 2020

2 Source	3 Forecast end of 4 2019 (% of GDP) (1)	5 Forecast in June 6 2020 (% of GDP) (2)	7 Impact of COVID-19 8 (% of GDP) (1)-(2)
World Bank	2.5	-4.3	-6.8
OECD	2.4	-5.6	-8
OECD 2/1	2.4	-7.1	-9.5
ECLAC	1	-5.3	-6.3
Average			-7.7

10 Note: OECD refers to the forecast with only one virus outbreak and OECD2 with a second.

11 thousands of millions Ch.\$) was used as the construction costs variable (C_c). It was also taken from the national
 12 accounts system. It was allocated to regions using the share of each region in total construction workers each year,
 13 share calculated using the National Employment Survey (ENE, mobile trimester November–January) run by the Chil-
 14 ean National Institute of Statistics (INE). For the price of construction (p_c), we used the deflator of fixed capital con-
 15 sumption in the construction sector in the national accounts system (base 100 = 2013), also unavailable for regions.
 16 Again, this is a source of measurement error, and possibly more important due to, for instance, regional differences
 17 in land prices, differences that we cannot control with the data at hand. The average income of workers in each
 18 region each year was obtained from the INE's Supplementary Survey of Incomes (ESI), an extra module of the ENE
 19 survey added each year in the mobile trimester October–December. It was multiplied by the regional number of
 20 workers to get the regional labour costs (C_l) each year. Workers' mean income was turned into an index (base
 21 100 = metropolitan region of Santiago in 2013) for its use in the regressions as the labour price variable (p). Total
 22 regional costs were obtained adding labour, machinery and construction costs and then the share of each factor (s_{lr} ,
 23 s_{kr} , s_{cr}) was computed. A summary of the variables used in the econometric estimation can be found in Table 1.⁴

T1

25 We define three scenarios of product fall following the most recent expert forecasts for the Chilean economy
 26 (World Bank, OECD and United Nations' ECLAC). The product impact of COVID-19 is defined as the difference
 27 between national product change forecasted before (December 2019–January 2020) and after (first days of June
 28 2020) the outbreak of the virus. The *average* scenario is defined as an impact equal to the average of the four fore-
 29 casts, and amounts to 7.7%. The *pessimistic* scenario is defined according to the largest impact, the OECD forecast
 30 with a second COVID-19 outbreak which amounts to a 9.5% fall. The *optimistic* scenario corresponds to the mildest
 31 product impact, by ECLAC, a fall of around 6.3%. The scenarios and the simulation parameters are summarized in
 32 Table 2.

T2

33 Using the expert forecasts, forecasted product impact in each scenario is allocated to regions using regional
 34 weights (w_r), such that Equation 8 now reads as:

$$35 \quad dl_r = C_{lr}/p_{lr} * dy^* r / (y^* w_r) (c_{yr} + s_{ly} / s_{lr}), \quad (9)$$

36 where y is the national product in 2019 and dy is the national product loss (in levels) for 2020 in each scenario. r is
 37 a regional parameter used for allocating the forecasted national product loss in 2020 among the (former) fifteen
 38 regions, and w_r is the regional share in total product (in 2018, last year available).⁵

39 The r parameter is calculated as:

$$40 \quad r = \sum_s W_s^{RM} * w_{sr}. \quad (10)$$

41 ⁴Data complied by the Chilean Central Bank was retrieved from its statistics website: <https://www.bcentral.cl/areas/estadisticas>. Data reported by INE
 42 was obtained from INE.stat (<https://stat.ine.cl/>) and INE databank (<http://bancodatosene.ine.cl/>) websites.

43 ⁵Total here means the sum of the 15 regions, which is not equal to the national product, as the national GDP includes items which are not suitable of
 44 regional allocation.

TABLE 3 System (1)–(3) estimation results

Variable	C	sl	sk
lnpl	0.940*** (0.098)	-0.065*** (0.017)	0.015 (0.020)
lnpl*lnpl	-0.065*** (0.017)		
lnpk	0.060 (0.098)	0.015 (0.020)	-0.000*** (0.000)
lnpk*lnpk	-0.000*** (0.000)		
lnpc	0.000*** (0.000)	-0.052** (0.024)	-0.000 (0.000)
lnpc*lnpc	0.056*** (0.020)	-0.006 (0.026)	0.000*** (0.000)
lny	0.489** (0.202)	-0.001 (0.005)	0.005 (0.006)
lny*lny	0.020* (0.011)		
lnpl*lnpk	0.015 (0.020)		
lnpl*lnpc	-0.006 (0.026)		
lnpl*lny	-0.001 (0.005)		
lnpk*lnpc	-0.000 (0.000)		
lnpk*lny	0.005 (0.006)		
lnpc*lny	-0.005 (0.005)		
t-t*	0.110 (0.108)	0.000** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
(t-t*)2	-0.013** (0.006)		
lnpl*(t-t*)	0.000*** (0.000)		
lnpk*(t-t*)	0.000*** (0.000)		
lnpc*(t-t*)	0.000*** (0.000)		
lny*(t-t*)	0.009 (0.010)		
Constant	-2.889*** (0.985)	0.940*** (0.098)	0.060 (0.098)
Observations	88	88	88
chi2 p-value	0.0000	0.0000	0.4725
Breusch-Pagan test of errors independence (p-value)	0.0000		

Note: significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Standard errors in parenthesis.⁶

w_s^{RM} is the contribution of each economic sector ($s = 1, \dots, 21$) to total employment change observed in the metropolitan region of Santiago between February–April 2020 and February–April 2019 (same trimester to avoid seasonality problems), and w_{sr} is the share of region r in total workers in the s sector. Thus, α_r considers the likely sectoral differences in employment effects of the pandemic and the importance of each sector in each regional economy.⁶

The use of employment changes in the metropolitan region to calculate the α_r parameter is grounded in the following reasons. In the period between the first draft of this paper and the revised version, the National Institute of Statistics released the results of the National Employment Survey (NES) for the moving trimester February–April, 2020 which allows assessing the initial employment effects of the virus outbreak. So far (first days of June 2020), the Chilean National Government has opted for a strategy of “dynamic lockdowns,” which means that specific areas (municipalities or specific areas within a municipality) are in lockdown and released according to the epidemiologic situation, an assessment largely based on the spatial concentration of detected COVID-19 cases. By the end of April 2020, the metropolitan region of Santiago accounted for around 80% of total cases (twice its share in national population) and is the only Chilean region where a sizeable population went into a prolonged (more than a few weeks) lockdown. For instance, a large section of the municipality of Santiago (where the city main business and public

⁶This way of allocating regionally the impacts of COVID-19 was motivated by the comments of an anonymous reviewer to whom we are very grateful.

1 **TABLE 4** Output elasticities of total costs in 2018 for Chilean regions

Region	ϵ_{Cyr}	Standard error	P-value	95% Confidence interval
Arica y Parinacota	0.838	0.057	0.000	0.726 0.950
Tarapacá	0.884	0.046	0.000	0.794 0.973
Antofagasta	0.942	0.050	0.000	0.845 1.039
Atacama	0.882	0.046	0.000	0.792 0.972
Coquimbo	0.892	0.045	0.000	0.804 0.980
Valparaíso	0.934	0.048	0.000	0.840 1.028
Metropolitana	0.991	0.068	0.000	0.858 1.124
O'Higgins	0.911	0.045	0.000	0.823 0.998
Maule	0.899	0.044	0.000	0.812 0.986
Biobio	0.930	0.047	0.000	0.838 1.023
Araucanía	0.889	0.045	0.000	0.801 0.978
Los Ríos	0.861	0.050	0.000	0.762 0.959
Los Lagos	0.896	0.045	0.000	0.809 0.984
Aysén	0.828	0.061	0.000	0.708 0.948
Magallanes	0.854	0.052	0.000	0.752 0.956

administration district is located) entered into lockdown by 26 March 2020, along with other six municipalities, amounting to around 1.3 million people. By the first days of June 2020, the municipality of Santiago has not been released yet and, on the contrary, the strategy of dynamic lockdowns has shifted to the lockdown of the entire greater Santiago City (34 municipalities) and some surrounding municipalities. The Santiago metropolitan region is the core and largest (around 40% of the national population) region, and has the highest sectoral diversity (with all economic sectors well represented). Thus, the results of the February–April round of the NES survey for the metropolitan region of Santiago provide what is arguably the best snapshot currently available of the sectorial employment effects in Chile in the likely case of the spread of the disease along the entire country and the implementation of total regional lockdowns.

To estimate the employment effects of COVID-19 in each region, total labour costs (C_{lr}), average regional workers' income (p_{lr}), the output elasticity of total costs (ϵ_{Cyr}) and the share of labour in total costs (s_{lr}) are all evaluated for each region in 2018 (last year with all data available). Confidence intervals for impacts calculated with equation 9 are calculated using the delta method.

3 | RESULTS

Table 3 summarizes the estimation results of system 1–3 for a filtered sample of 88 observations.⁷ The results are largely consistent with theory. Total marginal effects indicate that costs are non-decreasing in output and factor prices. Factors shares decrease as their price increase. Point estimates suggest substitution between machinery and constructions. There is, on the contrary, no clear substitution relationship between labour and the other production

⁷The system 1–3 was initially estimated using the full sample of 90 observations (15 regions × 6 years). Estimated elasticities were used to make retrodictions of employment changes in the 2008–2013 period, using Equations 7 and 8. An analysis of the standardized residuals (i.e., the standardized difference between observed and retrodicted employment changes) revealed two clear outliers where the rule-of-thumb criterion of a standardized residual greater than two (in absolute terms) was exceeded. Such outliers were excluded in the final estimations. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for motivating this validation exercise.




FIGURE 2 Model validation – predicted vs observed regional employment changes for the 2013–2018 period

factors, although this is probably more related to the small sample size and the lack of regional variation of capital and construction prices. Concavity is verified in around 76% of the sample. The Breusch–Pagan test confirms the lack of independence of the errors across equations, which is expected since all derive from the same underlying technology (implicit in the cost minimization problem). Altogether, the results give confidence in that in spite of considerable data limitations, the estimated translog cost function provides a reasonable representation of the aggregated regional production technology.

Output elasticities of total costs (ϵ_{Cyr}) in 2018 and their standard errors are reported for each region in Table 4. T4 They range from 0.828 (Aysén, south end of the country) to 0.991 (metropolitan region of Santiago). At a 95% confidence, in 11 out of the 15 regions, total costs respond less than proportionally to changes in output. In particular, the northernmost region (Arica y Parinacota) and the two southernmost (Aysén and Magallanes) are estimated as the less responsive to output changes. The estimated output elasticity of the labour share (constant across the sample space) indicates, on the contrary, that the share of labour in total costs is largely invariant to the scale of production ($\epsilon_{sly} = -0.0005$, not significant). This means that the impact of COVID-19 on employment would be mostly due to the reduction in output and would not be substantially buffered (nor amplified) by a factors' substitution triggered by the large product shrinkage. Again, we cannot discard that the lack of significance of this second elasticity is due to the lack of regional variation in factor prices and the small sample size. As a simple validation exercise, Figure 2 displays observed against predicted employment changes for the period 2013–2018. Predictions were obtained using the estimated elasticities in Equations 7 and 8. A 45-degree line is added to ease visualization. A simple regression indicates a R^2 of 0.57 and a slope coefficient of 0.74.⁸ Overall, the model seems to capture well the fundamental underlying economic relationships and the proposed method proves useful for estimating regional employment effects of COVID-19 in Chile. F2

Table 5 summarizes the regional parameters used in the calculation of labour impacts with Equation 9. They show the large (40%) share of the Santiago metropolitan region in the national impact (ϵ_r). The calculated share is, nevertheless, lower than its share in the total product (46%). The region of Antofagasta, the largest mining region in the country, is the one with the lowest calculated share in the national impact (2.4%) relative to its share in the total product (11%). On the contrary, Biobio, a region with the third largest urban agglomeration in the country (Concepción), has a high (12%) calculated share in the national impact given its share in the total product (around 8%). This is due to the specific regional employment structure characterized by a relatively high

⁸The standardized residuals were all below the rule of thumb value of two in absolute terms.

**TABLE 5** Regional parameters for the employment impact calculations

Region	Regional GDP 2018 (thousands of millions Ch.\$)	Regional weight (w_r)	Regional share in total product 2018 (w_r)	Total labour costs 2018 (thousands of million Ch.\$)	Mean workers annual wage 2018 (thousands Ch.\$)	Share of labour in total costs 2018 (%)
Arica y Parinacota	1,111.9	0.009	0.008	436.8	5,819	62.3
Tarapacá	3,433.1	0.016	0.025	1,031.6	6,138	62.8
Antofagasta	14,787.8	0.024	0.106	2,422.4	8,310	59.3
Atacama	3,323.5	0.013	0.024	942.4	6,592	63.4
Coquimbo	4,251.4	0.043	0.030	2,093.7	5,542	67.4
Valparaíso	12,135.3	0.098	0.087	5,584.0	6,589	67.4
Metropolitana	65,031.3	0.404	0.465	27,255.7	8,036	72.5
O'Higgins	6,733.1	0.052	0.048	2,659.4	5,862	70.8
Maula	4,999.9	0.067	0.036	2,692.9	5,287	66.0
Biobio	11,018.5	0.116	0.079	5,361.9	5,550	68.3
Araucanía	3,951.6	0.053	0.028	2,512.0	5,333	64.2
Los Ríos	1,947.4	0.027	0.014	1,122.5	5,868	66.3
Los Lagos	4,706.1	0.060	0.034	2,686.9	6,047	68.9
Aysén	856.1	0.008	0.006	468.3	7,494	67.7
Magallanes	1,654.8	0.010	0.012	890.7	10,134	77.2

Notes: /1 dy = -11,961.1 (th. MM Ch. \$) in the average, (th. MN Ch. \$) -14,757.2 in the pessimistic and -9,786.4 (th. MM Ch. \$) in the optimistic scenario. sly = -0.0005 for all regions.
 Cyr in Table 4. /2 "Total" costs are the sum of labour, machinery and constructions costs.

TABLE 6 Estimated impacts of COVID-19 on regional employment

Region	Average scenario			Optimistic scenario			Pessimistic scenario		
	Estimate	95% confidence interval		Estimate	95% confidence interval		Estimate	95% confidence interval	
Arica y Parinacota	-5,468	-6,208	-4,727	-4,474	-5,079	-3,868	-6,746	-7,659	-5,832
Tarapacá	-7,535	-8,313	-6,758	-6,165	-6,802	-5,529	-9,297	-10,257	-8,337
Antofagasta	-4,753	-5,255	-4,251	-3,889	-4,299	-3,478	-5,864	-6,483	-5,245
Atacama	-5,303	-5,854	-4,752	-4,339	-4,789	-3,888	-6,542	-7,222	-5,863
Coquimbo	-36,561	-40,213	-32,910	-29,914	-32,901	-26,926	-45,108	-49,613	-40,603
Valparaíso	-68,895	-75,910	-61,879	-56,368	-62,109	-50,628	-85,000	-93,656	-76,344
Metropolitana	-224,874	-255,276	-194,471	-183,987	-208,862	-159,113	-277,441	-314,951	-239,932
O'Higgins	-34,320	-37,663	-30,976	-28,080	-30,816	-25,344	-42,343	-46,468	-38,217
Maule	-65,848	-72,327	-59,369	-53,876	-59,176	-48,575	-81,241	-89,234	-73,248
BioBio	-102,136	-112,385	-91,887	-83,566	-91,951	-75,180	-126,012	-138,656	-113,367
Araucanía	-59,980	-66,027	-53,934	-49,075	-54,022	-44,128	-74,002	-81,462	-66,542
Los Ríos	-24,500	-27,340	-21,659	-20,045	-22,369	-17,721	-30,227	-33,731	-26,723
Los Lagos	-54,964	-60,405	-49,523	-44,970	-49,422	-40,519	-67,812	-74,525	-61,100
Aysén	-5,279	-6,052	-4,506	-4,319	-4,952	-3,687	-6,513	-7,467	-5,559
Magallanes	-5,013	-5,623	-4,403	-4,102	-4,601	-3,603	-6,185	-6,937	-5,433
Total	-705,428			-577,168			-870,333		



participation of agriculture and manufacturing, two sectors showing large initial employment impacts. According to the February–April ENE survey, retail, lodging and restaurants and manufacturing are the sectors most affected initially by the COVID-19 shock, while others such as health, education or mining are far less. While sectors such as lodging and restaurants correspond with those at the greatest risk in the US (Muro et al., 2020), others like mining (described as one with the highest risks in the US) are not among the industries with the highest initial job losses according to the ENE survey. This suggest some particularities of the (regional) employment effects of COVID-19 in Chile.

Table 6 summarizes the estimated employment losses in each region and their 95% confidence intervals and Figure 3 maps such losses as a percentage of total regional jobs. Overall, total job losses are more or less proportional to the expert forecasts of product shrinkage, as regional output elasticities are close to unity and the estimated output elasticity of the labour share in total costs is negligible. Total job losses amount to around 705,000 in the average scenario. In the pessimistic scenario, job losses amount to nearly 870,000 and to 577,000 in the optimistic scenario. Looking at the regional variation of impacts, almost a third of the national variation (nearly 225,000 jobs) is estimated in the metropolitan region of Santiago, although this is considerably less than its share in national employment (44%). The least impacted region in relative terms would be the region of Antofagasta, a region where mining accounts to around 54% of the regional GDP. In the average scenario, job losses would be of around 4,700, which means around 0.7% of the national job loss. This is proportionally less




FIGURE 3 Regional employment impacts as a percentage of total jobs. Left: Average scenario. Centre: Pessimistic scenario. Right: Optimistic Scenario

than its share in the national employment (3.6%), and only a 1.5% of total regional jobs. Although, compared to other regions, the expenditures in production factors has been relatively sensitive to output variations (Table 4) in Antofagasta, the regional employment structure is highly specialized in mining and this sector is not one of the most affected by the disease based on the evidence so far. Antofagasta's economy is highly sensitive to the copper price cycle (Atienza & Modrego, 2019), and the slow recovery in copper-buying countries (mainly China) will probably help mitigating the employment effects of the pandemic. On the contrary, the region of Los Lagos is the most affected region in relative terms (13.6% of total regional employment in the average scenario, Figure 3). Los Lagos is a region located in the south of the country, which is oriented to the primary natural resources production and its downstream agri-food industry. Agriculture, livestock, forestry, fishing and aquaculture alone account for around 12% of the regional product and manufacturing adds another 26%. Although the region's factors expenditure had an around average sensitivity to output changes (Table 4), its specialization in agriculture and (agri-food) manufacturing (two of the most initially affected sectors by COVID-19) leads to the large forecasted employment impacts in relative terms. More generally, Figure 3 illustrates how mining regions in the north of the country (Tarapacá, Antofagasta and Atacama) are predicted to have lower relative job losses compared to agriculture and agri-food-oriented regions in the centre and centre-south (Maule, Araucanía, Los Ríos and Los Lagos).

Overall, in all regions and scenarios, the estimated regional employment effects of COVID-19 are sizeable and call for determined actions for the protection of employment and production along the entire country. Considering that the pandemic is still ongoing and forecasts of economic impacts for the Chilean economy may still change, these estimations should be considered as a preliminary effort.

4 | CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents preliminary forecasts of the employment losses at the regional level due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Following a methodological approach based on the estimation of an aggregated cost function for the period 2013–2018 and dual production theory, the employment losses are calculated for different scenarios of regional output change. The estimations suggest sizeable impacts. In the average scenario, the estimated impact is around 705,000 jobs country-wide, which amounts to 870,000 and 577,000 in the pessimistic and optimistic scenarios respectively. In regional terms, impacts are heterogeneous across regions, being agriculture and agri-food oriented regions in the centre-south more affected than mining regions in the north.

These estimates are preliminary only, and should be taken with caution. A first limitation is given by the data, particularly the lack of regional data on consumption and prices of several production factors. Better estimates would be possible if there was more complete regional data, particularly on consumption and prices of production factors. A second limitation comes from the fact that we do not model explicitly the spatial spread of the disease nor output impacts of COVID-19 in each region. Instead, we rely on expert forecasts for the national economy, which are regionally allocated in a more or less *ad hoc* way, and implicitly assuming a uniform dispersion of the virus throughout the country. Finally, statistical relationships are estimated using data for a period of (moderated) growth of the national economy. On the contrary, estimated elasticities are used to forecast job losses in a situation of product fall not seeing during the estimation period. It is unclear whether employment adjustments in this COVID-19 context will be directly proportional to those seen in the estimation period. Indeed, the results of the ENE survey for the moving trimester February–April 2020 suggest that adjustment mechanisms not observed, at least recently, are currently taking place in the Chilean labour market. Traditionally, self-employment and informality have been powerful buffer mechanisms containing unemployment outbreaks during previous crises. This time, an unusual rise in the number of inactive people (around 720 people) is what accompanies an increase in unemployment of only 0.9% points between January–March and February–April 2020. At the same time, there was a large reduction in informal jobs (around 415,000). Both suggest that many



1 jobs lost are due to informal workers exiting the labour market, a pattern not observed at a large scale during
2 the 2013–2018 period. This phenomenon is interesting in itself and deserves further research and monitoring by
3 national and regional authorities.

4 Based on all these considerations, total job losses at the end of the pandemic will probably exceed the present
5 forecasts. Indeed, between the last two moving trimesters, a period capturing only the initial employment effects of
6 COVID-19, the National Employment Survey (ENE) reports a fall in the number of employed of around 706 already,
7 very close to what we forecast for the average scenario. The inactive people and unemployed behind these figures
8 may amplify the recession in the sense of Guerrieri et al. (2020). If that is the case, the expert forecasts of product
9 losses we are using may also fall short, as the downwards corrections in most expert projections between April and
10 June suggest.

11 Keeping these caveats in mind, the extent of estimated impacts is large (around 700 to 870,000 jobs potentially lost), and calls for determined actions for the protection of employment and production along the whole
12 country. As a response to the virus outbreak, sizeable support packages have been implemented in Chile and
13 others are currently being discussed. Actions already implemented include modifications to the national employment
14 insurance for its use in situations of temporary job suspensions (thus avoiding firings), insurance which is
15 being supported by supplementary public funds, state-guaranteed loans with near-zero real interest rates for firms,
16 and additional cash and in-kind transfers to vulnerable households. Regarding the reformed unemployment insurance,
17 the last ENE survey indicates an increase of around 365,000 “absent employees” (people having a job but
18 that was not performed on-site last week), a change of a magnitude which is only explainable by the reformed
19 employment insurance.

20 Regional authorities should stand ready for rapid and effective implementation of this support initiatives,
21 keeping a close monitoring of their communities and collaborating to the targeting and implementation of national
22 initiatives. Employers, in turn, can also make a contribution, making a good use of the employment protection
23 insurances, limiting its use to those cases when it is truly needed, and rapidly processing the requests. Financial
24 institutions can also play an important role in helping mitigate the economic consequences of COVID-19, by issuing
25 rapidly and effectively state-guaranteed loans to those firms which need them the most, particularly the small
26 and medium ones.

27 A direct extension of this work is the replication of the analysis for regional industries, in order to assess the sectoral
28 impacts in each region and thus inform regional strategies. Likewise, a better understanding of the different
29 types of contractual arrangements that are predominant in each productive sector and how sensitive are jobs to economic
30 shocks under these different arrangements, will shed lights on more specific employment protection policies
31 for this and other crises to come. Finally, this work has not considered regional interactions which, once taken into
32 account, could alter significantly the estimated regional distribution of the impacts of COVID-19. Such interactions
33 may stem, for instance, from physical and human capital externalities and regional growth spillover effects
34 (Valdez, 2019), and could be analyzed using spatial econometric methods, interregional input-output analysis and/or
35 regional computable general equilibrium models. Global VAR (GVAR) models (Pesaran, Schuermann, &
36 Weiner, 2004), which have been applied to forecasts of regional unemployment in Germany (Schanne, Wapler, &
37 Weyh, 2010), are also a particularly appealing alternative for forecasting and simulating regional impacts of COVID-
38 19. Further studies along these lines can substantially expand our understanding of the mechanisms by which the
39 effects of the pandemic may diffuse across regions.

40

42 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

43 The authors are grateful to the two anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments and suggestions. Any
44 errors are solely the authors' responsibility. Modrego wishes to thank the support of the Chilean National Agency of
45 Research and Development (ANID) through the FONDECYT Initiation in Research Fund 2019 [Grant: 11190112].
46 Canales is partially supported by FONDECYT Postdoctoral Grant No. 3200650 and by the Institute for Research in
47 Market Imperfections and Public Policy, MIPP, ICM IS130002.



1 REFERENCES

- 2 Anríquez, G., & López, R. (2007). Agricultural growth and poverty in an archetypical middle income country: Chile
3 1987–2003. *Agricultural Economics*, 36(2), 191–202.
- 4 Atienza, M., & Modrego, F. (2019). The spatially asymmetric evolution of mining services suppliers during the expansion and
5 contraction phases of the copper super-cycle in Chile. *Resources Policy*, 61, 77–87.
- 6 Baum, C. F., & Linz, T. (2009). Evaluating concavity for production and cost functions. *The Stata Journal*, 9(1), 161–165.
- 7 Berndt, E. R. (1991). *The practice of econometrics: Classic and contemporary*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- 8 Blanchard, O. J., Diamond, P., Hall, R. E., & Murphy, K. (1990). The cyclical behavior of the gross flows of US workers. QS
Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1990(2), 85–155.
- 9 Cerdá, H. A. (2018). Inversión, stock de capital e infraestructuras en la economía chilena: una aproximación por regiones y
10 actividad económica, 1990–2010. Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- 11 Chambers, R. G. (1988). *Applied production analysis: A dual approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 12 Christensen, L. R., Jorgenson, D. W., & Lau, L. J. (1971). Conjugate duality and the transcendental logarithmic production
13 function. *Econometrica*, 39(4), 255–256.
- 14 Darby, M. R., Haltiwanger, J. C., & Plant, M. W. (1985). Unemployment-rate dynamics and persistent unemployment under
15 rational expectations. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 1558.
- 16 Darby, M. R., Haltiwanger, J. C., & Plant, M. W. (1986). The ins and outs of unemployment: The ins win. National Bureau of
17 Economic Research Working Paper 1997.
- 18 Davis, S. J., & Haltiwanger, J. (1990). Gross job creation and destruction: Microeconomic evidence and macroeconomic
19 implications. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 5, 123–168.
- 20 Davis, S. J., & Haltiwanger, J. (1992). Gross job creation, gross job destruction, and employment reallocation. *The Quarterly
Journal of Economics*, 107(3), 819–863.
- 21 Diewert, W. E. (1974). Applications of duality theory. In M. D. Intriligator & D. A. Kendrick (Eds.), *Frontiers of quantitative
economics* (Vol. II) (pp. 106–171). Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing.
- 22 Diewert, W. E., & Wales, T. J. (1987). Flexible functional forms and global curvature conditions. *Econometrica*, 55(1), 43–68.
- 23 Finch, W. H., & Finch, M. E. H. (2017). Multivariate regression with small samples: A comparison of estimation methods.
General Linear Model Journal, 43, 16–30.
- 24 Guerrieri, V., Lorenzoni, G., Straub, L., & Werning, I. (2020). Macroeconomic implications of COVID-19: Can negative supply
shocks cause demand shortages?. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 26918.
- 25 Hussain, J., & Bernard, J. T. (2018). Flexible functional forms and curvature conditions: Parametric productivity estimation in
26 Canadian and US manufacturing industries. In W. H. Greene, L. Khalaf, P. Makdissi, R. C. Sickles, M. Veall, & M. C. Voia
(Eds.), *Productivity and inequality*. New York: Springer.
- 27 International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2020). World economic outlook, April 2020: The great lockdown. Washington, DC: IMF
URL: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO> Q6
- 28 Lund, S., Ellingrud, K., Hancock, B., Manyika, J., & Dua, A. (2020). Lives and livelihoods: Assessing the near-term impact of
COVID-19 on US workers. McKinsey global institute. URL: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2020/03/17/the-places-a-covid-19-](https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/McKinsey/Industries/
Public%20Sector/Our%20Insights/Lives%20and%20livelihoods%20Assessing%20the%20near%20term%20
impact%20of%20COVID%2019%20on%20US%20workers/Lives-and-livelihoods-Assessing-the-near-term-impact-of-
COVID-19-on-US-workers.pdf</p><p>29 Muro, M., Maxim, R., & Whiton, J. (2020). The places a COVID-19 recession will likely hit hardest. The Brookings Institution.
Metropolitan Policy Program. URL: <a href=)
recession-will-likely-hit-hardest/
- 30 Olfert, M. R., Partridge, M., Berdegué, J., Escobal, J., Jara, B., & Modrego, F. (2014). Places for place-based policy. *Development
and Policy Review*, 32(1), 5–32.
- 31 Pesaran, M. H., Schuermann, T., & Weiner, S. M. (2004). Modelling regional interdependencies using a global error-
correcting macroeconomic model. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 22, 129–162.
- 32 Pollak, R. A., Sickles, R. C., & Wales, T. J. (1984). The CES-translog: Specification and estimation of a new cost function. *The
Review of Economics and Statistics*, 66(4), 602–607.
- 33 Schanne, N., Wapler, R., & Weyh, A. (2010). Regional unemployment forecasts with spatial interdependencies. *International
Journal of Forecasting*, 26(4), 908–926.
- 34 UN News. (2020). COVID-19: impact could cause equivalent of 195 million job losses, says ILO chief. Media release. URL:
<https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/04/1061322>
- 35 Valdez, R. I. (2019). Spatial diffusion of economic growth and externalities in Mexico. *Investigaciones Regionales—Journal of
Regional Research*, 45, 139–160.



- 1 World Trade Organization (WTO). (2020). Trade set to plunge as COVID-19 pandemic upends global economy. World Trade
2 Organization Press Release 855. URL: https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/pres20_e/pr855_e.htm
- 3 Zellner, A. (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal*
4 *of the American Statistical Association*, 57(298), 348–368.
- 5
- 6

7 **How to cite this article:** Modrego F, Canales A, Bahamonde H. Employment effects of COVID-19 across
8 Chilean regions: An application of the translog cost function. *Reg Sci Policy Pract*. 2020;1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12337>

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Uncorrected Proofs

Inclusive Institutions, Unequal Outcomes: Democracy, State Infrastructural Power, and Inequality 1970-2015

HÉCTOR BAHAMONDE ^{*1} and

MART TRASBERG ^{†2}

¹Assistant Professor, O'Higgins University (Chile)

²PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Tulane University

April 17, 2020

Abstract

Although the relationship between democratic rule and income inequality has received important attention in recent literature, the evidence has been far from conclusive. In this paper, we explore whether the redistributive effect of democratic rule is conditional on state capacity. Previous literature has outlined that pre-existing state infrastructural power may be necessary for redistributive policies under democratic rule. In contrast to that intuitive view, this study argues that democratic rule combined with high state infrastructural power produce higher levels of income inequality through their positive effects on investor confidence, foreign direct investment inflows, and financial development, which favor income concentration at the top. By making use of a novel measure of state capacity based on cumulative census administration, this research finds empirical support for these claims using data from 184 industrial and developing countries between 1971-2016.

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

Keywords— inequality; state-capacity; foreign direct investment; democracy.

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

[†]tmart@tulane.edu; political-science/mart-etrasberg.

We both thank Robert Kaufman, Hillel Soifer, Victor Menaldo, and participants of the “XVI Conference” of *The Italian Association for the History of Economic Thought* (AISPE) in Bologna.

I. INTRODUCTION

Median voter and selectorate theories posit electoral democracy as fundamentally equalizing (Meltzer and Richard 1981; Boix 2003; Acemoglu and Robinson 2006; Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003). However, these “redistributive” propositions have not received support in recent, more empirically minded literature (Timmons 2010; Remington 2011; Acemoglu, Naidu, et al. 2015; Wong 2016; Scheve and Stasavage 2017). The critics of redistributive effects of democratic institutions have noted that deficiencies in mechanisms of responsiveness and accountability, clientelism, interest group capture, and institutional legacies of authoritarianism may pose serious obstacles to equalization policies under democratic rule (Albertus and Menaldo 2018). It has also been suggested that such effects might be heavily context-dependent (Hillel Soifer 2013).

By contrast, fewer scholars have posited that democracy may, instead, causally lead to a more unequal income distribution. For example, democratic checks and balances might increase inequality by strengthening the influence of economic elites in policy-making (Remington 2011; Acemoglu, Naidu, et al. 2015), or by blocking redistributive policies through institutional channels, such as legislatures, courts, and bureaucracy (Albertus 2015; Wong 2016; Albertus and Menaldo 2016). In some areas, such as land reform, autocracies have achieved greater success in pro-poor redistribution (Albertus 2015). Other, more distant literature, has documented that democracy may intensify distributive conflicts (S. Huntington 1968; Kohli 2004; Collier and Rohmer 2008), or reinforce clientelist modes of interest intermediation, which may be associated with dismal socio-economic outcomes, including increasing inequality (Keefer and Vlaicu 2008; Weitz-Shapiro 2014).

Looking at context-conditionality could be a new way forward to clarify both the theoretical and empirical relationship between democracy and inequality. In this paper, we explore whether democracy’s impact on inequality is conditioned by state capacity. It could be expected that pre-existing state capacity, in the form of functioning bureaucracies and territorial penetration, is necessary for redistributive policies under democratic rule (Ziblatt 2008). For example, Hillel Soifer (2013), focused on the effect of inequality on democratization and, argued that inequality-induced redistributive conflict only ensues in the context of considerable infrastructural power, which allows the implementation of redistributive taxation and transfer policies.

This study found no empirical support for these intuitive claims. Using error correction models with data from 184 industrial and developing countries from 1971-2016, along with a novel measure

of state infrastructural power based on cumulative census administration data, it was shown that democratic rule combined with high state capacity leads to increasing income inequality over time. This study's theoretical argument centers on the idea that democracy and high state capacity provide the context of optimal property rights and contract security, which favors a high-quality investment climate through lower risk. Democracy offers protection of private property rights from arbitrary government involvement, mostly benefiting economic elites and the business sector. High levels of state infrastructural power, in turn, provide the preconditions for the functioning of a capitalist market economy through supporting legal and administrative institutions, which enhances private contracting among economic agents (Williamson 1985; Chaudhry 1993). When property rights are protected from arbitrary government involvement and state institutions provide a well-oiled administration and legal system throughout national territory, the quality of the investment climate is likely to reach to its zenith.

This study argues that the high-quality investment environment backed by democratic and high-capacity state institutions increases income inequality through two transmission channels: the higher inflows of foreign direct investment (FDI) and the development of sophisticated financial sectors. Property rights and contract security, backed by high-capacity democratic institutions, are both major determinants of FDI inflows and financial development in the existing literature. Both of these variables have been associated in the recent literature with increasing inequality.¹ FDI inflows increase the demand for skilled workers, leading to a larger wage gap between skilled and unskilled works, which is likely to increase labor income inequality (Feenstra:1997aa; Jaumotte:2013aa). In addition, multinational corporations and transnational elites become more relevant actors in national politics with increasing FDI flows, likely exerting downward pressures to labor protecting regulations, redistributive taxation, and transfers. We also suggest that financial development is likely to happen in an “intensive margin,” benefiting the economic fortunes of those who already enjoy access to capital (Greenwood and Jovanovic 1990). For example, highly developed financial instruments are likely to provide higher rates of returns to pre-existing levels of capital, providing a basis for capital concentration Piketty (2014).

The theory and empirical approach here focus on the change in within-country inequality since 1970, a period which has largely coincided with an increase in inequality for many, if not most, high- and middle-income countries. Despite the fact that high-capacity nations with the longest

¹See Jaumotte:2013aa for an overview on that literature.

democratic experience are likely to have the lowest levels of inequality and the most far-reaching taxation and transfers systems, the growth of these institutions occurred largely before the 1970s. We remain agnostic on the reason behind both the development of these institutions and the dynamics of change in inequality before the 1970s,² as well as its relationship with state capacity and democratic rule.³ In other words, this work provides no arguments about the *levels* of inequality, only the determinants of the within-country change over time since 1970.

The crucial factors of our theory that increase inequality—the FDI and financial development—has spread since the 1970s, when the current wave of economic globalization related to cross-border capital flows and financial growth accelerated. Given the previous literature, it is plausible to believe that the within-country variation in these two variables is associated with within-country inequality changes. To be clear, our argument does not imply that nations that lack strong property rights protection and contract security would have lower inequality, rather, they are less likely to experience the trend of increasing inequality in the post-1970 period, given their limited capacity to attract FDI and develop sophisticated financial sectors. Our main testable prediction concerning the post-1970 period, therefore, is that inequality increases in the contexts of when democratic rule and high levels of state capacity coincide.

This paper makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, we contribute to the understanding of institutional underpinnings of increasing within-country inequality in the last four decades in many parts of the world.⁴ The trend of increasing income inequality has been amply documented (Piketty 2014; Atkinson 2015), however, we still lack a systematic understanding of the determinants of the relative salience of this trend within different countries. Second, we contribute to the broader literature on regime type and redistribution. In contrast with the previous literature, we focus less on the political determinants of redistributive capacity, such as taxation and redistributive transfers,⁵ and more on the changes in labor and capital markets, determining income distribution through the wage shares of high- and low-skilled workers and the degree of capital income concentration to the top. These changes are directly shaped by financial development

²Recent literature has vigorously explored the dynamics between historical change in inequality within nations making use of new historical datasets (Piketty 2014; Scheve and Stasavage 2012).

³Recent works employing historical datasets stemming back from the early 19th century have casted serious doubts on the idea that democratic rule expanded progressive income taxation (Scheve and Stasavage 2012) or education spending (Pagalyan:2018aa).

⁴There have been major exceptions to that trend, especially in Latin America, where inequality has declined since the end of 1990s, albeit very slowly (Lopez-Calva:2010aa).

⁵See (Pagalyan:2018aa; Albertus and Menaldo 2018; Scheve and Stasavage 2012) for recent contributions to that literature.

and FDI flows, which operate as causal mechanisms in our theory.

The paper is structured as follows. In section II we present the literature review. In section III, we present our theoretical argument on the interactive relationship between democratic rule, state capacity and inequality. Then, in section IV, we address issues of the measurement of inequality, democracy, and state infrastructural power. We also explain and justify our control variables. In section V we present our empirical design, results from error correction models, and the corresponding robustness checks. Our empirical analysis demonstrates both the interactive effect of democracy and state infrastructural power on income inequality and tests the transmission channels behind this relationship: the combined effects of state capacity and regime type on investor confidence, financial development, and inequality, as well as the effects of the latter variables on income distribution. In section VI we conclude.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Democratic institutions have been conceptualized as a major source of responsiveness and accountability in the political economy literature, providing electoral incentives to redistribute income. Leaders in democratic nations need widespread support to achieve and sustain power, and are, therefore, more likely to move beyond their narrow set of personal interests by appealing to a wider public through public policies (Meltzer and Richard 1981). Compared to authoritarian polities, widespread enfranchisement in democracies is likely to result in higher public goods provision, which may help the poor to benefit from economic growth via investments in human capital (Baum and Lake 2003; Lindert 2004; Morgan and Kelly 2013). These policies are expected to produce more equal income distribution over time. According to Bueno de Mesquita et al. (2003), authoritarian rulers find it more efficient to provide targeted private goods to their “winning coalition,” a narrower group of supporters, which often excludes the poor. In contrast, rulers in democratic systems have to satisfy larger constituencies and find it cheaper to rely on broadly distributed and equalizing public goods.

Democracy’s equalizing effects are also conditioned on and work through the political power of organized groups. Electoral institutions allow underprivileged groups to enter the political realm via political parties, unions, and social mobilization (Korpi 1983; Esping-Andersen 1990; Huber and Stephens 2012). According to power resource arguments, political organization and collective

action capacity are conditioning factors in the democracy-redistribution nexus. Rodrik (1999) found that democracies have higher real wages and labor share in national income, attributing these to a greater freedom of labor association. Despite these plausible theoretical mechanisms, empirical evidence has not offered solid support for inequality-reducing effects of democracy. Several empirical studies incorporating various regions of the developing world find that democracy does not induce lower income inequality (Gradstein and Milanovic 2004; Timmons 2010; Acemoglu, Naidu, et al. 2015; Wong 2016), more progressive taxation (Scheve and Stasavage 2014) or pro-poor social policies (Pagalyan:2018aa; Mulligan, Gil, and Sala-i-Martin 2004; Ross 2006). The causes of this “democratic unresponsiveness” have constituted a major puzzle for the literature. At the same time, some democracies might be more redistributive than others, and the focus on the social and institutional contexts in which democracies operate could be a new way forward for fruitful theorizing.

In this paper, we concentrate on the question of whether democracy’s effect on inequality is conditioned on state capacity. In particular, we study the conditional effect of state infrastructural power, which has received important recent attention as an explanatory variable in determining development outcomes (Knutsen 2013; Hanson 2015). Infrastructural power refers to the institutional capacity of the state to “penetrate its territories and logically implement decisions” (Mann 1984, p. 113). The quality, or “Weberiness,” of state bureaucracy—often used as measure of state capacity—is necessary, however, is by no means sufficient for high infrastructural power. As Hilliel Soifer (2008, pp. 231–232) argued, infrastructural power is conceptually distinct from Weberian bureaucratic professionalism, in that it is focused on the state’s ability to enforce and implement policies, rather than on the autonomy or quality of the bureaucracy itself. Bureaucratic professionalism contributes to infrastructural power, yet must be complemented by the ability of state agents to implement policies and regulations throughout the national territory.

The previous literature has hinted that redistributive policies are more likely in the context where both the political-electoral incentives stemming from regime characteristics and the state capacity to redistribute exist. In low capacity states, democratization should not matter for redistributive outcomes given their inability to collect taxes and implement social policy. Revenue extraction and policy implementation—both crucial for income redistribution—are dependent on the state’s ability to penetrate its territory and implement decisions (Ziblatt 2008). In states with lower state capacity, elites are able to escape taxation, lowering the state ability to provide public goods and

transfers. For example, income taxation requires identifying individual incomes within both the national territory and offshore, assessing value and collecting payments. It is no wonder that weak capacity states have relied on easily-collectible trade and consumption taxes, which tend to be less progressive than taxes on income and wealth (Lieberman 2003; Scott 1988).

Implementation of redistributive policies, such as basic education, health-care, social assistance, and insurance policies are also likely to be dependent on the infrastructural power of the state (Ziblatt 2008). At the same time, under authoritarianism, rulers have little incentive to supply equalizing public goods, regardless state capacity. In these regimes, the capacity—if any—to deliver these benefits, goes unused (Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003). Hillel Soifer (2013) contributes to this line of reasoning, arguing that state capacity affects the credibility of the threat of redistribution under democratic regimes.

III. DEMOCRACY, STATE CAPACITY, AND INVESTOR CONFIDENCE

In contrast to that intuitive account, we present a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between democracy, state capacity, and income inequality. Our theory focuses on changes in inequality since the 1970s, a period which has largely coincided with an increase in within-country inequality in most high- and middle-income countries. Counterintuitively, we argue that the combination of high state capacity and democracy is associated with increases in income inequality. We do not deny that the context of high infrastructural power democracy establishes preconditions for progressive taxation or redistributive policy. However, we contend that other inequality-increasing mechanisms have dominated over the growth of inequality-reducing taxation and government spending patterns in these contexts since the 1970s, given the global trend in the expansion of FDI and financial development during this period.⁶ We argue that democracy and high state capacity provide the context for optimal property rights and contract security, which favors investor confidence through lower risk for capitalist investors. The high-quality investment climate in democratic high capacity setting increases inequality through financial development and larger FDI flows.

Democratic regimes have been widely portrayed to be more likely to respect private property rights and provide greater rule of law, incentivizing capitalist investor confidence (North and Weingast 1989; Olson 2000). An influential argument has connected democracy with higher FDI inflows

⁶See Beck:2010aa for growth of financial sector, and UNCTAD:2012aa for spread of FDI in recent decades.

precisely because of greater investment security (Jensen 2003). **Jensen:2008aa** further argues that democratic regimes reduce investment risks by providing investors—most commonly multinational corporations—formal avenues of influencing policy through the legal system, allowing firms to both observe the legislative process and anticipate changes in policy through greater transparency in the decision-making process and through the potential suffering of larger “audience costs” by reneging on commitments with foreign investors. **Jensen:2008aa; Busse:2007aa;** Jensen (2003) have provided empirical evidence for the positive association between democratic rule and FDI.

At the same time, democracy alone is not enough to secure investor confidence. In the absence of the state’s infrastructural and coercive power, protection of property rights is hardly possible. Infrastructural capacity of state institutions—conceptually distinct from regime type—is likely to be another major determinant of FDI (Li and Resnick 2003). Contract enforcement—based on state capacity to enforce the rule of law among private agents—is likely to be crucial for business confidence and attracting foreign investors, along with the protection of private property from arbitrary government involvement. A long line of literature in contract theory links the economic realities of organizations and societies to the type and quality of contracts that can be written and enforced (Coase 1960; Williamson 1985). The state’s infrastructural power clearly underlies this positive contractual environment. The “watchman” capacities of the state Weberian-like central and local level bureaucracies, impartial courts, uniform weights and measures, and effective law enforcement institutions are crucial for reducing uncertainty and transaction costs.

Contract security is greatly enhanced by smoothly functioning national level markets, which, in turn, require a considerable state infrastructural power. As Chaudhry (1993, p. 252) notes, “creating and regulating markets requires myriad financial, legal, and civil institutions, with stable and firm long-term commitments to regulate the actions of actors.” Besley and Persson (2009) argue that state extractive capacity crucially supports the development of “legal” institutions supporting a contractual environment. By contrast, weak states with absent territorial control are not able to provide these market-enhancing public goods, resulting in below-average investor confidence. In addition, weak states with a low ability to penetrate territories with national bureaucracies may be incapable of dealing with the existence of pre-capitalist monopolies, obstructing the development of national markets (Polanyi 1944). Given that, it is likely that the highest level of investor confidence exists, on average, where democracy and high state capacity coincide. In the FDI literature, Li and Resnick (2003) have argued that FDI inflows tend to be highest in societies that combine both

democratic rule and high bureaucratic capacity.

In addition to fomenting FDI inflows, the democratic high-capacity contexts offer an especially nurturing context for financial development. As Haber, North, and Weingast (2008, p. 4) note, political rulers have “a strong incentive to govern financial systems so as to facilitate their own political survival,”—for example, limiting competition through higher barriers of entry, which allows the appropriation or distribution of rents among supporters stemming from banks and financial services. This rent-seeking behavior is likely to hinder the development of competitive banking systems and securities markets. At the same time, the checks and balances inherent to a democratic system reduce the leverage of governments to expropriate assets and threaten property rights in the financial sector (Haber, North, and Weingast 2008). Democratic politicians also have incentives to promote competitive banking sectors and thriving securities markets when they perceive that the majority of the population benefits from increased access to banking services and cheaper private credit, promoting the electoral fortunes of politicians (Menaldo and Yoo 2015).

State infrastructural power is also likely to support financial development in capitalist economies along with democratic rule, reducing important market failures stemming from information asymmetries obstructing contract writing and enforcement. For example, the creation of accurate property registers by the state allows the banks to know who owns which assets, which facilitates the creation of contracts. The enforcement of modern bankruptcy and the diffusion of modern accounting standards underlying credit expansion may depend on the state’s ability to penetrate the reaches of its territory. The latter have a crucial role in mitigating information asymmetries, allowing banks and investors to better assess their risks, which leads to a greater expansion of credit markets. Stock market expansion is likely to depend on stronger corporate governance and the capacity to enforce bankruptcy laws, which reduces informational asymmetries and transaction costs.⁷

There is an additional reason why low infrastructural power may obstruct the growth of a financial system. Low state capacity might not only contribute to market failure, but also to political failure. Limited capacity to tax populations and gather revenue, accompanying low infrastructural power, might increase the likelihood of the state to turn to the financial system for revenues needed for the political survival of incumbents (Becerra, Cavallo, and Scartascini 2012; Menaldo 2016). As Menaldo (2016, p. 458) argues, “in weak states, a ruler’s fiscal imperative drives the political and market failures that have been putatively fingered as independent causes of financial

⁷This section is based on Haber, North, and Weingast (2008) and Menaldo and Yoo (2015).

underdevelopment.” In weak capacity states, the rulers are especially likely to limit competition and create concentrated banking sectors for rent-extraction purposes, while demanding a share of those rents from the financial sector to finance their expenses (Menaldo 2016, p. 458).

Thus far, we have argued that democratic and high-capacity institutions are more likely to have a high-quality investment climate that attracts more FDI and develops sophisticated financial sectors. The second step of our argument connects these two variables with the trend in increasing income inequality. First, considerable recent evidence has pointed out that FDI flows may increase income inequality in both developed and developing worlds (Jaumotte:2013aa; Basu:2007aa; Reuveny and Li 2003). FDI inflows lead to an increased demand for skilled workers, associated with growing wage differentials between skilled and unskilled jobs, which is likely to increase income inequality (Feenstra:1997aa). For example, the investment of MNC in some sectors is likely to create a small sector of high wage earners and a large backward sector of low wages (Nafziger:1997aa). With increasing FDI flows, multinational corporations and transnational elites become more relevant actors in national politics and are likely to exert downward pressure to labor protecting regulations, redistributive taxation, and transfers (Wong 2016).

The development of a sophisticated financial system is another transmission channel how investor confidence in high-capacity democracies produces higher income inequality. While scholars have long recognized the growth-promoting and poverty-reducing effects of financial development through incentivizing and channeling savings (Beck:2008aa), recent literature has connected financial development with higher inequality. At least six recent papers find a positive association between financial sector size—usually proxied by private credit as a percentage of GDP—and an increase in income inequality, both in cross-national and subnational context (Jaumotte:2013aa; Li:2014aa; Dabla-Norris:2015aa; Denk and Cournède 2015; Jauch and Watzka 2016; Haan and Sturm 2017).

According to this view, financial development is likely to happen in the “intensive margin” through improvements in the quality and range of financial services for those who already enjoy access to the financial system, which has an important potential to widen inequality and perpetuate intergenerational differences in economic opportunity (Greenwood and Jovanovic 1990). Highly developed financial instruments, such as bonds and stocks, are likely to provide higher rates of returns to pre-existing capital, providing a basis for the concentration of financial assets (Piketty 2014). Cheaper credit from banks and access to investment instruments may also disproportionately reward those with the most skills and initiative, leading to the widening of the distribution of income.

In addition, the un-equalizing effects of the financial system could work through a labor income channel. Financial sector employees are strongly concentrated at the top of the income distribution, and their earnings exceed those of employees with similar profiles (such as age, gender or education) in other sectors. Asymmetric compensation schemes for bank managers may especially contribute to this un-equalizing dynamic (Denk and Cournède 2015). In addition, large financial sectors contribute to moral hazard problems. Given bailout expectations by the government in the financial sector, sophisticated financial instruments encourage high returns through risk-taking behaviors, benefiting members of the financial elite compared to other sectors of the economy (Korinek and Kreamer 2014). Similarly, financial liberalization, while aimed at facilitating access to financial services, might increase inequality due to the regulatory capture of financial elites (Claessens and Perotti 2007).

To summarize, our theoretical propositions have the following empirical implications. Our main hypothesis is that democratic rule under high state infrastructural power increases income inequality over time. We also posit that a democratic high infrastructural power context is associated with a high-quality investment environment, larger annual FDI inflows, and faster growth of the financial sector. Finally, we also expect to see a positive relationship of investor confidence, FDI inflows, and the size of the financial sector with income inequality.

IV. VARIABLES AND MEASUREMENT

Inequality Our outcome variable is income inequality measured by the Gini coefficient. The Gini coefficient ranges from 0 (perfect equality) to 1 (one person has all the income). Previous analyses of determinants of income inequality have generally been plagued by data comparability problems of the existing data sources (Solt 2016). Welfare definitions and income scales vary between household surveys administered in various countries and at different times, thus, harmonizing measurement across time and space is an important task for any analysis of inequality (Morgan and Kelly 2013, p. 676).⁸ The Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) offers a gold standard for the comparability of different income concepts of surveys, however, only offers data for a limited number of nations, mostly in the developed world.

To mitigate these concerns, we use the Standardized World Income Inequality Database (SWIID)

⁸Comparability problems abound: data on inequality are based on different definitions such as expenditures; market (gross) income, which consists mainly of salaries; or net income, which is gross income plus government redistribution in terms of tax and transfers (Wong 2016).

(Solt 2016), for our inequality measure, which allows the maximization of both comparability and coverage. Using the LIS as the methodological standard for comparability, the SWIID incorporates data from various data sources, such as OECD’s Income Distribution Database, the Socio-Economic Database for Latin America and the Caribbean, generated by CEDLAS, the World Bank, Eurostat, PovcalNet of the World Bank, national statistical offices around the world, and several academic sources. SWIID uses these sources to calculate a “model-based multiple imputation estimates of the many missing observations in the LIS series” (Solt 2016, p. 1271), maximizing both comparability and sample size.

SWIID is composed of four indicators—disposable income inequality (post-tax and transfer), market income inequality (pre-tax and transfer), absolute redistribution (the difference between the market income and disposable income Gini indexes), and relative redistribution (the percentage by which market income inequality is reduced). We use disposable income inequality as our main dependent variable, as measures of market inequality and redistribution do not exist for most countries in the developing world. For example, the data for disposable income inequality exists for 31.2% of country years in the developing world since 1970, while only 7.2% of country years for market inequality.

Democracy We adopt Polity IV and the Electoral Democracy (Polyarchy) from the V-Dem dataset as our democracy measures. Both of these measures offer almost universal country coverage over time. The Polity IV dataset provides an ordinal ranking of political regimes on a scale of 10 to –10 (democracy to authoritarian regimes), based on the following five dimensions: competitiveness and the regulation of political participation, competitiveness and openness of executive recruitment, and constraints on the chief executive. The Electoral Democracy Index of V-Dem intends to capture Dahl (1971)’s concept of *polyarchy* and is formed by an aggregate index of capturing the presence of the following institutions and policies: (1) elected officials; (2) free, fair, and frequent elections; (3) freedom of expression and alternative sources of information; (4) associational autonomy; and (5) inclusive citizenship (universal suffrage, as in Coppedge et al. 2016).⁹

⁹Electoral Democracy Index is formed by taking the average of, on the one hand, the weighted average of the indices measuring freedom of association, clean elections (`v2xel_frefair`), freedom of expression (`v2x_freeexp_thick`), elected officials (`v2x_elecöff`), and suffrage (`v2x_suffr`) and, on the other, the five-way multiplicative interaction between those indices. This is halfway between a straight average and strict multiplication, meaning the average of the two. It is thus a compromise between the two most well-known aggregation formulas in the literature, both allowing (partial) “compensation” in one subcomponent for lack of polyarchy in the others, but also punishing countries not strong in one sub-component according to the “weakest link” argument. The aggregation is done at the level of Dahl’s

State capacity Operationalizing state capacity is a complicated task. The chosen measurement should not reflect the policy preferences of governments, which could be affected by regime type. Taxation rates—a commonly used measure—are likely to be directly affected by these preferences. As Fukuyama (2013, p. 353) notes, there “is a difference between extractive potential and actual extraction rates.” For example, although the US collects less income taxes compared to Scandinavian Social democracies, it is not possible to argue that it is a weak state. Similarly, higher taxation levels do not imply higher state capacity. In late imperial China, “high taxes on peasants [...] were the result of rulers’ lack of power. Chinese rulers consistently attempted to limit official’s excessive extractions from the masses, but were unable to do so” (Kiser and Tong 1992, p. 301).

Other measures, most notably expert survey-based indicators, are likely to be affected by coding bias. For example, Kurtz and Schrank (2012, p. 542) explain that measurements that rely on surveys, particularly, of foreign investors or domestic firms, wrongly assume that “the interests of investors [...] and the interest of the nation are essentially coterminous.” In instances where the state is strong, and able to levy taxes and impose regulations, for example, the state will most likely ‘be judged ‘burdensome’ and ‘growth-inhibiting’ by many businesspersons’ (Kurtz and Schrank 2007, p. 542).

Recent literature has proposed a number of alternatives for measuring the levels of state capacity. For example, Luna and Toro (2014) and Luna and Hillel Soifer (2017) employ a survey-based design to measure contemporary subnational state capacity.¹⁰ Unfortunately, part of our challenge also consists of being able to capture levels of state capacity *overtime*.¹¹ Others have employed investment levels of public goods, such as infrastructure, roads, electrification (measured as light intensity per pixel), and railroads (Mann 1984; Enriquez, Sybllis, and Centeno 2017; Acemoglu 2005; Saylor 2012; Thies 2009; Besley and Persson 2009; H. Huntington and Wibbels 2014; Coatsworth 1974). However, it is possible that these infrastructure investments reflect—similarly to taxation rates—government’s policy preferences, or have been implemented by private companies, not the state (Hillel Soifer 2012, p. 593).

Following Hillel Soifer (2013), using data from the United Nations database on national censuses, we measure the infrastructural power of the state to penetrate its territory by observing whether

sub-components (with the one exception of the non-electoral component; Coppedge et al. 2016, p. 49).

¹⁰Concretely, they ask residents questions about their experiences with the state. For instance, how long it takes the police to arrive at their home if called to respond to a burglary.

¹¹See for example Bahamonde (2017) where he uses an earthquake approach to capture levels of state capacity overtime in Chile.

the state is able to conduct regular censuses.¹² The major advantage of that measure relies in the fact that census implementation is free of subjectivity in coding decisions, and does not respond to “policy preferences.” We construct a continuous indicator that counts the cumulative number of censuses in every country in our sample that we were able to conduct, beginning in 1946. We opted for a cumulative measure instead of a level measure—such as the presence or absence of a census in a country in the past 10 years—because it is likely to reflect better the long-term historical development of state institutions and their ability to implement decisions throughout national territory.

We believe the cumulative measure we use in this paper proxies both the “redistributive potential” through taxation and transfers, and the state’s “watchman capacities,” such as functioning bureaucracies and legal institutions. The cumulative census indicator captures the ability of the central state to gather information about its subjects, which is crucial for collecting taxes, while its continuous implementation needs functioning central (and often, local) bureaucracies and effective law enforcement institutions.

For example, our cumulative measurement captures the learning effects associated with state consolidation. Particularly, performing continuous censuses overtime will have year-by-year decreasing marginal costs. Pierson (2000, p. 254) explains that “New social initiatives—such as the creation of organizations or institutions—usually entail considerable start-up costs [and] learn by doing.” In contrast to “strong” states, “weak” states will not be able to bear these costs overtime. The ideal “strong state” will be able to use the accumulated stock of knowledge, being capable of fielding technologies like census-taking bureaucracies not only once, but multiple times, reproducing the infrastructural power of the state throughout the territory and overtime. By contrast, the contemporaneous (e.g., level) census measures of state capacity, such as the one employed in Hillel Soifer (2013) and Hanson (2015), should be less efficient for capturing the long-term development of state’s infrastructural power.

In our empirical analysis, we complement and check the robustness of our cumulative census measure with several other proxies for state development. Our results are robust to the State Antiquity Index proposed by Bockstette (2002) and updated by Hanson (2015), and other, less ideal, measurements based on fiscal capacity.¹³

¹²See this [link](#).

¹³The Index measures the roots of the state in its territory using three components: (1) the amount time from year 0 (C.E.) to 1950 that a government existed above the tribal level, (2) whether that government was foreign-based or

Control Variables We add a series of control variables to our main analysis to account for alternative factors outlined in the previous literature that might be associated with inequality changes. We add GDP per capita to control for level of economic development, and a first differenced GDP variable to account for growth dynamics. We include trade openness as an indicator of economic openness, measured as imports and exports as a percent of GDP (Reuveny and Li 2003). We also control for inflation, measured by the Consumer Price Index. Finally, we include two demographic controls: the share of population above the age of 65, and the share of urban population. Our control variables come from the World Development Indicators (WDI, The World Bank (n.d.)). In the Mechanisms section, we discuss more details about our control variables regarding investor confidence, FDI, and financial development.

V. RESEARCH DESIGN AND RESULTS

Estimation Procedures used to test our hypothesis, were a series of error correction models (ECM) with country and year fixed effects. The ECMs, which are especially suitable for dealing with issues of non-stationarity, serial correlation, and unobserved country-level heterogeneity, could be used for both integrated and non-integrated time-series data (Box-Steffensmeier et al. 2014, pp. 169–170). However, we maintain that our data exhibits important signs of non-stationarity. Given that we have panels (i.e. countries), standard unit root tests are not advisable. Thus, we implemented the Fisher-type test developed in (Choi 2001).¹⁴ We find evidence that generally points to non-stationarity in both the dependent and independent variables. Test results are available upon request.

The ECM allows to estimate the effects of independent variables in both accumulated levels and year-to-year changes, which are both relevant for a slow-moving variable such as income inequality. By differencing both the dependent variable and the independent variables, ECMs provide a flexible way for dealing with non-stationary in the data. In the case of ECMs, the first difference of the dependent variable is regressed on the lagged-dependent variable in levels, plus the lagged levels and first differences of every independent variable (Franzese 2002; Blaydes and Kayser 2011). We add only the lagged level of our state capacity variable since this variable is highly time-invariant. Our

locally based, and (3) the extent of the modern-day territory that was ruled by that government.

¹⁴The null hypothesis is that all panels have a unit root. The routine used was `xtunitroot fisher`, which was implemented in `Stata` 15.

main theoretical interest is the interaction term between the lagged values of democracy and the lagged values of cumulative state capacity (both in levels), although we also add differences of all independent variables to variables in our models. More formally, our main covariate of interest is ρ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \text{Inequality}_{i,t} = & \alpha_0 + \\
& \alpha_1 \text{Inequality}_{i,t-1} + \\
& \rho (\text{Democracy}_{i,t-1} \times \text{State Capacity}_{i,t-1}) + \\
& \beta_1 (\Delta \text{Democracy}_{i,t} \times \text{State Capacity}_{i,t-1}) + \\
& \beta_n \text{Control Variables}_n + \\
& \gamma_i + \lambda_t + \mu_{i,t}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where γ_i and λ_t are the country and year fixed effects, respectively, $\mu_{i,t}$ the estimated residuals, and *Control Variables* a matrix of length $n_{i,t}$ relevant control variables.

[Equation 1](#) β_2 captures the immediate effects, estimated by the yearly change in the dependent variable produced in the short-term shock to the explanatory variable. This effect occurs wholly at one point of time. The coefficients ρ and α_1 are used to account for long-term effects, also called the error correction component of the model ([Morgan and Kelly 2013](#), p. 678). The long-term effect is the portion that connects X and Y, which does not occur at one particular point in time, but is distributed temporally ([Morgan and Kelly 2013](#), p. 678). The magnitude of this effect is determined by $\frac{\rho}{\alpha_1}$ ([De Boef and Keele 2008](#), p. 191). Given that the effects of political variables, such as regime type and state capacity are likely to be distributed over many years, the ECMS are especially useful strategies for testing our hypothesis.

The inclusion of a lagged-dependent variable, in turn, controls for autocorrelation. To account for “country-specific omitted factors that are either relatively stable over time or evolve smoothly over time” ([Herzer and Vollmer 2012](#), p. 492), we also include country fixed effects. We used fixed effects because we are particularly interested in changes within individual countries over time. By contrast, the cross-national differences in inequality do not change much over time, as inequality is a slow-moving variable (and hence, the small coefficients in the regression output tables). At the same time, we admit that including country fixed effects comes with the cost of controlling for all

cross-country variation and solely relying on estimates from within-country dynamics.

Results We start the presentation of our results with a model without the interaction term (without ρ in [Equation 1](#)). Our results directly replicate previous studies about inequality (Gradstein and Milanovic [2004](#); Timmons [2010](#); Wong [2016](#)). Model 0 shows null results between democracy (measured both in levels and yearly changes) and inequality, while controlling for covariates typically used in the literature. This is considering country and year fixed effects.

[Equation 1](#) (the benchmark model, including ρ) is presented in the second column of [Table 1](#), along with other five other specifications. Our main theoretical interest is the interaction term between the lagged values of polity, and the lagged values of cumulative state capacity. The results directly support our counterintuitive theoretical contentions: inequality increases when state capacity and democracy are high. Acknowledging that neither constitutive terms nor interaction terms are directly interpretable (Brambor, Clark, and Golder [2006](#)), we still note that the interaction term is positive and significant ($\alpha < 0.05$).

We follow the advice of Berry, Golder, and Milton ([2012](#)) and estimate *both* the conditional effect of democracy at different levels of state capacity, *and* the conditional effect of state capacity at different levels of democracy, including 95% confidence intervals ([Figure 1](#)).¹⁵ The left panel of [Figure 1](#) shows that the average levels of democracy have a positive effect on income inequality when state capacity is high, while it has a negative effect Gini in lower values of cumulative census variable. The right panel also supports our hypothesis. Average levels of state capacity have a positive effect on income inequality contingent on high values of democracy, which directly aligns with our hypothesis.

Following De Boef and Keele ([2008](#), p. 191), we compute the long-run effect, which is the product of the long-run multiplier (LRM) and the short-run effects (Blaydes and Kayser [2011](#), p. 898). The short-run effect is also called the error correction rate (ECR) De Boef and Keele ([2008](#), p. 191). More specifically, the LRM “is the cumulative effect of a covariate on the outcome” that spreads over future time periods (Keele, Linn, and Webb [2016](#), p. 292). In turn, the ECR is the “speed of adjustment” (Keele, Linn, and Webb [2016](#), p. 295). In our case, the LRM is $\frac{\rho}{\alpha_1} = \frac{0.00007}{-0.02055} = -0.0034$, while the ECR is $\rho = -0.02055$. Consequently, the long-run effect is $LRM \times ECR = 0.00007$. Substantively that means that if state capacity and democracy levels jointly increase,

¹⁵Figure made using **R** package **DAMisc** (Armstrong [2016](#)).

	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Polity _{t-1} × Census _{t-1}		0.00007*** (0.00001)		0.00007*** (0.00001)		0.00008*** (0.00001)	
Census _{t-1} × Polity _Δ		0.00006** (0.00003)		0.00005 (0.00003)		0.00005 (0.00003)	
Polyarchy _{t-1} × Census _{t-1}			0.00164*** (0.00029)		0.00187*** (0.00037)		0.00202*** (0.00032)
Census _{t-1} × Polyarchy _Δ			0.00159 (0.00102)		0.00115 (0.00114)		0.00137 (0.00109)
Polity _{t-1}	-0.00001 (0.00003)	-0.00028*** (0.00005)		-0.00029*** (0.00006)		-0.00032*** (0.00006)	
Polity _Δ	-0.00007 (0.00005)	-0.00028** (0.00012)		-0.00027** (0.00014)		-0.00027** (0.00013)	
Polyarchy _{t-1}			-0.00666*** (0.00146)		-0.00786*** (0.00187)		-0.00824*** (0.00158)
Polyarchy _Δ			-0.00713 (0.00461)		-0.00539 (0.00509)		-0.00639 (0.00491)
Cesus _{t-1}	0.00033* (0.00017)	-0.00028 (0.00020)	-0.00099*** (0.00028)	-0.00019 (0.00024)	-0.00092*** (0.00032)	-0.00023 (0.00022)	-0.00106*** (0.00029)
GDP _{t-1}	0.00000*** (0.00000)						
GDP _Δ	-0.00000* (0.00000)						
Inflation _{t-1}	0.00000*** (0.00000)						
Inflation _Δ	0.00000** (0.00000)						
FDI _{t-1}	-0.00000 (0.00002)	-0.00000 (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00002)	-0.00001 (0.00002)	-0.00001 (0.00002)	-0.00001 (0.00002)	0.00000 (0.00002)
FDI _Δ	-0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)
Trade _{t-1}	0.00001* (0.00001)	0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00001* (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)
Trade _Δ	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)
Agriculture _{t-1}	-0.00013*** (0.00002)	-0.00013*** (0.00002)	-0.00014*** (0.00002)	-0.00013*** (0.00002)	-0.00014*** (0.00002)	-0.00013*** (0.00002)	-0.00014*** (0.00002)
Agriculture _Δ	-0.00014*** (0.00004)	-0.00014*** (0.00004)	-0.00014*** (0.00003)	-0.00015*** (0.00004)	-0.00014*** (0.00004)	-0.00014*** (0.00004)	-0.00014*** (0.00004)
Pop. Age _{t-1}	0.00006 (0.00004)	0.00008* (0.00004)	0.00005 (0.00004)	0.00003 (0.00005)	0.00001 (0.00005)	0.00009** (0.00005)	0.00005 (0.00005)
Pop. Age _Δ	0.00048 (0.00037)	0.00062* (0.00036)	0.00063* (0.00035)	0.00082* (0.00042)	0.00077* (0.00041)	0.00109*** (0.00039)	0.00104*** (0.00038)
Urban Pop. _{t-1}	0.00003 (0.00003)	0.00004 (0.00003)	0.00004 (0.00003)	0.00007** (0.00003)	0.00006* (0.00003)	0.00006* (0.00003)	0.00006* (0.00003)
Urban Pop. _Δ	0.00073** (0.00033)	0.00078** (0.00033)	0.00077** (0.00032)	0.00109*** (0.00038)	0.00104*** (0.00038)	0.00094*** (0.00035)	0.00090*** (0.00035)
Lagged Dependent Variable							
Gini _{t-1}	-0.01765*** (0.00340)	-0.02055*** (0.00341)	-0.02057*** (0.00335)	-0.02234*** (0.00385)	-0.02184*** (0.00377)	-0.02022*** (0.00361)	-0.02051*** (0.00354)
R ²	0.31698	0.32583	0.32826	0.34821	0.35098	0.33371	0.33747
Adj. R ²	0.27085	0.27976	0.28183	0.29814	0.30061	0.28556	0.28911
Num. obs.	2846	2846	2940	2244	2320	2553	2647
RMSE	0.00363	0.00361	0.00358	0.00380	0.00376	0.00368	0.00364

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Year and country fixed effects in all models (not shown). Intercept was excluded from the table. All models are OLS.

Table 1: Error Correction Models: Long-term Effects of State Capacity and Regime Type on Economic Inequality.




Figure 1: Conditional Effect of State Capacity and Democracy on Inequality.

Note: Following the advice of Brambor, Clark, and Golder (2006) and Berry, Golder, and Milton (2012), the estimations of model 1 in Table 1 were used to compute the conditional effects of the constitutive variables of the interaction term. The figure shows that as state capacity increases, the conditional effect of democracy on inequality is positive and significant (left panel). The figure also shows that, as countries become more democratic, the conditional effect of state capacity on inequality is positive and significant too (right panel).

inequality increases in the long run at a rate dictated by this long-run effect, dissipating after a number of periods. Using the already mentioned LRM along with the ECR, we observe that Gini points increase immediately in $t + 1 = 0.00007$, continue increasing 0.00003 the next period, when both democracy and state capacity increase one unit each.

To put these results in context, a country with the highest levels of democracy and state capacity, like Ireland from 2013 to 2015, is expected to increase its annual inequality levels by an order of 0.0007 immediately (short-time effect).¹⁶ This is a small, but still a substantively significant effect, given the slow-moving nature of income inequality. The estimated cross-country long-term effects

¹⁶These quantities of interests were obtained by computing, as per Equation 1, $\beta_2 + (\rho \times \text{State Capacity}_{i,t-1}) = \frac{\partial \Delta \text{Gini}_{it}}{\partial \text{Polity}_{i,t-1}}$. See Brambor, Clark, and Golder 2006, p. 73, equation 13.

are shown in [Figure 2](#).




Figure 2: Overtime Effect of Increases in State Capacity and Democracy on Inequality (Gini Points).

Note: The figure shows that the long-run effect of higher state capacity and democracy levels, increases inequality overtime, dissipating at a rate dictated by the error correction rate $\beta_1 = -0.02055$. Note that given the long run multiplier, defined by $\frac{\rho}{\beta_1} = \frac{0.00007}{-0.02055}$, inequality increases during the first periods, reequilibrating over future time periods.

Model 2 produces identical results to Model 1 using the V-Dem Polyarchy democracy measure. The interaction plots also suggest a significant interaction between polyarchy and cumulative census variable (not shown).¹⁷ In Model 3, we replicate our main results, however, excluding industrial countries from the sample, using the polity variable as our democracy measure. Therefore, we have certainty that our results are not driven by an increasing inequality trend in the industrial world since the 1970s, but can be generalized more widely to other regions (Piketty 2014; Atkinson 2015). Identical results were produced using V-Dem Polyarchy (Model 4).

Further models include a series of robustness tests. First possible concern raises with the particular choice of measurement of state capacity, captured via cumulative census variable. Most nations

¹⁷Plots available upon request.

celebrate censuses in 10-year cycles. However, a small number of both developed and developing world nations have celebrated censuses in 5-year cycles.¹⁸ Reasons behind these dynamics vary, and are only partially associated with state ability to implement censuses. For example, Brazil and México started to celebrate a 5-year census cycle due to a significant need to better understand the dynamics around poverty and inequality in the 1990s (Ferreira 2000). At the same time, major industrial nations—such as the US and the UK—have not diverged from the 10-year census cycle. To avoid potential bias stemming from some unobserved factors related to the different cycle lengths, we excluded countries with 5-year cycles from our analysis in Models 5 and 6, testing each model with the two different democracy measures. The results are identical to the full sample.

In Models 7-9, we control for different government spending items to account for the idea that government spending may possibly offset inequality increases posited by our theoretical framework. Given that the redistributive effects of democracy have widely been portrayed to work through education, and health care spending, as well as welfare transfers, we would expect that adding these controls reduces the statistical and substantive importance of the democracy variable to the models (Huber and Stephens 2012; Morgan and Kelly 2013). In Model 7, we add government education spending as a percentage of GDP on the right side of the equation. It has been widely posited that democracy might lead to lower inequality through investment in human capital, especially in education (Huber and Stephens 2012; Morgan and Kelly 2013). In Model 8, government health spending is included, while Model 9 controls for Income Tax revenue as a percentage of GDP—a measure of the size of progressive taxation. We replicate our significant results after adding these control variables. Data for all of these control variables comes from WDI.

Other models introduce further robustness checks. In Model 10, we control for democracy's duration to control for possible long-lasting effects of democratic regimes leading to higher levels of inequality, as suggested by Wong (2016). Our results are also robust to various other measurements of state capacity and infrastructural power. In Model 11, we replicate our results using State Antiquity Index developed by Bockstette (2002) as conditioning variable. Model 12 tests the robustness of the results with another, albeit imperfect, proxy invoked to measure state capacity in the previous literature—income tax as a percentage of GDP. Our results remain unaltered.

¹⁸ Among the countries that have data on inequality, these countries are Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Japan and New Zealand in the industrial world, and Brazil, México, South Korea and Turkey among developing nations.

Mechanisms In this section we empirically test the causal mechanisms portrayed by our theory. We have posited that democratic high infrastructural power contexts increase inequality through high-quality investment climate, FDI inflows and financial development. First, we expect to see a positive interaction effect of democratic rule and state capacity on three outcomes: investment climate, FDI inflows and the size of the financial sector. Lastly, we also test if our three mechanism variables are statistically associated with inequality increases in the post-1970 period.

We proxy investment climate quality with a widely used indicator in previous literature: credit ratings published by the institutional investor (II) magazine (**Arias:2018aa; DiGiuseppe:2012aa**). This indicator is based on semiannual credit surveys, which collect expert opinions to rank country creditworthiness, ranging on a scale from 0 to 100. Higher values represent more credit-worthy states. We use the yearly average, which spans 1980 to 2013 and covers up to 110 developing countries. The major advantage of this indicator compared to main alternatives, such as Heritage Foundation or Fraser Foundation economic freedom indexes, relies on the fact that it is available for longer time-frames, a similar period to our main analysis, allowing comparability of the results. FDI is measured by annual FDI inflows to a country, as a percentage of GDP. The data are retrieved from WDI. We measure financial development with an indicator commonly used in studies of financial development—Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks and Other Financial Institutions to GDP. This measure captures the ratio of claims on the private sector by deposit money banks and other financial institutions to GDP (**Beck:2010aa**).

We test these relationships using similar ECMs as in the main analysis. For the analysis of investment climate, FDI inflows and financial sector size, we add a series of control variables portrayed as determinants of business confidence, FDI inflows, and a financial depth model in addition to democracy and state capacity, such as GDP per capita, GDP annual change, trade openness and inflation.

First, we find—rather intuitively—considerable evidence that democratic high state capacity context provides an environment that favors positive investment climate, FDI inflows and financial sophistication. Models 14-16 use institutional investor credit ratings, FDI, and financial development as dependent variables, respectively. In Model 14, we estimate the interaction effect of polity and cumulative census on institutional investor credit ratings. The sign of the interaction term is positive, while it slightly misses significance at conventional levels. In Model 16, we document a positive and significant interaction effect of polity and cumulative state capacity variable on private credit to

	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Polity _{t-1} × Census _{t-1}	0.00008*** (0.00002)	0.00005* (0.00002)	0.00003* (0.00002)	0.00007*** (0.00001)			
Census _{t-1} × Polity Δ	0.00004 (0.00004)	0.00001 (0.00004)	-0.00000 (0.00003)	0.00006* (0.00003)			
Polity _{t-1} × State History (5) _{t-1}				0.00039** (0.00013)			
State History (5) _{t-1} × Polity Δ				-0.00029 (0.00023)			
Polity _{t-1} × Income Tax _{t-1}					0.00001*** (0.00000)		
Income Tax _{t-1} × Polity Δ					0.00001 (0.00000)		
Polity _{t-1} × Tax Revenue _{t-1}						-0.00001* (0.00000)	
Tax Revenue _{t-1} × Polity Δ						0.00000 (0.00001)	
State History (5)					-0.00705 (0.00601)		
Tax Revenue _{t-1}						0.00004* (0.00002)	
Census _{t-1}	-0.00060* (0.00029)	-0.00034 (0.00029)	-0.00024 (0.00024)	-0.00040 (0.00025)			
Polity _{t-1}	-0.00032*** (0.00008)	-0.00013 (0.00011)	-0.00014* (0.00007)	-0.00033*** (0.00006)	-0.00012* (0.00006)	-0.00024*** (0.00006)	0.00006 (0.00005)
Polity Δ	-0.00026 (0.00019)	-0.00014 (0.00019)	-0.00007 (0.00015)	-0.00031* (0.00014)	0.00010 (0.00011)	-0.00022* (0.00012)	-0.00005 (0.00016)
GDP _{t-1}	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)
GDP Δ	-0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000* (0.00000)	-0.00000** (0.00000)
Inflation _{t-1}	0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)
Inflation Δ	0.00001 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000* (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)
FDI _{t-1}	-0.00002 (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00003)	0.00005* (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00002)	0.00001 (0.00002)
FDI Δ	-0.00004* (0.00002)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00003)	0.00003* (0.00001)	0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00001 (0.00001)
Trade _{t-1}	0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00001* (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00001* (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)
Trade Δ	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	-0.00000 (0.00001)
Agriculture _{t-1}	-0.00015*** (0.00004)	0.00000 (0.00003)	0.00000 (0.00003)	-0.00017*** (0.00003)	-0.00013*** (0.00003)	-0.00001 (0.00003)	
Agriculture Δ	-0.00018** (0.00006)	-0.00008* (0.00005)	-0.00011* (0.00005)	-0.00013*** (0.00004)	-0.00015** (0.00005)	-0.00012* (0.00005)	
Pop. Age _{t-1}	0.00015* (0.00006)	0.00032*** (0.00007)	0.00022*** (0.00006)	0.00001 (0.00005)	0.00005 (0.00005)	0.00024*** (0.00005)	0.00021*** (0.00005)
Pop. Age Δ	0.00112* (0.00049)	0.00135** (0.00046)	0.00025 (0.00039)	0.00035 (0.00047)	0.00066 (0.00049)	0.00040 (0.00038)	0.00064* (0.00035)
Govt. Expenditure _{t-1}	-0.00049** (0.00015)						
Govt. Expenditure Δ	-0.00051* (0.00021)						
Urban PoP _{t-1}	-0.00002 (0.00004)	-0.00011* (0.00005)	0.00004 (0.00003)	0.00013** (0.00004)	-0.00001 (0.00003)	0.00001 (0.00004)	0.00000 (0.00003)
Urban PoP Δ	0.00018 (0.00059)	0.00216*** (0.00059)		0.00110** (0.00036)	0.00092* (0.00037)	0.00035 (0.00040)	0.00040 (0.00035)
Health Expenditure _{t-1}		0.00074*** (0.00011)					
Health Expenditure Δ		0.00021 (0.00016)					
Income Tax _{t-1}			-0.00004** (0.00001)			-0.00007*** (0.00001)	
Income Tax Δ			-0.00003* (0.00002)				
Democracy Duration _{t-1}				-0.00001* (0.00001)			
Democracy Duration Δ				-0.00001 (0.00001)			
Lagged Dependent Variable							
Gini _{t-1}	-0.02685*** (0.00527)	-0.03887*** (0.00544)	-0.03775*** (0.00515)	-0.01997*** (0.00446)	-0.01619*** (0.00376)	-0.03799*** (0.00514)	-0.03330*** (0.00427)
R ²	0.39665	0.40920	0.38019	0.35539	0.28769	0.37547	0.33683
Adj. R ²	0.31570	0.35496	0.32062	0.29911	0.23765	0.31722	0.28480
Num. obs.	1455	1880	1894	2143	2210	1935	2255
RMSE	0.00323	0.00340	0.00301	0.00364	0.00368	0.00305	0.00310

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, cdot $p < 0.1$. Year and country fixed effects in all models. Intercepted was excluded from the table. All models OLS.

Table 2: Error Correction Models (Robustness Checks): Long-term Effects of State Capacity and Regime Type on Economic Inequality.

GDP. Although democracy and state capacity interaction effect are insignificant when explaining FDI inflows (Model 15), we find that the interaction of these variables might affect FDI through better investment climate. In Model 17, we document a positive and significant effect of institutional investor credit ratings on FDI. Similarly, investor confidence is highly significant predictor of finance sector size (Model 18).

Second, we also find evidence that better investment climate, FDI inflows and financial depth work as a mechanism between inequality increases in high-capacity democracies. Models 19-21 first used a differenced Gini coefficient as a dependent variable, and institutional investor credit ratings, FDI inflows, and financial development as dependent variables, respectively. The control variables are from our baseline model (Model 1). In Model 19, we document a positive relationship between institutional investor credit ratings, and change in income inequality, although this relationship is not robust to country fixed effects. The FDI remains insignificant, but positive, in Model 20, however. In Model 21 we document a positive and statistically significant effect of financial development variable on Gini coefficient. These effects are also substantively important. One unit increase of private credit as GDP, results in 0.00001 change in Gini points. These results point to a direction that the interactive effect of democratic rule and infrastructural power posited by our theory and tested in our main analysis might operate through investor confidence and financial development.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have explored whether the effect of democratic rule on income inequality could be conditional on state capacity. Counterintuitively, we argue that democratic rule combined with high state infrastructural power is associated with increasing income inequality, through the positive effect on investor confidence, which tends to produce larger financial sectors and attract larger FDI inflows in the post-1970 period. Both of these factors favor income concentration to the top. To test our hypothesis, we introduced a novel measure of state capacity based on cumulative census administration. Our empirical results are robust to various alternative measures of state infrastructural power and democracy, and apply beyond the context of industrial world, a high-capacity democratic context where inequality has increased sharply in recent decades. In addition, we also test the mechanisms of our theory, finding broadly consistent support of our claim that the interactive effect of democratic rule and infrastructural power posited in our main analysis might

	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)
Polity _{t-1} × Census _{t-1}	0.01516 (0.00999)	-0.01032 (0.01073)	0.03712** (0.01135)					
Census _{t-1} × Polity Δ	0.03391 (0.02198)	0.01624 (0.03012)	0.04814 (0.03162)					
Institutional Investor Credit Ratings Δ			0.08038* (0.03384)	0.43325*** (0.04541)	0.00004 (0.00004)			
Institutional Investor Credit Ratings _{t-1}	-0.09127*** (0.00817)		0.02386 (0.01267)	0.15427*** (0.01743)	0.00002* (0.00001)			
Private Credit _{t-1}		-0.06598*** (0.00561)		-0.06779*** (0.00849)			0.00001* (0.00001)	
Polity _{t-1}	-0.04264 (0.04443)	0.07475 (0.04665)	-0.16560*** (0.04855)					
Polity Δ	-0.21145* (0.09594)	-0.02581 (0.12234)	-0.18367 (0.12464)					
Census _{t-1}	0.05230 (0.16391)	-0.22547 (0.19761)	0.24740 (0.20631)					
FDI Δ		0.03889* (0.01573)			0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)		
Private Credit Δ							0.00003* (0.00001)	
GPD _{t-1}	0.00000 (0.00002)	0.00011*** (0.00003)	0.00014*** (0.00003)	0.00018*** (0.00003)	0.00024*** (0.00004)	-0.00000* (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)
GPD Δ	0.00012 (0.00011)	0.00073*** (0.00015)	-0.00076*** (0.00015)	0.00051** (0.00017)	-0.00097*** (0.00021)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	-0.00000 (0.00000)
Inflation _{t-1}	-0.00043** (0.00014)	-0.00020 (0.00030)	-0.00031 (0.00028)	-0.00022 (0.00024)	0.00019 (0.00028)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)	0.00000*** (0.00000)
Inflation Δ	-0.00018 (0.00012)	-0.00010 (0.00026)	-0.00011 (0.00024)	-0.00008 (0.00020)	-0.00004 (0.00024)	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000* (0.00000)	0.00000* (0.00000)
Trade _{t-1}	-0.00046 (0.00405)	0.03309*** (0.00545)	-0.00858 (0.00588)	0.01989** (0.00614)	-0.01751* (0.00880)	-0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00001* (0.00000)	0.00001 (0.00001)
Trade Δ	-0.00291 (0.00577)	0.04149*** (0.00882)	0.00327 (0.00929)	0.01827 (0.00950)	-0.00999 (0.01314)	-0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)	0.00000 (0.00001)
Agriculture _{t-1}					-0.00005** (0.00002)	-0.00013*** (0.00002)	-0.00014*** (0.00002)	
Agriculture Δ					-0.00017** (0.00005)	-0.00013*** (0.00003)	-0.00015*** (0.00004)	
Urban Pop _{-t-1}					-0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00002 (0.00003)	0.00000 (0.00003)	
Urban Pop Δ					0.00078* (0.00031)	0.00056* (0.00032)	0.00056* (0.00034)	
Pop. Age _{t-1}					0.00005 (0.00004)	0.00005 (0.00005)	0.00005 (0.00005)	
Pop. Age Δ					0.00053 (0.00035)	0.00049 (0.00039)	0.00049 (0.00039)	
Lagged Dependent Variable								
FDI _{t-1} (only M15 y M17; covariate in M16)		-0.82270*** (0.01528)	0.07888*** (0.02180)	-0.54824*** (0.02234)			0.00001 (0.00001)	0.00001 (0.00001)
Gini _{t-1}					-0.00607*** (0.00152)	-0.01814*** (0.00328)	-0.01817*** (0.00367)	
R ²	0.33895	0.41347	0.14077	0.26263	0.23457	0.07523	0.32120	0.31644
Adj. R ²	0.29036	0.38778	0.09784	0.21824	0.17618	0.05359	0.27541	0.26673
Num. obs.	2221	4457	3699	2220	2075	1663	2992	2597
RMSE	2.37832	5.40579	4.98555	4.05510	4.74794	0.00421	0.00359	0.00368

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, $cdot p < 0.1$. Year and country FE in all models. Intercept excluded. All models OLS.

Table 3: Error Correction Models: Long-term Effects of Business Confidence on Economic Inequality.

operate through high-quality investment climate, financial development and FDI.

We believe our conclusion speaks directly to recent literature on increasing inequality in the developed and many regions of the developing world, reflecting the natural tendency of well-functioning capitalism to produce higher income concentration (Piketty 2014). Institutionalist literature has implicitly assumed that “inclusive institutions” do not only promote development, but also more equal income distribution, at least in the long-term (Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson 2001). In this paper, we have provided evidence that this conclusion may not be warranted, and “inclusive” institutions—captured in the combination of democratic regime type and high-capacity state institutions—might well lead to a trend of steady increases in income inequality, which we argue happens through higher business confidence, financial development, and FDI inflows. These variables, generally associated with both democratic and well-functioning state institutions (Jensen:2008aa; Li and Resnick 2003), and high economic growth could well bring higher inequality as a side-effect. Further research should clarify the additional pathways through which the high-capacity state institutions and democratic regime type affect inequality.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron (2005). "Politics and Economics in Weak and Strong States." In: *Journal of Monetary Economics* 52.7, pp. 1199–1226.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson (2001). "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." In: *American Economic Review* 91, pp. 1369–1401.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Suresh Naidu, et al. (2015). "Handbook of Income Distribution." In: ed. by Anthony Atkinson and François Bourguignon. North Holland. Chap. Democracy, Redistribution, and Inequality.
- Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson (2006). *The Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Albertus, Michael (2015). *Autocracy and Redistribution: The Politics of Land Reform*. Cambridge University Press.
- Albertus, Michael and Victor Menaldo (May 2016). "Capital in the Twenty-First Century-In the Rest of the World." In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 19.1, pp. 49–66.
- Albertus, Michael and Victor Menaldo (2018). *Authoritarianism and the Elite Origins of Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, Dave (2016). package "DAMisc".
- Atkinson, Anthony (2015). *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Harvard University Press.
- Bahamonde, Hector (2017). "Income Taxation and State Capacities in Chile: Measuring Institutional Development Using Historical Earthquake Data." In: *[Unpublished]*.
- Baum, Mathew and David Lake (2003). "The Political Economy of Growth: Democracy and Human Capital." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 47.2, pp. 333–347.
- Becerra, Oscar, Eduardo Cavallo, and Carlos Scartascini (2012). "The Politics of Financial Development: The Role of Interest Groups and Government Capabilities." In: *Journal of Banking and Finance* 36.3, pp. 626–643.
- Berry, William, Matt Golder, and Daniel Milton (2012). "Improving Tests of Theories Positing Interaction." In: *Journal of Politics* 74.3, pp. 653–671.
- Besley, Timothy and Torsten Persson (Aug. 2009). "The Origins of State Capacity: Property Rights, Taxation, and Politics." In: *American Economic Review* 99.4, pp. 1218–1244.

- Blaydes, Lisa and Mark Kayser (Dec. 2011). "Counting Calories: Democracy and Distribution in the Developing World." In: *International Studies Quarterly* 55.4, pp. 887–908.
- Bockstette, Valerie (2002). "States and Markets: The Advantage of an Early Start." In: *The Journal of Economic Growth* 7.4, pp. 347–369.
- Boix, Carles (2003). *Democracy and Redistribution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet et al. (2014). *Time Series Analysis for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brambor, Thomas, William Clark, and Matt Golder (Jan. 2006). "Understanding Interaction Models: Improving Empirical Analyses." In: *Political Analysis* 14.01, pp. 63–82.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce et al. (2003). *The Logic of Political Survival*. MIT Press.
- Chaudhry, Kiren Aziz (1993). "The Myths of the Market and the Common History of Late Developers." In: *Politics & Society* 21.3, pp. 245–273.
- Choi, In (Apr. 2001). "Unit Root Tests for Panel Data." In: *Journal of International Money and Finance* 20.2, pp. 249–272.
- Claessens, Stijn and Enrico Perotti (2007). "Finance and Finance and Inequality: Channels and Evidence." In: *Journal of Comparative Economics Finance* 35, pp. 748–773.
- Coase, Ronald (1960). "The Problem of Social Cost." In: *Journal of Law and Economics* 3.1, pp. 1–44.
- Coatsworth, John (1974). "Railroads, Landholding, and Agrarian Protest in the Early Porfiriato." In: *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 54.1, pp. 48–71.
- Collier, Paul and Dominic Rohmer (Apr. 2008). "Democracy, Development and Conflict." In: *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6.2-3, pp. 531–540.
- Coppedge, Michael et al. (Nov. 2016). "Measuring High Level Democratic Principles Using the V-Dem Data." In: *International Political Science Review* 37.5, pp. 580–593.
- Dahl, Robert (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale University Press.
- De Boef, Suzanna and Luke Keele (Jan. 2008). "Taking Time Seriously." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 52.1, pp. 184–200.
- Denk, Oliver and Boris Cournède (2015). "Finance and Income Inequality in OECD Countries."
- Enriquez, Elaine, Martin Sybllis, and Miguel Centeno (Aug. 2017). "A Cross-National Comparison of Subnational Variation." In: *American Behavioral Scientist*, p. 000276421772394.
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

- Ferreira, Francisco (2000). "A new poverty profile for Brazil using PPV, PNAD and census data." In: *Pontifícia Universidad Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Dep. de Economia Working Paper*.
- Franzese, Robert (June 2002). "Electoral and Partisan Cycles in Economic Policies and Outcomes." In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 5.1, pp. 369–421.
- Fukuyama, Francis (July 2013). "What Is Governance?" In: *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 26.3, pp. 347–368.
- Gradstein, Mark and Branko Milanovic (2004). "Democracy and Income Inequality: An Empirical Analysis." In: *World Bank Policy Research Working Papers Series* 2561.
- Greenwood, Jeremy and Boyan Jovanovic (1990). "Financial Development, Growth, and the Distribution of Income." In: *The Journal of Political Economy* 98.5, pp. 1076–1107.
- Haan, Jakob de and Jan-Egbert Sturm (Dec. 2017). "Finance and Income Inequality: A Review and New Evidence." In: *European Journal of Political Economy* 50, pp. 171–195.
- Haber, Stephen, Douglass North, and Barry Weingast (2008). *Political Institutions and Financial Development*. Ed. by Stephen Haber, Douglass North, and Barry Weingast. Stanford University Press.
- Hanson, Jonathan (Sept. 2015). "Democracy and State Capacity: Complements or Substitutes?" In: *Studies in Comparative International Development* 50.3, pp. 304–330.
- Herzer, Dierk and Sebastian Vollmer (2012). "Inequality and Growth: Evidence From Panel Cointegration." In: *Journal of Economic Inequality* 10.4, pp. 489–503.
- Huber, Evelyn and John Stephens (2012). *Democracy and the Left: Social Policy and Inequality in Latin America*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Huntington, Heather and Erik Wibbels (Oct. 2014). "The Geography of Governance in Africa: New Tools from Satellites, Surveys and Mapping Initiatives." In: *Regional & Federal Studies* 24.5, pp. 625–645.
- Huntington, Samuel (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Harvard University Press.
- Jauch, Sebastian and Sebastian Watzka (Aug. 2016). "Financial Development and Income Inequality: A Panel Data Approach." In: *Empirical Economics* 51.1, pp. 291–314.
- Jensen, Nathan (2003). "Democratic Governance and Multinational Corporations: Political Regimes and Inflows of Foreign Direct Investment." In: *International Organization* 57.3, pp. 587–616.
- Keefer, Philip and Raizvan Vlaicu (2008). "Democracy, Credibility, and Clientelism." In: *Journal of Law and Economic Organization* 24.2, pp. 371–406.

- Keele, Luke, Suzanna Linn, and Clayton Webb (Apr. 2016). “Erratum for Keele, Linn, and Webb.” In: *Political Analysis* 24.2, pp. 291–306.
- Kiser, Edgar and Xiaoxi Tong (Oct. 1992). “Determinants of the Amount and Type of Corruption in State Fiscal Bureaucracies: An Analysis of Late Imperial China.” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 25.3, pp. 300–331.
- Knutsen, Carl Erik (2013). “Democracy, State Capacity and Economic Growth.” In: *World Development* 43, pp. 1–18.
- Kohli, Atul (2004). *State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery*. Cambridge University Press.
- Korinek, Anton and Jonathan Kreamer (2014). “The Redistributive Effects of Financial Deregulation.” In: *Journal of Monetary Economics* 68, S55–S67.
- Korpi, Walter (1983). *The Democratic Class Struggle*. London. Routledge.
- Kurtz, Marcus and Andrew Schrank (2007). “Growth and Governance: Models, Measures, and Mechanisms.” In: *Journal of Politics* 69.2, pp. 538–554.
- Kurtz, Marcus and Andrew Schrank (2012). “Capturing State Strength: Experimental and Econometric Approaches.” In: *Revista De Ciencia Política* 32.3, pp. 613–622.
- Li, Quan and Adam Resnick (2003). “Reversal of Fortunes: Democratic Institutions and Foreign Direct Investment Inflows to Developing Countries.” In: *International Organization* 57.1, pp. 175–211.
- Lieberman, Evan (2003). *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in South Africa and Brazil*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lindert, Peter (2004). *Growing Public: Social Spending and Economic Growth since the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge University Press.
- Luna, Juan Pablo and Hillel Soifer (July 2017). “Capturing Subnational Variation in State Capacity: A Survey-Based Approach.” In: *American Behavioral Scientist*.
- Luna, Juan Pablo and Sergio Toro (2014). “State Capacity and Democratic Government in Latin America: A Survey Data-Based Approach to Measurement and Assessment.”
- Mann, Michael (1984). “The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results.” In: *European Journal of Sociology* 25.02, pp. 185–213.
- Meltzer, Allan and Scott Richard (1981). “A Rational Theory of the Size of Government.” In: *Journal of Political Economy* 89.5, pp. 914–927.

- Menaldo, Victor (2016). "The Fiscal Roots of Financial Underdevelopment." In: *American Journal of Political Science* 60.
- Menaldo, Victor and Daniel Yoo (2015). "Democracy, Elite Bias, and Financial Development in Latin America." In: *World Politics* 67.4, pp. 726–759.
- Morgan, Jana and Nathan Kelly (July 2013). "Market Inequality and Redistribution in Latin America and the Caribbean." In: *The Journal of Politics* 75.3, pp. 672–685.
- Mulligan, Casey, Richard Gil, and Xavier Sala-i-Martin (2004). "Do Democracies Have Different Public Policies than Nondemocracies?" In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18.1, pp. 51–74.
- North, Douglass and Barry Weingast (1989). "The Constitution of Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England." In: *Journal of Economic History* 49.4, pp. 803–831.
- Olson, Mancur (2000). *Power And Prosperity: Outgrowing Communist And Capitalist Dictatorships*. Basic Books.
- Pierson, Paul (2000). "Path Dependence, Increasing Returns, and the Study of Politics." In: *The American Political Science Review* 94.2, pp. 251–267.
- Piketty, Thomas (2014). *Capital in the Twenty First Century*. Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press.
- Polanyi, Karl (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press.
- Remington, Thomas (2011). *The Politics of Inequality in Russia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reuveny, Rafael and Quan Li (2003). "Economic Openness, Democracy, and Income Inequality: An Empirical Analysis." In: *Comparative Political Studies* 36.5, pp. 575–601.
- Rodrik, Dani (1999). "Democracies Pay Higher Wages." In: *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114.3, pp. 707–738.
- Ross, Michael (2006). "Is Democracy Good for the Poor?" In: *American Journal of Political Science* 50.4, pp. 860–874.
- Saylor, Ryan (2012). "Sources of State Capacity in Latin America: Commodity Booms and State Building Motives in Chile." In: *Theory and Society* 41.3, pp. 301–324.
- Scheve, Kenneth and David Stasavage (2012). "Democracy, War, and Wealth: Lessons from Two Centuries of Inheritance Taxation." In: *The American Political Science Review* 106.1, pp. 81–10.

- Scheve, Kenneth and David Stasavage (2017). "Wealth Inequality and Democracy." In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 20.1, pp. 451–468.
- Scott, James (1988). *Seeing like a State*. Yale University Press.
- Soifer, Hillel (2012). "Measuring State Capacity in Contemporary Latin America." In: *Revista de Ciencia Política* 32.3, pp. 585–598.
- Soifer, Hillel (2013). "State Power and the Economic Origins of Democracy." In: *Studies in Comparative International Development* 48.1, pp. 1–22.
- Soifer, Hilliel (2008). "State Infrastructural Power: Approaches to Conceptualization and Measurement." In: *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43, pp. 231–253.
- Solt, Frederick (Nov. 2016). "The Standardized World Income Inequality Database." In: *Social Science Quarterly* 97.5, pp. 1267–1281.
- The World Bank (n.d.). *World Development Indicators*.
- Thies, Cameron (2009). "National Design and State Building in Sub-Saharan Africa." In: *World Politics* 61.4, pp. 623–669.
- Timmons, Jeffrey (2010). "Does Democracy Reduce Economic Inequality?" In: *British Journal of Political Science* 40.4, pp. 741–757.
- Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca (2014). *Curbing Clientelism in Argentina: Politics, Poverty and Social Policy*. Cambridge Univeristy Press.
- Williamson, Oliver (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
- Wong, Mathew (2016). "Democratic Persistence and Inequality: the Role of Foreign Direct Investments." In: *Studies in Comparative International Development* 51.2, pp. 103–123.
- Ziblatt, Daniel (2008). "Why Some Cities Provide More Public Goods than Others: A Subnational Comparison of the Provision of Public Goods in German Cities in 1912." In: *Studies of Comparative International Development* 43, pp. 273–289.

.....Word count: 8,165

Recreating Market Conditions for Vote-Selling and Vote-Buying in the Lab: The Chilean Case

HÉCTOR BAHAMONDE *¹ and

ANDREA CANALES †²

¹Assistant Professor, O'Higgins University (Chile)

²Postdoctoral Fellow, O'Higgins University (Chile)

December 9, 2019

Abstract

The literature asserts that Chilean parties no longer buy votes. While those are good news, the bad news are that we are rather ignorant about a number of other interesting, and yet, unanswered questions. First and foremost, the approach used by most scholars focuses exclusively on vote-buying. That is, parties offering to buy votes, completely ignoring the ones who sell their votes (i.e. voters). This is a rather important distinction. What would voters do if offered the chance to sell their votes? Would they sell them? And if so, at what price? Would voters still sell their votes to their own party of preference, or would they sell it to the opposing party? Do voters set a higher selling price if selling to the opposing party, while lowering the price if selling to the party they would have supported anyways? Another important question is who political parties target: party supporters, opposers, or swing voters? By recreating market conditions that exist between vote-buyers and vote-sellers implemented in the lab, the paper sheds light on these issues.

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

Rough draft PLEASE DO NOT CIRCULATE.

Keywords— clientelism; vote-buying; vote-selling; experimental economics; formal modeling.

*hector.bahamonde@uoh.cl; www.HectorBahamonde.com.

†andrea.canales@uoh.cl; website.

We thank O'Higgins University for funding this project, and the participants of the colloquium at the Centre for Experimental Social Sciences (CESS) at Universidad de Santiago. Javiera Tobar, Christopher Reyes and Bastian Garrido provided excellent research assistance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars mostly agree on the positive correlation between poverty and clientelism (Calvo and Murillo 2004; Weitz-Shapiro 2012; Kitschelt 2000; Kitschelt and Altamirano 2015).¹ Since the poor derive more utility from immediate transfers than the uncertain returns associated with future policy packages, clientelist political parties only target the poor (Brusco, Nazareno, and Stokes (2004) and Stokes et al. (2013)). Indeed, Weitz-Shapiro (2014, p. 12) explained that “[a]lmost universally, scholars of clientelism treat and analyze [this] practice as an exchange between politicians and their poor clients.”

This agreement has recently been challenged (Hicken 2007, p. 55). González-Ocantos et al. (2012) and Holland and Palmer-Rubin (2015) found that income had little or no effect on vote-buying. For instance, Szwarcberg (2013, p. 32) “challenges the assumption [that brokers] with access to material benefits will always distribute goods to low-income voters in exchange for electoral support.” In fact, Bahamonde (2018) explains that non-poor individuals can be targeted when they are sufficiently noticeable, increasing compliance. He explains that wealthy houses in very poor neighborhoods in Brazil can be targeted too.

While there are important agreements, the literature has failed to provide a convincing answer to the following question: *Who do parties target? Swing or core voters? Why?* These questions have historically haunted the literature. In fact, Carlin and Moseley (2015, p. 14) states that “our knowledge of who parties target remains incomplete.” On the one hand, Cox and McCubbins (1986) explain that since constituencies are well-known, they allocate resources to core voters. On the other hand, Stokes (2005) argues that since allocating resources to individuals who *ex-ante* vote for the party is a waste, parties target swing voters (similarly, see Zarazaga (2016) and Gallego (2014)). Yet, Zarazaga (2016, p7) asserts that both “[q]ualitative and quantitative evidence mainly shows that party machines reward their own supporters,” not swing voters.

Instead, the clientelism literature has seen a proliferation of tangential answers. While all of them are contributions, they do not really tackle the afore mentioned question. Dixit and Londregan (1996) explain that parties both swing and core voters, but that depends on a number of factors. . Nicther (2008) (turnout-buying) is another very important contribution. Unfortunately, it deviates from the question by increasing the complexity on the varieties of clientelism. Similarly, Zarazaga

add something

¹Following Nicther (2014, p. 316), clientelist vote-buying is defined as “the distribution of rewards to individuals or small groups during elections in contingent exchange for vote choices.”

(2016, p. 7) introduces yet another category (conditional supporters) who “will vote for the party machine only as long as unexpected events do not persuade them to do otherwise”

The paper seeks to contribute to this issue by incorporating both structural and individual factors that foster clientelism in the same theory.

II. THE MODEL

We consider an electorate of n voters. Voters vote for a leader to implement a common policy γ from the set $\Gamma = \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$. Each citizen i has an ideal point x_i which is an *iid* draw from an uniform distribution Γ . When policy γ is implemented, payoffs of citizen i are given by $u(D, x_i, \gamma) = D - |x_i - \gamma|$, where D represents **completar acá**. This payoff can be incremented by transferences from both parties to voter i .

In this election, there are two candidates. One “left-wing” party and one “right-wing” party. The left-wing (right-wing) candidate represents a policy γ_L (γ_R) which is an *iid* draw from an uniform distribution over $\{1, \dots, 50\}$ ($\{51, \dots, 100\}$). The location of this policy give us the number of voters n_L leaning towards the left-wing candidate, while the number of voters leaning towards the right-wing party is given by $n_L + n_R = n$. While we consider that voters are attached to an ideological continuum, we do so with the sole purpose of modeling preferences—both formally and experimentally.²

Moving forward, both parties negotiate with only one of these n voters. That voter is randomly selected from the total population n . Observe that the higher the n , the lower the representation in the election of this voter. That is, a larger n necessarily implies that every individual electoral choice matters less. However, if n is small, negotiating with this voter may be more attractive to political parties. This is because negotiating with a large number of voters is costly. We assume that each party has a budget (B) that they can use to buy votes. If a party decides not to negotiate with the voter (or the voter does no accept the offer), the party keeps this budget. The profits of party i is given by,

²Ultimately, experimental subjects are not told anything about ideology. They only observe that there are a number of “points” associated with the victory of party A or party B. In this sense, voters lean (“ideologically”) towards the party that gives them more points.

$$\pi_i(W, e_i, s_i) = W \cdot e_i + (1 - s_i \cdot a_j) \cdot B$$

where W ($W \geq B$) is a constant that represents how much each party values winning the election, $e_i = 1$ if party i wins the election, 0 otherwise, s_i is the fraction of B that the party offers to voter j who can accept the offer ($a_j = 1$) or not ($a_j = 0$). We study two versions of this party-voter interaction. One is where both parties make simultaneous offers to the voter, and she decides whether to accept the offer (vote-buying case). Another one is where the voter can make private offers to both parties, and then the party decides if to pay or not for that voter's vote (vote-selling case).

The timing of the game is as follows: at the beginning of the game n voters and two political parties are randomly located on their respective ideal points: voters along Γ , the “left-wing” candidate along $\{1, \dots, 50\}$, and the “right-wing” candidate on $\{51, \dots, 100\}$. All locations are public information, as well as every party’s budget B , the total number of voters (n) and the number of supporters of each party (n_L and n_R). What follows then, depends on the specific game. On the vote-buying case, each party simultaneously decides if making an offer to the voter. If a party decides to negotiate with the voter, privately offers him to buy his vote (i.e. accept the offer and vote for the party). Then the voter decides if to take the offer, or which one accept if he receives two offers. If he accepts an offer, he should vote for that candidate.³ On the vote-selling case, the voter may privately propose a certain amount to each party in exchange for her vote. Then the parties decide if to pay or not the offer. The voter then decides which one to accept, if any. In this case, the voter offers to one or both parties, and each proposed amount might be different.

I. Equilibrium in Vote-Buying Case

In this case, both parties can offer certain amount in exchange for electoral support. Note that parties only have incentives to negotiate with a voter if he is the pivotal voter. That means that $|n_L - n_R| \leq 1$, and that voter i supports the ex-ante winner of the election ($i \in \max\{n_L, n_R\}$). The voter prefers the party closer to her ideal point. If both parties are located at the same distance, the

³It is important to consider that to simplify the game (and the experiment), accepting the offer necessarily implies compliance. That is, accepting the offer means voting for the party the voter accepted the offer from. We leave for future research the case where the voter may defect.

voter is indifferent. Denote by $i^* \in \{L, R\}$ the preferred party of the voter, and $-i^*$ the other party.

Note that, naturally, both parties want to make different offers. If the voter is pivotal, the less preferred party has incentives to offer him a certain amount m_{-i^*} such that he perceives more utility voting for that party rather than voting for the opposite party, that is:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{-i^*} &\geq (D - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{i^*}|) - (D - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{-i^*}|) \\ &= |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{-i^*}| - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{i^*}|. \end{aligned}$$

Parties expect winning the election but have limited budgets. Hence, they want to win the election at a minimum cost. If party $-i^*$ offers the voter $m_{-i^*} = |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{-i^*}| - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{i^*}|$, he will be indifferent between voting for party i^* or party $-i^*$. Both offers $m_{i^*} = 0$ and $m_{-i^*} = |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{-i^*}| - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{i^*}|$ are the minimum amount, but enough to make the pivotal voter indifferent between both political parties. Indifference gives the party some electoral advantage of winning of the election. Voter indifference gives two possible Nash equilibria. In one equilibrium the voter rejects the offer and votes for i^* . In the other equilibrium, the voter accepts the offer and the elected party is $-i^*$. If individuals are utility maximizers, they should be indifferent between these two equilibria.

II. Equilibrium in Vote-Selling Case

In the case that the voter can set the price of his vote, he may negotiate with one or both parties setting the price that he is willing to accept in exchanging of voting for that party. In this setting, the voter has incentives to set the highest price each party can pay. In our model this is given by B (which is public knowledge). When the voter is pivotal, he may swing towards party $-i^*$ only if the budget is big enough to compensate what he loses when voting for his less prefer policy ($B > |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{-i^*}| - |x_{i^*} - \gamma_{i^*}|$). When the voter decides to negotiate with both parties, and both accept to pay the price set by him, he chooses one offer, voting for his preferred political party i^* .

Since the parties-voter negotiation does not change the electoral outcome, vote-selling is not efficient to parties. When a party wins the election due to vote-selling, the party's payoff is $\pi_i(W, 1, 1) = W$, while the loser party obtains $\pi_i(W, 0, 0) = B$. If the pivotal voter decides to negotiate with both political forces, parties i^* and $-i^*$ have to decide if accept to pay B to the

voter. This strategic situation is represented as follows,⁴

		$-i^*$
	Accept	Reject
i^*	Accept	W, B
	Reject	B, W
		$W + B, B$

Thus, we can observe that there exists an unique equilibrium where both parties are willing to pay B to the voter.

III. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Following our theoretical formalizations, a lab economic experiment was performed. The experiment was conducted at O'Higgins University and Centre for Experimental Social Sciences (CESS) of *Universidad de Santiago*, Chile. Subjects received a minimum of \$5,000 Chilean pesos. The maximum depended on the quality of individual decisions. [summary statistics here](#). The basic flow is depicted in [Figure 1](#).

The experiment has two parts, with four stages each. The first part is the vote-buying portion. During the first stage, participants are assigned a role at random. They can be either *party A*, *party B*, or *voter*. Voters are assigned at random an “ideological” position. That is, voters receive a certain amount of points (at random) depending on whether party A or B wins the election. For instance, if party A wins election, a voter might receive 2,400 points, whereas if party B wins the election, the voter might receive 200 points. It is in this sense that the voter is “ideologically” closer to party A. The substantive correlate is that voters perceive some utility when, for instance, their preferred fiscal policies are implemented. During the first stage, both parties receive different endowments too. The idea is to reflect the fact that some parties are wealthier than others. Note that voters receive zero endowments. The clientelism literature is consistent in that both poor and rich voters are prone to receive clientelist offerings ([Bahamonde 2018](#)).

⁴This situation is considering that, if both parties accept to pay the price set by the voter, he prefers the party i^* .




Figure 1: Experimental Flow.

Note: Note here.

During the second stage of the first part, parties decide whether to go out and buy votes by making clientelist offerings. Experimental subjects playing the party role enter an amount of points, which ranges from zero to the maximum assigned budget. They are told that offering zero means they do not want to buy votes. Importantly, both budgets (for party A and B) are the same. However, given that the voter-party distance is assigned at random, both parties have *relative* “different” budgets.

In the third stage voters evaluate whether to take that offer or not. If the party decided that it did not want to make an offer at that time, the voter is told that the party did not make an offer. Voters are told that accepting the offer necessarily implies voting for that party (no defecting in this experimental design). In this regard, the third and fourth stage are in reality one stage.

The second part is the vote-selling portion of the experiment. This part is run during the same experimental session, but loading a separate `Ztree` program. Right after the first part is completed, experimental subjects are then asked to continue with the study.

The second part is exactly the same, except that this time voters are first-players: they get to offer parties an amount of points, and then, parties get to decide whether to take or reject that offer. Note that the experimental currency are “points,” which later translated into actual money.⁵

I. Expected Comparative Statics

This experiment randomizes the voter’s and party’s “ideological” positions, party endowments,⁶, and whether the voter is pivotal or not (whether the voter represents $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the electorate). There is one static event, namely, the order of the experiment (the vote-buying part goes first, while the

⁵Particularly, Chilean pesos.

⁶As explained above, not directly, but by randomizing the ideological position of voters. By doing so, we are able to manipulate the *relative* purchasing power of every party.

vote-selling part goes second). This aspect is presented to all experimental subjects (both roles) before the second stage (both experimental parts). Exploiting this experimental data, we intend to shed light on the conditions that foster vote-buying/selling. Particularly, we are interested in analyzing the next aspects of a clientelist transaction.

Ideology. Since Downs (1957), spatial theorist have theorized for a long time about the role of political ideology on different electoral aspects (see Enelow and Hinich (1990) for a review). Unfortunately, one of the main criticisms of the Downsian paradigm, is its unidimensionality. That is, the big assumption of voters being concerned only about the spatial distance between their policy preferences and the ones of the available parties. Acknowledging this problem, Adams, III, and Grofman (2005, p. 20) introduce “non-policy” factors. Unfortunately, these factors are mainly socio-demographics traits, such as race, gender, income, among others. While it is true that these traits are not strictly policy-based, they are highly correlated with them. In this paper we try to advance the literature by incorporating clientelism, a non-policy issue (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2006).

Our experimental design allows us to explore the tipping point at which voters stop caring about ideology. Since the voter-party spatial distance is randomized, our design sheds some light on the elasticity of ideology, clarifying *when* voters renounce to politics (and start selling their votes). Hence, by offering voters a non-policy choice (selling one’s vote), we complement the spatial literature, ultimately, by focusing on the question of democratic values too.

Competitiveness. The degree in which elections are contested or not has an important role in explaining clientelism. Competitive authoritarian regimes (Levitsky and Way 2010) survive not due to electoral fraud, but because of the incumbent’s capacity to mobilize a large mass of supporters, discouraging likely opposers (Magaloni 2008). Unfortunately, we still do not know at which point likely opposers feel discouraged, and abandon the electoral race. Since the experiment also randomizes the number of likely voters, we will be able to observe at which point is efficient to buy votes (when needed), and at which point is a waste.

Endowments. For the Brazilian case, Bahamonde (2018) explains that parties with access to more resources are also able to buy more expensive goods, even targeting the wealthy. However, Szwarcberg (2013, p. 32) finds that parties with access to material resources does not necessarily

imply clientelist targeting. The literature then has not been really able to explain the relationship between having resources and vote-buying: *Do parties with more resources engage in vote-buying?*

Targeting. *Who do political parties target? Swing voters or core supporters?*

Voter's Bargaining Power. By manipulating the relative importance of a voter, we will be able to answer the following question: *Does block voting (i.e. when unions or other civic groups vote coordinately for the same candidate) increase the selling price?*

Sequence. By considering two sequences, one where the party gets to be the first player, and one where the voter does, *Does the order matter?*

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSES

pending.

V. DISCUSSION

pending.

REFERENCES

- Adams, James, Samuel Merrill III, and Bernard Grofman (2005). *A Unified Theory of Party Competition: A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan Stokes (2004). “Vote Buying in Argentina.” In: *Latin American Research Review* 39.2, pp. 66–88.
- Calvo, Ernesto and María Victoria Murillo (Oct. 2004). “Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market.” In: *American Journal of Political Science* 48.4, pp. 742–757.
- 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.
- Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins (1986). “Electoral Politics and Redistributive Game.” In: *The Journal of Politics* 48.2, pp. 370–389.
- Dixit, Avinash and John Londregan (1996). “The Determinants of Success of Special Interests in Redistributive Politics.” In: *The Journal of Politics* 58.4, pp. 1132–1155.
- Downs, Anthony (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Addison-Wesley.
- Enelow, James and Melvyn Hinich (1990). *Advances in the Spatial Theory of Voting*. Ed. by James Enelow and Melvyn Hinich. Cambridge University Press.
- Gallego, Jorge (May 2014). “Self-Enforcing Clientelism.” In: *Journal of Theoretical Politics* May.
- González-Ocantos, Ezequiel 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.
- Hicken, Allen (2007). “How Do Rules and Institutions Encourage Vote Buying?” In: *Elections for Sale: The Causes and Consequences of Vote Buying*. Ed. by Frederic Schaffer. 1st ed. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Pub. Chap. 4, pp. 47–60.
- Holland, Alisha and Brian Palmer-Rubin (Aug. 2015). “Beyond the Machine: Clientelist Brokers and Interest Organizations in Latin America.” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 48.9, pp. 1186–1223.
- Kitschelt, Herbert (Sept. 2000). “Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities.” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 33.6–7, pp. 845–879.

- Kitschelt, Herbert and Melina Altamirano (2015). "Clientelism in Latin America Effort and Effectiveness." In: *The Latin American Voter: Pursuing Representation and Accountability in Challenging Contexts*. Ed. by Ryan Carlin and Matthew Singer. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chap. 10.
- Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson, eds. (2006). *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge University Press, p. 392.
- Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way (Aug. 2010). *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Magaloni, Beatriz (2008). *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nichter, Simeon (Feb. 2008). "Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot." In: *American Political Science Review* 102.01, pp. 19–31.
- Nichter, Simeon (Sept. 2014). "Conceptualizing Vote Buying." In: *Electoral Studies* 35, pp. 315–327.
- Stokes, Susan (Sept. 2005). "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina." In: *American Political Science Review* 99.3, pp. 315–325.
- Stokes, Susan et al. (2013). *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Szwarcberg, Mariela (2013). "The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism. Lessons from the Argentine Case." In: *Latin American Research Review* 48.2, pp. 32–54.
- 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.
- Zarazaga, Rodrigo (Oct. 2016). "Party Machines and Voter-Customized Rewards Strategies." In: *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 28.4, pp. 678–701.

.....Word count: 2,907

Vote Selling in the United States: Introducing Machine Learning 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

September 2, 2020

Abstract

Hello World

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 AQUI.

We both thank.

I. TOWARD A MULTIDIMENSIONAL STUDY OF CLIENTELISM

Democracy has been theorized as a multidimensional concept. Referring particularly to *polyarchies*, Dahl (1971, p. 3) explains that among some of the requirements for sustaining a democracy, there must be some institutional guarantees that create opportunities to (1) formulate preferences, (2) signify those preferences, and (3) have preferences weighted equally when conducting a government.

Yet, clientelism—as a democratic 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. Quantitative scholars then usually focus on the “effects of causes” rather than on the “causes of effects” (Pearl 2015). 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; Nicther 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).

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*. While qualitative researchers are better equipped to properly do so, the are some quantitative techniques that might provide broader explanations 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. Ultimately, this paper tries to provide a multidimensional explanation for clientelism within the “effects of causes” approach. Exploiting a novel conjoint dataset, this paper developed an experimental

designs which sough to answer *which of the three democratic subdimensions explained by Dahl (1971) should fail to produce clientelism?*

II. THE UNITED STATES AS A CASE STUDY

This paper makes both methodological and substantive contributions to the literature by leveraging a conjoint experiment on hypothetical vote selling in a consolidated democracy. 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), this paper presents experimental evidence of hypothetical willingness to sell the vote in the United States.

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

The evidence that this paper presents may be associated with a probable erosion of American democracy.¹ 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)). 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.” 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.

¹Relatedly, see Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018).

I. Clientelism in the U.S.: A Brief Historical Account

At first, many advanced democracies were clientelist political systems. For instance, Stokes et al. (2013, p. 200) explain that in the nineteenth-century United States, “vote buying was commonplace” and “the major urban political institution in the late nineteenth century” (Erie 1990, p. 2). Poor bureaucracies and bad-quality record-keeping helped to foster electoral malpractice. First, most states did not have actual registration laws, making voter eligibility difficult to determine (Argersinger 1985, p. 672). Historians frequently report that judges at polling places had a hard time determining not only the age of the potential voter, but also whether the prospective voter was a U.S. citizen, especially in cases that involved newly naturalized immigrants with strong foreign accents (Bensel 2004, p. 20). For instance, judges used as a rough proxy whether the prospective voter had the ability to grow a beard (Bensel 2004, p. 20). Consequently, it was often up to the judge’s discretion whether to let prospective voters cast a ballot. Since judges were party appointees (Argersinger 1985, p. 672), their discretionary powers were systematically used to shape electoral outcomes.

The “party strip” or “unofficial” ballot system also permitted all sorts of fraudulent practices. The parties themselves produced party tickets. Since tickets varied by size and color, it made “the voter’s choice of party a public act and rendered voters susceptible to various forms of intimidation and influence while facilitating vote buying” (Argersinger 1985, p. 672). In addition, the ticket system required very strong party machines, which, in turn, required considerable economic resources to make the system work. However, political machines were oiled not only with money. On the one hand, many “ticket peddlers” (Argersinger 1985, p. 672) were volunteers (Bensel 2004, p. 17). Most of these volunteers “enjoyed the patronage of elected party officials by holding government jobs” (Bensel 2004, p. 17). On the other hand, political appointees “from janitor to secretary of state” and some corporations donated annually part of their revenues (Reynolds 1980, p. 197). Thus, parties amassed huge amounts of money. With all these resources flooding the polls on election day, voting was truly an interesting spectacle. On that day, party agents would offer voters plenty of liquor as an incentive to vote the party ticket. Hence, “the street or square outside the voting window frequently became a kind of alcoholic festival in which many men were clearly and spectacularly drunk [to the point that] some could not remember whether or not they had voted” (Bensel 2004, p. 20).




Figure 1: Frequency of Clientelism in the United States (2010).

Note: Figure shows the frequency of survey respondents, $N = 755$.

Source: *LAPOP*, 2010 wave for the United States. Question is *clien1*: “In recent years and thinking about election campaigns, has a candidate or someone from a political party offered you something, like a favor, food, or any other benefit or object in return for your vote or support? Has this happened often, sometimes, or never?”

Today, the *modus operandi* of clientelism has changed, and both the frequency of vote buying/selling and the importance of party machines have declined (Figure 1). Scholars have pointed out that “party machines are a thing of the past” (Stokes et al. 2013, p. 230). However, some contemporary accounts remain of vote buying and selling in American elections.² Similarly, non-academic sources find that during the 2010 elections, “selling votes [was a] common type of election fraud” (Fahrenthold 2012). Others find that “[v]ote-buying is extremely common in developed [...] countries” (Leight, Pande, and Ralston 2016, p. 1). *While clientelism seems to have declined in the United States, which of the three subdimensions explained by Dahl (1971) would need to fail to make clientelism more likely?*

III. CONJOINT DESIGNS: TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

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

²For instance, Campbell (2005, pp. 243–244) explains how a Democratic leader in Logan County, West Virginia, accepted \$35,000 in cash to support Senator Kennedy. As the Democratic leader explained, “this money was for one purpose: ‘We bought votes with it [...] that’s the way real politics works.’ ” Other examples are the famous primary election in March 1972 in Chicago (Campbell 2005, p. 262) and the elections in the coal-rich Appalachian Mountains during the 1980s (Campbell 2005, p. 275).

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 combinations (profiles) (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 traditional conjoint designs exploited the “additive measurements” of the utilities associated with the respective attribute (Luce and Tukey 1964, p. 2), some times this might lead to non-accounted-for 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), 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).³ 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).⁴ 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 also it 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).⁵ Importantly, they show that “when attribute levels are randomized independently from one another, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates of the coefficients 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).⁶ Others have also 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).⁷

IV. CONJOINT DESIGNS: STUDYING CLIENTELISM MULTIDIMENSIONALLY

Our approach 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 this multidimensional approach to studying issues related to democracy, but also leveraging the Hainmueller, Hopkins, and

³Due 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).

⁴Importantly, 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.”

⁵Yet, 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).

⁶Hainmueller, 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.”

⁷However, see Horiuchi, Markovich, and Yamamoto (2020).

Yamamoto (2014) approach to designing a conjoint experiment, we developed a conjoint design aimed to studying the multidimensionality of conditions that make vote selling most likely. Particularly, we are interested in studying the multidimensionality of conditions that make vote selling most likely. The multidimensional study of clientelism 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) and González-Ocantos, Jonge, et al. 2012; González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson 2014; González-Ocantos, Kiewiet de Jonge, and Nickerson 2015 use a list experiment to study the effect of vote-selling prices or specific issues related to norms and legitimacy on the probability of clientelism. 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 number. As Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014, p. 2) point out, these designs “have an important limitation for analyzing multidimensional decision making.”

Which democratic dimension(s), as specified by Dahl (1971), should fail to make clientelism more 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. Every dimension has a number of requirements. In order to operationalize Dahl (1971)’s requirements, for the conjoint experiment, we devised five attributes that reflected these requirements: (1) *citizens can associate with others and form groups*, (2) *media can confront the government*, (3) *citizens can vote in the next two elections*, (4) *president cannot rule without congress* and (5) *citizens can run for office for the next two elections*. 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 the correct tool to answer the aforementioned question.

To study which democratic dimension(s) should fail to produce clientelism, we presented subjects two hypothetical candidates that supported (or not) every policy (attribute). 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

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

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 a democracy. 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. As Table 2 shows, all participants were asked to choose between hypothetical candidates that either supported or rejected each of these five attributes.

both approaches, reflecting reality goes beyond the scope of our experiment. Ultimately, our goal is to identify the set of democratic attributes that, when absent, make clientelism more likely. In fact, external validity seems to be the tradeoff 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 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 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 the possibility of biased answers when asking participants **the direct question** about vote selling, the 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. 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 (as explained in Table 2), participants were asked to answer a battery of socio-demographic and political questions.

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.

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

Which of these candidates represents the lesser of the two evils for you?

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.

V. DATA ANALYSES

Classic Conjoint Analyses Collected in 2016, the data ($N=11,080$) are representative at the national level.⁸ Figure A1 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 two different yet classic conjoint analyses. In the first one, we show the hypothetical candidates that were selected by survey respondents. In the second set of analyses, we change the dependent variable of the attribute-specific OLS estimators for the vote-selling question (which is also dichotomous) for the direct question about vote selling. The rationale behind this second set of analyses is the same that the one of first set of analyses, i.e. to identify specific attributes that are associated with the outcome of interest.




Figure 2: Classic AMCE Analyses: Candidate Selection and Vote Selling Models.

Note: Following Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto (2014), the figure shows the corresponding AMCEs for every of the attributes explained Table 1. These attributes were based on Dahl (1971).

⁸1108 respondents, everyone answering 5 with 2 each. Research Now SSI collected the data between March 2 and March 6. 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 [redacted] University.

hb: analyze figure
2 briefly

REFERENCES

- Argersinger, Peter (1985). "New Perspectives on Election Fraud in the Gilded Age." In: *Political Science Quarterly* 100.4, pp. 669–687.
- 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.
- Bensel, Richard (2004). *The American Ballot Box in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Campbell, Tracy (2005). *Deliver the Vote: A History of Election Fraud, an American Political Tradition-1742-2004*. Carroll & Graf.
- 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.
- Erie, Steven (1990). *Rainbow’s End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840-1985*. University of California Press.
- Fahrenthold, David (Oct. 2012). *Selling Votes is Common Type of Election Fraud*.
- 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.
- Leight, Jessica, Rohini Pande, and Laura Ralston (2016). “Value for Money in Purchasing Votes? Vote-buying and Voter Behavior in the Laboratory.”
- 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.
- 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.

- Reynolds, John (1980). “‘The Silent Dollar’: Vote Buying in New Jersey.” In: *New Jersey History* 98.3, pp. 191–211.
- 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.
- Stokes, Susan et al. (2013). *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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:** 3,408

VI. APPENDIX

I. Geographical Distribution of Survey Respondents




Figure A1: Geographical Distribution of Survey Respondents by Party Identification.

II. 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.

Es nuestro
approach
causal
inference?
Al menos
si cumple
con 3
assumptions
en Hain-
mueller2014a.
Estas son
dadas por el
diseno del
experimento.

Not Just Guns or Butter, but What Came First—Guns or Butter? Introducing GVAR to International Relations

HÉCTOR BAHAMONDE ^{*1} and

IGOR KOVAC ^{†2}

¹Assistant Professor, O'Higgins University (Chile)

²PhD Candidate in Political Science, University of Cincinnati

September 3, 2020

Abstract

Power remains one of the crucial and most studied concepts in International Relations. In recent decades a prevailing notion became present in the literature explaining that the economic power is the most fundamental type of power—a sort of a prerequisite for all other forms of power (military, political, cultural). Yet, such an assumption has never been properly tested. Therefore, to test this assumption, the paper introduces a new time-series method to Political Science—Global Vector Auto-regression. The method enables the researcher to perform big-n and big-t hypotheses tests. In this paper, we test if economic power is a prerequisite for military power. We use four variables from National Material Capabilities from the Correlates of War dataset, where two are used as proxies for measuring economic power, and two are used to measure military power. We run the analysis for two separate time-spends: first from 1871 through 1913, and from 1955 through 2012. Our inquiry suggests that the role of the economy has changed through history. Namely, in 19th century it was the military power that drove (Granger-caused) the economy; yet, since 1955 the roles are reversed. Finally, we identify future research projects how to test also the relations between the remaining two power factors (political and cultural).

Keywords— time series; IPE; GVAR; IR

Work in progress. Please don't cite. Download the last version of the paper [here](#).

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

[†]kovacir@mail.uc.edu; <https://igorkovac.com>.

We thank Tsung-wu Ho and Cristobal Quininao for their suggestions.

I. INTRODUCTION

“Power is the ultimate aphrodisiac,” said Henry Kissinger (Kissinger 1973). Since the dawn of social and political science, power has been a key object of multiple research projects as well as served as a crucial explanation for others (Lasswell and Kaplan 1950). In recent decades a prevailing notion became present in International Relations, which sometimes takes the shape of a latent assumption, and sometimes as an explicit disclaimer, that the economic power is the most fundamental type of power—a sort of a condition for all other forms (Kennedy 1989; Luttwak 1990; Fukuyama 1992; Nau 1995; Kirshner 1997; Gilpin 2001; Brooks 2005; Ikenberry 2011). The argument is neatly summed by Organski, who claimed that economic power is a prerequisite for all other power capabilities, without a strong economy and good growth potential a dominant state stagnates and declines (Organski 1958, 299-306).

However, this claim has never been properly tested. For instance, Mearsheimer (2001, Ch. 3) dedicates a whole chapter in his masterpiece to explain how latent power matters to military power,¹ but he does not test this claim for great power relations, nor for international relations in general. Hence, are we taking this assumption for granted due to its sound causal pathway? Namely, states need good economy to purchase or make weapons.² However, if such a claim may be self-evident when it comes to relations between economic and military power, than this is not the case for relations between economic and political, and economic and cultural power.³

As such, if the literature offers assumptions about the nature of power and proposes causal relations between power factors,⁴ than it should also provide general evidence that those are accurate. Nevertheless, such test is suspiciously missing from the International Relations scholarship. So far, the literature has not offered a general study which would test the assumption that economic power is a prerequisite of all other power factors. Several reasons may contribute to such a situation. First, the problem of measuring power, particularly political and cultural.⁵ Second, the lack of appropriate methods of tackling this question. Third, the absence of unified theoretical framework of power that would allow for generalization of such test.

We acknowledge the first issue, but by no means should this limit scientific endeavors. Being aware of vices in databases and variables used to measure a concept should only motivate us to do additional primary research, as well as to reproduce existing studies with different variables from variety of data bases. Furthermore, being cognizant of the problem requires transparency,

not avoidance. Regarding the third point, it is very difficult to imagine that Political Science will ever develop an ultimate definition of power.⁶ Still, this skepticism should not discourage us to advance power assessments, as well as limit scientific inquiries that are based on a specific definition. Therefore, this paper tackles the second problem—methodological. Namely, we introduce to Political Science a new time series method—Global Vector Autoregression (GVAR).⁷ The latter, among other characteristics, enables a big N and big T analysis.⁸ Therefore, it is ideal for testing such an assumption as relations between economic and military power.

As such, in this paper we focus solely on the relations between economic and military power factors. We use GVAR to determine which power factor drives the other—Granger causality (C. W. J. Granger 1969). We hypothesize that pre-World War One, it was military power that generated economic power—greater military, led to greater economic power. Moreover, we also expect in the second hypothesis that after the World War Two the relations would be reverse. Hence, it is the economic power that conditions military power. These two hypotheses derive from structural changes of international relations, such as advancement of technology, which contributes to slower fungibility of military power in modern time.⁹ However, fungibility does not mean causality, it only refers to a possibility and the likelihood of that possibility—a resource to be used in more than one issue area.

We operationalize military and economic power using variables from Correlates of War Project, components of National Capability Index (Singer 1987). Namely, the number of military personnel, the amount of military expenditure, the amount of energy consumption, and the production of iron and steel. Furthermore, in GVAR model we also use Bilateral Trade data from the same database that is used as the foreign or structural variable.(Barbieri and O. M. Keshk 2016) Namely, in order to construct a GVAR model, one needs country specific data, as well as global variables, which generates the framework or weights of those country level numbers.¹⁰ Our initial results are ambiguous, where the first hypothesis is confirmed, while the second one is not. This means that military power is the prerequisite for economic power not only in 19th century, but also today. Still, more research is necessary on the subject. Yet, what matters at this point is that the results attest that we should not take any assumption for granted.

Hence, the paper proceeds by first positioning the question of relations between economic and military power in the broader literature on power. Second, we introduce the new method and GVAR model. Then we present our results and finally, elaborate our future research prospects and

proposals regarding this scientific inquiry.

II. POWER

The literature offers numerous ways how to think and understand power.¹¹ For the sake of clarity and being cognizant of the risk of oversimplification, we identify three approaches of conceptualizing power. First are the “dimensions of power”—“power to,” “power over,” “power with.” Second are the faces of power. Third are power factors (economic, military, political, cultural). These three approaches may be distinct, but this does not mean that there are no commonalities, which can serve for new theory developments on power. However, we will leave this question of synthesis for a different paper.

Dimensions of power see power as either agential, structural, or relational (Qin 2018). “Power to” refers to the possession of the resources by a specific actor. Hence, it is linked with capabilities of states, which can be latent or already manifested. Namely, the more of a certain capability a state has, the more powerful it is. This is a straightforward logic; hence politicians and strategists like to operate with it (Deibel 2007). “Power over” refers to influence and control over outcomes or over other actors and their behavior (Hart 1976). As such, it bears a structural element, where the structure of international relations is favorable for certain states. “Power with” sees power residing in relations between A and B and therefore, both can draw from it. Thus, different type of relations lead to different levels of power in those relations. In fact, it is argued that the only way power is found is through the process of determining a consensus of goals and values among diverse interests (Arendt 1970). Deriving from these three dimensions of power Barnett and Duvall have presented their systemic, precise, and general typology of power (Barnett and Duvall 2005).

Another way of classifying power is through the so called “faces of power.” Such a classification developed gradually throughout the decades after the end of the World War Two and resides in the notion that power needs to be understood as a cause. Hence, the “faces of power” look for causal pathways through which power functions. Digeser sums it up: “Under the first face of power the central question is, ‘Who, if anyone, is exercising power?’ Under the second face, ‘What issues have been mobilized off the agenda and by whom?’ Under the radical conception, ‘Whose objective interests are being harmed?’ Under the fourth face of power the critical issue is, ‘What kind of subject is being produced?’ ” (Digeser 1992, 980). Namely, the first face sees power as coercion

behind the decision of making B do what A wants. It stresses direct contact between A and B (Dahl 1957). Yet, Bachrach and Baratz (1962) expanded the causal mechanism of power and identified that power also lies in the ability of A to make B do what A wants it to without with affection. They have called this the ‘Second Face of Power.’ Thus, B may do what A wants not only because A has an authority over B, but it also may be the case that B likes A and wants to please it. However, a ‘third face of power’ further expanded the causal mechanisms of power. It looks at the mechanism of subliminal ideological causes of shaping others’ interest, rules and in international relations (Lukes 1974). Finally, the fourth ‘face of power’ postulates that subjectivity or individuality is not biologically given. Subjects are understood as social constructions, whose formation can be historically described. Thus, power works through the identity construction of A’s and B’s (Digeser 1992).

The third approach of looking at power is to look at a particular domain of state interaction. Subsequently, each domain has its unique sources of power and causal mechanisms how that power functions. As stated, Mann (1986) determined economic, military, political, and ideological power domains.

The present research is related to first and third approach of studying power, hinting therefore, also towards the possibility of a synthesizing approach to conceptualize power. We look at capabilities of states, hence, we understand power as “power to.” Moreover, we are also testing the relations between economic and military power factors. Thus, state capabilities can be either economic, military, political and cultural. In future research we wish to test all those relations, nevertheless, this paper is only focused on testing the economic power prerequisite assumption.

The latter was the biggest constraining factor in our analysis. We had to balance the wish for long time span with the wish for big number of states included. In future iterations, as well as for robustness checks we may consider different time spans, which subsequently would change also the amount of states included—e.g. instead of taking 1955 as one of the starting points, consider 1971 or 1973, when the Bretton Woods International Monetary system collapsed, as well as when a big chunk of de-colonialization had already happened.

Moreover, in the current state of the project, we only look at two variables, one measuring military power (military personnel) and one economic power (iron and steel production). We will be adding two more variables, one for each power factor, in the next iteration—military expenditure and energy consumption. However, the global variable, or the variable that determines the structure

of international relations, where a state operates in is the bilateral trade between countries. It may not be the best proxy for a structure, but it is the only one in a dyadic format with a time span we can take advantage of. Nevertheless, in the future iterations of the project, particularly for the time after World War II, a different variable may be used.

III. MODELING “BUTTER AND GUNS” IN A GLOBAL SETTING: PRESENTING THE GVAR METHODOLOGY

To our knowledge, so far GVAR has not been used or introduced in Political Science. Although the method has been widely used in economics, its characteristics are appealing also for Political Science. Three such features come to mind. First, as already stated, GVAR enables a panel time series analysis of a big N and big T dataset. Second, unlike PVAR, it generates results for individual countries, or other units, hence, the particularities and complexities of politics are considered. Finally, it enables to model the effects of agency, structure, as well as their interaction. Still, for all its advantages, GVAR has one important shortcoming. Namely, there must not be any gaps in the data.

I. GVAR: Country-specific Equations and Granger-causality Tests

Global vector auto-regressive models (GVAR) are a special category of vector auto-regressive models (VAR). Following Box-Steffensmeier et al. (2014, 164), define a VAR model as follows,

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i \mathbf{x}_{i,t-p} + \mathbf{u}_{it} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x}_{it} is a $k_i \times 1$ vector of endogenous variables which are lagged p times on the right-hand side, and where $E(\mathbf{u}_{it}) = 0$. Now, following Mauro and Pesaran (2013, 14), define a GVAR model with p lags for country i as follows,

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i \mathbf{x}_{i,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{1i} \mathbf{W}_{x,t} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{2i} \mathbf{W}_{x,t-p} + \mathbf{u}_{it} \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{x}_{it} is a $k_i \times 1$ vector of domestic (i.e. endogenous) variables, \mathbf{W}_t is a $k_i \times 1$ vector of weakly-exogenous foreign variables, and \mathbf{u}_{it} is a serially uncorrelated and cross-sectionally weakly dependent process. As it becomes apparent, the inclusion of foreign variables \mathbf{W}_t in Equation 2

is one of the main characteristics of the GVAR approach, and the main difference with the VAR equation described in [Equation 1](#). In simple, the Global vector autoregressive GVAR model in [Equation 2](#) explains $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ as a function of past values $\mathbf{x}_{i,t-p}$ lagged p times, at the same time that it weights these dynamics by weakly-exogenous foreign variables \mathbf{W}_{t-p} (weights which are captured by parameters $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{ni}$). Note that the exogeneity of x is obtained by multiplying this term by the weights matrix \mathbf{W}_t , both with its current values and p lagged values.

Since we are substantively interested in weather “guns” *cause* “butter” or the other way around, in this paper we estimate country-specific bivariate Granger-causality tests within the GVAR framework.¹² The Granger-causality method was introduced in C. Granger ([1969](#)) and it seeks to investigate if some variable X Granger-causes another variable Y , or the other way around. A variable X is said to Granger-cause Y if predictions of Y based on lagged values of Y and lagged values of X perform better than explaining Y just with its own past values. Since Granger-causality tests are usually estimated by fitting VAR equations ([Equation 1](#)) we now derive the Granger-causality test within the GVAR framework. The substantive advantage of GVAR Granger-causality tests over regular Granger-causality tests is that estimates are weighted by the global economy, situating the domestic dynamics within the global context. More formally, we estimate the following GVAR Granger-causality system for every country i with p lags as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_{it} &= \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1i}\mathbf{y}_{i,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{2i}\mathbf{x}_{i,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{1i}\mathbf{W}_{x,t} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{2i}\mathbf{W}_{x,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{3i}\mathbf{W}_{y,t} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{4i}\mathbf{W}_{y,t-p} + \mathbf{u}_{it} \\ \mathbf{y}_{it} &= \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1i}\mathbf{x}_{i,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{2i}\mathbf{y}_{i,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{1i}\mathbf{W}_{y,t} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{2i}\mathbf{W}_{y,t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{3i}\mathbf{W}_{x,t} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{4i}\mathbf{W}_{x,t-p} + \mathbf{u}_{it}\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

Likewise, note that the exogeneity of x and y is obtained by multiplying each by the weights matrix \mathbf{W}_t , both with its current values and p lagged values. Particularly, the vector \mathbf{x}_{it} contains country-year levels of “military personnel,” while vector \mathbf{y}_{it} contains country-year levels of “iron and steel production.” Both variables were systematized by the Correlates of War Project, particularly, the National Material Capabilities dataset (Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey [1972](#)).¹³ The dataset covers all countries in the world between 1816-2012.

We have truncated this time period into two parts, each related to a specific hypothesis. Namely, the first period is between 1871 and 1913. The time spread is rather obvious—unification of Germany and the beginning of World War I. The Zeitgeist of that period is neatly summed up in the infamous Bismarck’s “Blood and Iron” speech *Excerpt from Bismarck’s “Blood and Iron” Speech* ([1862](#), 1862):




Figure 1: National Steel and Guns Production (log), 1871-1913.

Note: Variables are “milper” and “irst.” Both were obtained from Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey (1972).

Germany is not looking to Prussia's liberalism, but to its power; Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden may indulge liberalism, and yet no one will assign them Prussia's role; Prussia has to coalesce and concentrate its power for the opportune moment, which has already been missed several times; Prussia's borders according to the Vienna Treaties are not favorable for a healthy, vital state; it is not by speeches and majority resolutions that the great questions of the time are decided—that was the big mistake of 1848 and 1849—but by iron and blood.

As history has shown, by iron he did not mean economy, but military power (Hobsbawm 1987; Kissinger 1994; Schroeder 1976). Therefore, our hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1. *Between 1871 and 1913 military power Granger causes economic power.*

In the future versions of the paper we may include only the very few numbers of states, whose data goes all the way back to 1816. Furthermore, we also may take advantage of imputing some data points for some states in order to enhance the number of states also in this period—for both versions 1816-1913 and 1871-1913.

Figure 1 portrays the values of the two variables used in our model by country between 1871 and 1913. The second period of our analysis takes place between 1955 and 2012. The beginning of this framework was generated based on the balance between the competing objective of time length and amount of states included in our model. As stated earlier, here we have opted more in favor of greater time span, whereas in the future iterations and as a sort of robustness checks, we will also use a different starting points, such as: 1971 (Nixon Shock) or 1973 (the end of Bretton Woods System), 1946 (the end of World War II), 1991 (the end of Cold War), and 1980 (oil crisis). Moreover, we will also consider imputation in all these formats.

Nevertheless, we suspect that the nature of relations between economic and military power would be reversed in this period. This is not due to the technological advancement of the military, but rather due to the changed nature of the economy. The latter became finance driven, which is detached from the real economy. Namely, exponential growth of trade, Foreign Direct Investments, and monetary transactions altogether all attribute to the growth of monetary velocity (Cagan and Schwartz 1987), the creation of international banking consortia—by 1971 90% of 50 world's biggest banks had become a part of broader and larger conglomerates (Ganoe 1972), and “by the end of 1970s financial flow size dwarfed trade flows by 25:1 and they were much more volatile” (Gilpin




Figure 2: National Steel and Guns Production⁹ (log), 1955-2012.

Note: Variables are “milper” and “irst.” Both were obtained from Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey (1972).

2011) therefore, today 99% of all financial transactions are short term-speculative transactions. All this contributes to the fact that the economy is not only adjacent to the strategic interactions of states, but in fact has become its own domain of power relations among states.¹⁴ Subsequently, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 2. *Between 1955 and 2012 economic power Granger causes military power.*

Figure 2 displays the values of the two variables used in our model by country from 1955 and 2012.

When it comes to the foreign or global variable that determines the structure of international relations in our model, we have opted for dyadic trade data, which is available also for the period in 19th century. This variable was constructed by the same project but in the Trade dataset (Barbieri, Keshk, and Pollins 2009; Barbieri and O. Keshk 2016)¹⁵ and was used to construct the weight matrix \mathbf{W} . The matrix is a square matrix which has all K countries in both its columns and rows with zeros as diagonal elements. The matrix represents bilateral trade among two countries measured by the $flow1$ and the $flow2$ variables. The former measures imports from a country ($importer1$) to another country ($importer2$), and the latter measures the reverse dyad, i.e. imports from $importer2$ to $importer1$. More formally, \mathbf{W} contains t sub-matrices (one sub-matrix per year) with dimensions $k \times k$ for a total of \mathbf{K} countries such that,

$$\mathbf{W}_t = \begin{bmatrix} & \mathbf{i}_1 & \mathbf{i}_2 & \mathbf{i}_3 & \dots & \mathbf{i}_K \\ \mathbf{i}_1 & 0 & f_{21} & f_{31} & \dots & i_{K1} \\ \mathbf{i}_2 & f_{12} & 0 & f_{32} & \dots & i_{K2} \\ \mathbf{i}_3 & f_{13} & f_{23} & 0 & \dots & i_{K3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{i}_K & f_{1K} & f_{2K} & f_{3K} & \dots & i_{KK} \end{bmatrix}$$

Every W_t matrix weights all K country-specific Granger regressions described in Equation 3. Every K system is weighted by the other $K - 1$ countries. And as Equation 3 shows, the GVAR methodology also considers p lags of the \mathbf{W} matrix. Following the literature on Granger-causality tests we focus our attention model-specific f-tests (one per country) which tests if all variables in the model are jointly significant. Then null is that there is no Granger causality.

IV. RESULTS

Figure 3 shows country-specific p-values of the Granger-causality f-tests obtained when fitting Equation 3 (detailed results shown in the Appendix section, particularly Table A1, Table A2 and Table A3).

The plot shows that during the 1871 – 1913 period, in 44% of the countries economic power Granger-caused military power. Yet, interestingly, this percentage drops to 38% and 33% for the great power during the 1955 – 2012 period. On the other hand, in the same second period in 46% of the countries military power Granger-caused economic power.




Figure 3: P-Values of the Country-specific Granger-causality F-Tests, 1871-2012.

Note: Plot shows country-specific p-values of the Granger-causality f-tests obtained when fitting Equation 3 (detailed results shown in Table A1, Table A2 and Table A3). The plot shows that during the 1871-1913 period, in 44% of the countries, steel Granger-caused guns. This porcentage changes to 38% and to 33% for the hegemonic countries during the 1955-2012 period.

Hence, we have failed to reject 1, which was expected. However, our results have rejected 2, which was not. Therefore, the results speak in favor of persistent dominance of the military power among the power factors.

As such, military power has passed the most likely and the most difficult case test. Namely, the first period presents itself as the most likely case for the military power be the prerequisite for the

economic power. Furthermore, the second period can be labeled as the most difficult case for the military power. And conversely for the economic power. Its dominance was rejected by both the least likely and the most likely case. Where the second period presents the most likely case and the first one the most difficult case.¹⁶

V. DISCUSSION

The present research project makes two contributions to the broader International Relations literature. First, we test the general assumption that the economic power is the prerequisite for all other power factors. Second, we introduce to Political Science a new time series method—GVAR.

Our preliminary results indicate that the assumption of economic power dominance, which is so often and with ease made by scholars, is at least dubious, and flawed at best. In fact, the military power Granger-causes economic power in both periods—19th and 20th century.

However, future iterations of this project are necessary to be fully confident in such a result and conclusion. First, we need to enhance our model to also include military expenditures and energy consumption. Second, robustness checks using different time frames and imputation needs to be performed as well. Third, a comparison of results using GVAR with PVAR method would be beneficial. Namely, the amount of countries whose data is available for 19th century would still be classified as a small N. Thus, PVAR would also be appropriate method to be used for this period with small N. Consequently, we would expect that for 19th century conclusions from PVAR and GVAR would be the same, whereas for 20th century the conclusions would differ due to the big N in that period.

REFERENCES

- Alzuabi, Raslan, Mustafa Caglayan, and Kostas Mouratidis. 2020. “The risk-taking channel in the United States: A GVAR approach.” Online published on 22 June. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1970. *On violence*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Art, Robert J. 1996. “American foreign policy and the fungibility of force.” *Security Studies* 5 (4): 7–42.
- . 1999. “Force and fungibility reconsidered.” *Security Studies* 8 (4): 183–9.
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. 1962. “Two Faces of Power.” *The American Political Science Review* 56 (4): 947–52.
- Baldwin, David A. 1985. *Economic statecraft*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1999. “Force, fungibility, and influence.” *Security Studies* 8 (4): 173–83.
- . 2016. *Power and international relations: A conceptual approach*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Barbieri, Katherine, and Omar Keshk. 2016. “Correlates of War Project Trade Data Set Codebook, Version 4.0.” <http://correlatesofwar.org>.
- Barbieri, Katherine, Omar Keshk, and Brian Pollins. 2009. “TRADING DATA: Evaluating our Assumptions and Coding Rules.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26 (5): 471–491.
- Barbieri, Katherine, and Omar M.G.Omar Keshk. 2016. *Correlates of War Project Trade Data Set Codebook, Version 4.0*. Online.
- Barnett, Michael, and Raymond Duvall. 2005. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59 (1): 39–75.
- Beckley, Michael. 2010. “Economic Development and Military Effectiveness.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33 (1): 43–79.
- Blackwill, Robert D., and Jennifer M. Harris. 2016. *War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Bouvet, Florence, Ryan Brady, and Sharmila King. 2013. "Debt Contagion in Europe: A Panel-Vector Autoregressive (VAR) Analysis." *Social Sciences* 2 (4): 318–40.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet, John Freeman, Matthew Hitt, and Jon Pevehouse. 2014. *Time Series Analysis for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, Stephen G. 2005. *Producing security: Multinational corporations, globalization, and the changing calculus of conflict*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cagan, Phillip, and Anna J. Schwartz. 1987. "Has the growth of money substitutes hindered monetary policy?" In *Money in Historical Perspective*, edited by Anna J. Schwartz, 209–33. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Canova, Fabio, and Matteo Ciccarelli. 2013. *Panel Vector Autoregressive Models: A Survey*. Frankfurt.
- Chudik, Alexander, and M.Hashem Pesaran. 2016. "Theory and practice of GVAR modelling." *Journal of Economic Surveys* 30 (1): 165–97.
- Cohen, Eliot. 2017. *The Big Stick: The Limits of Soft Power and the Necessity of Military Force*. New York: Basic Books.
- Copeland, Dale C. 2014. *Economic interdependence and war*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Csurgai, Gyula. 2009. "Sovereign Wealth Funds: Strategies of Geo-economic Power Projections." In *Globalization and the Reform of the International Banking and Monetary System*, edited by Otto Hieronymi. London: Palgrave.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. "The Concept of Power." *Behavioral Science* 2 (3): 201 15.
- Deibel, Terry L. 2007. *Foreign affairs strategy: Logic for American statecraft*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Digeser, Peter. 1992. "The Fourth Face of Power." *The Journal of Politics* 54 (4): 977 1007.
- Elster, Jon. 1976. "Some Conceptual Problems in Political Theory." In *Power and Political Theory*, edited by Brian Barry, 245–70. New York: Willey.
- Excerpt from Bismarck's "Blood and Iron" Speech*. 1862.

- Findlay, Ronald, and Kevin H. O'rourke. 2009. *Power and plenty: trade, war, and the world economy in the second millennium*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- French, John R. P., and Bertram Raven. 1959. "The bases of social power." In *Studies in social power*, edited by Dowin Cartwright, 311–20. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Ganoe, Charles. 1972. "Banking Consortia: are they here to stay?" *Columbia Journal of World Business* 7 (4): 517.
- Gilpin, Robert. 2001. *Global Political Economy Understanding the International Economic Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2011. *Global political economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gowa, Joanne. 1994. *Allies, Adversaries, and International Trade*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Granger, Clive. 1969. "Investigating Causal Relations by Econometric Models and Cross-spectral Methods." *Econometrica* 37 (3): 424.
- Granger, Clive W. J. 1969. "Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods." *Econometrica* 37 (3): 424–38.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2008. "Power or plenty: How do international trade institutions affect economic sanctions?" *Journal of conflict Resolution* 52 (2): 213–42.
- Hart, Jeffrey. 1976. "Three Approaches to the Measurement of Power in International Relations." *International Organization* 30 (2): 289–305.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1987. *The Age of Empire: 1875-1914*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hohn, Karl Hermann. 2014. *Geopolitics and the Measurement of National Power*. PhD dissertation, University of Hamburg.
- Hunter, Floyd. 1953. *Community power structure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Ikenberry, G. John. 2011. *Liberal Leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- International Monetary Fund. 2016. “Cross-Country Report on Spillovers: Selected Issues.”
- Katzenstein, Peter J., ed. 1977. *Between power and plenty: Foreign economic policies of advanced industrial states*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kennedy, Paul. 1989. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kirshner, Jonathan. 1997. *Currency and coercion: the political economy of international monetary power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kissinger, Henry. 1973. “The Sayings of Secretary Henry.” <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9F07E4DF1439E73ABC4051DFB6678388669EDE>.
- . 1994. *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon / Schuster.
- Lasswell, Harold D., and Abraham Kaplan. 1950. *Power and Society A Framework for Political Inquiry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lemke, Douglas, and Suzanne Werner. 1996. “Power parity, commitment to change, and war.” *International Studies Quarterly* 40 (2): 235–60.
- Levy, Jack. 2008. “Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25 (1): 1–18.
- Lukes, Steven. 1974. *Power: a radical view*. New York: Macmillan.
- Luttwak, Edward N. 1990. “From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce.” *The National Interest* 20:17–23.
- Mann, Michael. 1986. *The sources of social power*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- March, James G. 1955. “An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence.” *American Political Science Review* 49 (2): 431–51.

- Mauro, Di, Filippo, and M.Hashem Pesaran, eds. 2013. *The GVAR handbook: Structure and applications of a macro model of the global economy for policy analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Mauro, Filippo di, and Hashem Pesaran. 2013. *The GVAR Handbook: Structure and Applications of a Macro Model of the Global Economy for Policy Analysis*. 1st, edited by Filippo di Mauro and Hashem Pesaran. Oxford University Press.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. *The tragedy of great power politics*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Mills, Wright C. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nau, Henry R. 1995. *Trade and security: U.S. policies at cross-purposes*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute.
- Norrlof, Carla, and Williaim C. Wohlforth. 2016. “Is US grand strategy self-defeating? Deep engagement, military spending and sovereign debt.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science, Online First*.
- Oppenheim, Felix E. 1976. “Power and Causation.” In *Power and Political Theory: Some European Perspectives*, edited by Brian Berry, 103–16. London: John Wiley.
- Organski, Abramo F. K. 1958. *World politics*. New York: Knopf.
- Organski, Abramo F. K., and Jacek Kugler. 1980. *The war ledger*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pesaran, M.Hashem, Til Schuermann, and Scott M. Weiner. 2004. “Modeling regional interdependen- cies using a global error-correcting macroeconometric model.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 22 (2): 129–62.
- Qin, Yaqing. 2018. *A relational theory of world politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russel, Bertrand. 1938. *Power, a new social analysis* [in io]. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Schnucker, Annika. 2017. *Penalized Estimation of Panel VARs: A Lasso Approach*.
- Schroeder, Paul W. 1976. “Alliances, 1815-1945: Weapons of Power and Tools of Management.” In *Historical Dimensions of National Security Problems*, edited by Klaus Knorr, 227–256. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

- Scott, John, ed. 1994. *Power: Critical Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1953. "Notes on the observation and measurement of political power." *Journal of Politics* 15 (4): 500–16.
- Singer, David, Stuart Bremer, and John Stuckey. 1972. *Capability Distribution, Uncertainty, and Major Power War, 1820-1965*, edited by Bruce Russett, 19–48. Sage.
- Singer, J. David. 1987. "Reconstructing the Correlates of War Dataset on Material Capabilities of States, 1816-1985." *International Interactions* 14 (2): 115–32.
- Soysa, De, John R. Oneal Indra, and Yong-Hee Park. 1997. "Testing power-transition theory using alternative measures of national capabilities." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41 (4): 509–28.
- Stokman, Frans N., Rolf Ziegler, and John Scott, eds. 1985. *Networks of corporate power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Viner, Jacob. 1948. "Power versus plenty as objectives of foreign policy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." *World Politics* 1 (1): 1–29.

.....Word count: 4,575

VI. APPENDIX

I. Appendix

Table A1: *Bivariate Gobal Granger Causality Tests of the World Political Economy, 1871-1913*

	Granger Relationship	F-Test	P-Value	DF	Adjusted R-sq	Lags
Austria-Hungary	butter → guns	2.16	0.06	8,31	0.192	1
	guns → butter	2.48	0.03	8,31	0.233	
Belgium	butter → guns	1.781	0.11	16,19	0.263	5
	guns → butter	2.339	0.04	16,19	0.38	
France	butter → guns	1.27	0.29	8,31	0.052	1
	guns → butter	2.72	0.02	8,31	0.261	
Germany	butter → guns	1.844	0.11	8,31	0.148	1
	guns → butter	7.891	0	8,31	0.586	
Italy	butter → guns	2.777	0.02	16,19	0.448	5
	guns → butter	6.801	0	16,19	0.726	
Russia	butter → guns	8.725	0	16,19	0.779	5
	guns → butter	3.595	0	16,19	0.543	
Spain	butter → guns	1.454	0.21	8,31	0.085	1
	guns → butter	0.554	0.81	8,31	-0.101	
United Kingdom	butter → guns	1.85	0.1	16,19	0.28	5
	guns → butter	0.966	0.52	16,19	-0.016	
United States	butter → guns	2.942	0.01	8,31	0.285	1
	guns → butter	8.608	0	8,31	0.609	

Table shows country-specific Granger-causality F-tests. Last column shows number of domestic lags used per every country-specific Granger model. Number of lags for endogenous variables = 2. Number of lags for foreign variables = 2. Max number of lags for estimating the country-specific VAR model = 5.

Information criteria for optimal lag length = AIC. Deterministic variables: Trend and constant.

Table A2: *Bivariate Global Granger Causality Tests of the World Political Economy, 1955-2012 (A)*

	Granger Relationship	F-Test	P-Value	DF	Adjusted R-sq	Lags
Argentina	butter → guns	0.422	0.93	10,44	-0.12	1
	guns → butter	7.765	0	10,44	0.556	
Australia	butter → guns	0.629	0.8	12,41	-0.092	2
	guns → butter	5.618	0	12,41	0.511	
Austria	butter → guns	0.656	0.78	12,41	-0.084	2
	guns → butter	7.305	0	12,41	0.588	
Belgium	butter → guns	3.842	0	12,41	0.392	2
	guns → butter	3.001	0	12,41	0.312	
Brazil	butter → guns	0.237	0.99	12,41	-0.209	2
	guns → butter	9.498	0	12,41	0.658	
Bulgaria	butter → guns	1.269	0.27	12,41	0.057	2
	guns → butter	4.286	0	12,41	0.427	
Canada	butter → guns	1.69	0.11	10,44	0.113	1
	guns → butter	5.055	0	10,44	0.429	
Chile	butter → guns	0.561	0.84	10,44	-0.088	1
	guns → butter	7.313	0	10,44	0.539	
Colombia	butter → guns	4.855	0	18,32	0.581	5
	guns → butter	1.737	0.08	18,32	0.21	
Egypt	butter → guns	0.219	0.99	10,44	-0.169	1
	guns → butter	5.471	0	10,44	0.453	
Finland	butter → guns	1.428	0.19	12,41	0.088	2
	guns → butter	5.041	0	12,41	0.478	
France	butter → guns	8.235	0	16,35	0.694	4
	guns → butter	1.442	0.18	16,35	0.122	
Greece	butter → guns	1.344	0.23	18,32	0.11	5
	guns → butter	2.39	0.02	18,32	0.334	
Hungary	butter → guns	3.363	0	12,41	0.349	2
	guns → butter	3.711	0	12,41	0.38	
India	butter → guns	1.287	0.26	14,38	0.072	3
	guns → butter	6.048	0	14,38	0.576	
Israel	butter → guns	0.702	0.72	10,44	-0.058	1
	guns → butter	0.63	0.78	10,44	-0.073	
Italy	butter → guns	2.151	0.04	10,44	0.176	1
	guns → butter	11.365	0	10,44	0.657	
Japan	butter → guns	1.876	0.06	16,35	0.216	4
	guns → butter	4.079	0	16,35	0.491	
Luxembourg	butter → guns	2.296	0.03	10,44	0.194	1
	guns → butter	0.925	0.52	10,44	-0.014	
Mexico	butter → guns	1.436	0.18	16,35	0.12	4
	guns → butter	8.525	0	16,35	0.702	
Netherlands	butter → guns	2.483	0.02	10,44	0.216	1
	guns → butter	3.73	0	10,44	0.336	
North Korea	butter → guns	2.875	0	18,32	0.403	5
	guns → butter	2.143	0.03	18,32	0.292	
Norway	butter → guns	1.02	0.44	10,44	0.004	1
	guns → butter	1.122	0.37	10,44	0.022	
Poland	butter → guns	1.57	0.14	12,41	0.114	2
	guns → butter	2.745	0.01	12,41	0.283	
Portugal	butter → guns	0.749	0.68	10,44	-0.049	1
	guns → butter	3.265	0	10,44	0.296	
Romania	butter → guns	1.019	0.44	10,44	0.004	1
	guns → butter	2.878	0.01	10,44	0.258	
South Africa	butter → guns	0.686	0.73	10,44	-0.062	1
	guns → butter	1.102	0.38	10,44	0.019	
South Korea	butter → guns	0.448	0.91	10,44	-0.114	1
	guns → butter	9.019	0	10,44	0.598	
Spain	butter → guns	4.66	0	10,44	0.404	1
	guns → butter	4.92	0	10,44	0.421	
Taiwan	butter → guns	1.382	0.21	12,41	0.08	2
	guns → butter	5.667	0	12,41	0.514	
Turkey	butter → guns	1.696	0.1	14,38	0.158	3
	guns → butter	25.426	0	14,38	0.868	
United Kingdom	butter → guns	9.085	0	10,44	0.6	1
	guns → butter	1.139	0.36	10,44	0.025	

Table shows country-specific Granger-causality F-tests. Last column shows number of domestic lags used per every country-specific Granger model. Number of lags for endogenous variables = 3. Number of lags for foreign variables = 3. Max number of lags for estimating the country-specific VAR model = 5. Information criteria for optimal lag length = AIC. Deterministic variables: Trend.

Table A3: *Bivariate Global Granger Causality Tests of the World Political Economy, 1955-2012 (B)*

	Granger Relationship	F-Test	P-Value	DF	Adjusted R-sq	Lags
China	butter → guns	0.252	0.98	9,45	-0.142	2
	guns → butter	83.191	0	9,45	0.932	
Russia	butter → guns	3.663	0	7,48	0.253	1
	guns → butter	1.775	0.11	7,48	0.09	
United States	butter → guns	1.821	0.1	7,48	0.095	1
	guns → butter	1.961	0.08	7,48	0.109	

Table shows country-specific Granger-causality F-tests. Last column shows number of domestic lags used per every country-specific Granger model. Number of lags for endogenous variables = 2. Number of lags for foreign variables = 2. Max number of lags for estimating the country-specific VAR model = 5. Information criteria for optimal lag length = AIC. Deterministic variables: NA.

NOTES

1. They described it as perhaps the most fundamental in the whole Political Science; whereas Elster (1976, 245-70, 249) is even more assertive arguing that power is the most important single idea in Political Theory.
2. Some studies have posed a similar research questions—generally touching upon the relations between the economy and military or strategy, e.g.: Baldwin (1985), Beckley (2010), and Copeland (2014). Moreover, Power Transition literature defined economic growth and development as a primary source of international change, and Gross Domestic Product has been identified as the parsimonious indicator of satisfaction with the status quo, see for example Organski and Kugler (1980), Lemke and Werner (1996), and Soysa, Indra, and Park (1997). However, these are inquiries about the change in the international system, not of power *per se*. International Political Economy also posed ontologically different questions and has not offered a comprehensive research on power. It is primarily interested in the political decision to prefer economic benefits or security, as if these two issues would be mutually exclusive—the question of “Power or plenty,” for instance Viner (1948), Katzenstein (1977), Gowa (1994), Hafner-Burton and Montgomery (2008), Findlay and O’rourke (2009), and Cohen (2017). For an insightful analysis on false exclusivity of the economic and security interests, see Norrlöf and Wohlforth (2016).
3. We decided to use the term culture, and not ideological, as it is often referred to in the literature (e.g Mann (1986)). Although we agree with Mann regarding the concept and what it implies, we think the name carries a negative connotation, relating mostly to Marxist traditions where it has been identified with false consciousness. Nevertheless, the ideational dimension of power should not be understood as something negative. Identity is also something positive. Thus, to avoid any prejudgments, we talk about cultural, which is neutral in its connotation, not ideology.
4. Military, economic, political, and cultural power factors (Mann 1986).
5. On this issue see Hohn (2014).
6. There is no lack of definitions and conceptualizations of power, which have been hotly debated for

decades. See: Russel (1938), Simon (1953), Hunter (1953), March (1955), Mills (1956), French and Raven (1959), Bachrach and Baratz (1962), Lukes (1974), Oppenheim (1976), Stokman, Ziegler, and Scott (1985), Digeser (1992), and Scott (1994).

7. GVAR was introduced in 2004, see Pesaran, Schuermann, and Weiner (2004). It “was developed in the aftermath of the 1997 Asian financial crisis to quantify the effects of macroeconomic developments on the losses of major financial institutions. It was clear then that all major banks are exposed to risk from adverse global or regional shocks, but quantifying these effects required a coherent and simple-to-simulate global macroeconomic model. The GVAR approach provides a useful and practical way of building such a model, and, although developed originally as a tool for credit risk analysis, it soon became apparent that it has numerous other applications Chudik and Pesaran (2016).”

8. This was so far not possible to perform. PVAR allowed for small N and big T, and Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation is used for big N and small T. On particularities of GVAR and how they relate to other time series methods see Mauro, Filippo, and Pesaran (2013), Bouvet, Brady, and King (2013), Canova and Ciccarelli (2013), Schnucker (2017), and Alzuabi, Caglayan, and Mouratidis (2020).

9. On the debate on fungibility of power see Art (1996, 1999) and Baldwin (1999).

10. “Through the use of foreign variables, the GVAR is able to account for bilateral inter-relationships amongst countries, and therefore control for spillovers on the basis of cross-country exposure. Additionally, the use of foreign variables allows the GVAR to scale up in a coherent manner and include a larger number of variables than possible in a VAR. Unlike a PVAR model, a GVAR also maintains the capability of giving country-level estimates ” (International Monetary Fund 2016).

11. A good overview is Baldwin (2016).

12. We acknowledge that without proper experimentation and randomization there cannot be proper causation. Consequently, and following the Granger methodology, we employ a rather lose definition of “causation” and explore if lagged values of a variable *forecast* another variable.

13. Version 5.0.

14. On the issue, see Luttwak (1990), Csurgai (2009), and Blackwill and Harris (2016).
15. Version 4.0.
16. On most and least likely case research design see Levy (2008).