

Supplemental Information Appendix

Joby Schaffer and Andy Baker. "Clientelism as Persuasion-Buying: Evidence from Latin America." *Comparative Political Studies*

A. Question Wordings and Codings

LAPOP 2010

Target of clientelism: "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?" (0) Never, (1) Sometimes or Often.

Persuasion frequency: "During election times, some people try to convince others to vote for a party or a candidate. How often have you tried to persuade others to vote for a party or candidate?" (0) Never, (1) Rarely, (2) Occasionally, (3) Frequently.

Parental associations, Community improvement associations, Trade or business associations, or Political party meetings: "I am going to read a list of groups and organizations. Please tell me if you attend their meetings at least once a week, once or twice a month, once or twice a year, or never." (0) Never, (1) Once or twice a year, (2) Once or twice a month, (3) Once a week.

Partisan identifier: "Do you currently identify with a political party?" (0) Does not identify with a political party, (1) Identifies with a political party.

Kirchner approval: "Speaking in general of the current administration, how would you rate the job performance of President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner?" (0) Very Bad, (1) Bad, (2) Neither good nor bad (fair), (3) Good, (4) Very Good.

Political participation index: A 4-point additive scale converted to a z-score (mean-centered by country).

1. "In the last 12 months, have you participated in a demonstration or protest march?" (0) No, (1) Yes.

2. "Have you attended a town meeting, city council meeting or other meeting in the past 12 months?" (0) No, (1) Yes.

3. "If the next presidential elections were being held this week, what would you do?" (0) Wouldn't vote, (1) Would vote.

In Chile, Colombia, and Haiti, the third question was not asked, so theirs was measured on a 3-point scale (and made comparable to the others via the calculation of the z-score).

Worked for a campaign: "There are people who work for parties or candidates during electoral campaigns. Did you work for any candidate or party in the last presidential [prime minister] elections?" (0) No, (1) Yes.

Income: "Into which of the following income ranges does the total monthly income of this household fit, including remittances from abroad and the income of all the working adults and children?" (0) No Income, (1) Less than \$25 (2) \$26- \$50 (3) \$51-\$100 (4) \$101-\$150 (5) \$151-\$200 (6) \$201-\$300 (7) \$301-\$400 (8) \$401-500 (9) \$501-\$750 (10) More than \$751

Education: "How many years of schooling have you completed?"

Gender: (0) Male, (1) Female.

Place of residence: (0) Rural Area, (1) Small City, (2) Medium City/Large City, (3) National Capital. In Argentina, there were no respondents in a “Small City,” so the variable was collapsed into a 3-point ordinal variable.

Mexico 2006 Panel Study

Target of clientelism: “Over the last few weeks, has a representative of a political party or candidate given you a gift, money, food, subsidy or any other type of help?” (0) No, (1) Yes.

Number of non-familial discussants: “Could you name the three persons with whom you most frequently talk about politics? Would you mind telling me first and last name, or just the first name and the last name initial?” (0) No non-familial discussants named, (1) one non-familial discussant named, (2) two non-familial discussants named, (3) three non-familial discussants named. The relationship to each discussant was determined with the following question asked about each one: “What is your relationship with [named discussant]?” Coded into Spouse/child/parent/sibling (F), another type of relative (F), neighbor (NF), godparent (F), friend (NF), acquaintance from church (NF), friend from work (NF), or other? NF categories coded as non-familial

Number of familial discussants: “Could you name the three persons with whom you most frequently talk about politics? Would you mind telling me first and last name, or just the first name and the last name initial?” (0) No familial discussants named, (1) one familial discussant named, (2) two familial discussants named, (3) three familial discussants named. The relationship to each discussant was determined with the following question asked about each one: “What is your relationship with [named discussant]?” Coded into Spouse/child/parent/sibling (F), another type of relative (F), neighbor (NF), godparent (F), friend (NF), acquaintance from church (NF), friend from work (NF), or other? F categories coded as non-familial

Strength of partisanship: “In general, would you say you identify with the PAN, the PRI or the PRD? [Answer of “none” scored as zero (0)] Would you say you are very identified (2) with the [named party] or only somewhat identified (1) with it?”

Political interest: “How much interest do you have in politics. (3) A lot, (2) some, (1) little, or (0) none?”

Wealth: “In this household, do you have a radio? TV? Stove with oven? Refrigerator? Washing machine? Car or truck? Computer? Paid television subscription?” Variables is percentage of valid responses that are “yes.”

Education: “How many years of schooling have you had?” (1) Has no schooling, (2) Incomplete elementary, (3) Complete elementary, (4) Incomplete middle/technical, (5) Complete middle/technical, (6) Incomplete high, (7) Complete high, (8) Incomplete college, (9) Complete college or more. (Wave 2)

Age: “How old are you?”

Female: (0) Male, (1) Female.

Urban Residence: (1) Rural (2) Mixed (3) Urban.”

Parents associations, Neighborhood improvement associations, Professional associations, New social movements, Sports association, or Political party: “I will read you a list of voluntary associations. For each one, please tell me if you do not belong to the association, a member who is not active, or you are an active member.” (0) non-member (1) inactive member (2) active member

B. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables Used

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
LAPOP						
Clientelism	38461	0.12	0	0.32	0	1
Persuasion frequency	41946	0.56	0	0.92	0	3
Parents associations	42168	0.68	0	0.90	0	3
Comm Impr Assoc	43650	0.44	0	0.79	0	3
Trade/Biz Assoc	42139	0.24	0	0.61	0	3
Political Party Meetings	42035	0.25	0	0.62	0	3
Partisan Identifier	42976	0.34	0	0.47	0	3
Pol Partic Index	34436	0.87	1	0.66	0	3
Income	39313	4.21	4	2.44	0	10
Education	40772	9.37	10	4.33	0	18
Age	43828	39.47	37	15.92	16	98
Female	43990	0.51	NA	0.50	0	1
Mexico Panel Study						
Clientelism W3	1358	0.05	0	0.23	0	1
Clientelism W2	1358	0.04	0	0.20	0	1
Non-Family Ties W2	1358	0.75	0	1.08	0	3
Family Ties W3	1358	0.81	0	1.04	0	3
Partisanship W2	1358	0.99	1	0.74	0	2
Political Interest W2	1338	1.35	1	0.93	0	3
Wealth W1	1358	0.65	0.63	0.23	0	1
Education W2	1355	4.77	5	2.52	1	9
Age W1	1320	42.81	41	16.49	18	94
Female W1	1358	0.53	1	0.50	0	1
Sports Association W3	1358	0.19	0	0.56	0	2
PTA Association W3	1358	0.28	0	0.66	0	2
Neighborh. Assoc. W3	1358	0.19	0	0.55	0	2
Prof. Assoc. W3	1358	0.16	0	0.52	0	2
Environ. Assoc. W3	1358	0.08	0	0.37	0	2
Pol. Party Assoc. W3	1358	0.19	0	0.54	0	2

C. Scatterplot of Frequency of Clientelism by Availability of Mass Media

