

# Supplementary Materials for "Does Competence Make Citizens Tolerate Undemocratic Behavior?"

Kristian Vrede Skaaning Frederiksen\*

January 26, 2022

## **A: Candidate Attributes, Scenario Example, and Ethical Practices**

This section provides all candidate attributes and their probabilities of being assigned (Tables A1-A3) as well as a conjoint scenario example as shown to the respondents (Figure A1). As described in the article, age, gender, and profession are assigned according to the target population of the candidates whereas party, policy positions, undemocratic/democratic behaviors, and competence reputations are assigned using uniform distributions (where the probability of each attribute level is equal to one divided by the number of possible levels).

As these conjoint scenarios are what the experiments presented in the article are about, I also describe ethical practices here. Regarding deception, harm, and impact, it is clearly stated in the surveys that the candidates are fictitious and hypothetical. I chose to present fictitious candidates for the respondents in order not to let impressions about real-world candidates bias the results or deceive respondents about political candidates that actually exist. Moreover, it is stated clearly in the surveys that they are part of a research study about political attitudes. Lucid obtained consent and compensated each respondent economically for participating. Confidentiality was ensured and a data processing agreement was entered into to ensure protection of personal data and to comply with GDPR law.

---

\*PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University. ORCID: 0000-0003-1845-3297. Email: ksf@ps.au.dk

Table A1: Distribution of attributes: US, UK, and CZ. Age is drawn randomly from probability-specified intervals.

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Values (probability)</b>
Age	<b>US:</b> 40-49 (0.2), 50-59 (0.2), 60-62 (0.2), 63-66 (0.2), 67-75 (0.2), <b>CZ:</b> 43-57 (0.333), 58-67 (0.333), 68-77 (0.333), <b>UK:</b> 44-53 (0.333), 54-57 (0.333), 58-61 (0.333)
Gender	<b>US:</b> Female (0.2), Male (0.8), <b>CZ:</b> Female (0.083), Male (0.917), <b>UK:</b> Female (0.286), Male (0.714)
Profession	<b>US:</b> Company director/founder (0.4), Civil servant (0.1), Self-employed (0.1), Lawyer (0.3), Political career (0.1), <b>CZ:</b> Political career (0.083), Actor (0.167), Journalist (0.25), Academic (0.5), <b>UK:</b> Lawyer (0.222), Civil servant (0.111), Banker (0.222), Journalist (0.222), Political career (0.222)
Party	<b>US:</b> Democrat (0.5), Republican (0.5), <b>CZ:</b> ČSSD (0.333), ODS (0.333), ANO 2011 (0.333), <b>UK:</b> Conservatives (0.5), Labour (0.5)
Position:	
Redistribution	Increase/Decrease public welfare spending (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease power of labor ( <b>UK:</b> trade) unions (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease income tax on 10 percent richest (0.167/0.167)
Position:	
Morality policy	Make it easier/harder for women to get an abortion (0.167/0.167) Make it easier/harder for people of the same sex to marry each other (0.167/0.167) Allow illegal immigrants to apply for citizenship/Increase efforts to arrest and eventually deport illegal immigrants (0.167/0.167)
Undemocratic/ Democratic behavior	Said it is legitimate to fight political opponents in the streets if one feels provoked/Said it is unacceptable to fight political opponents in the streets even though one feels provoked (0.125/0.125) Supported a proposal to reduce polling stations in areas that support opposing parties/Supported a proposal to preserve existing polling-stations in all areas (0.125/0.125) Said court rulings by judges appointed by opposing parties should be ignored/adhered to (0.125/0.125) Said it is acceptable to harass journalists that do not reveal sources/Said it is unacceptable to harass journalists even though they do not reveal sources (0.125/0.125)
Reputation: Economy	Good/Bad at handling economic matters (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on economic matters (0.333)
Reputation: Corruption	Bad/Good at fighting corruption (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on fighting corruption (0.333)

Table A2: Distribution of attributes: Mexico

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Values (probability)</b>
Age	39 (0.031), 40 (0.031), 44 (0.063), 45 (0.031), 46 (0.031), 47 (0.031), 48 (0.031), 49 (0.063), 50 (0.094), 51 (0.031), 52 (0.094), 53 (0.031), 54 (0.031), 55 (0.031), 56 (0.063), 57 (0.094), 58 (0.031), 60 (0.031), 61 (0.063), 62 (0.031), 69 (0.062)
Gender	Female (0.062), Male (0.938)
Profession	Accountant (0.125), Business administration (0.062), Civil servant (0.094), Engineer (0.125), Self-employed (0.094), Journalist (0.031), Lawyer (0.406), Academic (0.031), Professional sports (0.031)
Party	MORENA (0.25), PAN (0.25), PRD (0.25), PRI (0.25)
Position:	
Redistribution	Increase/Decrease public welfare spending (0.167/0.167) Provide/Prevent universal access to public colleges (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease income tax on 10 percent richest (0.167/0.167)
Position:	
Morality policy	Legalize/Prohibit same-sex marriage nationally (0.167/0.167) Relax abortion law/Make abortion law more strict (0.167/0.167) Provide amnesty to low-level drug offenders/Punish all drug-related crime harsher (0.167/0.167)
Undemocratic/ Democratic behavior	Said it is legitimate to fight political opponents in the streets if one feels provoked/Said it is unacceptable to fight political opponents in the streets even though one feels provoked (0.125/0.125) Supported a proposal to reduce polling stations in areas that support opposing parties/Supported a proposal to preserve existing polling-stations in all areas (0.125/0.125) Said court rulings by judges appointed by opposing parties should be ignored/adhered to (0.125/0.125) Said it is acceptable to harass journalists that do not reveal sources/Said it is unacceptable to harass journalists even though they do not reveal sources (0.125/0.125)
Reputation: Economy	Good/Bad at handling economic matters (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on economic matters (0.333)
Reputation: Corruption	Bad/Good at fighting corruption (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on fighting corruption (0.333)

Table A3: Distribution of attributes: South Korea

<b>Attributes</b>	<b>Values (probability)</b>
Age	49 (0.056), 54 (0.056), 55 (0.111), 56 (0.056), 59 (0.056), 60 (0.111), 62 (0.056), 63 (0.056), 64 (0.056), 65 (0.056), 66 (0.056), 67 (0.056), 68 (0.056), 72 (0.056), 73 (0.056), 77 (0.056)
Gender	Female (0.056), Male (0.944)
Profession	Army general (0.056), Civil servant (0.056), Company director (0.056), Engineer (0.056), Self-employed (0.167), Journalist (0.056), Lawyer (0.389), Professor (0.056), Political career (0.111)
Party	UFP (0.50), DPK (0.50)
Position:	
Redistribution	Increase/Decrease public welfare spending (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease power of labor unions (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease income tax on 10 percent richest (0.167/0.167)
Position:	
Morality policy	Legalize/Prohibit same-sex marriage nationally (0.167/0.167) Relax abortion law/Make abortion law more strict (0.167/0.167) Increase/Decrease funds to the army (0.167/0.167)
Undemocratic/ Democratic behavior	Said it is legitimate to fight political opponents in the streets if one feels provoked/Said it is unacceptable to fight political opponents in the streets even though one feels provoked (0.125/0.125) Supported a proposal to reduce polling stations in areas that support opposing parties/Supported a proposal to preserve existing polling-stations in all areas (0.125/0.125) Said court rulings by judges appointed by opposing parties should be ignored/adhered to (0.125/0.125) Said it is acceptable to harass journalists that do not reveal sources/Said it is unacceptable to harass journalists even though they do not reveal sources (0.125/0.125)
Reputation: Economy	Good/Bad at handling economic matters (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on economic matters (0.333)
Reputation: Corruption	Bad/Good at fighting corruption (0.333/0.333), Neither good nor bad reputation on fighting corruption (0.333)

Figure A1: Conjoint example: US.

Imagine that the following two candidates run for the 2024 presidential election. Please read the candidate profiles carefully, and tell us how likely you would be to vote for each of the two candidates at the election.

	<b>Candidate 1</b>	<b>Candidate 2</b>
<b>Age</b>	66	44
<b>Gender</b>	Male	Male
<b>Background</b>	Lawyer	Company Founder/Director
<b>Party</b>	Republican	Democrat
<b>Positions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease public welfare spending</li> <li>- Make it harder for women to get an abortion</li> <li>- Supported a proposal to reduce polling stations in areas that support opposing parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease public welfare spending</li> <li>- Make it easier for women to get an abortion</li> <li>- Said it is legitimate to fight political opponents in the streets if one feels provoked</li> </ul>
<b>Reputation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good at handling economic matters</li> <li>- Good at fighting corruption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bad at handling economic matters</li> <li>- Good at fighting corruption</li> </ul>

	How likely is it that you would vote for <b>candidate 1</b> ?	How likely is it that you would vote for <b>candidate 2</b> ?
Very likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Somewhat likely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neither likely nor unlikely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Somewhat unlikely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Very unlikely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Don't know	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



## B: Description of Deviations from Pre-registration

In this section, I list each deviation from how the study is described in the pre-registration (<https://osf.io/qjm42>). As also mentioned in the article, this entire study is only a smaller part of a larger project outlined by the pre-registration (specifically testing 'H5'). On the basis of suggestions and comments on the project collected after conducting the pre-registration, I decided to split up the reporting of the different hypotheses to keep all parts fairly concise.

1. **The sample.** The samples of each country employed are larger than the approximation in the pre-registration. The pre-registration states that the samples would be approximately 1,500-1,800 respondents in each country whereas the actual samples are between 2,481 and 3,159 respondents. The reason for this discrepancy is simply that it became evident during the data collection that it was possible to collect more data within the relevant limitations.
2. **Inclusion of respondents with missing data on partisanship and policy preference measures.** The do-file in the pre-registration excludes respondents which have missing data on the policy distance or partisanship measures. I also mention this in the text in the registration. As it is completely unnecessary to exclude these respondents when these variables are not central to this study, I have included the extra observations in the analysis. The specifications behind Figure C1 in the Dataverse appendix include the partisanship and policy measures (thus excluding the extra observations), so this figure in fact shows that including these extra observations makes no difference to the results (Frederiksen 2022).
3. **Non-parametric estimation of interaction between competence and undemocratic behavior.** I estimate the interaction between undemocratic behavior and competence non-parametrically instead of with competence in its squared form. Please see Appendix E in the Dataverse appendix for an elaboration of this choice and for a test showing that using competence in its squared form does not change the results.

## References

Frederiksen, Kristian Vrede Skaaning. 2022. "Replication Data for: Does Competence Make Citizens Tolerate Undemocratic Behavior?" *Harvard Dataverse*. doi:10.7910/DVN/NGFLR0.