

Losers' Consent and Democratic Stability: Experimental Evidence from Chile and Estonia

Hector Bahamonde ¹ Inga Saikkonen ² Mart Trasberg ³

Authors in alphabetical order. All contributed equally to this paper.

¹University of Turku, Finland

²Åbo Akademi, Finland

³Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico

April 5, 2024

“Losers’ Consent”: A Weak Assumption

- Political elites typically accept election outcomes in stable democracies.

“Losers’ Consent”: A Weak Assumption

- Political elites typically accept election outcomes in stable democracies.
- Yet, actions by Trump’s and Bolsonaro’s supporters question the acceptance of defeat.



“Losers’ Consent”: A Weak Assumption

- Political elites typically accept election outcomes in stable democracies.
- Yet, actions by Trump’s and Bolsonaro’s supporters question the acceptance of defeat.
- Research has looked into “losers’ consent,” focusing on satisfaction, trust, and efficacy.



“Losers’ Consent”: A Weak Assumption

- Political elites typically accept election outcomes in stable democracies.
- Yet, actions by Trump’s and Bolsonaro’s supporters question the acceptance of defeat.
- Research has looked into “losers’ consent,” focusing on satisfaction, trust, and efficacy.
- Still, we know little about the losing side’s *commitment to democracy among voters*; “systemic support” (Easton, 1965).



Voters' Commitment:

Electoral Losses and Institutional Heterogeneities

- We analyze the level of system support among electoral “losers” using data from a novel conjoint experiment in Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639).
- We exploit institutional heterogeneities in presidential and parliamentary systems, which effectively shift the *costs* of losing/winning an election.
- We pre-registered the following hypotheses: [▶ link](#)
 - Election “losers” favor candidates endorsing anti-systemic actions more than “winners.”
 - This tendency is stronger in presidential versus parliamentary systems.

Voters' Commitment:

Electoral Losses and Institutional Heterogeneities

- We analyze the level of system support among electoral “losers” using data from a novel conjoint experiment in Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639).
- We exploit institutional heterogeneities in presidential and parliamentary systems, which effectively shift the *costs* of losing/winning an election.
- We pre-registered the following hypotheses: [▶ link](#)
 - Election “losers” favor candidates endorsing anti-systemic actions more than “winners.”
 - This tendency is stronger in presidential versus parliamentary systems.

Voters' Commitment:

Electoral Losses and Institutional Heterogeneities

- We analyze the level of system support among electoral “losers” using data from a novel conjoint experiment in Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639).
- We exploit institutional heterogeneities in presidential and parliamentary systems, which effectively shift the *costs* of losing/winning an election.
- We pre-registered the following hypotheses: [▶ link](#)
 - Election “losers” favor candidates endorsing anti-systemic actions more than “winners.”
 - This tendency is stronger in presidential versus parliamentary systems.

Voters' Commitment:

Electoral Losses and Institutional Heterogeneities


1. Citizens' support for anti-system mobilizations varies between electoral winners and losers.
 - *"Enraged" losers* might be more willing to support anti-systemic politicians (Bowler, Donovan, and Karp 2007).
 - Winners should oppose politicians supporting anti-systemic actions.
2. Institutional setting should affect differently the costs of losing an election (Lijphart, 2012).
 - **Presidential:** losers have little input outside of the electoral cycle.
 - **Parliamentary:** losers' interests can be represented through a variety of power sharing institutions.

Losers' Consent and Democratic Stability

- Collected novel data from Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639) with gender and party sample quotas.
- **Most dissimilar cases:** maximize variance regarding government system (Presidential and Parliamentary).
- **Most similar cases:** minimize variance regarding critical V-Dem variables.


Losers' Consent and Democratic Stability

- Collected novel data from Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639) with gender and party sample quotas.
- **Most dissimilar cases:** maximize variance regarding government system (Presidential and Parliamentary).
- **Most similar cases:** minimize variance regarding critical V-Dem variables.




Losers' Consent and Democratic Stability

- Collected novel data from Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639) with gender and party sample quotas.
- **Most dissimilar cases:** maximize variance regarding government system (Presidential and Parliamentary).
- **Most similar cases:** minimize variance regarding critical V-Dem variables.



Losers' Consent and Democratic Stability

- Collected novel data from Chile (N=811) and Estonia (N=639) with gender and party sample quotas.
- **Most dissimilar cases:** maximize variance regarding government system (Presidential and Parliamentary).
- **Most similar cases:** minimize variance regarding critical V-Dem variables.



Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50 , Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50 .
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Conjoint Experiment

- Designed an unconstrained, fully randomized conjoint experiment.
- We depart from standard AMCE analyses (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto [2014](#)) and instead compute **subgroup marginal means** (Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley [2020](#)).

Dimension	Attribute Set
Gender	Male, Female.
Age	Younger than 35, Between 35-50, Over 50.
Protest	The candidate OPPOSES anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government, The candidate SUPPORTS anti-government protest that will seek to de-stabilize the current government
Pensions	The candidate OPPOSES increases in pensions for the elderly, The candidate SUPPORTS increases in pensions for the elderly

Additional Questions

- Included questions on socio-demographics and support for democracy.
- **Losers/Winners:** asked who respondents voted for.
 - **Chile:** *“Which candidate did you vote for in the 2nd round of the December 2021 presidential election?”*
Kast, Boric, Others (Blank/Spoiled, I did not vote, Prefer not to say).
 - **Estonia:** *“Which political party did you vote for in the last elections?”*
List of Estonian political parties that participated in the March 2023 parliamentary election.

Additional Questions


- Included questions on socio-demographics and support for democracy.
- **Losers**/Winners: asked who respondents voted for.
 - **Chile**: *“Which candidate did you vote for in the 2nd round of the December 2021 presidential election?”*
Kast, Boric, Others (Blank/Spoiled, I did not vote, Prefer not to say).
 - **Estonia**: *“Which political party did you vote for in the last elections?”*
List of Estonian political parties that participated in the March 2023 parliamentary election.

Additional Questions

- Included questions on socio-demographics and support for democracy.
- **Losers/Winners:** asked who respondents voted for.
 - **Chile:** *“Which candidate did you vote for in the 2nd round of the December 2021 presidential election?”*
Kast, Boric, Others (Blank/Spoiled, I did not vote, Prefer not to say).
 - **Estonia:** *“Which political party did you vote for in the last elections?”*
List of Estonian political parties that participated in the March 2023 parliamentary election.


Subgroup Marginal Means (MM): Boric, Kast

- Candidates favoring anti-systemic protests are systematically **rejected** by **both** winners and losers
- **Losers** show even **stronger disapproval** of such candidates.
- Effects might be driven by the legacies of the 2019–20 protests (*Estallido Social*)?
- **Estonia**: results support H1.




Subgroup Marginal Means (MM): Boric, Kast

- Candidates favoring anti-systemic protests are systematically **rejected** by **both winners and losers**
- **Losers** show even **stronger disapproval** of such candidates.
- Effects might be driven by the legacies of the 2019–20 protests (*Estallido Social*)?
- **Estonia**: results support H1.




Subgroup Marginal Means (MM): Boric, Kast

- Candidates favoring anti-systemic protests are systematically **rejected** by **both** winners and losers
- **Losers** show even **stronger disapproval** of such candidates.
- Effects might be driven by the legacies of the 2019–20 protests (*Estallido Social*)?
- **Estonia**: results support H1.




Subgroup Marginal Means (MM): Boric, Kast

- Candidates favoring anti-systemic protests are systematically **rejected** by **both** winners and losers
- **Losers** show even **stronger disapproval** of such candidates.
- Effects might be driven by the legacies of the 2019–20 protests (*Estallido Social*)?
- **Estonia**: results support H1.




Subgroup Marginal Means (MM): Boric, Kast

- Candidates favoring anti-systemic protests are systematically **rejected** by **both** winners and losers
- **Losers** show even **stronger disapproval** of such candidates.
- Effects might be driven by the legacies of the 2019–20 protests (*Estallido Social*)?
- **Estonia**: results support H1.




Exploratory Analysis (MM): Partisanship/Ideology

- Voters generally reject candidates favoring protests.
- Extreme right voters (*Rep. Party*) are especially likely to reject candidates associated with anti-systemic protest.
- **Estonia**: loser effects are largely driven by the extreme right.




- Voters generally reject candidates favoring protests.
- Extreme right voters (*Rep. Party*) are especially likely to reject candidates associated with anti-systemic protest.
- **Estonia**: loser effects are largely driven by the extreme right.




Exploratory Analysis (MM): Partisanship/Ideology

- Voters generally reject candidates favoring protests.
- Extreme right voters (*Rep. Party*) are especially likely to reject candidates associated with anti-systemic protest.
- **Estonia**: loser effects are largely driven by the extreme right.



Exploratory Analysis (MM): Partisanship/Ideology

- Voters generally reject candidates favoring protests.
- Extreme right voters (*Rep. Party*) are especially likely to reject candidates associated with anti-systemic protest.
- **Estonia**: loser effects are largely driven by the extreme right.



More Questions Than Answers

- Hipotetizamos que los *electoral losers* estarían más dispuestos a apoyar acciones no-democráticas (protestas anti-sistémicas).
- Registramos esta hipótesis.
- Sin embargo, no encontramos resultados que vayan en línea con nuestras expectativas iniciales.
- Preguntas para ustedes: cometimos un error en mezclar a la derecha con “protestas”?

Thank you



to check updates on this project.