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Appendix A: Data Description

Table A.1: Survey Representativeness, Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All public employees</th>
<th>Email Survey Frame</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>At least one conjoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>163585</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93276</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>163585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>21135</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>60167</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>71150</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>65416</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and more</td>
<td>38746</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>256861</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source for “All Employees”: Ministry of Public Administration (MAP), Dominican Republic (2015)
Table A.2: Public Employee Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>All public employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>558</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or less</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Studies</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank in Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction and Supervision</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Appointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1996</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2012</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2012</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of years in public sector</td>
<td>12.8 years</td>
<td>9.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joined Administrative Career</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2012</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2012</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources for “All employees”:
Table A.3: Institutions in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Audit Office</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Public Administration</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Office of Statistics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Directorate for Pensions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Office</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Industry and Commerce</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Politics and Legislation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>558</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Although our sample over-represents the General Audit Office, our findings about merit and tenure are not sensitive to the exclusion of this institution.
### Appendix B: Regression Results

Table B.1: Regression Estimates for Figure 2 (Corruption)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (Fernandez Presidency)</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (Medina Presidency)</td>
<td>0.119***</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>0.104***</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>0.158***</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process of incorporation</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0.154***</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Professional</td>
<td>0.059**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 4844
Respondents: 547

Note: Table reports coefficients (column 3) and standard errors (column 4) clustered by respondent from regression models from Figure 2.
Table B.2: Regression Estimates for Figure 3 (Political Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (Fernandez Presidency)</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (Medina Presidency)</td>
<td>0.129***</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>-0.117***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>-0.081***</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process of Incorporation</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>-0.053*</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Professional</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.040**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports coefficients (column 3) and standard errors (column 4) clustered by respondent from regression models from Figure 3.
Table B.3: Regression Estimates for Figure 4 (Work Motivation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Appointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (Fernandez Presidency)</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (Medina Presidency)</td>
<td>0.102***</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public examination</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Career</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>0.059**</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process of incorporation</td>
<td>0.073**</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0.057*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Professional</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>4896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents</strong></td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports coefficients (column 3) and standard errors (column 4) clustered by respondent from regression models from Figure 4.
Appendix C: Robustness Checks

Figure 1: Ideological Proximity to incumbent President Medina

On the following, scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is left and 10 is right
I. Where would you place yourself ideologically?
II. Where would you place President Medina ideologically?

Note: Figure includes respondents who answered at least one conjoint experiment.
Figure 2.a: Political Services, by Ideological Alignment of Respondent

Figure 2.b: Corruption, by Ideological Alignment of Respondent
Figure 2.c: Work Motivation, by Ideological Alignment of Respondent

Recruitment Modality:
- Appointment
- Examination

Tenure Protection:
- No
- In Process of Incorporation
- Yes

Position:
- Administrative Support
- Technical-Professional

Education Level:
- High School
- University Degree

Year of Appointment:
- 2002 (Mejía Presidency)
- 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
- 2013 (Medina Presidency)

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Can Be Convinced to Work Extra Hours To Finish Work

Same Ideological Self Placement as President Medina = No

Same Ideological Self Placement as President Medina = Yes
**Figure 3: Perception of Job Stability Associated with Administrative Career**

For each of the following statements, please indicate if you: strongly agree (1), somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree (5):

I. All public servants are protected from arbitrary dismissals
II. Administrative career servants are protected from arbitrary dismissals

Note: Figure includes respondents who answered at least one conjoint experiment.
Figure 3.a: Political Services, by Perception of Job Stability of Career Servants

Figure 3.b: Corruption, by Perception of Job Stability of Career Servants
Figure 3.c: Work Motivation, by Perception of Job Stability of Career Servants

Figure 4.a: Political Services, Respondents Recruited by Governing vs. Opposition Party Presidents
Figure 4.b: Corruption, Respondents Recruited by Governing vs. Opposition Party Presidents

Recruitment Modality:
- Appointment
- Examination

Tenure Protection:
- No
- In Process of Incorporation
- Yes

Position:
- Administrative Support
- Technical-Professional

Education Level:
- High School
- University Degree

Year of Appointment:
- 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
- 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
- 2013 (Medina Presidency)

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Would Trust to Manage Project Funds Transparently

Figure 4.c: Work Motivation, Respondents Recruited by Governing vs. Opposition Party Presidents

Recruitment Modality:
- Appointment
- Examination

Tenure Protection:
- No
- In Process of Incorporation
- Yes

Position:
- Administrative Support
- Technical-Professional

Education Level:
- High School
- University Degree

Year of Appointment:
- 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
- 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
- 2013 (Medina Presidency)

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Can Be Convinced to Work Extra Hours To Finish Work
Figure 5.a: Political Services, by Gender

- Recruitment Modality: Appointment, Examination
- Tenure Protection: No, In Process of Incorporation, Yes
- Position: Administrative Support, Technical-Professional
- Education Level: High School, University Degree
- Gender: Male, Female

Easier to Convince to Attend an Electoral Campaign Event

Figure 5.b: Corruption, by Gender

- Recruitment Modality: Appointment, Examination
- Tenure Protection: No, In Process of Incorporation, Yes
- Position: Administrative Support, Technical-Professional
- Education Level: High School, University Degree
- Gender: Male, Female

Would Trust to Manage Project Funds Transparently
Figure 5.c: Work Motivation, by Gender

Figure 6.a: Corruption, by Rank in Hierarchy
(Q4=1: administrative assistant; Q4=2: technical-professional; Q4=3: managerial)
Figure 6.b: Political Services, by Rank in Hierarchy
(Q4=1: administrative assistant; Q4=2: technical-professional; Q4=3: managerial)

Figure 6.c: Work Motivation, by Rank in Hierarchy
(Q4=1: administrative assistant; Q4=2: technical-professional; Q4=3: managerial)
Figure 7.a: Political Services, by Seniority

Position:
- Administrative Support
- Technical-Professional

Education Level:
- High School
- University Degree

Tenure Protection:
- No
- In Process of Incorporation
- Yes

Year of Appointment:
- 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
- 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
- 2013 (Medina Presidency)

Recruitment Modality:
- Appointment
- Examination

Gender:
- Male
- Female

Figure 7.b: Work Motivation, by Seniority

Position:
- Administrative Support
- Technical-Professional

Education Level:
- High School
- University Degree

Tenure Protection:
- No
- In Process of Incorporation
- Yes

Year of Appointment:
- 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
- 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
- 2013 (Medina Presidency)

Recruitment Modality:
- Appointment
- Examination

Gender:
- Male
- Female
Figure 7.c: Corruption, by Seniority

Figure 8.a: Corruption, by Seniority (only PLD recruits)
(0 = a decade or less in the public sector, 1 = more than a decade in the public sector)
Figure 8.b: Political Services, by Seniority (only PLD recruits)
(0 = a decade or less in the public sector, 1 = more than a decade in the public sector)

Figure 8.c: Work Motivation, by Seniority (only PLD recruits)
(0 = a decade or less in the public sector, 1 = more than a decade in the public sector)
Figure 9.a: Political Services, by Education
(Q3=2: high school, Q3=3: university/bachelor, Q3=4: master’s/PhD)

| Position: | Administrative Support | Technical-Professional |
| Education Level: | High School | University Degree |
| Tenure Protection: | No | In Process of Incorporation |
| Year of Appointment: | 2002 (Meja Presidency) | 2005 (Fernandez Presidency) | 2013 (Medina Presidency) |
| Recruitment Modality: | Appointment | Examination |
| Gender: | Male | Female |

Figure 9.b: Corruption, by Education
(Q3=2: high school, Q3=3: university/bachelor, Q3=4: master’s/PhD)

| Position: | Administrative Support | Technical-Professional |
| Education Level: | High School | University Degree |
| Tenure Protection: | No | In Process of Incorporation |
| Year of Appointment: | 2002 (Meja Presidency) | 2005 (Fernandez Presidency) | 2013 (Medina Presidency) |
| Recruitment Modality: | Appointment | Examination |
| Gender: | Male | Female |
Figure 9.c: Work Motivation, by Education
(Q3=2: high school, Q3=3: university/bachelor, Q3=4: master’s/PhD)

Figure 10.a: Corruption, by Age
Figure 10.b Political Services, by Age

- Position:
  - Administrative Support
  - Technical-Professional

- Education Level:
  - High School
  - University Degree

- Tenure Protection:
  - No
  - In Process of Incorporation
  - Yes

- Year of Appointment:
  - 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
  - 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
  - 2013 (Medina Presidency)

- Recruitment Modality:
  - Appointment
  - Examination

- Gender:
  - Male
  - Female

Figure 10.c Work Motivation, by Age

- Position:
  - Administrative Support
  - Technical-Professional

- Education Level:
  - High School
  - University Degree

- Tenure Protection:
  - No
  - In Process of Incorporation
  - Yes

- Year of Appointment:
  - 2002 (Mejia Presidency)
  - 2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
  - 2013 (Medina Presidency)

- Recruitment Modality:
  - Appointment
  - Examination

- Gender:
  - Male
  - Female
Figure 11.a. Corruption, by year of entry into administrative career

Position:
Administrative Support
Technical-Professional

Education Level:
High School
University Degree

Tenure Protection:
No
In Process of Incorporation
Yes

Year of Appointment:
2002 (Mejia Presidency)
2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
2013 (Medina Presidency)

Recruitment Modality:
Appointment
Examination

Gender:
Male
Female

Figure 11.b. Political Services, by year of entry into administrative career

Position:
Administrative Support
Technical-Professional

Education Level:
High School
University Degree

Tenure Protection:
No
In Process of Incorporation
Yes

Year of Appointment:
2002 (Mejia Presidency)
2005 (Fernandez Presidency)
2013 (Medina Presidency)

Recruitment Modality:
Appointment
Examination

Gender:
Male
Female
Figure 11.c Work Motivation, by year of entry into administrative career

Figure 12.a Corruption, by Institution of Respondent