

Online Appendix

Democracy, Interrupted: Regime Change and Partisanship in Twentieth-Century Argentina

Table R1. *Year dummy effects from aggregate regression analyses*

Year	Radicals			Peronists		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
1914		-11.679 (7.230)	-42.243*** (4.140)			
1916	28.917*** (4.017)	12.442** (6.061)	-17.678*** (2.182)			
1918	40.492*** (3.891)	19.799*** (5.932)	-10.359*** (1.727)			
1920	38.058*** (4.148)	13.431** (5.664)	-16.720*** (1.876)			
1922	51.478*** (4.083)	23.879*** (5.654)	-6.631*** (1.846)			
1926	53.902*** (4.239)	19.131*** (5.683)	-11.551*** (1.495)			
1928	64.028*** (4.084)	25.938*** (5.245)	-4.946*** (1.890)			
1930	69.599*** (4.476)	28.067*** (5.105)	-2.896 (2.138)			
1937	34.596*** (3.725)					
1940	43.171*** (3.555)	21.534*** (3.871)				
1946	-6.639* (3.725)		6.733*** (1.500)			
1948 (Mar)	-23.337*** (3.151)	2.836 (3.927)	-10.910*** (0.950)	-5.556*** (0.865)	-7.314*** (0.871)	-3.556*** (0.750)
1948 (Dec)	-16.347*** (3.139)	9.902** (4.114)				
1954						
1957	5.631** (2.264)	5.573*** (1.819)	8.503*** (1.052)	-39.017*** (0.828)	-44.752*** (1.256)	
1958	21.079*** (2.357)	49.370*** (3.385)	35.959*** (0.960)			
1960	0.482 (2.513)	24.254*** (3.145)	9.755*** (1.299)	-31.209*** (1.226)	-37.013*** (1.335)	

1962	5.450** (2.361)	27.121*** (3.017)	12.085*** (0.784)	-24.589*** (1.174)	-28.152*** (1.218)	
1963	5.557** (2.357)	25.709*** (2.957)	11.732*** (0.897)	-35.838*** (1.188)	-38.340*** (1.200)	
1965	8.114*** (2.309)	25.092*** (2.794)	9.575*** (0.820)	-25.225*** (1.293)	-25.236*** (1.242)	-25.581*** (1.159)
1973 (Mar)	-27.324*** (1.095)	-22.893*** (2.307)	-20.171*** (0.655)	5.955*** (0.531)	-16.685*** (0.675)	0.050 (0.887)
1973 (Sep)	-18.114*** (1.121)	16.541*** (2.219)	4.331*** (0.542)	11.138*** (0.481)	-10.883*** (0.539)	-13.831*** (0.587)
1983		2.066 (3.123)			-25.567*** (0.911)	-3.734*** (0.779)
1985	-0.178 (0.497)	30.355*** (1.356)	12.521*** (0.435)	-9.991*** (0.680)	-34.409*** (0.580)	-33.825*** (0.654)
1987	-1.855*** (0.496)	25.220*** (1.225)	7.184*** (0.486)	1.108 (0.726)	-19.480*** (0.784)	-20.497*** (0.859)
1989	1.100*** (0.392)	25.145*** (1.142)	6.772*** (0.487)	0.185 (0.460)	-18.943*** (0.702)	-18.202*** (0.721)
1991	-1.145** (0.494)	19.597*** (0.998)	0.958* (0.536)	-8.754*** (0.498)	-25.403*** (0.668)	-24.109*** (0.721)
1993	6.474*** (0.408)	24.089*** (0.850)	5.104*** (0.506)	-6.318*** (0.392)	-19.884*** (0.491)	-19.417*** (0.520)
1995	0.871** (0.415)	14.895*** (0.643)	-4.261*** (0.435)	-6.876*** (0.454)	-17.793*** (0.527)	-16.901*** (0.544)
1997	22.336*** (0.567)	33.241*** (0.800)	13.679*** (0.768)	-16.164*** (0.568)	-24.269*** (0.661)	-23.024*** (0.637)
1999	28.246*** (0.425)	35.140*** (0.548)	15.667*** (0.624)	-18.527*** (0.507)	-23.897*** (0.549)	-23.425*** (0.575)
2001	16.284*** (0.593)	19.545*** (0.599)		-21.315*** (0.848)	-24.009*** (0.846)	-23.777*** (0.808)
2003			-20.010*** (0.604)			

These year dummy variable coefficients correspond to results reported in Tables 2 and 3. Arellano robust (clustered) standard errors reported in parentheses. Two-tailed tests.

*** Significant at 1% level, ** Significant at 5% level, * Significant at 10% level

Note: Reference group is 1912. Some year dummies dropped out of certain models because of perfect correlation with other variables (i.e. 2003 is the only observation in which democracy was 20 years old).

Table R2. *Probit estimates of determinants of 1999 vote (2001 survey)*

Independent variables	Radical vote	Peronist vote
Voted for same party in 1995	0.330 (0.217)	0.628*** (0.182)
Voted for same party in 1989	0.862*** (0.179)	0.476*** (0.181)
Voted for same party in 1983	1.350*** (0.136)	1.318*** (0.155)
Identifies with party	0.762*** (0.200)	0.881*** (0.159)
Income	.215*** (0.093)	-0.175* (0.102)
Education	0.012 (0.037)	-0.051 (0.320)
Buenos Aires resident	-0.175 (0.058)	-0.284 (0.193)
Córdoba resident	-0.457*** (0.024)	-0.474*** (0.204)
Misiones resident	0.171 (0.077)	-0.379* (0.205)
Constant	-1.716 *** (0.187)	-1.156*** (0.279)
Pseudo- R^2	0.393	0.476
Observations	677	677

Standard errors in parentheses

*** Significant at 1% level, ** Significant at 5% level, * Significant at 10% level

Dependent variable is responses of “Fernando de la Rúa” (Radical/Alliance candidate) or “Eduardo Duhalde” (Peronist candidate) to the question, “Whom did you vote for in the 1999 presidential election?”

Includes only voters who were eligible to vote by 1983 (i.e., those 34 years and older at the time of the survey).

Table R3. *Probit estimates of the probability of partisanship (2003 survey)*

Independent variables	Coefficient
Age	0.006*** (0.002)
Income	0.065 (0.059)
Education	-0.072*** (0.020)
Gender	-0.051 (0.062)
Buenos Aires resident	-0.314*** (0.089)
Córdoba resident	0.012 (0.087)
Misiones resident	-0.008 (0.087)
Constant	0.197 (0.199)
Pseudo- R^2	0.020
Observations	1,733

Standard errors in parentheses

*** Significant at 1% level, ** Significant at 5% level

Note: Dependent variable is a dummy for those who answered the question “with which party do you identify most” by mentioning some party

Appendix A: Data and Calculations¹

Each observation in our ecological dataset corresponds to an election in a department.

Electoral data: Our data consist of the department-level returns for 34 national elections between 1912 and 2003 (Canton 1968; Escolar 2003; Ministerio del Interior 1950, various; Zalduendo 1958). In cases where departmental borders were redrawn, we used returns from that department only after the redistricting took place. Department name and boundary changes were determined using Cacopardo (1967) and notes in census publications. In cases where departmental lines were completely redrawn for an entire province (such as Chaco and Tucumán), we include both pre- and post-redistricting observations as distinct departments. For vote-share calculations, we used as the denominator the total number of votes, including blank and null ballots. In two-round presidential elections, our observations were of the first round of elections. When elections for National Deputies and President were simultaneous, we used only presidential election observations.²

Census data: Argentina conducted national censuses with some regularity over the course of the twentieth century, in 1914, 1947, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1991 and again in 2001. These censuses provided us with the data on population, literacy rates, and urbanization rates by department. Additional data are also available from provincial censuses for La Pampa (1920, 1935 and 1942), and for Santa Fe (1958). Results from the 1927 census (Canton and Moreno 1971), which surveyed only eligible voters (at that time meaning Argentine men over 18), are reported only at the province level. Literacy measures vary somewhat across censuses, from the percentage of literate registered voters (1914) to the percentage of literate individuals over 14 years old (1947, 1980) to the percentage of

¹Note that much of the below information regarding our data will be published in a separate forthcoming article by the authors.

²Because of the nature of the party ballot in Argentina, splitting tickets is very difficult during concurrent elections. Thus, our choice of using presidential electoral results is of little consequence.

literate individuals over 10 years old (1991, 2001).

We interpolated these variables using simple rates of growth for years between censuses.

Election coding: Based on the historical literature (e.g. Romero 2002), we code the following periods as democratic: 1912-30, 1937-43, 1946-50, 1957-66, 1973-76 and 1983-present (see Appendix B). This coding differs slightly from those of previous studies (Boix 2003; Mainwaring et al. 2001; Przeworski et al. 2000) in that we consider democratic the period of Perón’s first term (1946-50) in which relatively free and fair elections were held but in which no alternation of executive power occurred. The opposition Radical Party was active and relatively free during this period, suggesting that voters could anticipate an opposition victory and would therefore be likely to vote on the basis of personal preference rather than limited choice.

Effective number of parties: We use the N_2 index (the inverse of the sum of squared vote shares) developed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979) to calculate the effective number of parties in each department-year observed. We include blank votes as a party in these calculations, but exclude null votes. In cases where election returns are reported with an “others” category, we follow Taagepera’s (1997) suggested method: we take the average of the index value excluding the “others” category and the index value multiplied by the lower of a) the vote share of the “others” category alone, or b) the vote share of the “others” category multiplied by the lowest party vote share.

Survey data: Survey data were collected by Stokes in 2001 and 2003 in collaboration with Brusco and Nazareno (see Brusco et al. 2004). The samples in both surveys were drawn from clusters based on census tracks. The 2001 survey was of 480 adults each in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Córdoba, and Misiones and in the department of General Pueyrredón. The margin of error was ± 4.5 percent. The 2003 survey was of 500 adults in each of four provinces (Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Misiones, and San Luis). The margin of error was 6 percent. The 2003 surveys excluded upper-middle and upper-income

individuals; results thus are generalizable only to middle and lower-income strata. This fact should be kept in mind when interpreting the effect of socioeconomic factors, factors that are not, however, of central theoretical importance in the survey-based analyses in this paper.

Appendix B: Coding of national elections in Argentina, 1912-2003

Year [†]	In Data	Office	Democracy [‡]	Age of	Competitiveness [‡]	
				Democracy	Radicals	Peronists
1912	•	National Deputies	1	0	1	
1914	•	National Deputies	1	2	1	
1916	◦	President and Nat. Deps.	1	4	1	
1918	•	National Deputies	1	6	1	
1920	•	National Deputies	1	8	1	
1922	◦	President and Nat. Deps.	1	10	1	
1924		National Deputies	1	12	1	
1926	•	National Deputies	1	14	1	
1928	◦	President and Nat. Deps.	1	16	1	
1930	•	National Deputies	1	18	1	
1931		President and Nat. Deps.	0		0	
1934		National Deputies	0		0	
1936		National Deputies	0		0	
1937	•	President	0		0	
1938		National Deputies	0		0	
1940	•	Nat. Deps.	0		0	
1942		National Deputies	0		0	
1946	◦	President and Nat. Deps.	1	0	1	1
1948 (Mar)	•	Nat. Deps.	1	2	1	1
1948 (Dec)	•	Constituent Assembly	1	2	1	1
1951		President and Nat. Deps.	0		0	0
1954	•	Vice President and Nat. Deps.	0		0	0
1957	•	Constituent Assembly	1	0	1	0
1958	◦	President and Nat. Deps.	1	1	1	0
1960	•	National Deputies	1	3	1	0
1962	•	National Deputies	1	5	1	1
1963	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	0	1	0
1965	•	National Deputies	1	2	1	1
1973 (Mar)	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	0	1	1
1973 (Sep)	•	President	1	0	1	1
1983	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	0	1	1
1985	•	National Deputies	1	2	1	1
1987	•	National Deputies	1	4	1	1
1989	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	6	1	1
1991	•	National Deputies	1	8	1	1
1993	•	National Deputies	1	10	1	1
1995	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	12	1	1
1997	•	National Deputies	1	14	1	1
1999	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	16	1	1
2001	•	National Deputies	1	18	1	1
2003	•	President and Nat. Deps.	1	20	1	1

• Data for election of all national offices is included in dataset

◦ Data for election of some offices is included in dataset (National Deputies only: 1916; President only: 1922, 1928, 1946, 1958)

No symbol indicates elections that are missing from the dataset.

[†] Data for 1912-1920, 1937, 1940, 1948, 1960 and 1963 are available for some provinces (see Canton 1968).

[‡] For these variables, a value of 1 represents democracy/competitiveness and a value of 0 represents non-democracy/non-competitiveness (See Appendix A for further explanations of our coding).

Appendix C

Our calculation of Radical vote shares included the following party labels: *Acción por la República Federal* (1999); *Alianza Concertación por el Desarrollo* (2003); *Alianza Salteña* (1983, 1997); *Alianza Frente Cívico y Social* (1991-2001); *Alianza Frente de Todos* (2003); *Alianza Frente Juntos por San Luis* (2003); *Alianza Frente Provincia Unida* (2003); *Alianza Frente Social Entre Ríos Tiene Futuro* (2003); *Alianza para el Trabajo, la Justicia y la Educación* (1997-2001); *Alianza para Todos* (1997); *Alianza Unidos por Salta* (2003); *Confederación Federalista Independiente* (1989); *Convergencia por Santa Cruz* (2003); *Frente de Todos* (1997-2001); *Frente Social y Productivo* (2003); *Frente Unión por Tucumán* (2003); *Lema Riojano por el Trabajo y la Producción* (2003); *Movilización* (1987, 1989); *Movimiento de Integración y Desarrollo* (1965); *Movimiento Popular de Recuperación Radical* (1957-1962); *Partido Radical* (1916-1940); *Unión Cívica Radical* (1912-2003); and *Unión Democrática* (1946).

Our calculation of Peronist vote shares included the following party labels: *Acción Progresista* (1962); *Acción Provincial* (1965); *Alianza Frente Movimiento Popular* (2003); *Alianza Frente para la Victoria* (2003); *Alianza Frente por la Lealtad* (2003); *Alianza Unidos por Córdoba* (2003); *Concertación Justicialista para el Cambio* (1999); *Frente Fundacional por el Cambio* (2003); *Frente Justicialista* (1987-1995); *Frente Justicialista de la Esperanza* (1999); *Frente Justicialista Popular* (1989-1995); *Frente Justicialista por la Victoria* (1993-1995); *Movimiento Cívico Bandera Popular* (1962); *Movimiento Las Flores-Luján* (1965); *Movimiento Popular Mendocino* (1965); *Movimiento Popular Neuquino* (1962-1965); *Partido Blanco de Mendoza* (1965); *Partido Blanco de Río Negro* (1962, 1965); *Partido Blanco de Santa Fe* (1962); *Partido de la Justicia Social* (1963, 1965); *Partido de la Provincia de Chubut* (1962); *Partido Laborista* (1946-1965); *Partido Peronista* (1946-1954); *Partido Justicialista* (1963-2001); *Partido Socialista Argentino de Vanguardia* (1962); *Tres Banderas* (1962-1965); *Unión Cívica Radical Junta Renovadora* (1946); *Unión del Centro Democrático* (2003); *Unión Popular* (1962-1965); *Unión*

Provincial (1965); *Unión y Libertad* (2003); and blank votes (1957, 1960, 1963).³

³Many Peronist voters cast blank ballots in the elections of 1957, 1960 and 1963, when Perón and the Peronist party were proscribed. Indeed, the share of blank votes rose from a national average of 4.2 percent in 1948 to 19.4 percent in 1957 and 21.9 percent in 1960.

References

- Boix, C., 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brusco, V., Nazareno, M., Stokes, S.C., 2004. Vote Buying in Argentina. *Lat. Am. Res. Rev.* 39 (2), 66-88.
- Cacopardo, M.C., 1967. República Argentina: Cambios en los límites nacionales, provinciales y departamentales, a través de los censos nacionales de población. Instituto Torcuato Di Tella Working Paper 47.
- Canton, D., 1968. *Materiales para el estudio de la sociología política en la Argentina*. Instituto Di Tella, Buenos Aires.
- Escolar, M., 2003. Bases Departamentales de la Argentina, 1983-1999. Programa de Estudios Electorales y Legislativos (PEEL), Universidad Torcuato Di Tella.
- Laakso, M., Taagepera, R., 1979. Effective Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe. *Comp. Polit. Stud.* 12 (1), 3-27.
- Mainwaring, S., Brinks, D., Pérez-Liñán, A., 2001. Classifying Political Regimes in Latin America, 1945-1999. *Stud. in Comp. Int. Dev.* 36 (1), 37-65.
- Ministerio del Interior, 1950. *Resultados Electorales*. Ministerio del Interior, Buenos Aires.
- Ministerio del Interior, various. *Escrutinio definitivo de resultados electorales por departamento*.
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M., Cheibub, J.A., Limongi, F., 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Romero, L.A., 2002. *A History of Argentina in the Twentieth Century*. Translated by Brennan, J.P. The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, PA.
- Taagepera, R., 1997. Effective Number of Parties for Incomplete Data. *Elect. Stud.* 16 (2), 145-51.
- Zalduendo, E., 1958. *Geografía electoral de la Argentina*. Ediciones Ancora, Buenos Aires.