Experimental Protocols for: All Sins are not Created Equal: The Factors that Drive Perceptions of Corruption Severity

Lucy Martin*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, lucy.martin@unc.edu.

1 Experimental Protocols: Conjoint Experiment

This section reports the English-language text of the conjoint survey experiment. Because corruption is a politically sensitive topic, the protocols stress that the officials described are only hypothetical. To make the forced-choice nature of the experiment plausible, the protocol also stressed that governments may not have the resources to prosecute all corruption cases. This encourages respondents to select the officials they think most deserve punishment. For enumeration, these protocols were translated into Lusoga and Luganda.

Text of Conjoint Experiment:

I am going to show you some scenarios that we have made up. You will see several pairs of officials who are suspected of corruption. These are not real people, but rather examples of the types of corruption that occur in some countries. Remember, we are not saying that any of your own officials have done this - it is an example of something that might happen in some places. Governments have limited resources to prosecute and punish corruption. For each pair of officials, you will be asked to choose which one you would rather see punished for his or her corrupt behavior. Even if you would like to see both punished, or neither, you must choose one. You will then be asked some other questions about your thoughts on these officials. **Enumerators: Go through the following script four times. Use the randomization on your data collection form, and explain the pictures to respondents.**

These columns represent two different officials. Each has a different role in government, and is accused of a different type of corruption.

Consider the first official. **(NOTE: set out each attribute in turn)**

1. He is an [BLANK] official.
2. He works in the [BLANK] government.
3. He is accused of spending the money on [BLANK].

4. The funds were supposed to be used to fund [BLANK].
5. He is accused of misusing funds that came from [BLANK].

Now, consider the second official. **(NOTE: set out each attribute in turn)**

1. He is an [BLANK] official.
2. He works in the [BLANK] government.
3. He is accused of spending the money on [BLANK].
4. The funds were supposed to be used to fund [BLANK].
5. He is accused of misusing funds that came from [BLANK].

Q1: Which of these two officials would you personally rather see prosecuted and punished for what they have done?**(Record response.)**

Q2a: Now, on a scale of 1 to 5, how serious was the corruption that Official 1 is accused of (point to correct profile)? Was it not at all serious, a bit serious, somewhat serious, very serious, or extremely serious? **(1=not at all serious, 5=extremely serious)**

Q2b: Now, on a scale of 1 to 5, how serious was the corruption that Official 2 is accused of (point to correct profile)? Was it not at all serious, a bit serious, somewhat serious, very serious, or extremely serious? **(1=not at all serious, 5=extremely serious)**

[Respondents then see three more pairs of randomized profiles.]

Implementation notes:

Figure 1 shows an example of enumeration (left) and all image icons used in the conjoint experiment (right). For quality control purposes, enumerators were asked to take a picture of the enumeration sheet, with all icons placed, 25% of the time; this was randomly determined by the survey software.

Figure 1: Left: an example of enumeration. Right: the icons used for each attribute-level.