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Dissertation Abstract

By trading bullets for ballots, elections are posited to be a peaceful alternative to settling power-struggles. Yet they repeatedly trigger hostilities amongst ordinary citizens in African democracies. While most accounts claim these acts are due to “ethnically-based grievances,” I posit that conflict may instead occur along partisan lines. First, where ethnic groups are nested inside political parties, discriminatory acts on ethnic cleavages may be observationally equivalent with partisan cleavages. Second, the exclusive emphasis on extremely malevolent acts may have biased previous research in favor of finding that elections exacerbate (interethnic) discrimination. If discrimination is measured more broadly to include benevolent acts, we may find that elections serve to mitigate interethnic discrimination, most notably, between copartisans. Lastly, scholars overlook the possibility of partisanship in Africa.

To adjudicate whether elections exacerbate discrimination on ethnic or partisan lines and capture discrimination more extensively, I measure behavior in consequential yet completely ordinary interactions between citizens at multiple time points around the 2008 National Elections in Ghana. I conduct field experiments on market price bargaining and a survey experiment on resource allocation with a representative sample of the capital city. Buyers continually bargain the best prices from coethnic sellers on average. Only at election time does an additional layer of price discrimination occur for non-coethnics, resulting in lower prices for copartisans and higher for non-copartisans. The resource allocation experiments show similar patterns of discrimination and analysis reveals dramatic and policy-relevant differences based on partisanship strength, education, age, and contact with (un)shared groups.

The dissertation then tackles an equally pressing question - why are citizens discriminating against each other when elites are the folks competing over power? I combine field interviews with the experimental results to build the following two-part theory. First, shared group membership increases trust in the fulfillment of “contracts” because of the availability of effective punishment mechanisms for enforcement. Consequently, the expected value of exchange is lower with an outgroup member because of the higher probability of non-compliance. I argue the resulting “ingroup/outgroup discrimination” (e.g. in price or sharing differentials) based on this mechanism is a learned strategy applied to a wide class of contract settings, becoming second nature when group membership is (un)shared. Second, at election time, citizens trade public displays of partisanship (and compatible to incentives - their vote) to parties in return for the prospect of obtaining favorable access to state resources upon winning. Such public partisanship buying forges a partisan ingroup and outgroup, as voter-party vertical ties and horizontal voter-voter ties strengthen to achieve their shared goal. I posit that this strategy appeals where election observation makes vote buying untenable but information constraints and credible commitment problems render programmatic appeals ineffective.
1 Introduction

It is rare for an election in one of Africa’s new democracies to occur without reports of at least small-scale conflict amongst ordinary citizens. Tensions - ranging from verbal altercation, to destruction of property, loss of job or housing, or to other acts of discrimination culminating in violence - often spike around election time.\(^1\) Elections thus constitute a paradox: while they are supposed to substitute for conflict, they also seem to provoke it.\(^2\) Although differing as to whether the mechanism is rationally or psychologically based, seminal works on African politics broadly agree that such conflict is due to ethnicity.\(^3\) Recent work has generally concurred and turned to focus on the formation of parties around ethnic groups to secure minimal winning coalitions in the wake of post-Cold War democratic transitions, discover exactly how ethnicity is instrumentalized by entrepreneurial elites versus citizens (or both), and estimate the degree to which ethnicity dominates vote choice or otherwise becomes salient around elections.\(^4\) Prescriptions to reduce conflicts entail reducing the salience of ethnicity, for example through nation-building policies or institutionalizing ethnic powersharing.\(^5\)

This study diverges from this body of literature to posit an alternative hypothesis. I conjecture that citizens are discriminating on partisan, not ethnic cleavages. While ethnic groups were constructed in the past to compete over the spoils of the central government, so now have strong parties been “under construction” in the post-Cold War era of democratization.\(^6\) Yet because parties nest ethnic groups, hostilities on party lines continue to be interpreted as interethnic, even despite the observational equivalence problem. The problem is resolved if we give up a narrow focus on hostile acts around election time. If discrimination is measured more richly to include a broader spectrum of malevolent to benevolent acts, one might find that elections serve to mitigate interethnic discrimination between copartisans, consistent with the hypothesis that elections exacerbate interpartisan rather than interethnic discrimination. The first aim of this dissertation is to empirically adjudicate whether electoral competition exacerbates discrimination between ordinary citizens based on ethnic or partisan cleavages. The second and more difficult aim is to build theory as to why elite-contested elections arouse citizen-level discrimination.

I conducted this research around the 2008 National Elections in Ghana. Ghana in the club of democratization darlings in sub-Saharan Africa, featuring institutionalizing parties, a consol-

---

\(^1\)Strauss (2009) reports that 39% of elections 1990-2007 in sub-Saharan Africa were marred by low levels of harassment, 19% with significant violence, and 42% were without violence. See Rapoport and Weinberg (2005), Sisk (2008), Collier and Vicente (2009), Newman (2010). See also the literature on elections and conflict in India such as Wilkinson (2004), Chaturvedi (2005), Chaturvedi and Mukherji (2005), Brass (1997), Haid and Wilkinson (2009), and Ghosh (2006).

\(^2\)Dunning (2010a)

\(^3\)Horowitz (1985), Bates (1983), Young (1976), Young (1965)

\(^4\)Eifert, Miguel and Posner (2010), Horowitz (2010), Posner (2005), Carlson (2011)


\(^6\)Note that only a selection of countries experienced party consolidation. See van de Walle (1999), Lindberg (2006)
idating party system, and four competitive elections. The 2008 elections allowed Ghana to pass Huntington’s “two turnover test” of democratic consolidation (1991). I implemented three waves of experiments to identify whether cleavages of group-based discrimination exist on ethnic or partisan lines and whether those cleavages fluctuate at election time. Substantively, the design was aimed at revealing patterns of discrimination in conflictual, consequential, and yet completely ordinary interactions between Ghanaian citizens. Methodologically, the design was aimed at richly measuring behavior along a latent dimension of discrimination and being able to cleanly parse out the causal effect of (un)shared ethnicity or partisanship. I thus conduct two series of experiments on the most prevalent allocative activities in which citizens engage on a daily basis: market price bargaining and resource sharing.

Small-scale market price bargaining is perhaps the most frequent conflictual event citizens encounter in the course of daily life in Ghana (and elsewhere in Africa). For most products, buyers must haggle a price from a seller and average prices based on (un)shared group membership will indicate systematic discrimination. I specifically conduct field experiments on taxi fare bargaining behavior in order to maximize ecological validity (authenticity) and causal validity. This study joins the Gambetta and Hamill (2005) study in using taxis as an example of a broad class of interactive, conflictual settings. Further, market price bargaining in Africa is interesting in its own right, as such markets significantly differ from standard textbook markets and are still poorly understood.

Resource sharing is a prominent means to buffer against adverse life shocks in sub-Saharan Africa, where state and private insurance are weak or non-existent. Such “economies of reciprocity” or “economies of affection” have been described at length amongst extended family or clan in rural areas and between urban migrants and rural counterparts. Citizens describe the norm as a strong obligation to “give what you have when you have something,” coming ultimately into tension with the desire to save, consume, or self-invest. While citizens expect reciprocity, they expect diffuse reciprocity - they do not expect that it must come from a particular individual in the group or at a particular time. It is unknown to what degree this sharing obligation exists amongst the exploding population of often transient urbanites, and whether there is discrimination based on (un)shared tribe or party. I conduct resource allocation experiments in a large-scale survey representative of

---

7While the decentralized market analyzed in the present study analyzes price discrimination and ultimately theorizes that the discrimination arises from risk of non-payment, the detailed ethnographic work Gambetta and Hamill provide explores taxiing in fixed-price Western markets in which discrimination in the selection of passengers is due to another type of deflection - risk of robbery and homicide. The authors argue taxi fares represent a “near-perfect microcosm” in which to study a broader class of interactive settings requiring strategic trust decisions between strangers.

8According to Fafchamps (1997), markets constitute the main structure governing how goods and services are allocated in Africa, as opposed to hierarchies (e.g. large firms), which dominate allocation in industrialized economies. He further elaborates that Africans may be considered more market-oriented than Westerners due to the much higher number of entrepreneurs engaging in a much higher number of small market negotiations.


Accra in order to capture discrimination across a broad spectrum of society.

I find evidence that electoral competition exacerbates interpartisan rather than interethnic discrimination. Coethnic riders are able to bargain a lower price from drivers than noncoethnic riders on average. However, at election time, and only at election time, prices for non-coethnic diverge based on partisanship. Prices for non-coethnic riders in the driver’s political party are significantly lower, while they are significantly higher for non-coethnics affiliated with the opposing political party. Differences in average price are non-trivial. The difference between a non-coethnic copartisan and a non-coethnic non-copartisan at election time is equivalent to a day’s supply of clean water, while between a coethnic copartisan and a non-coethnic non-copartisan is equivalent to a meal of local food. I find similar patterns in the resource allocation experiments. These results support the general theoretical claim that group memberships are characterized by multiplicity and fluidity, which in turn affect individual behavior. More specifically, they compliment the work of those who find long-term effects of political institutions and policy on intergroup and nationalistic attitudes, or short-term effects on discriminatory behavior due to other political phenomena. This study suggests that citizens’ discriminatory behavior is much more nuanced and fluid in the short-term in response to political phenomena - a National Election - than previously thought.

Yet why are citizens “in conflict” when elites are the folks competing over political power? To gain leverage on this vintage question, I conducted open-ended interviews with citizens and local party representatives concurrent with the experiments, seeking to understand the dynamics of discrimination at the individual level and what particular strategies were being undertaken by parties and citizens that foster fluctuations in discrimination at election time. Previous theoretical treatments of election-related tensions typically have not consider citizens as strategic actors, black boxing the leaders and followers into one strategic actor or modeling citizens as non-strategic followers of entrepreneurial elites. In contrast, I have found citizens to be incredibly strategic - elections and partisan networks can be fantastic sources of resources and many citizens are eager

---

11Chandra (2004), Shih, Pittinsky and Ambady (1999), McCauley (2009)
13Shayo and Zussman (2010) shows that terrorist attacks increases discrimination in small-claims courts in Israel. Also see Eifert, Miguel and Posner (2010), who find that ethnic identity salience increases at election time for competitive elections in 10 countries. These findings seem at first to conflict with those of this study. However, as the authors self-critique, their finding does not represent an absolute increase in ethnic salience, but rather increase in salience relative to class and gender identities. Second, partisanship is not a group identity option offered in their survey question. Third, election time behavioral discrimination may be caused by something other than change in identity preferences. Fourth, expressions may be falsely reported, whereas behavioral measures are better measures to elicit sensitive information. Lastly, the most interesting possibility is that there is serious heterogeneity in party system and party development across the continent, which may lead to different types of discrimination between citizens at election time.
14This question plagues Horowitz throughout the first five chapters of his 1985 book.
to get their hands on as much as possible in their quest for economic well-being. Their agency in the electoral process cannot be taken for granted.

Using the experimental results and insights from interviews as building blocks, I put forth the following two-part theory, elaborated in Section 6. First, sharing group membership strengthens belief in a partner’s “contract” compliance (= “trust”) because access to various punishment mechanisms enhance enforcement in a setting of weak state contract enforcement. This difference in trust ultimately leads to discrimination based on (un)shared group in the form of sharing more resources and enjoying gains from trade at lower prices when group membership is shared.\footnote{Put differently, “untrustworthy” persons (who are outgroup members ceteris paribus) must pay sellers a risk premium in market exchange. The logic can be extended to other contract settings of compliance versus defection.} Differences in trust regarding ingroup and outgroup strangers are learned from prior interactions built on parentally bestowed priors. The mechanism itself may be at work, or responsible for the rise and persistence of a behavioral norm of ingroup/outgroup discrimination to which individuals “best respond.”

This theoretical work follows in the footsteps of anthropological, economics, and political science studies of contract enforcement in “stateless” settings. Most have focused on the mechanics of long-distance trade,\footnote{Dixit (2004), North (1990), Milgrom, North and Weingast (1991), Kandori (1992), Ensminger (1992), and Greif (1993)} trade between large firms\footnote{Fafchamps (1996)} buffering against adverse life shocks,\footnote{Scheve and Stasavage (2006)} ability to solve collective action problems\footnote{Habyarimana et al. (2007) and Grossman (2011)} and abstract cooperation.\footnote{Fearon and Laitin (1996)} What these works have in common is seeking to understand the mechanisms of contract enforcement, producing public goods, sustaining cooperation over conflict, or buffering against adverse life shocks developed by citizens in the face of weak state capacity. In the contemporary African setting, both high levels of poverty and low global findability of persons yield high levels of impunity for “defectors” and shape the types of enforcement mechanisms available. Like many of these authors, I find evidence for the role of reputation and coercion in deterring defection. Beyond these mechanisms I find that individuals are motivated to fulfill contracts due to belief in supranatural enforcement such as faith in both mass (Christian, Muslim) and traditional (e.g. ancestors, juju) religious beliefs.\footnote{See, for example, Amponsah (1977), Parrinder (1976), Abioye (2001). While works such as Greif (1993)’s and Ensminger (1992)’s studies center on trade in the context of religious groups, they continue to emphasize the human coercive or reputational aspect rather than the supernatural. Fafchamps (1996) indicates a role for internal guilt, which may be socialized by such cultural institutions as religion, but does not elaborate further.}

This account of group-based discrimination also enters the debate as to whether (un)shared group changes behavior by influencing a person’s expectations about others’ behavior or by changing his/her preferences. The work of Shayo (2007), Akerlof and Kranton (2000), Penn (2008), Horowitz...
(1985), and Tajfel and Turner (1979) account for ingroup/outgroup discrimination by assuming that individuals gain utility or self-esteem from absolute or relative group-level payoffs and/or conformity to group identity prescriptions. By contrast to such preference based accounts, my account is based on beliefs about others’ play that are structured by economic and political factors, similar to Fearon and Laitin (1996). Unlike Fearon and Laitin (1996), my account does not focus on a coordinated symmetric group-level strategy where defection is solely undertaken by unscrupulous individuals, but on individual-level strategy allowing additionally for exogenous adverse shocks to contract compliance that is characteristic of African life as in Fafchamps (2004).23

Second, I argue that a partisan ingroup and outgroup emerges at election time in Ghana because of strong party clientelism. Voters believe that access to state resources is non-professional and personalized rather than standardized and impartial, and voter-party courtship is centered around the belief that elite and citizen election winners have favorable access to state resources. I term a particular type of urban party-voter courtship public partisanship buying, or clientelistically trading public acts of support for a party (attending rallies, meetings, decorating one’s person and dwelling, publicly persuading or declaring partisanship) in return for promises of favorable access to state resources if the party wins. The more publicly one pronounces strong partisanship, the more one believes she can individually extract if her party wins.

This type of clientelism strengthens vertical party-voter ties and horizontal voter-voter ties and installs a group hierarchy. These factors forge an elite-citizen ingroup against an opposing elite-citizen outgroup, inducing differences in trust, and in turn, discrimination between citizens on (un)shared party at election time. However, after election results have been accepted, music replaces the talk radio, the parties’ neighborhood presence drops dramatically, and elites largely turn to infighting within the legislature and trying desperately to secure state resources. Thus, discrimination between the elite-citizen partisan ingroup and outgroup waxes and wanes according to the electoral cycle, while ethnic or tribal group membership as an amalgamation and extension of clan, retains its group properties regardless of the electoral cycle.

This study offers some new perspectives to the political clientelism literature. So far, this literature has mostly concentrated on the vertical dyadic relationships between patron and client and usually emphasizes the clandestine nature of clientelism.24 By contrast, this account of public partisanship buying in Ghana emphasizes the role of horizontal relationships between clients and a relatively sophisticated strategy that overcomes the credible commitment problem of the secret ballot. Importantly, public partisanship offers urban voters the opportunity to obtain resources individuals - they do not have built in brokers in the form of chiefs or other traditional Big Men as

23That is, the cost of contract fulfillment is affected exogenously by environmental shocks.
rural voters do.\textsuperscript{25}

This study contributes substantially to the scholarship on partisanship. Many partisanship scholars underscore that partisanship is only relevant in established democracies, and perhaps as a result, most previous work on voter behavior in Africa has simply ignored the possibility that Africans have partisanship.\textsuperscript{26} This study is one of just a few analyses showing in fact that partisanship exists and varies in important ways both cross-nationally and at the individual-level in Africa.\textsuperscript{27} Second, this study shows the importance of clientelism as a critical factor in strengthening partisanship, but partisanship also facilitating clientelism, tying together these two literatures. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, this study has added that partisanship may have important effects beyond influencing vote choice, opinion formation, or factual perception - it can also influence discriminatory behavior on the partisan cleavage.

To reduce citizen-level electoral conflict, we might consider combating the clientelism that forges partisan ingroup/outgroup cleavages. One prescription is to increase citizen access to reliable information about the performance of government in enhancing citizen’s welfare spatially throughout the country. A number of recent voter information campaigns have shown that voters in low-income countries readily respond and utilize newly disseminated performance information.\textsuperscript{28} However, unlike these studies, such campaigns should be announced to parties well in advance such that they may anticipate the upcoming reduction in performance impunity and strategize accordingly.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, reducing the impunity of bureaucrats or other measures to professionalize and depersonalize access to government services will mitigate (beliefs about) clientelistic favoritism.\textsuperscript{30} This prescription stands in stark contrast to the prescriptions of those suggesting strategies to reduce (ethnic) identity salience, polarization, fractionalization, and so forth to attenuate citizen conflict. While these strategies may be beneficial for entirely separate reasons, they do not address the root cause of citizen-level discrimination, (belief in) clientelistic access to state resources.

2 Election-Induced Cleavages of Conflict: Ethnic or Partisan?

While modernization and Marxist theorists held that ethnic conflict would fade away with increasing economic development in the newly independent African nation-states, Bates (1974)’s provocative work argued exactly the opposite. He theorized that there would be competition over scarce

\textsuperscript{25}An exception may be the local Ga chiefs. See Baldwin (2011).


\textsuperscript{27}See Pande (2011)’s review.

\textsuperscript{28}Humphreys and Weinstein (2010), for example, is issuing yearly “reportcards” for Ugandan Members of Parliament on their parliamentary duties.

\textsuperscript{29}To assuage other forms of group based discrimination will require longer term socioeconomic development that decreases the impunity of contract defectors and exogenous shocks to defection, essentially rendering unnecessary the extra benefit of contract enforcement within groups.
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“modern” goods - access to jobs, electricity, education, water sources, roads, and so forth - and because these goods must necessarily be geographically distributed, individuals would naturally desire them to be located as close as possible in order to utilize them. Further, because traditional political units - tribes and clans - are also geographically distributed, it was natural that they organize politically to secure modern goods in their locality. The rise of the modern nation-state thus incentivized the amalgamation of small traditional political units into ethno-regional groups to better compete at the national level over control of the central government and the goods of modernity. These ethnic groups shared a mutually intelligible mother tongue and were comprised of a mutual alliance between elite urban “moderns” and rural traditional authorities pursuing the joint mission of gaining access to politically powerful jobs and the distribution of state resources back home.

Lemarchand (1972) relates that in most places, the parties remained weak and highly reliant on traditional political structures for political support in the post-independence era. Many incumbents quickly strategized to eliminate multiparty elections to establish single-party or no-party regimes composed of a multiethnic alliance of urban modern politicians. Without elections, citizens did not need to be mobilized, and these regimes were stable as long as the party could distribute state resources well enough to placate the various ethnic elite coalition members and their rural elite counterparts. Citizens could be ignored almost entirely. When economic shocks made resources ever scarcer and favorites had to be chosen, alliances of the unfavored ethnic groups displaced incumbents via coup d’etats in what was generally termed “ethnic conflict.” Attempts at multiparty elections similarly brought about tenuous ethnic group alliances and frequent reversions to dictatorship, leading Bates to say that “there can be no doubt that electoral competition arouses ethnic conflict” (1974: p. 161).

---

31 A lack of economic differentiation meant that occupational or economic cleavages cross cutting tribes were by and far inexistent. See Mercier (1968), Tuden and Plotnicov (1970)
32 Clan or tribe (and thus ethnic) held land is also tied heavily to (belief of) common ancestry. In this work, I will refer to these ethno-linguistic-regional groups simply as “ethnic groups” for brevity, although globally the definition of ethnic group is more expansive to include any identity category for which eligibility for membership is determined by descent-based attribute(s) Chandra (2005). Note that previously, colonialism acted to create or fortify such ethnic groups through censuses, identification cards, favoritism towards particular groups in the bureaucracy or military, or indirect rule utilizing traditional power structures or amalgamating traditional power structures together. See for example, Laitin (1985). This view of ethnicity as constructed and fluid contrasts with those who believe ethnicity is primordial and fixed.
33 See Caldwell (1969), Clapham (1982)Comhaire (1969), Bates (1983), Lemarchand (1972) on the urban-rural relationship and Young (1965), Young (1976), Laitin (1986), Horowitz (1985), Laitin (1986) and Chandra (2005) (for a global review) on the fluidity with which groups were constructed and deconstructed for these purposes. Note that while Horowitz (1985) argued that the modern nation state incentivized the construction of ethnic groups, he disagreed with this “rationalist” or “materialist” account in favor of psychological accounts stressing the search for group status and group legitimacy.
34 van de Walle (2007), Clapham (1982)
35 See van de Walle (2001). The role of citizens in the matter is largely characterized by deference to ethnic elites or fear.
Although transitioning to multipartyism after the Cold War led to some democratic breakdowns across the continent, those countries that avoided a total breakdown in the midst of the founding election have largely managed to “stay on track.” Ethnicity has continued to be a mainstay of scholarly research on African politics in this contemporary era. Posner (2005)’s important work demonstrates that democratic political institutions established in the transitions incentivized the formation of multiethnic parties to produce minimum winning coalitions - a joint function of institutions and ethnic group sizes. This “nesting” of ethnic groups in parties is reflected in the widespread finding that ethnicity is a prime determinant of vote choice across the region and parties failing to distinguish themselves on program or ideology. As van de Walle and Butler put it, “few African parties have sought to distinguish themselves through policy stances; [ethno-regional] identities have been a major, if not the only, factor in differentiating parties” (1999: p. 151).

Why did the parties organize again around ethnic cleavages rather than any other cleavages? The legacy of ethnic political competition from the previous era and the absence of other societal cleavages or civil society networks led new (or reincarnated) parties to rely again upon mobilizing citizens via their membership in ethnic groups. From their side, citizens used ethnicity as a heuristic to find party affiliation. Besides ethnicity, other cleavage types known to produce party systems

---


37 Note that yet others did not fully transition to multipartyism or augmented themselves to become dominant party regimes. See Lindberg (2004), who counts that most breakdowns of democracy occur at the founding elections - only 17% of breakdowns occurred after second elections were held. He notes that all countries that have managed to muddle through to third elections have stayed on track, save one, and argues throughout his work that repeated elections, regardless of their merit, have a positive impact on other dimensions of democracy, see especially Lindberg (2006).

38 Ake writes that “we see ethnic conflict too ubiquitously - in ethnic misrepresentations of survival strategies, in emancipatory projects, and strategies of power” (2010: p. 13). Further, the role of ethnicity, ethnic diversity, ethnic polarization is often assumed, poorly conceptualized, measured insufficiently in empirical analyses, and not understood to be endogenous to many of the outcomes it supposedly causes. See Chandra (2005), Lindberg and Morrison (2008), Brubaker and Laitin (1998)

39 See Cheeseman and Ford (2007), Michelitch et al. (2011), Carlson (2011), Scarritt and Mozaffar (1999), van de Walle (2003), Birnir (2007), Carlson (2011), Dunning (2010a) and Basadau et al. (2011). According to Erdmann’s review, while the relevance is not disputed, the crucial question is whether ethnicity is the only or one of a number of relevant cleavages in voter alignment. Besides tribe or ethnolinguistic group, authors have explored other types of ethnic identities. For example, Dunning and Harrison (2009) describes the role of cousinage, inherited relationships between those with particular last names in Southern Mali. Dunning (2010b) and Ferree (2006) explore the role of race in South Africa. Religion may also be an important cleavage, sometimes coinciding and sometimes cross-cutting tribe. See also the classic works of Lemarchand (1972), Young (1976). Weghorst and Lindberg (2009) points out that the degree of ethnic voting varies from one ethnic group to another - parties usually have core ethnic group constituencies, while other ethnic groups’ votes are more up for grabs.

40 Using social group membership as a pathway to partisanship is argued in Green, Palmquist and Schickler (2002), and can be found in the seminal works of Converse (1967), Lipset and Rokkan (1967), and Lodge and Hamill (1986). Birnir (2007) argues and finds that generally ethnic groups based on language, such as the ones here, have an advantage in stabilizing vote choice over racial or religious groups in founding elections characterized by high information constraints about true party intentions.
from the classical work of Lipset and Rokkan (1967) find little bearing. Most notably, class consciousness has not yet emerged in sub-Saharan Africa because industrialization did not take place to create a proletariat/bourgeois or land shortage to create a landed/peasant class. Further, universal suffrage and multipartyism were not “won” through collective actions by lower versus upper class, which may have acted to develop class consciousness. As for the possibility of ideological cleavages left over in successor parties of USSR or USA leaning dictators, the only vestiges of former parties’ ideological leaning is empty rhetoric in party manifestos. Given the lack of lifestyle diversity to create divergent policy interests, the absence of cross-pressures from membership in multiple groups with diverse party ties, and overall heavy information, mobility and coordination constraints, elites and citizens easily relied on their existing societal cleavages rather than created new ones for party formation.

Since the founding elections, democratization has marched forward in Africa’s multiparty systems on many dimensions now that 3rd and 4th elections have been held. An increasing number of countries find themselves in the club that have passed Huntington (1991)’s “two turnover test,” providing unambiguous evidence for Przeworski (1986)’s conceptualization of democracy as institutionalized uncertainty. An explosion of domestic and international election monitoring have strengthened the need for parties to actually mobilize citizens and decreased the effectiveness of some of the most obvious tools into their bag of election-stealing tricks. In some countries, parties have been stabilizing, institutionalizing, and building capacity to mobilize citizens. Rather than relying exclusively on ethnic or traditional political leaders to drive out their followers, they are

---

41 See Erdmann (N.d.)’s review. While religious cleavages may coincide with ethnicity or party, they may also cross-cut (see Laitin (1986)) or be nonexistent in homogenous religion countries.
42 See Mercier (1968) on classical discussions of the lack of class formation in Africa. Rwanda and Burundi are notable exceptions, where tribe and class coincided.
43 Universal suffrage was adopted upon independence along with other democratic institutions either bloodlessly or through national movements against the colonizer. Third wave democratization was also greatly influenced by the end of the Cold War and international incentives to end hegemonic party rule and any internal pressure sourced from excluded tribes rather than a lower class. See Brubaker and Laitin (1998).
44 As Brubaker and Laitin (1998) relate, the incentives to frame conflicts in grand ideological terms to gain resources from the international realm disappeared after the Cold War.
45 See Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1944), van de Walle and Butler (1999), Lawson (1999). However, as Young (1976) points out, different levels of political competition yield competition on different cleavages. Local politics might take place on, for example, clan lines.
46 See Lindberg (2004), who shows that on average with each election, freeness and fairness improve, competition intensifies, and loser acceptance increases. Also see Wiseman (1999), Lindberg (2006), and Moehler (2009). Others are more pessimistic, see Chabal and Daloz (1999), Joseph (1997). See Strauss (2009) on election-related violent conflict, while no work to my knowledge deal with other manifestations of conflict.
47 That is to say, political parties have been turned over and replaced peacefully by a challenger twice. Moehler (2009) finds that turnovers also consolidate democracy (via legitimacy of institutions and political players) in the minds of citizens in Africa, importantly, in the minds of those affiliated with the losing party.
49 In the 2000s, we no longer have to choose between dominant party systems with their stable but anti-democratic nature, and the fragile or fragmentized party systems of competitive multiparty systems characterized by instability van de Walle and Butler (1999) Lindberg (2007).
able to reach their own tentacles down to the local level.

Unfortunately, despite increasing levels of democratization, so-called ethnic conflict amongst citizens at election time has persisted.\textsuperscript{50} Many still argue that the process of democratization itself inevitable interacts with existing ethnic divisions to yield ethnic conflict in such times of fluid political authority.\textsuperscript{51} Indeed, the hypothesis that elections exacerbate interethnic conflict is attractive since Eifert, Miguel and Posner (2010) find that the salience of ethnic identity increases relative to other group identities at election time in 10 African countries.\textsuperscript{52} Scholars have largely moved on to theorizing, testing, and prescribing which institutions or policies are best at preventing, exacerbating, and alleviating ethnic conflict, for example through consociationalism, power-sharing or policies to build national identity and/or suppress ethnic identity salience.\textsuperscript{53}

This paper argues that we should not be so hasty in the conclusion that election-induced conflict amongst citizens is based on ethnicity in the multiparty era. On the contrary, I hypothesize that the cleavage of citizen conflict may instead be based on partisan affiliation. Much like ethnicity was constructed in the past for the purpose of political competition, I posit that partisanship is being constructed in this contemporary era of increasingly democratic party competition. Whether parties have truly consolidated or remain fluid, citizens may recognize that it is the parties that are in competition rather than ethnic groups and, accordingly, favor their co-partisans while discriminating against individuals affiliated with other parties.\textsuperscript{54} There are three reasons why this supposition has thus far escaped scholarly and journalistic attention: (1) the nesting of ethnic groups in parties leads to an observational equivalence between partisan cleavages and a subset of ethnic cleavages, (2) the exclusive selection of malevolent behaviors for measurement does not allow us to observe fluctuations in benevolent or favoritistic acts, and (3) the assumption that closeness or affiliation with a party must be associated with ideological (be it rational or affective) preferences that are

\textsuperscript{50}Strauss (2009), Sisk (2008), Basadua, Erdmann and Mehler (2007), Collier (2009), Rapoport and Weinberg (2005)

\textsuperscript{51}Huntington (1997), Gurr (1993), Mousseau (2001), Diamond, Linz and Lipset (1995) Confusingly, some work argues that a party system formed out of social cleavages stabilizes democracy, while in the African case the exact opposite is argued. Fridy (2007) believes the difference lies in what Duverger (1954) described as Gemeinschaft (communal- geographic/blood kin) versus Gesellschaft (societal- geographically diffuse and non-blood kin) style social cleavages around which parties form. Sklar differentiates that Gesellschaft parties “instead of being based on neighbourhood, geographical proximity, or blood relationship...[are] based on interest” (1963: p. 474)

\textsuperscript{52}They find further that this result is conditional on the election being competitive. The survey question did not include the possibility of partisan identity group salience. van de Walle and Butler (1999) argue that it is difficult to disagree with the view that electoral politics have enhanced ethnic identities. Also see Glickman (1995)

\textsuperscript{53}See Basadua et al. (2011)’s review - he notes there are two camps - (1) those that wish to deny ethnicity as a source of political articulation and aim to remove or reduce ethnic identity as a source of political mobilization, and (2) those that accept ethnicity as a source of political mobilization and wish to accommodate ethnic groups institutionally. Empirically, results are mainly inconclusive about the extent to which various configurations of ethnic polarization, fractionalization, or dominance affect ethnic conflict. Also see Reilly (2001). Note that, though scholars deem ethnic conflict as involving both violent and non-violent components, empirically the literature has focused almost exclusively on violence, probably due to cross-national data availability. Further it has mostly not focused on the role of elections specifically as a causal factor. Wilkinson (2004)’s work in India is an exception.

\textsuperscript{54}The second half of this dissertation is devoted to understanding why such competition yields citizen conflict.
undeveloped in new democracies or amongst uneducated low income citizens.

Let us start with the identification problem. Consider the stylized example in Figure 1, which depicts the nesting of ethnic groups ‘A’ and ‘F’ into the super-ordinate incumbent party and the ethnic groups ‘E’ and ‘G’ into the super-ordinate opposition party. Suppose that one observed a systematic increase in clashes between citizens from any or all of the following sets of groups around election time: \{A, E\}, \{A, G\}, \{F, E\}, \{F, G\}. Such a pattern may indicate an increase in discrimination based on ethnicity OR partisan affiliation; they are observationally equivalent.\[55\]

Figure 1: Stylized Example of Political Parties Nesting Ethnic Groups

In order for us to determine that previous authors are correct in the supposition that elections exacerbate interethnic conflict by opening an “ethnic Pandora’s box,”\[56\] we would need to see a systematic increase in tensions between any and all ethnic groups regardless of partisanship. In the example, we would need to observe increasing hostilities between the sets \{A, F\} and \{G, E\}, perhaps with the same probability as \{A, E\}, \{A, G\}, \{F, E\}, \{F, G\}. We could resume our debate about institutional and policy engineering geared towards diffusing ethnicity in politics, and whether ethnicity is different from any other societal cleavages used for (at least initial) electoral mobilization.

If systematic hostilities between \{A, E\}, \{A, G\}, \{F, E\}, \{F, G\} were instead based on partisanship, we would expect to observe further evidence of favoritism between individuals affiliated with the same party but from different ethnic groups at election time.\[57\] An increase in, for example, cooperation between members of \{A, F\} and/or \{E, G\} around election time would indicate copartisan favoritism. It would be incorrect to conclude that elections serve to exacerbate ethnic conflict if they are simultaneously mitigating them between particular ethnic groups. Attempts at decreasing the salience of ethnicity or institutionalizing access to power based on ethnic group would be in vain.

\[55\] This is not to say that a solitary incident may not have anything to do at all with being members of ethnic or partisan groups.

\[56\] (Basadau et al. 2011: p. 10)

\[57\] A large body of evidence shows that where “outgroup” tensions increase, it is accompanied by an increase in “ingroup” favoritism. Social-psychological and economics work have focused on this phenomenon. The list of such works is impressive and I direct the interested reader to the work of Samuel Bowles, and Henri Tajfel, for example Tajfel (1982), and followers.
This point brings us to a second reason why previous studies have interpreted election time hostilities as interethnic conflict: measurement issues. If conflict is group-based, one should see not only outgroup hostility but ingroup favoritism. Previous studies have only focused on extremely malevolent acts, typically murder or property destruction, to draw their conclusions about the basis of conflict, thereby ignoring the possibility that elections may induce “benevolent” acts such as sharing, cooperation, or favoritism. The only cross-national dataset for election conflict in existence involves only violence. Indeed, by focusing on the dichotomy of an act falling into the category “murder” versus “non-murder,” a very wide range of variation on the continuum of discrimination is lumped into the “non-murder” category. The possibility to find that the election improved interethnic relations is “designed away” when data is collected only on malevolent acts. For this reason, I prefer the term discrimination to conflict because the former encompasses the notion of ingroup favoritism. Finally, heightened interest in electoral competition may lead to the over-reporting of citizen-level discrimination close to elections, giving the illusion that the clashes are election-related when in fact they occur continually (based on ethnicity, partisanship, or something else). In this case, elections do not exacerbate discrimination between citizens, they may only appear to do so because of incomplete data collection.

Lastly, scholars and journalists have not supposed that citizen conflict could be on partisan lines because they do not fathom that African citizens have party identification. Party identification (or partisanship or party affiliation) has been defined to be: an “affective orientation” towards a party that “raises a perceptual screen” through which the identifier interprets and organizes the political world in a partisan fashion, a loyal pattern of party support, or a predisposition to a party based on a “running tally” of parties’ retrospective and prospective policy performance. The literature suggests that partisanship forms via parental socialization, affiliation with social groups who are affiliated with a party, party performance information, political interest and cognitive ability. Partisanship is thought to influence not only vote choice, but opinion formation, factual perception, attribution for blame, and the stability of ties between politicians and citizens to enable them to overcome collective action problems. I suggest further that partisanship may lead to conflict between citizens on party cleavages, as their view of the political world becomes, as Brader and Tucker (2008) write, increasingly shaped with reference to their party of choice. Increasing intensity

---

58 Fearon and Laitin (1996) emphasize that the point that interethnic “cooperation” (or non-defection) is more prevalent than hostility in sub-Saharan Africa and that future scholarship must consider and explain this fact.
59 See Strauss (2009), who points out that even such data is extremely limited. Data on yet other acts of discrimination would be extraordinarily difficult to obtain cross-nationally.
60 Further, such extremely malevolent acts are undertaken by a small subset of society, whereas broader cleavages of conflict may be supported by society more generally. Indeed, cleavages of conflict supported broadly may induce, allow, or otherwise instigate extremely malevolent acts. It is unlikely that extremely malevolent and systematic acts appear serendipitously.
61 See Campbell et al. (1960), Key (1966), and Fiorina (1981) respectively.
62 See Brader and Tucker (2008) for a review of these pathways to partisanship.
63 See Bartels (2002), Lodge and Hamill (1986); Bullock (2006); Malhotra (2008); Aldrich (1995).
of mass partisanship may not unequivocally enhance the prospects of all aspects of democratic consolidation.\textsuperscript{64}

While some believe that partisanship is only (or at least much more) relevant in established democracies,\textsuperscript{65} new theory and evidence show otherwise. Brader and Tucker (2010) show that partisanship develops after only a few elections, even in fluid party systems, and has meaningful consequences for citizen behavior in new democracies.\textsuperscript{66} They further show that rates of partisanship in some new democracies are just as high as in the United States after only a few elections (over 70 percent), and further, experimental evidence that partisans use their party’s cues to update opinions. In the work on Africa specifically, Norris and Mattes (N.d.) and Ishiyama (2006) show not only that partisanship exists, but that it varies meaningfully across individual traits. Lastly, Ishiyama (2006) find in a cross-national analysis that the intensity of ethnic identity is not heavily correlated with intensity of partisan attachment, meaning that intensity of partisanship is indeed more than just a projection of ethnic group salience.

This dissertation is devoted to discovering whether electoral competition exacerbates broad partisan or ethnic conflict amongst ordinary citizens, and why citizens are in conflict when elites are those competing over political power. Cross-national analyses are of little use due to constraints on data and lack of on the ground knowledge in these uncharted waters. Thus, in order to conduct a rigorous theory building exercise, I focus on one election in one country and leave it to future research to expand to yet other countries and elections that vary in meaningful ways. I briefly describe this one election in one country in the following section.

3 Political Competition, Partisanship, and Ethnicity in Ghana

Ghana, a new democracy in West Africa, is an ideal setting to investigate fluctuations in ethnic versus partisan discrimination. While deemed a “partly free” democracy in the late 1990s, it has since moved up its ranking to be considered “free,” as well as stable in its party system.\textsuperscript{67} I conducted the experiments in the capital city, Accra, which contains a mix of ethnic groups and parties. There are two major consolidated parties who must compete to win elections and these parties are believed by citizens to house particular ethnic groups. The stylized example of Figure 1 depicts the nesting of the 4 largest ethnic groups into the two parties: the incumbent New Patriotic

\textsuperscript{64} Converse (1962), Almond and Verba (1963), Converse (1969), Mainwaring (1999)
\textsuperscript{65} See Dalton (2006), Barnes, McDonough and Pin (1985), Converse (1969)
\textsuperscript{66} Also see Dalton and Wattenberg (2000), Popkin (1994), Inglehart (1977) who amongst others argue that the heuristic value of partisanship for vote choice, political opinions, and political action should actually be stronger amongst low income low education voters and in new democracies due to severe information constraints in navigating the new political world. Also see Shively (1979), Downs (1957), Popkin (1994), and Huber, Kernell and Leoni (2005)
\textsuperscript{67} van de Walle (1999), Lindberg (2004), Lindberg (2007), Nugent (2001b). Despite flaws, Ghana has been able to ride both the wave of party system institutionalization and increasing electoral competitiveness, escaping a migration towards a dominant party or a fluid party system Lindberg (2007). For previous accounts of Ghanaian politics in the contemporary era see Ayee (2001), Gyimah-Boadi (2001), Lentz and Nugent (2000), Nugent (1999), Nugent (2001a), Nugent (2001c)
Party (NPP) with the Ashanti and Fanti, and the opposition National Democratic Congress (NDC) with the Ewe and Ga.\footnote{Ashantis are 15\%, Fanti 10\%, Gas 8\%, and Ewes 13\% of the population according to the 2000 census. These tribes are the most numerous save the Mole Dagbani of 15\%. However, this latter group is not as plentiful in Accra as the Ga and are also primarily Muslim, introducing a religious cleavage with these Christian tribes.}

Both the leadership and followership have exhibited this nesting, though particular ethnic groups are believed to dominate. The NDC is heavily associated with the Ewe because it was founded by Jerry John Rawlings, an Ewe and former authoritarian leader from 1981-1992 and President from 1992-2000.\footnote{The party was a successor party to his military-civilian Provisional National Defense Council (PNDC) of 1981-1992 and thus an “ex-single party” according to van de Walle and Butler (1999). Many still suspect him of having major clout and meddling in the affairs of current President John Atta-Mills, and his wife has recently made a bid against Mills for flagbearership in 2012.} The leadership of the New Patriotic Party (NPP) has been considered closely associated with the Ashanti (and to a lesser extent Akyem) people generally due to its own founding heritage and current leadership.\footnote{In the 4th Republic, the NPP revived the “Danquah-Busia” tradition starting with the United Party in the 1st Republic (1960- 1966), the Progressive Party in the 2nd Republic (1969 - 1972), and the Popular Front Party in the 3rd Republic (1979 - 1981). Because this party is reincarnated, van de Walle (1999) deem it a “historic party.” See Morrison (2004) on the reincarnation of parties in Ghana through its four republics.} The 1992-2004 NPP presidential candidates were all Ashanti, with John Kufuor winning in 2000 and 2004. Regional voting patterns were clear in Ghana’s three competitive elections leading up to the 2008 election; the Akans\footnote{Akan is the ethnolinguistic group including the Ashanti, Fanti, Akuapem, Akyem and other groups speaking Twi. Price (1973) documents the construction of this ethnic group out of these various tribes.} and particular Northerners voted for NPP and the Ewes, Gas, and particular Northerners voted for NDC. Perceptions of parties nesting particular ethnic groups became quickly widespread amongst the citizens starting at the advent of multipartyism, and accusations of favoritism in the distribution of state resources by each party towards their ethnic constituencies were rife.\footnote{The degree of ethnic voting is not undisputed in the literature. While all studies find Ashanti and Ewe to be core constituencies of NPP and NDC respectively, studies vary on the degree of support found for ethnic voting by yet other tribes, arguing that policy preferences or evaluations of candidates matter. One shortcoming with the latter studies is that such variables are likely to be endogenous to ethnicity and/or partisanship. See Frempong (2006), Erdmann (N.d.), Boafo-Arthur (2000), Fridy (2007), Lindberg and Morrison (2008), Anebo (2006) for an opposing opinion.} Fridy (2007) describes how maps with party systems over the constituencies were sold in the streets following the election, reinforcing the beliefs in ethnic block voting instead of the reality. However, he notes that Ghanaians are usually bashful about admitting to ethnic voting, and often accuse other tribes of ethnic voting, while claiming their tribe does not do it.

The December 2008 election in question for this study was the 3rd competitive election and the second peaceful partisan transfer of power.\footnote{See Gyimah-Boadi (2009) and Jockers, Nugent and Kohnert (2010) for reviews of this election.} While democracy is young - 1996 was the first year that an elected chief executive completed his term without a coup since independence in 1957, Ghana is currently lauded as one of the most stable democracies in sub-Saharan Africa. The election was particularly close; in the runoff, the NDC candidate John Atta Mills triumphed with a wafer-
thin lead with 50.23% of the vote to Nana Akufo-Addo of the NPP with 49.77%. Interestingly, the NPP flag-bearer was an Akyem and the NDC flag-bearer a Fanti in this election. While an Akyem flag-bearer is not inconsistent with the NPP ethnic nesting, Atta-Mills being a Fanti does represent an inconsistency. Yet Atta-Mills, as Rawlings’ former Vice-President, ran unsuccessfully for the NDC in the 2000 and 2004 against Kufuor, and failed to get the Fanti vote each time. The results of the 2008 election reveal that, in a surprise move, the Fanti region largely switched to the NDC.

It is important to establish citizens’ beliefs about who are copartisans and who are not rather than making assumptions. The majoritarian system may hide the number of dissenting votes in tribal regions, for example, and information on individual-level vote choice may be so constrained that stereotypes form the basis of beliefs rather than actual voting patterns. However, there may be the opposite problem which is that Accra residents may have different voting patterns altogether than those living in tribal homelands. I collected three waves of survey data (described in Section 4) on citizens’ beliefs about how typical members of particular tribes vote. Specifically, I collected beliefs of Accra residents about other Accra residents, since those beliefs may differ from national level beliefs and Accra residents are those participating in the experiments. Figure 2 shows beliefs about the voting patterns of the Ashanti, Ewe, Ga and Fanti from a random sample of citizens in Accra in June/July 2008, November/December 2008 (exactly prior to the election), and November/December 2009. In black are the percent of respondents who believe members of a particular tribe vote for the party out of those that provide an answer, while the raw percentage of those who don’t know are in gray. There are no surprises here. Beliefs are very consistent for Ashantis voting for the NPP and Ewes for the NDC. The Fanti and the Ga are less affiliated with a particular party, and though the Accra Fanti are still believed to be affiliated with NPP, we can see the number of those who don’t know increases dramatically in the last wave. The weaker affiliation of the Fanti and Ga may be a strength of the study because if results are found, one could expect similar results for tribes more strongly affiliated with the NPP and NDC.

Since this study seeks to adjudicate between ethnic and partisan based individual-level discrimination, one must establish that there are no overlapping group cleavages which could confound the identification of tribal or partisan divides. Muslim-Christian religious cleavages will not confound

---

74 The president is directly elected using a two round runoff system; if a party wins 50% plus one vote in the first round, no runoff is held, but if no party wins 50% plus one vote in the first round, then the two parties with the highest vote shares advance to a runoff election. Presidents preside for four year terms with a two term limit. The unicameral parliament contains single member districts elected simultaneously by plurality rule.

75 Perhaps because he was viewed as a stooge of Rawlings coupled with Rawlings’ infamous joke about Fantis using the beach as a cat uses a litterbox.

76 Beliefs figure prominently in the study of Fridy (2007), who finds that citizens peg the NPP as an Akan/Ashanti party, and the NDC an Ewe/ Northerner party.

77 The question was: “In this city, if I met an average [insert tribe], what party would he or she be likely to vote?”. I did not ask people about their guess as to a percent of people in each tribe voting for each party, which would be a better measure, because my experience was that many poor people would have difficulty answering the question.
the study because the tribes under question are Christian, with the exception of a very few Ga and Ewe who are Muslim. We may also worry about class. Fridy (2007) finds it is ethnicity, not socioeconomic variables that determine party allegiance. Yet Lindberg and Morrison (2005) claim that the parties have ideological positions with the NPP being a center-right party and the NDC the center-left, perhaps indicating a class cleavage. However, in the parties’ manifestos and at rallies, both parties call for sweeping “development,” and the NPP instituted such social policies as free primary education. Citizens are by and large unable to cite programmatic differences, or if so, not differences that would indicate differing class ideology.

![Figure 2: Accra Residents’ Beliefs about Accra Residents’ Voting Habits](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti</td>
<td>94% NPP (12% IDK)</td>
<td>97% NPP (15% IDK)</td>
<td>98% NPP (1% IDK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe</td>
<td>91% NDC (10% IDK)</td>
<td>97% NDC (2% IDK)</td>
<td>99% NDC (1% IDK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanti</td>
<td>84% NPP (11% IDK)</td>
<td>86% NPP (19% IDK)</td>
<td>62% NPP (33% IDK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>83% NDC (19% IDK)</td>
<td>82% NDC (21% IDK)</td>
<td>89% NDC (14% IDK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 1532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Research Design

4.1 General Design Strategy

The purpose of the empirical design is to investigate whether interethnic and/or interpartisan discrimination exists amongst citizens and discover whether patterns of discrimination change around a high-stakes national election. Hypothetically, I would like to take Ghana and treat it with a national election, and take Ghana and have no election so as to compare patterns of discrimination under the two counterfactual states. Since it is impossible to do so, I collected data on discrimination at times when electoral competition was high and low. I conducted three waves of data collection: six months prior to the December 2008 election before campaigning had begun but candidates were known, directly before the election, and exactly one year after the election. Elected officials in Ghana serve fixed terms which have been respected, rendering election timing de jure and de facto exogenous to interethnic or interpartisan strife, or an omitted variable which would directly or indirectly affect both intergroup strife and holding elections (e.g. economic changes).

In each wave, the data were conducted identically so we can be very confident that any difference in patterns of discrimination are due to the level of electoral competition.

---

78Note that because many Northerners vote NDC, and Northerns are poorer than southerners manyfold, there is a correlation between the NDC and poverty when ethnicity is not controlled for. Further, Akans are much more urbanized than others, and the NPP may also be correlated with urbanites if the analysis does not condition on ethnicity.

79Wave 1: 7/29-30/08, Wave 2: 12/3-5/08 (election was 12/7/08), Wave 3:12/9-11/09

80In parliamentary systems, elections may be called endogenously to any factor, thus confounding the causal estimate of the election’s effect. Because the election is not an experimental manipulation, I discuss possible confounding factors in Section 5.
To reveal latent cleavages of conflict, I conducted experiments on whether (un)shared ethnicity and partisanship affects two ordinary yet extremely consequential activities in which all Ghanaians engage on a daily basis: market price bargaining and resource sharing. Using behavioral measures of discrimination is integral, since we can expect individuals to self-censor discriminatory expressions, and further, discrimination may even be subconscious rather than deliberate. Further, these specific behaviors will overcome the dilemma on measurement discussed in Section 2, that a wider, more continuous range on the continuum of discrimination must be observed and measured to reveal any “favoritism” between individuals on the basis of (un)shared group membership.\footnote{Note that, by using behaviors naturally incentivized by monetary rewards and thus being able to incentivize monetarily in the experiment, I can better hold constant citizens’ valuations of the “reward medium.” By contrast, other reward mediums (e.g. prestige, goods/services) produce uncertainty as to whether individuals derive identical utility from them, calling into question whether payoffs map onto utility. See Morton and Williams (2010)} Though important in and of themselves, cleavages of group-based discrimination revealed in market price and resource sharing reasonably indicate general societal cleavages of conflict that manifest itself in yet other behaviors.

Table 1: Treatment Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Coethnic</th>
<th>Coethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe-Ashanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe-Fanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti-Ga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga-Fanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti-Fanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe-Ga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashanti-Ashanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanti-Fanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga-Ga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe-Ewe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of the experiments, I define group-based discrimination as a statistically significant difference in average price or amount of resources shared when particular group memberships are \textit{shared versus unshared.}\footnote{Note that this definition of group-based discrimination based on (un)shared group is distinct from the type in which the researcher investigates whether simply belonging to a particular group along an identity dimension yields variation in an outcome, as in Bertrand and Mullainathan (2003), where they estimate whether black or white names on resumes affect the probability of an interview call back, or Gambetta and Hamill (2005) who study they types of people taxi drivers are more willing to pick up.} Table 1 depicts the treatment table, whereby the columns indicate whether ethnicity is shared, the rows whether partisanship is shared, and the tribe dyads that fit under each treatment in the boxes. Recall that, due to the nesting of tribes in parties, there are no coethnic non-copartisans.\footnote{In the population, and therefore survey sample, there are of course a few coethnic non-copartisans, but the group is far better or worse so small as to explore any meaningful statistical variation in resource sharing.}

Much fieldwork, involving open-ended interviews and other immersion techniques, was conducted. First, fieldwork preceded the development of each experiment.\footnote{Dunning (N.d.) underscores the importance of qualitative research for proper field experimental design.} One goal of the experimental designs was to maximize the ecological validity - the “fieldness” or similarity between the environment in which the research takes place and the target environment. At the same time,
care was taken achieve a high degree of causal validity by maintaining control over confounding factors existing in the natural environment and potential for treatment spillover. Achieving these goals necessitated a deep understanding of the environment.

Second, fieldwork was conducted in each research wave to understand why citizens are “in conflict,” when elites are those competing over power. I interviewed citizens and local party representatives about how markets work, resource sharing, and party and voter strategy at election time.\textsuperscript{85} I sold tiger nuts and magazines in a local neighborhood market. While some of the interviews were serendipitous, others were systematic. Because the resource sharing experiments were conducted in a large-scale survey using sampling techniques to gain a representative sample of Accra, I would typically conduct the close-ended survey with the survey team in the morning, and then conduct open-ended interviews using the same random sampling techniques in the afternoon.

\section*{4.2 Market Price Bargaining Experiment}
Markets are the primary structure governing how goods and services are allocated in sub-Saharan Africa, as opposed to hierarchies (e.g. large firms), which dominate allocation in industrialized economies.\textsuperscript{86} In fact, Africa may be seen as more market-oriented than industrialized economies due to the much higher number of entrepreneurs leading small businesses and the larger number of intermediary transactions between producer and consumer.\textsuperscript{87} As few goods or services have fixed prices, urban traders and hawkers spend their day negotiating over prices either as buyer or seller. Poverty drives citizens to seek even small profits from negotiations. The experiment is meant to capture this daily activity, which is conflictual and has allocative consequences for both buyer and seller.

Specifically, I opted to conduct experiments on taxi fare bargaining, which belongs to a common class of service in which the service is rendered before payment (e.g. a hairdresser braids before payment, a tailor sews a dress before payment, a cobbler fixes shoes before payment).\textsuperscript{88} Taxi fare negotiation takes place privately (from other riders or drivers) outside the vehicle before consumption of the service takes place. When a price has been agreed upon, the rider enters the car and is taken to the specified location before payment occurs.

Before describing the exact proceedings of the experiment, it is important to explain why this type of transaction is useful for uncovering patterns of discrimination. First, I can hold the object

\textsuperscript{85}Such interviews were by and far conducted with citizens. While I was able to talk to some local party agents, i found citizens more candid about what happens at election time. Further, in trying to understand the determinants of citizen-level conflict, it is more useful to elicit citizen perceptions of citizen and party strategy rather than from the party’s perspective.

\textsuperscript{86}Fafchamps (1997)

\textsuperscript{87}Fafchamps (2004)

\textsuperscript{88}A few others have also utilized taxis to investigate non-taxi research. Gambetta and Hamill (2005)’s ethnography of taxis hold that taxis represent a broad class of interpersonal conflictual settings of trust. Ayres, Vars and Zakariya (2005) investigates the role of ethnicity in tips for black and white taxi drivers in the USA.
of negotiation constant (and thus comparable) by having subjects repeatedly negotiate fare between
the same two locations in Accra. Many other negotiable goods found in African markets such as
perishable agricultural goods are variable in size and quality, and subject to seasonal input prices
or availability. Such variability might render negotiations incomparable, confounding the treatment
or election. Nonetheless, I collected data on the quality of the taxi, the time of day (due to traffic
patterns), and the weather in case these confound the independence of treatment due to finite
sampling.

Second, the negotiation, the rendering of the service, and the payment can be monitored without
raising suspicion due to my or my research assistants’ presence. It is well known that individuals
change their behavior when feeling “watched.” However, because taxi drivers are mobile, they
do not have the opportunity to become suspicious due to my or my research assistants’ sustained
presence at the roadside. Possible locations were pre-tested, and the two chosen (trotro stops
near Danqua Circle and Holy Spirit Cathedral) were on busy major roads (see the map in the
online appendix) such that there would be enough people coming and going so as not to attract
attention. Secondly, the negotiation, the rendering of the service, and the payment can be monitored without
raising suspicion due to my or my research assistants’ presence. It is well known that individuals
change their behavior when feeling “watched.” However, because taxi drivers are mobile, they
do not have the opportunity to become suspicious due to my or my research assistants’ sustained
presence at the roadside. Possible locations were pre-tested, and the two chosen (trotro stops
near Danqua Circle and Holy Spirit Cathedral) were on busy major roads (see the map in the
online appendix) such that there would be enough people coming and going so as not to attract
attention. Lastly, driving a taxi is not a job dominated by any particular ethnic group, providing
enough variation in ethnic and partisan identity of the drivers. With a finite sample of Ashanti,
Fanti, Ewe and Ga subject-riders, I calculated that sufficient data would exist in all treatment
dyads in Table 1 in expectation.

The step-by-step proceedings of the experiment can be found in Figure 3. A rider receives a
data slip and 3.5 Ghana cedis (about US$3.50). The rider hails the 3rd empty taxi coming down
the road, and when the taxi stops, says an opening script in his (there are only male subjects)
tribe’s language to start off the negotiation. This opening script subtly and naturally reveals the
tribe of the rider to the driver. Rider and driver negotiate until a price has been agreed upon to
go to the other location, continuing to use either the rider’s mother tongue or English. Through
the negotiation, the rider also learns the tribe of the driver through his accent. The subject fills in
the data slip on the way to the other location, exits the vehicle, pays and keeps the profit from the
negotiation. The experiment assumes that the riders and drivers correctly infer the partisanship
based on the other’s tribe according to the survey results presented in Figure 2.

The experiment respects Smith (1976)’s induced value theory, the theory that reward media
such as financial incentives can induce subjects to hold preferences as theoretically assumed to
have in natural life. I reasonably assume that taxi drivers “on the job” prefer higher prices to lower
prices ceteris paribus to earn a higher income. In order to generate the natural incentives of taxi

89 Additionally, the locations were picked so that there were no other convenient forms of public transportation in
between (so no cheating could occur) and no commonsensical price.
90 It is easy to see that there would have been a substantial loss of control to use subject-drivers. For example, it
would have been difficult to find riders who wanted to take identical rides across town.
91 Protocols can be found in an online appendix.
riders who would prefer to pay less to more ceteris paribus, I gave subject-riders a fixed amount of money before each negotiation and they kept the remainder of the money left over after they paid for the ride. I assume the subject-riders prefer lower prices to higher prices ceteris paribus in order to retain more money, as in natural life.\textsuperscript{92}

In order to estimate the impact of shared versus unshared ethnicity and partisanship on prices, the matchup manipulation must live up to the definition of an ideal instrumental variable. The better the design achieves this goal ex ante, the less one must rely on control techniques (e.g. matching or regression) ex post to “make up” for design flaws in confounding factors. First, the manipulations and the potential outcome must be independent, which experimenters can expect to achieve in expectation through random assignment of the manipulation. This experiment reasonably meets this requirement, as subject-riders were required to start in a random order and hail and take the third empty taxi that came down the road.\textsuperscript{93} Subject-riders were required to take the taxi that they were assigned and could not “select into” a particular taxi or “select out of” a taxi they were assigned in order to take a different taxi. By monitoring this requirement, I attempt to ensure compliance with the manipulation. Further, individuals undertake between 8-14 rounds of negotiation, meaning that the same individuals are observed in multiple treatment statuses and individual unobservable characteristics are better “balanced” across treatment status. If each subject only undertook the negotiation one time, we might worry about the ability of randomization to create appropriate counterfactual groups to compare across treatments in a finite sample.\textsuperscript{94}

Second, no missing data are allowed to meet the criteria for an ideal instrument. In order to reduce missing data, my research assistant and I collected each individual’s data after each round of negotiation before the next round was allowed to commence. Note that if there was more than one violation of the rules, then the subject was disqualified.\textsuperscript{95}

Third, the “manipulation” must be a perfect substitute for the treatment. Riders and drivers must be aware on some level of cognizance of the matchup in order to be treated.\textsuperscript{96} Since tribes

\textsuperscript{92} Subjects were also paid a fixed amount of 10 Ghana cedi for successfully completing the entire session. Note that without further financial incentives, it is not clear that they would have the incentive to negotiate the price down, as in natural life. If effects were nonetheless found, it would be unclear what would be incentivizing the behavior.

\textsuperscript{93} I find that there is no statistically significant difference in subjects’ probability of getting a driver of a particular ethnic group.

\textsuperscript{94} This design is frequently called “within subjects design.” There are known differences across individuals that have been found to matter in bargaining (e.g. attractiveness, bargaining ability varies across individuals). I did not choose to do a panel study for this experiment, which would have allowed me to control for rider fixed effects across points in time. The reason is because riders may, in the mean time between data collection rounds, figure out a way to cheat, think about how better to get money out of the experiment by improving bargaining skills, or find out the purpose of the experiment by looking up the nature of my research on the internet. Thus, the riders would not be “the same” between the first, second, and third data collection rounds. In this sense, how “fixed” would the individuals’ “fixed effects” be? I thank Eric Dickson for this advice.

\textsuperscript{95} One individual in the July set of experiments was disqualified because he twice did not pull up in front of the Researcher and Research Assistant.

\textsuperscript{96} It is useful to distinguish between the experimental manipulation and the treatment. Morton and Williams
Figure 3: Proceedings

Start of Experiment

1. Subjects recruited at Circle by distributing flyers from a few locations, potential subjects given an alphabetical letter to indicate their identity during the experiment
2. Drive to a quiet place near Location 1
3. Read through instructions
4. Subjects consent to participate
5. Check for subjects’ comprehension with quiz
6. Subjects memorize script in mother tongue
7. Walk to Location 1, randomize order of subjects to start

Each Round for 8-14 Rounds

8. Distribute data slip and 3.5 Ghana cedis to subject
9. Subject stands near Researcher/Research Assistant and hails 3rd empty taxi coming down the road
10. Taxi stops and subject peeks into window, says opening script in mother tongue
11. Subject and driver negotiate until a price is agreed upon in mother tongue or English
12. Subject enters taxi and goes to the other location
13. Subject rates quality of the taxi and confirms tribe of driver by (a) confirming that driver is person in displayed license, (b) through last name and accent determines tribe, and (c) if in doubt asks driver through normal conversation
14. Subject exits and pays in front of Researcher/Research Assistant, notes license plate number and keeps the leftover money
15. Subject submits data slip to Researcher/Research Assistant, who checks if it is complete

End of Experiment

16. Subjects briefly interviewed
17. Subjects given participation payment of 10 Ghana cedis

Subjects must get all answers correct before participation, and were explained the instructions until they understood everything correctly.

Research Assistants were Ghanaian so as to avoid any suspicion on behalf of the taxi drivers.

None of these actions are considered rude conversation.

The data is essential so as to check if the same taxi is used more than once. There was no taxi used more than once because subjects could hail only the 3rd empty taxi. However, this move was also meant to deter scamming.
are distinguishable by language (as well as other characteristics such as last name), ethnic identity can be subtly communicated. Ghanaians can identify one another’s tribe by accent in English or other Ghanaian languages, or ability to speak a certain language as a mother tongue. To be absolutely certain, the riders start out with an opening script in their tribe’s language. By speaking in their mother-tongue, riders are indicating their tribe to the drivers. The script translated into English would be something like: “Good Afternoon. I am going to the [Location]. What is your price?” After the opening script, the rider and driver could negotiate how they pleased. However, each person was only allowed to speak their native language, or English if the driver could not communicate in that particular tribe’s language. Subjects were not allowed to speak any other Ghanaian language because this could introduce variation in prices between subjects due to the use of multiple languages as a bargaining technology. I also conducted manipulation checks to see if, when Ghanaians said the script in their mother tongue to others in their own group or different groups, that people inferred their tribe correctly. For partisan identity, I assume that once ethnic identity is known, partisanship is correctly inferred according to the widespread beliefs in Figure 1. I did not ask subjects about partisanship directly because I wanted behavior as natural as possible and to eliminate any possibility that riders would act differently if they surmised I was interested in the role of partisanship in prices.

An often underscrutenized part of experimental design is the recruitment strategy. The recruitment strategy is an important part of the design process because it limits the confidence one can have in the statistical validity of the findings to the target population. The target population for recruitment was urban male Ghanaians between 18 and 45 from the tribes in Figure 1. I attempted to gain a random sample of the target population by using a strategy which would lower

(2010) defines a manipulation as the exogenous intervention by the researcher, that presumably causes variation in the desired treatment variable, while a treatment variable is the principal variable that we expect to have a causal impact on the dependent variable. This conceptual distinction recognizes that the manipulation usually does not perfectly determine all variation in the treatment variable of interest, but should seek to. One can think of the manipulation as an instrument in an instrumental variables approach.

97 Though this may be introducing an unnatural element into the experiment, it was essential in order to control for riders’ ability to speak multiple tribal languages. I did extensive research on whether it would be odd for passengers would start off speaking their native language. I found it was not odd to speak Ashanti, Fanti, or Ga, and a little odd to speak Ewe. Thus, speaking Ewe may make the driver think that the person is from out of town and charge them a higher rate. Yet the results show that drivers do not charge Ewes more than other groups. Moreover, the results do not rely on the Ewe.

98 Instructing riders to speak in their mother tongue may raise suspicion amongst riders that the research was about tribal price discrimination. Because of this worry, subjects were told that it would not be fair to speak different Ghanaian languages to be fair to some subjects who could only speak their own mother tongue and English. After the experiment, riders were asked what they thought the purpose of the experiment was. Not a single subject mentioned the election or interethnic or interpartisan price discrimination.

99 I also checked to see if taxi drivers beliefs were similar to the population at large by my own experience riding in taxis. It is my experience that taxi drivers are very aware.

100 I used males only because I suspect there would be gender effects in bargaining (See for example Leon-Mejia and Miller (2007)). In the Ghanaian context, women are known to be better market price bargainers. Power calculations revealed that the number of observations I could have given the budget constraint limited me to including only 1 gender.
the cost of participation of its members, and thereby decrease selection bias in participation. I distributed flyers around the major market area “Circle” where all sorts of goods and services are sold and includes the biggest transportation hub in the city. Additionally, I started recruiting the morning of the experiment, about 3 hours before, and ended about 30 minutes before.\textsuperscript{101} Given that the average Ghanaian earns about $4/day and the flat fee for participating in the experiment was about $10 (with the prospect of earning more through bargaining), I was able to attract participants from a reasonably wide range of wealth status and employment type. The recruitment needed to be “spontaneous” (same day) so that subjects would not have time to invent scams, seek information on transportation or bargaining, or otherwise “pretreat” themselves. Additionally, I believe that the same day recruitment strategy improves the ability to obtain a random sample because time lags allow for friends to sign up together, and increases the costs to participation (since people have to pay an additional transportation cost to return).

### 4.3 Resource Sharing Experiment in Large-Scale Survey

Reciprocal resource sharing\textsuperscript{102} is second to market exchange as the major mode of resource allocation in sub-Saharan Africa.\textsuperscript{103} Reciprocal resource sharing involves an informal contract of obligation among a group of participants to share resources at an unspecified time with an unspecified contribution.\textsuperscript{104} While both market exchange and resource sharing are based on a contract of reciprocity, market exchange depends on the existence of gains from trade and makes contractual terms explicit, while in reciprocal resource sharing, it is common for exchange to be unequal and implicit. Further, the exchange needn’t involve direct reciprocity between two individuals, but simply that group members share with some other group members. Because adverse life shocks such as sickness, unemployment, hunger, or property damage occur so frequently and formal institutions of insurance are nonexistent, resource sharing in informal groups allows individuals to draw critical support in times of need. Unfortunately, however, the obligation to share is so strong that it is difficult to save money for future investments, stymying development.\textsuperscript{105}

Mostly this sharing obligation has been studied in rural areas amongst extended family or clan groups, the major shared group memberships. It is unknown whether the obligation carries any weight amongst urbanites, who are no longer in close-knit kin groups, but in very heterogeneous and transient environments in which group membership is shared diffusely with much larger groups of people that include strangers. The experiment is meant to capture whether sharing institutions

\textsuperscript{101}Note that some may call the drivers subjects and the riders “confederates.” Confederates participate in an experiment as part of the experimental treatment administered to subjects and do not make choices but behave according to a script. Because the riders do not know the research agenda and are free to make their own choices, i consider them subjects.

\textsuperscript{102}Also known in various forms, called: economies of affection economies of reciprocity, gift exchange economies, or private buffering against adverse life shocks. See Hyden (1980), Ferrara (2003)

\textsuperscript{103}Fafchamps (2004)

\textsuperscript{104}One man described it as an obligation in which “you must share whatever is in your pocket.”

\textsuperscript{105}Giving rise to the institution of su-su collection.
consistently found in rural areas carry over into the urban environment. For the purpose of eliciting the latent cleavages of discrimination, the experiment will investigate whether citizens share more with members of (un)shared groups in a very diffuse urban sharing setting.

This experiment took place in the context of a large-scale survey in order to expand recruitment to be a representative sample of Accra. Standard survey sampling techniques were used to select neighborhoods, enumerator start points, and households/businesses. Respondents answered a battery of questions and engaged in a resource sharing activity exactly once.

Respondents were given a bag of 31 ‘nickels’ (5 pesewa coins), and two envelopes. One envelope said ‘Me’ and the other had one of four randomly assigned treatment surnames, which are thus gender neutral. The names were Gadzekpo, Osei, Johnson, or Ashitey, which signals Ewe, Ashanti, Fant, and Ga tribal membership respectively. Respondents were told that they could divide the coins however they wanted between the two envelopes and that he/she got to keep what was put in the ‘Me’ envelope, while what was put in the other envelope was given to a person from Accra with that particular name. I counted the coins for the treatment envelopes at the end of each day and put the money into accounts for Gadzekpo, Osei, Johnson, and Ashitey. Randomly selected individuals from Accra with those names were indeed given the money in the accounts, thus there was no deception used in the experiment.

The experimental design reasonably allows the experimental interventions to meet the requirements of an ideal instrument and to confidently estimate the causal effect of being in a coethnic copartisan, non-coethnic copartisan, or non-coethnic non-copartisan treatment dyad on resource sharing. Because the treatment names were randomly assigned to respondents, being assigned to a dyad is orthogonal to potential sharing decisions. To reduce missing data incidence, my survey enumerators and I took pains to develop good rapport with potential survey respondents and I was present on all days of the survey in the neighborhood to increase confidence in undertaking the resource allocation task. Nonetheless, a small number of individuals in each wave opted out of the task for fear that the coins could be bewitched by a saccuwa, a succubus causing physical deformities to those who make money off of witchcraft.

Lastly, to ensure that the experimental manipulation of receiving a particular envelope is sub-

---

106 Further documentation on survey sampling and experiment materials can be found in an online appendix. The survey involved close-ended questions and was conducted in English, which did act to exclude some non-English speakers which were mostly older women.

107 Subjects did not repeat the task so as not to raise suspicion that the task regarded discrimination. The order of the questions and the experiment were randomized in the event that undertaking one influenced the other.

108 This task is a commonly used task called “the Dictator Game” used to measure altruism or generosity. Specifically respondents were told they could “share” it since “divide” (American English) = “divide equally” (Ghanaian English), while “share” (Ghanaian English) = “divide” (American English). Respondents were also told to take the materials to a private location, which was usually within a nearby dwelling, as the interviews were usually conducted outside in the courtyard area away from others.
stitutable for the intended treatment dyad, the names used on the envelopes were selected via manipulation checks. I tested the ability of a different set of subjects from a convenience sample to assess the tribal identity of a list of names and think of any associations with the surname (e.g. belongs to prominent figure). The final names chosen are common and unambiguously but subtly communicated tribal membership and were otherwise unassociated on a societal level. By eliciting beliefs about the believed partisanship of members of different tribes (See Figure 2), I can control for individual beliefs about partisan affiliation rather than rely upon society wide beliefs as in the experiment. Key to both experiments, tribe (and party) affiliation are subtly communicated through name and language/accent, as they are in natural life, rather than using much more artificial and commonly used “in your face” treatments indicating group membership.

5 Results

5.1 Market Price Bargaining Results

Before putting the data to statistical tests, what does the raw data reveal? Figure 4 shows a graphical representation of mean prices by coethnic copartisan (blue dotted line), non-coethnic copartisan (red solid line), and non-coethnic non-copartisan (green dashed line) dyad at each wave of experiments.\textsuperscript{109} The left panel shows the average prices pooling both parties together, while the right panel shows the average prices disaggregated by party. To keep the value of the cedi constant, all monetary amounts are in July 2008 Ghana cedis.\textsuperscript{110} This figure shows the main take home points from the empirical analysis. Riders continually negotiate the lowest prices from coethnic drivers on average. However, \textit{at election time and only at election time}, the average price that riders are able to negotiate from non-coethnic drivers depends critically on partisan affiliation. Copartisan riders achieve much lower prices than non-copartisan riders, if non-coethnic. Differences in average price are non-trivial for Ghanaians. For example, the difference of 20 pesewas between non-coethnics who are copartisan and non-coethnics who are non-copartisan is equivalent to 4 satchets (2 liters) of water, a person’s daily intake. For another example, a 30 pesewa difference between price for a coethnic copartisan and a non-coethnic non-copartisan is equivalent to a meal of local food. Results are similar for the incumbent and opposition party in the right panel.

There were a total of 259 rides in July 2008 (after candidates had been announced but before campaigning had begun), 587 rides in December 2008 (directly before the election), and 614 in December 2009 (exactly one year after the election). All tribe dyads have sufficient observations, though due to the lower total number of observations in the July 2008 wave, some cells for particular tribe dyads are low. Note that while the riders are either Ashanti, Fanti, Ewe or Ga, taxi drivers may come from yet other tribes. Any pairings involving taxi drivers who are not Ashanti, Fanti,

\textsuperscript{109}That the dots are connected is meant to visually aid the reader.
\textsuperscript{110}I used the monthly statistics on inflation provided by Ghana’s National Statistical Service. Inflation occured between the election and post-election waves.
Ewe, or Ga are classified as “Other dyad,” and left out of the empirical analysis unless otherwise noted.\textsuperscript{111} The analysis keeps dyads consistent with the Fanti in the NPP. Because the partisan cleavage disappears in determining price in the last wave, this is unproblematic. However, because beliefs about the Fanti are ambiguous for the final wave, the analysis is also conducted with the Fanti in the NDC and also by leaving out the Fanti. Results do not depend on these changes unless otherwise noted.\textsuperscript{112} Table ?? in the Appendix shows descriptive statistics for the experimental sessions including the breakdown of the data by the group memberships of the riders and drivers and the means and standard deviations of the dependent and independent variables.

The following empirical analyses test whether the ocular differences in average price observed in Figure 4 are statistically significant, indicating that the election is associated with interpartisan discrimination. Figure 5 shows two tables of mean prices for coethnic copartisans, non-coethnic copartisans, and non-coethnic non-copartisans in the inner boxes, where shared ethnicity is indicated by the columns and shared partisanship in the rows. The table on the left indicates the mean prices at election time while the table on the right shows the prices in the absence of electoral competition pooled from the pre and post election experiments. Difference in means and the p-values from nonparametric two-tailed difference of means tests are indicated in the outer boxes in each table.\textsuperscript{113}

There are three main take home points from these tables. First, average price is statistically indistinguishable between non-coethnics who are copartisan, and non-coethnics who are non-copartisan absent electoral competition (D-E). However, at election time, and only at election time, there is differentiation between non-coethnics based on partisanship (A-B). Non-coethnics non-copartisans

\textsuperscript{111}Some “Other” dyads are indeed non-coethnics copartisan, as in the case of, for example, a pairing of Aquapim and an Ashanti or non-coethnics non-copartisan, for example and Akyem with a Ga. Results are robust regardless of whether “Other” dyads are included in the analysis.

\textsuperscript{112}Results are available upon request. Note that by leaving out the Fanti, there would be no non-coethnics copartisan observations for NPP.

\textsuperscript{113}These results are robust to parametric tests, but I favor the non-parametric tests were possible to drop assumptions about particular population distributions.
are charged a whopping 19 pesewas more on average than non-coethnics who are copartisan. Second, the difference within the copartisans between those sharing ethnicity and those not sharing ethnicity is smaller at election time at 11 pesewas (B-C) than absent electoral competition at 17 pesewas (E-F). Third, the difference between the two most “distant groups” - coethnic copartisans and non-coethnic non-copartisans is 30 pesewas (A-C) at election time and 16 pesewas otherwise (D-F).

Figure 5: Mean Price by Partisan and Ethnic Dyad across Electoral Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECTION</th>
<th></th>
<th>NO ELECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td>Coethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.16 (.38) N = 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copartisan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.97 (.37) N = 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td>A-B</td>
<td>.19 (.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference in Differences*</th>
<th>Non-Copartisan</th>
<th>Coethnic</th>
<th>Difference in Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.03 (.38) N = 351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copartisan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.04 (.37) N = 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Copartisan</td>
<td>A-D</td>
<td>.13 (.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Differences*</td>
<td>(A-D) - (B-E)</td>
<td>.07 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lastly, it is interesting to estimate further quantities such as difference in means for a particular dyad at the time of electoral competition versus otherwise. Figure 6 shows these average price differences within each dyad at election time and not at election time in the inner boxes. Non-coethnics non-copartisans (A-D) and coethnic copartisans (C-F) do not experience statistically significant fluctuations in average price at election time versus otherwise. Non-coethnics copartisans (B-E) have a statistically significant lower price at election time than otherwise by 7 pesewas. In the outer boxes, Figure 6 shows difference in difference estimates of whether change in price due to electoral competition is different across treatment dyads. I estimate this quantity with the population model: \( \text{price} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{dyad}_1 + \beta_2 \cdot \text{election} + \beta_3 \cdot \text{dyad}_2 + \beta_4 \cdot \text{election} \cdot \text{dyad}_2 + \epsilon \). Estimating with OLS, the difference in difference estimate (\( \hat{\beta}_4 \)) is reported in Figure 6. The election-time price gap for non-coethnics on the basis of partisanship is 18 pesewas more (A-D) - (B-E). Moreover, the gap
in price between coethnic copartisans and non-coethnic non-copartisans increased substantially by 15 pesewas (A-D) - (C-F). Although the gap closed 4 pesewas between coethnic copartisans and non-coethnic copartisans at election time (B-E) - (C-F), this decrease is not statistically significant.

The dominant view is that elections exacerbate interethnic discrimination. What would have a researcher found if she had (erroneously) ignored overlapping partisan cleavages, and simply sought to test whether ethnic discrimination existed, and whether it was exacerbated by the election? The difference in mean price between coethnic and non-coethnic dyads is statistically significant at election time at 25 pesewas, and at times of low electoral competition 15 pesewas. A difference in differences estimate of whether the size of the price gap was larger during electoral competition shows the 10 pesewa difference is indeed statistically significant. Such an analysis would (erroneously) conclude that elections exacerbate discrimination between coethnics and non-coethnics, while we know from the more nuanced analysis that non-coethnics who were copartisan experienced less discrimination, while non-coethnics who were non-copartisans experienced more discrimination. Ethnicity would have masked that the line of discrimination that emerges at election time is based on partisan affiliation.

Next, is the effect of the election different depending on party? It could be that being an opposition party versus an incumbent party leads to different tendencies towards partisan bias. Further, the tribes in the NPP are much more closely related in terms of language than the tribes in the NDC. Thus, if we see that the results are being driven by the NPP, then the election might differentially affect partisans only if they are close in ethnic background. Figure 4 reveals that the results are not driven by either the NPP or the NDC. However, the coethnic non-coethnic gap is much wider for NPP partisans versus NDC partisans. In fact, the price difference between coethnics and non-coethnic copartisans is almost the same in the NDC, while the difference is much greater in the NPP mostly due to a larger coethnic favoritism. Lastly, is it the case that these results are being driven by a particular ethnic dyads? Since the NPP is largely seen as being dominated by the Ashantis, while the NDC is largely seen as being dominated by the Ewes, the results could be merely masking tribal tensions between these two groups. While the effect is strongest between Ashanti-Ewe dyads, the results are by no means driven by these dyads (results in dissertation).

In order to be very confident in the causal claims made in the empirical analysis, we can check that other variables did not confound the effect of the treatment dyads or the election on price. To rule out dyad confounders due to finite sampling, I checked for imbalance across dyads on covariates such as weather, taxi quality, age of rider, and time of day. Both univariate distributions and joint distributions are well balanced.\textsuperscript{114} I employ Coarsened Exact Matching on these same covariates to attempt to improve balance nonetheless. After pruning off unmatched cases (i.e. cases which have no proper counterfactual), I find very little difference in results. Further still, I can also leverage

\textsuperscript{114}I used Iacus, King and Porro (2009)’s coarsened exact matching package.
the within-subjects design of the experiment to conduct a very strict robustness check. In other words, I can restrict the observations to only consider cases in which the same person appears in all treatment dyads to make sure that due to finite sampling some individuals are only showing up into coethnic copartisan dyads, others in non-coethnic copartisan dyads, and yet others in non-coethnic non-copartisan dyads. Although the number of observations are cut down, the general results still hold (results in dissertation). Further, I run generalized least squares random effects models (RE) with standard errors clustered for the subject. An advantage of the RE model over matching is being able to evaluate the effect of yet other determinants of price. Although not of principal interest in this study, I find that rain significantly raised the price of the taxifare, but rider’s age and taxi quality does not seem to have a meaningful effect on price. I also control for the ride number because the subjects could become better at bargaining over time. Ride number was not a substantively significant determinant of taxifare. However, heavy traffic increases over the afternoon as well, so these effects may have cancelled each other out.

Lastly, I can check whether the July 2008 versus the December 2009 “not election” waves are, in turn, driving results. As it appears, besides controlling for round effects (of which the third round sees an overall general price increase due to inflation), there is no difference between the pre and post election round that should alter our interpretation of the election’s effect on mean price of the treatment dyads.

5.2 Resource Sharing Results

Similar results are found for resource sharing. Figure 5.2 shows the mean amount of pesewas (cents) shared with a partner who is either coethnic copartisan, coethnic non-copartisan, non-coethnic copartisan, and non-coethnic non-copartisan. The amounts are adjusted for inflation to be in July 2008 Ghana cedis. The raw data gives a telling picture. More is shared with coethnics than non-coethnics consistently. At election time, more is shared with non-coethnics who are copartisan than with those who are non-copartisan. However, absent the election, there is no differentiation between non-coethnics based on partisanship. Thus, the election seems to have an effect only on treatment of non-coethnics. The difference between coethnics who are copartisan is almost identical to coethnics who are non-copartisan. Coethnicity trumps partisanship in the decision to share resources.

Are these differences significant? Turning to Figure 5, in the left panel are the means in the

---

In these models, subject-specific observable and unobservable characteristics (e.g. attractiveness, bargaining ability) are controlled for in the event that they somehow (despite random assignment) confounded the result. For example, if the good bargainers happened by coincidence to get matched into coethnic dyads a lot, falsely making it seem like coethnics get lower prices. While many use fixed effects (FE) models to control for unmeasured subject-specific effects in panel data, RE produces more efficient estimates given that unmeasured subject-specific effects are orthogonal to the independent variables due to successful random assignment to treatment. Indeed, I failed to reject the null hypothesis that individual-specific effects are uncorrelated with the independent variables by using a Hausman test. Results are nonetheless robust to using OLS and FE models.
various treatment groups at election time, while in the right panel are the means in the various treatment groups of the pooled data from the two waves of data collection at low electoral competition levels. The first observation is that the standard deviations of the means are quite large - there is a large dispersion of the amount shared around these means that is unexplained by the treatments. Also, the number of observations is quite low for coethnic non-copartisans, so we cannot conclude much from that category. Further results in dissertation.

Figure 7: Average Price by Partisan and Ethnic Dyads at Election time and not at Election time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Coethnic</th>
<th>Non-Coethnic</th>
<th>Difference in Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(23.5)</td>
<td>(26.5)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 90</td>
<td>N = 203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(25.9)</td>
<td>(24.9)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-C</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Election</th>
<th>Coethnic</th>
<th>Non-Coethnic</th>
<th>Difference in Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>(21.5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.3 Robustness of the Election Effect

Next, there are two topics of concern related to the causal validity of the claim that the election caused interpartisan discrimination. As is the case in much work in political science, this aspect of the study has a “low t, large n” problem, meaning there are many observations at each time point, but not enough time points to conduct time series analysis. Further, even though the election was exogenously timed through fixed (and de facto respected) timing of elections, there may be an omitted variable which is occurring coincidentally with the election. By conducting the postelection round of experiments one year after the election and finding similar results as the first round of experiments 6 months prior to the election, it reduces any omitted variables which simply acts to increase or decrease interpartisan or interethnic discrimination monotonically over time.
Additionally, any seasonal effects would be controlled for through comparison of the December 2008 (election) and December 2009 (no election) waves.

It is difficult to think of an omitted variable that exacerbates interpartisan discrimination only at election time, yet is not the election. There is no way to empirically verify omitted variable bias in non-experimental research. Nonetheless, in a further effort to identify any confounding variables, I asked survey respondents whether they noticed any change in economic conditions over the last [6 or 12] months and if yes, what the cause was. Second, I asked them whether they noticed that the amount talk about tribe in the media had changed over the last [6 or 12] months and if yes, what the cause was. Further, I considered measurable observable macro variables that may account for the results such as: rapid price changes, laws passed favoring some ethnic groups, unemployment shocks, incidents of ethnic or partisan conflict unrelated to the election, and changes in the price of fuel or other costs to taxi driving. From monitoring the news, there is no evidence of unemployment shocks, laws passed favoring some ethnic groups, or non-election related incidents of violent ethnic or partisan conflict between these tribes. Inflation increased prices monotonically over time, and increased disproportionately more between wave two and three, though this change does not account for the results.

One potential concern for taxifare is that there were changes in the price of fuel over this time period. After collecting time series petrol price data from nearby gas stations, I ruled it out. Perhaps true to the political business cycle, the price per liter was 18 pesewas higher at low levels of electoral competition (both July 2008 and December 2009) versus the election time (December 2008). If this study had found that average prices for all dyads had decreased, then we would be worried that the result was caused by lower fuel prices. Yet average price did not simply decrease for the election (in absolute terms and in July 2008 GH cedis).

6 Why Citizens are in Conflict When Elites are Competing over Power

I corroborate field interviews with the experimental and survey results to build the following two party theory as to why citizens discriminate against one another on partisan lines at election time.
time, while coethnic favoritism is stable in the face of electoral competition. First, I argue that shared group increases trust in “contract” fulfillment due to more effective punishment mechanisms, leading sellers to receive gains from trade at lower prices from ingroup buyers and individuals to receive higher gains from sharing. Thus, ingroup/outgroup discrimination emerges. The mechanism may be itself at work or responsible for the rise of a norm of ingroup/outgroup discrimination as a commonly recognized and useful strategy. Second, I argue that public partisanship buying forges a partisan ingroup and outgroup at election time, resulting in copartisan/non-copartisan discrimination. However, political competition does not alter the value of (un)shared ethnicity, because it does not alter either the efficacy of actual punishment mechanisms or the norm of coethnic/non-coethnic discrimination.

6.1 Trust, Contracts, and Shared Group where Impunity is High

In sub-Saharan Africa, the risk of agreement or contract “breach” in a reciprocal exchange, either through external shock or dishonest opportunism, is high. Borrowing from Fafchamps (2004) model, one can view reciprocal exchange such as market exchange or resource sharing as imperfect contract enforcement problems. I adapt this model to explain why (un)shared group membership leads to discrimination on group lines on the example of market exchange (formally stated in Appendix A).

Suppose that two individuals are agreeing on an exchange, whereby the seller first renders the good or service and the buyer thereafter renders payment. The seller faces a risk that the buyer will not come through on her end of the agreement. The reason may be opportunism, but it also may be due to any number of unanticipated external shocks that befall the buyer, which make it costly to pay the seller. The buyer - whether unscrupulous or the victim of bad luck - calculates whether it is optimal to incur the cost of paying the seller, or breach the contract and face any punishments.

116Transportation is unreliable, electricity is unreliable, mother nature yields unpredictable yields of crop, people and their family members are often ill, etc. Information is extremely limited and costly to obtain about a trading partner’s ability or willingness to comply with an exchange. Information technology is limited, businesses are not registered and individuals do not have (reliable) identification, a common language may be spoken only on a limited basis, the media limited or untrusted, and products are not standardized or regulated and thus quality suspect and variable. The state does not provide a legal system available for neutral and speedy dispute arbitration. Even if the state could provide legal arbitration and individuals were findable, they do not have valuable assets to seize for retribution. Citizens are also hovering around the survival line - daily income is uncertain and liquidity very limited and have very little access to private insurance against adverse life shocks. While some exchange can be conducted through trusted networks or relatively simultaneously, many goods, especially services are not. See Fafchamps (2004), Kandori (1992), Greif (1993, 1989).

117Note that rather than trade credit, one could generalize and call the seller the creditor and call the buyer the debtor and include situations involving pure credit or advance payment.

118This distinction is important because not all contract defectors are in fact unscrupulous as painted in most models; negative shocks are simply so frequent that regular individuals may face any number of difficulties or additional costs in following through.
Given the seller knows the dilemma of the buyer - a comparison of payment versus punishment cost, under what conditions will she agree to render the good or service? The seller must form beliefs about the probability of receiving payment from the buyer. I call this belief trust. The seller will use all the information available to her - prior knowledge of personal interaction with the buyer, the buyer’s reputation, the likelihood of various external negative shocks to the buyer, the distribution of unscrupulous versus scrupulous types in the world, and any other quickly available information which affects the seller’s belief about the probability of compliance with the contract. A seller agrees to the contract only if the expected value (the probability of payment times the payment itself plus the probability of breach times zero) of the buyer’s payment will allow her to profit from the trade of her good. For identical expected value of payment, untrustworthy buyers will have to pay more than trustworthy buyers, “making up” for the fact that they are less likely to pay. In other words, untrustworthy buyers must pay a risk premium.\textsuperscript{119} Note that the buyer agrees to the contract if and only if the benefit from compliance is greater than the expected cost of complying when compliance occurs plus the expected cost of punishment when compliance does not occur.\textsuperscript{120}

The case of resource sharing is based on similar logic. Individuals are willing to share resources with others who are trusted to share back and get a higher payoff from sharing with someone from whom they can expect reciprocity. The difference is that resource sharing is not based on explicit terms, and sharing is often expected only at an unspecified time for unspecified value and even diffusely within the group or even intergenerationally rather than a two-way exchange.\textsuperscript{121}

If shared group increases the availability and effectiveness of punishment mechanisms and shared group markers are cheaply available information and hard to mimic,\textsuperscript{122} then the probability of contract compliance is higher ceteris paribus for ingroup members in stranger meetups. It then follows that sellers experience gains from trade at lower agreed prices ceteris paribus when group membership is shared. Similarly, it also follows that sharing more resources “pays off” more with an ingroup member because he or she is likelier to reciprocate, incentivizing sharing more with ingroup members and less with outgroup members ceteris paribus. In this account, properties of (un)shared group membership and expectations about the actions of others leads to discrimination on group lines, not underlying differences in preferences for or against the welfare of ingroup or

\textsuperscript{119}The expected value of an agreement of 13 cedi with a trustworthy buyer is very close to 13 cedi (1*13 cedi + 0*0 cedi), while the expected value for an untrustworthy buyer, say 20 percent likely to breach, is 10.4 cedi (.8*13 cedi + .2* 0 cedi). In order for the expected value of an agreement to equal 13 cedi, the agreement with the untrustworthy buyer must be made for 16.25 cedi (.8*16.25 cedi + .2*0 cedi).

\textsuperscript{120}For exchange to occur in this context, enforcement must be strong enough to deter opportunistic breach but not so strong to scare off all potential buyers.

\textsuperscript{121}That is belief and practice that, for example, A shares with B, B shares with C, and C shares with A. See Ferrara (2003)’s model.

\textsuperscript{122}It must be hard to mimic so that the group membership signal is credible. Gambetta and Hamill (2005) describes how in his case individuals often try to mimic or “pass” for members of groups that they are actually not in.
outgroup members.

To substantiate this abstract theory, what kind of concrete punishment mechanisms are used in this context, and how does group membership increase the availability and effectiveness of them? To very briefly summarize my findings from interviews, the following classes of punishment mechanism to enforce contracts are relied upon to varying degrees: (1) loss of expected discounted value of future market transactions and social interactions with the seller or other individuals mutually known, (2) second or third party coercion from human and supernatural (religious, witchcraft, ancestor) forces, and (3) internal psychological punishment such as guilt, regret, or obligation. These findings echo the work of Fafchamps (2004), Greif (1993), and Ensminger (1992) to varying degrees. My findings differ mainly in that I find a much larger emphasis on supernatural punishment forces and internal psychological punishment.

The major factors increasing the effectiveness of punishment mechanisms in this context are: (a) denser networks that enhance findability, (b) a shared ancestry or traditional practices of witchcraft, and (c) group leadership which increases access both to third party arbitrators and psychological appeals or propaganda. Enhanced findability in the group through increased density of the network, for example, increases the availability and effectiveness of punishment through coercion and reputation, which affects future market transactions and social interactions. Group leadership provides an arbitrator to settle disputes and enforce sanctions with other ingroup members, where no (fair) arbitrator may exist for disputes with outgroup members. Group leadership may also make group appeals or propaganda to trigger internal psychological punishment such as guilt, fear, or obligation. Lastly, shared ancestry or traditional beliefs increases internal psychological punishment and enforcement from supernatural forces. Individuals are more likely to feel guilty for violating a behavioral code (e.g. cooperating) if they share the behavioral code with their interaction partner, than if the partner is unaware of the code. Supernatural forces such as ancestors or deities are omniscient and sometimes willing to punish for “bad behavior” or behav-

123 While works such as Greif (1993) and Ensminger (1992) which discuss trade in the context of religious groups, they emphasize the human coercive or reputational aspect facilitated by jointly shared religion rather than the supernatural element. A second key finding is that the more diffuse and impersonal the relationship with the trading partner, the more feelings of internal psychological punishment and supernatural omniscient forces are mentioned as reasons why contracts are fulfilled. On the flip side, the more heavily networked individuals are, the more likely they are to mention loss of future interaction or second or third party coercion. In the case of a friend or a neighbor, for example, individuals invoke 2nd or 3rd party punishment very often.

124 See Habyarimana et al. (2007), Leider et al. (2007), Besley, Coate and Loury (1993), Miguel and Gugerty (2005), Ferrara (2003). Enhanced communication technology is also said to decreases the cost of information transmission, which would enhance findability holding density of networks constant. See Ghosh and Ray (1996). However, networks and enhanced communication technology (common language or proverbs) are often tightly correlated in practice.


126 Fearon and Laitin (1996) provide an account of various group-level punishment strategies, possibly coordinated by group leadership, to either cooperate or defect with ingroup/outgroup members at the individual level.
ioral code violation even if not called upon to do so by another person. The supernatural forces are sometimes believed not to punish the particular defector, but curse the defector’s family or property. They are based on traditional beliefs (called witchcraft or juju), organized religious beliefs, and both interwoven together. Note that each group may have a different subset of properties, but only one of these properties may be sufficient to induce ingroup/outgroup discrimination.

One may contend, however, the norm of ingroup/outgroup discrimination features globally in social science laboratories, even when actual availability and effectiveness of punishment mechanisms are not apparent and groups are minimally induced and carry neither networks, reputation or play history, arbitrators, or supernatural forces. I argue that people learn at a young age, typically through parental priors updated by increasing interactions with others, the norm that people discriminate based on group lines, and perhaps even explicitly that the norm is based on trust differentials (as suggested in the model). Even when faced with an ingroup versus outgroup stranger from newly created groups, individuals apply ingroup/outgroup discrimination strategies, believing that most other people have been exposed to this norm and will behave according to the belief that everyone is operating by this norm.\textsuperscript{127} In this way, what might be rooted originally in the mechanisms described here, may become an expected norm. Ingroup/outgroup discrimination is an individual “best response” in a world in which everyone believes this behavior is taken by others.\textsuperscript{128} Thus, as long as group membership is recognized, even without the specific properties that facilitate availability and effectiveness of punishment, ingroup/outgroup discrimination may ensue.\textsuperscript{129}

6.2 Electoral Competition Forging Groups on Partisan Affiliation

The dominant party-voter courtship strategy in the urban environment can be characterized by a particular form of political clientelism called public partisanship buying, which forges elite-citizen partisan ingroups that compete against elite-citizen partisan outgroups over control of state resources. I argue that forging such an ingroup/outgroup structure around electoral competition induces copartisan/non-copartisan discrimination between citizens via the trust mechanism described in the preceding section.

Public partisanship buying is the exchange of a citizen’s publicly displayed party support in return for small private benefits at election time and favorable private access to (state) resources and services should her party win. To display public party support, citizens may participate in local

\textsuperscript{127} Yamagishi and Kiyonari (2000), Leider et al. (2007)

\textsuperscript{128} As Habyarimana et al. (2007) put it regarding ethnic groups, it can be difficult to disentangle whether it is the actual technology group members share to punish, or best response to common knowledge that the norm is practiced that ingroup members will cooperate while outgroup members will defect. The outcomes are observationally equivalent to these two mechanisms.

\textsuperscript{129} Bowles and Gintis (2004, 65) theorizes that such an ingroup/outgroup discrimination strategy norm may be evolutionarily successful, that is, groups and individuals who use it will persist and bequeath the norm while groups who fail to use it will die out.
party meetings or gatherings, attend rallies, fly flags or hang posters on their home, wear regalia such as shirts, hats, umbrellas or hair weavings, and/or pronounce partisanship in discussions with neighbors. Often times party regalia or in-kind goods displaying the party logo are given for the purpose of allowing the citizen to display adherence to the party.\footnote{Some authors describe these handouts as the state resources exchanged in return for votes, which they call “vote-buying.” However, in my interviews I find that there is no quid pro quo relationship for these types of items in exchange for political support. Voters expect to “harvest” personal handouts from parties and candidates just like people expect their to be drinks and food at a party. Rather than an exchange of these items for party support, these items enable the credible signaling of party support.} Citizens believe that the more they show party loyalty in these very public ways, the more likely they will be able to access favorable services and goods if their party obtains power.

Local party agents rely on the incentive compatibility of showing public support for a party and voting for that party on the polling day.\footnote{Citizens have the incentive to vote for the party to which they display public support because they believe they will not get anything from the other party if the other party wins. While actual vote choice may not be monitorable, turnout is public and observable. This belief is reasonable since each of the major parties had one party activist next to neutral election observers to monitor the electoral process at each polling station across the country. This method of clientelism circumvents the increasing integrity of elections and the secret ballot that have steadily increased in Ghana. The exception to this is a rising class of very savvy and well-educated students, who extract as much as possible from both major parties at election time. It remains to be seen whether the students are able to trick the parties into thinking they are loyal supporters because of their mobility, or if parties know the students extract from both parties but the parties keep giving them private transfers in a bidding war to recruit them into the upper echelons of the party.} They use the citizens’ publicly displayed support to monitor who is a loyal partisan in order to determine which citizens will be prioritized for “compensation” if the party wins. Both parties are incredibly institutionalized and have agents down to the very local level.\footnote{Because these agents are eligible to vote in the party primaries (see Ichino (2011), Ichino and Nathan (2011)) and are responsible for mobilizing and monitoring citizens, they stand in the middle of the hierarchy between candidates and voters. \textit{Lindberg} (2010) notes that members of parliament report the fiercest clientelistic demands from such party agents for mobilizing the votes for them to win.} Examples of the types of goods and services citizens expect to receive are money for payment of school expenses, medical bills, business start-up, housing emergencies, funerals and weddings, or other emergency situations.\footnote{Since members of parliament don’t have offices, you can observe these transactions simply by walking into the atrium of the parliament.} They also believe they will gain assistance in dispute resolution and if they have any problems with the law. Very loyal partisans believe they will gain access to jobs (e.g. in the police or army).\footnote{\textit{Lindberg} (2010) also finds that citizens seek jobs in immigration and the fire service. Note further that, in contrast to rural areas in which chiefs broker votes for local club goods, urban citizens are “on their own” to extract benefits and must vociferously demand them. Urban citizens believe it would be advantageous for their neighborhood or polling station to vote as a block in order to get local club goods like street lights or better public latrines, but the leadership or coordination lacks.} This account of party-voter courtship from the perspective of citizens matches up with the findings from \textit{Lindberg} (2010)’s unique survey of parliamentarians with evidence from the citizen perspective. His account stresses that, not only do citizens actively demand resources, but increasing electoral competition has led to the rapid expansion of campaign costs, as citizens and party agents demand increasingly more.
At election time, this form of political clientelism constructs what citizens perceive to be a partisan group structure whereby other citizens belong to either their partisan ingroup or outgroup. They note the strengthening of party-voter vertical ties, but also the strengthening of horizontal voter-voter ties through participation in public partisanship. They recognize a hierarchy of group leadership, expecting the party leadership to “take care of me.” They regularly believe their personal financial situation will improve only if their party wins. They hear debates on the radio about the “NDC people” versus the “NPP people.” They maintain a stark belief that they must show partisan group membership to obtain benefits from politicians in the group. However, absent electoral competition, citizens do not often go to party meetings, rallies are not held or regalia distributed, and music replaces the shouting matches of the political talk radio. They are not monitored to show their partisan identification because they have already “held up their end of the bargain.” Thus, the ingroup/outgroup discrimination amongst citizens waxes and wanes on partisan cleavages across levels of electoral competition. On the other hand, ethnic or tribal group membership as an amalgamation and extension of clan retains its group properties regardless of the electoral cycle, including denser networks, closer traditional beliefs and ancestry, and traditional leaders (at least back in rural areas). Thus, coethnic/non-coethnic discrimination remains consistent regardless of electoral competition. Whether the actual group properties provide an increase in the availability or effectiveness of punishment mechanisms in individual-level interactions OR citizens simply recognize the strategy norm of ingroup/outgroupism in either case remains a critical topic for future research.

6.3 Competing Accounts

The most viable competing account for the experimental results combines others-regarding preferences with the possibility that shared group membership or its salience governs such preferences. Others regarding preferences has been theorized in two main forms - positive utility from the welfare of others and inequity aversion between oneself and an interaction partner. Either way, others regarding preferences may only exist from increasing welfare or equity with ingroup members but no or decreasing welfare or equity with outgroup members. Other recent theorists have posited that one receives utility increasing in the status (or relative status) of the group as a whole and therefore can benefit personally by improving the status or welfare of others within one’s group. A different account deals with deriving utility from behavior which is consistent

---

136 See the review article by Penner et al. (2005) and also Tajfel (1974), Tajfel and Turner (1979), Hogg (2003), Abdelal et al. (2009), Deaux (1996), Chen and Li (2009). Further, others such as Eckel and Grossman (2005), Charness, Rigotti and Rustichini (2007), or Mullen, Brown and Smith (1992), have found that increasing the salience of the group increases ingroup/outgroup discrimination, or yet others that stress the salience of the competition such as Bobo (1983), Scheepers et al. (2006), or Sherif et al. (1961) exacerbates ingroup/outgroup discrimination.
with the stereotypes or behavioral code associated with the group identity.\textsuperscript{138} A last possibility is that utility from the process of dealing with an ingroup but not an outgroup member compensates the interaction partners. These theorists may interpret the results as indicating that the election exacerbates ingroup/outgroup discrimination on partisan lines because the election induces other-regarding preferences towards copartisans but not non-copartisans, but did not cause fluctuations in the preferences towards coethnics or non-coethnics. These accounts of social identity salience changing agents’ preferences is fundamentally different than influencing agents’ expectation about ingroup and outgroup members’ behavior.

While these results may be an alternative account for the results of the resource sharing experiment,\textsuperscript{139} they do not explain the market bargaining experiment. First, if individuals have such other regarding preferences for ingroup members, why does only the seller have other regarding preferences for the buyer, but not vice versa? Why doesn’t, for example, the buyer pay more to an ingroup seller than an outgroup seller? Theories of other regarding preference can not explain this asymmetry. However, supposing there was a good explanation for why sellers have other regarding preferences for buyers but buyers not for sellers. We would then expect to see drivers systematically offering lower prices to ingroup buyers. I regressed seller’s first offer on treatment groups in various model specifications (results in the full dissertation). (Un)shared group was not significant in determining the seller’s first offer. (Un)shared group does determine the first offers of the buyers. Thus, differences in average price paid are a result of buyer’s ability to negotiate the price down, not an automatic favor on behalf of the driver. These results are consistent with the theory posited in this paper, that sellers receive gains from trade at lower prices for ingroup buyers.

6.4 Theoretical Conclusions and Prescriptions

Ake laments that, “Africa is seen to be ridden with ethnic conflict” and “ethnic conflicts are actually the false face of something else” (2010: p. 7). This paper digs deep into one African country to discover such a masquerade in the context of election-induced cleavages of conflict between ordinary citizens. While coethnic favoritism is relatively consistent, the election exacerbated discrimination on partisan lines. The results from two experiments coupled with qualitative interviews provide evidence as to why. First, the difficulty in enforcing agreements of reciprocal exchange leads to ingroup/outgroup discrimination generally, because ingroup members can be trusted to fulfill contracts with a higher likelihood in the face of more and better punishment mechanisms for breach. Second, while the value of coethnicity versus non-coethnicity does not change with regard to electoral competition, a form of clientelism - public partisanship buying - is responsible for forging an ingroup/outgroup cleavage on partisan lines at election time, yielding copartisan/non-copartisan discrimination.


\textsuperscript{139}The mechanism responsible for these two phenomena may be the same or different.
The theory, if true, has very different prescriptions for reducing election time conflict than previous accounts that call such conflict “ethnic conflict.” Ethnic conflict accounts promote either nation-building, ethnic identity reduction strategies or the use of ethnic power-sharing agreements or otherwise institutionalizing ethnic representation in government. These prescriptions, while useful to achieve other goals perhaps, will not address the issue of citizen conflict at election time if such conflict is not based on ethnicity. Instead, we should undertake efforts to reduce the root causes of general ingroup/outgroup discrimination or to reduce the root causes of ingroup/outgroup structure on partisan cleavages at election time. For example, creating cheaply available small claims courts or issuing credible or verifiable identity cards, albeit difficult tasks, would reduce the impunity of contract defectors and reduce the utility of ingroup mechanisms to enforce punishments. If election time ingroup/outgroup discrimination is the target, efforts to reduce (the belief in) loyal partisan group membership as a criterion for access to state resources may reduce the reinforcing nature of clientelism and the strengthening of the partisan ingroup. Just as citizens in less clientelistic regimes believe they will get their social security check regardless of their partisan affiliation, so to should Ghanaian citizens have access to state goods and services without having to (a) be in the same elite-citizen partisan ingroup as their representative, and (b) credibly demonstrate this group membership. In other words, the clientelism that reinforces partisanship as a group membership must be reduced. While this is no easy task either, new evidence shows that when citizens in low income countries actually have performance and qualification information (e.g. on the job effort towards the constituency as a whole) for candidates, they utilize it in vote choice. Increasing the information environment on performance and thus performance-based voting may then trigger political accountability through performance to the constituency rather than through clientelism.

Future research includes two main directions. First, it is necessary to test the components of the theory built here, in particular, establishing whether (belief in) increases in the probability of defection exist via change in punishment technology, or whether citizens recognize ingroup/outgroup cleavages and believe society members are acting according to the ingroup/outgroup discrimination norm. Second, electoral competition and the nature of partisanship vary across the region. There is much to be done to test whether the argument put forth in this paper holds in yet other settings, and if not, to isolate why. Is the Ghanaian case, with its institutionalized and competitive parties, exceptional? Would we find the same outcome where the party system is more fluid, or alternatively, non-competitive? Would we find the same outcome even in an established democracy with lower levels of clientelism? These are all empirical questions which can help us learn why and on what basis citizens are in conflict at election time when it is the elites who are competing over power.

140 See the reviews of Pande (2011) and Moehler (2010).
A Appendix for Market Exchange Model

A seller and a buyer bargain and agree to the terms of exchange, after which the seller chooses whether to give the buyer $k$, and the buyer subsequently chooses whether to give the seller $f$.\footnote{Note that rather than trade credit ($k$ good or service, $f$ money) one could generalize and call the seller the creditor and call the buyer the debtor and include situations involving pure credit ($k$ and $f$ money) or advance payment ($k$ money, $f$ good or service).} Assume that the seller and buyer value $k$ and $f$ differently such that there are gains from trade. Define $\Pi_i(k)$ and $\Pi_i(f)$ as the value of $k$ and $f$ to an agent $i \in S, B$ and $\Pi_S(k) < \Pi_S(f)$ while $\Pi_B(k) > \Pi_B(f)$. To understand under what conditions the seller gives the buyer $k$, the seller anticipates the likelihood that the buyer will pay the seller $f$. Thus, the set of subgame perfect equilibria can be derived by using backward induction.

In the last stage, the buyer considers whether it is optimal to incur the cost of paying the seller $f$ or breach the contract and face the punishments. The cost of complying with the contract will depend on the buyer’s type and unanticipated shocks, examples of which were discussed above. Let $\tau \in \triangle$ denote a vector of the buyer’s characteristics, which represents those characteristic of the buyer relevant to the contracting situation.\footnote{For example, $\tau$ could include the following components: (1) technology/endowments, indicating the type/quality of goods and services the buyer is able to provide and willing to accept, (2) preferences and payoffs, indicating the person’s motivations for conducting business (bonafide, side deal, fly by night), (3) morality, or propensity for self-punishment, and (4) ability to dissimulate.} For simplicity, we can consider the single variable $\tau$ as capturing the degree to which the buyer has an aptitude to pay versus breach. The buyer knows her $\tau$, whereas the distribution of types $\triangle$ is common knowledge. Let $\epsilon \in \Sigma$ denote the (exogenous) state of nature, that is, what type of unforeseen negative or positive shocks. For example, a low $\epsilon$ may result from roads being flooded or cash flow problems. The distribution of shocks $\Sigma$ is common knowledge, and in some cases $\epsilon$ may be observable to the buyer or both the buyer and the seller ex post.

Define $\pi(f, \tau, \epsilon)$ as the cost to the buyer of delivering $f$, which is decreasing in $\epsilon$ (it is easier to comply in good states), regardless of type $\tau$. How severely shocks affect the buyer’s ability to fulfill the contract depends on their type. In the case of breach, the buyer incurs costly extrajudicial punishments $P(D, \tau, \epsilon)$. $D$ is the “deal”, the form of the contract such as provisions for formal guarantees, or whether contractual obligations were put down in writing to ease the burden of proof, or if payment must be made upon delivery (“cash and carry”), etc. For all punishments, the cost of punishment is non-decreasing in $\epsilon$, meaning that the buyer has more to lose in good states of the world than bad.\footnote{Breach in a good state of the world indicates that the breach was due to the buyer’s own incompetence or dishonesty more so that unanticipated shocks, and punishment can be ascertained accordingly.} Thus, the buyer fulfills the contract if the cost of complying is smaller than penalty of breach.\footnote{Partial payment is ignored for notational simplicity.}
\( \pi(f, \tau, \epsilon) \leq P(D, \tau, \epsilon) \). Define the function \( h(\tau) \) as the level of shock \( \epsilon \) at which a buyer of type \( \tau \) is indifferent between compliance and breach. Thus, we say that the buyer is indifferent when \( h(\tau) = \epsilon^* \) s.t.:

\[
\pi(f, \tau, \epsilon^*) = P(D, \tau, \epsilon^*) \tag{1}
\]

For any shock \( \epsilon \) above \( h(\tau) \), the debtor pays, and for any shock below \( h(\tau) \), no payment is made. Let the support of \( \tau \) and \( \epsilon \) be \( [\tau, \overline{\tau}] \) and \( [\underline{\epsilon}, \overline{\epsilon}] \) respectively.

Next, given that the seller knows the problem of the buyer, let us consider under what conditions the seller agrees to deliver \( k \). The seller must form beliefs about the probability of receiving \( f \), that is, the probability that \( \pi(f, \tau, \epsilon) \leq P(D, \tau, \epsilon) \) is satisfied. The seller will use all the information available to her, denoted \( \Omega \), which includes \( \Delta, \Sigma \), immediately available information about \( \tau \), prior knowledge of the particular buyer’s type \( \tau \) from former interactions, prior knowledge of other buyers that are similar to the buyer from former interactions, and information conveyed by others about the particular buyer (reputation). Designate \( F(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega) \) as the joint cumulative distribution over \( \tau \) and \( \epsilon \) capturing the sellers beliefs given \( \Omega \). It is not sufficient for there to exist gains from trade \( \Pi_S(k) < \Pi_S(f) \), but a seller agrees to the contract if and only if the expected value of the payment is more than the valuation of \( k \):

\[
\Pi_S(k) \leq E(\Pi_S(f)|\Omega) = \Pi_S(f)Pr(payment) = \Pi_S(f) \int_{\underline{\tau}}^{\overline{\tau}} \int_{h(\tau)}^{\overline{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega) \tag{2}
\]

Since the seller does not know whether the state of nature will be bad or good and the seller does not know \( \tau \), the probability of being paid must be computed over all types in all circumstances.\(^{145}\) The seller may be able to affect the probability of repayment by affecting the \( D \), the terms of the contract, but at a cost since the state does not provide it. There are many types of contracts \( D_N \), which may each come at a non-negative cost \( B_N \). The seller would then choose a form of the contract such that the value of the transaction net of transaction cost is maximized \( E(\Pi_S(f)|\Omega) - \Pi_S(k) - B_N \).

Assuming there was a quick, cheaply obtained heuristic that sellers and buyers could use in the market to know more about \( \Omega \) - whether punishment strategies would be more relatively more effective, such that \( P_C(D, \tau, \epsilon) \geq P_N(D, \tau, \epsilon) \). I will argue later that sharing group membership (‘Co’members versus ‘Non-comembers’) increases the effectiveness of punishment strategies, and if the shared group membership is cheaply obtained information, it can be factored into small-scaled market price bargaining. Recalling the conditions under which the buyer is indifferent to fulfilling or breaching the contract from Equation 1, define the functions for buyer indifference \( h_C(\tau) = \epsilon^* \) and \( h_N(\tau) = \epsilon^* \) for the ingroup and the outgroup buyer respectively. Above these functions, the contract is fulfilled and below which breached. Because punishment is costlier for ingroup members,

\(^{145}\)If the seller knew the buyer’s type \( \tau' \), than she would only have to compute the probability of being paid as the probability that the state of nature \( \epsilon \) is greater than \( h(\tau') \) to have \( \int_{h(\tau')}^{\overline{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega) \).
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the indifference function for type $\tau$ is “lower” for the ingroup: $h_C(\tau) \leq h_N(\tau)$. In other words, for a given $\tau$, the external shock must be worse for breach to occur with ingroup members because the cost of punishment in the case of breach is higher. From the seller’s perspective, the expected value of payment given $f$ from a ingroup buyer is higher than $f$ from an outgroup buyer ceteris paribus because probability of payment is higher. To see why, consider that the cumulative distribution of the shock $\epsilon$ under which payment is made - $[h_C(\tau), \bar{\epsilon}]$ is larger than $[h_N(\tau), \bar{\epsilon}]$, regardless of the probability distribution.

\[ \Pi_S(f) \int_{\bar{\epsilon}}^{\bar{\epsilon}} \int_{h_C(\tau)}^{\bar{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega_C) \geq \Pi_S(f) \int_{\bar{\epsilon}}^{\bar{\epsilon}} \int_{h_N(\tau)}^{\bar{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega_N) \] (3)

Recall that the seller only agrees to the exchange if she earns gains from trade. She is indifferent where $\Pi_S(k) = \Pi_S(f) \int_{\bar{\epsilon}}^{\bar{\epsilon}} \int_{h_C(\tau)}^{\bar{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega_C)$ and $\Pi_S(k) = \Pi_S(f) \int_{\bar{\epsilon}}^{\bar{\epsilon}} \int_{h_N(\tau)}^{\bar{\epsilon}} dF(\tau, \epsilon|\Omega_N)$. Holding $\Pi_S(k)$ and all other terms constant and solving for $f$ yields $f^*_C$ and $f^*_N$ respectively, whereby:

\[ f^*_C \leq f^*_N \] (4)

The consequences from having a higher probability of payment from ingroup members means that sellers will ultimately accept lower payment from ingroup buyers than outgroup buyers, given there are gains from trade.

Note that the buyer will engage the seller in a contract if she expects to derive a benefit. She also knows her type $\tau'$. Thus, suppose that $\pi(k, \tau')$ is the value of receiving $k$ for the buyer. The buyer agrees if and only if the benefit from compliance is greater than the expected cost of complying when compliance occurs plus the expected cost of punishment when compliance does not occur:

\[ \pi(k, \tau') \geq \int_{h(\tau')}^{\bar{\epsilon}} \pi(f, \tau')dF(\epsilon|\tau') + \int_{\bar{\epsilon}}^{h(\tau')} P(D, \tau', \epsilon)dF(\epsilon|\tau') \]

Thus, if enforcement is too lenient, say in the extreme it is zero $h(\tau) = \bar{\epsilon}$, the seller expects no payment at all and thus no contract is concluded. If enforcement is very harsh such that $h(\tau) = \infty$, then the expected cost of punishment is larger than the gain from any contract and the buyer refuses to enter a contract unless she is 100% certain to deliver. These cases could occur even though gains from trade exist. The equation shows that enforcement must be strong enough to deter opportunistic breach but not so strong to scare off all potential buyers. The model shows that, holding all other personal traits $\tau$ constant, ingroup buyers will be able to bargain lower prices than outgroup buyers. Naturally, price is still partially based on other characteristics the seller perceives about the buyer, and the buyer’s ability to negotiate a price, but ceteris paribus, ingroup buyers will on average achieve lower prices than outgroup buyers.

\[146\text{Note that this assumes that the joint distribution of } \tau \text{ and } \epsilon \text{ is identical for coethnics and non-coethnics. Non-controversially, the assumption means that good/bad types and exogenous shocks are both orthogonal to ethnicity.}\]
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