Figure A1: Sample Map of Original Baseline Survey



Note: Each dot represents a sample cluster. Reference omitted for review

Table A1: PF Vote Share by Province in 2016 and 2021 Elections

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016 | 2021 |
| Central | 44% | 36% |
| Copperbelt | 64% | 41% |
| Eastern | 80% | 56% |
| Luapula | 81% | 63% |
| Lusaka | 62% | 44% |
| Muchinga | 82% | 64% |
| Northern | 76% | 58% |
| North Western | 12% | 9% |
| Southern  | 7% | 6% |
| Western | 17% | 14% |

Source: Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ)

Table A2: Urban Constituencies (Population Denisty> 100 Inhabitants/km2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bwana Mkubwa | Kanyama | Munali |
| Chawama | Kapiri Mposhi | Nchanga |
| Chililabombwe | Kasenengwa | Ndonla Central |
| Chimwemwe | Katuba | Nkana |
| Chingola | Livingstone | Roan |
| Kabushi | Lusaka Central | Wusakile |
| Kawata | Mandevu |  |
| Kafue | Mansa Central |  |
| Kafulafuta | Matero |  |
| Kalushi | Mkaika |  |
| Kamfinsa | Monze Central |  |
| Kankoyo | Mpongwe |  |
| Kantanshi | Mufulira |  |

Table A3: Codebook

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Survey Question | Response options | Operationalization |
| PF Vote | If the presidential electionswere held tomorrow, whichparty’s candidate would youvote for? | All parties with presidential candidates as well as “I don’t vote” “I don’t know” and “Refuse to answer” | Coded as 1 if responded “PF” |
| Urban | “What Constituency do you live in?” | All Zambian constituencies | Coded as urban if constituency has more than 100 inh/km2. For the four constituencies on the outskirts of Lusaka (Chilanga, Chongwe, Katuba, and Kafue) we code all respondents who do not respond “rural” to the question: “Is your current village/neighborhood, urban, rural, or peri-urban.” In cases where respondents do not know the name of their constituencies, we code respondents in Lusaka as urban if they characterize their area as urban or peri-urban.  |
| Poverty | “I will read out a fewstatements about your income.Please tell me, which of thefollowing statement is closestto your situation TODAY:” | 1. Our household incomecovers the needs well - we cansave.2. Our household incomecovers the needs alright,without much difficulty.3. Our household income doesnot cover the needs, there aredifficulties.4. Our household income doesnot cover the needs, there aregreat difficulties.5. Don’t Know/Refuse to | Coded as poor if responded option 4 |
| Age | “How old are you?” | Respondent Age | Age enterer |
| Female | “Are you a man or a woman” | 1. Male2. Female3. Don’t Know/Refuse toAnswer | Coded as woman if responded option 2 |
| Bemba-Ngoni | “What is your primary ethniccommunity, cultural group, ortribe?” | List of ethnic groups | Dummy variables coded in relation to what ethnic group stated by respondent |
| Lungu Economic Performance | “Since 2016 how well or badlywould you say that PresidentLungu has . . . managed theeconomy?” | 1. Badly2. Well3. Refused to answer | Coded as 1 is option 2 |
| Lungu Corruption Performance  | “Since 2016 how well or badlywould you say that PresidentLungu has . . . reducedcorruption?” | 1. Badly2. Well3. Refused to answer | Coded as 1 is option 2 |
| Lungu Infrastructure Performance  | “Since 2016 how well or badlywould you say that PresidentLungu has . . . improved andmaintained roads and otherinfrastructure?” | 1. Badly2. Well3. Refused to answer | Coded as 1 is option 2 |
| PF Rallies | “About how many of the PF rallies did you attend?” | 1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. Four
6. Five
7. More than five
8. Refuse to answer/Don’t know
 | Coded as 1 if option 2,3,5,6,7 |
| UPND Rallies | “About how many of the UPND rallies did you attend?” | 1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. Four
6. Five
7. More than five
8. Refuse to answer/Don’t know
 | Coded as 1 if option 2,3,5,6,7 |
| PF Contact | “During the campaign leading up to the August 12th elections, were you contacted by any political party?” | All parties | Coded as 1 if mentioned PF |
| UPND Contact | “During the campaign leading up to the August 12th elections, were you contacted by any political party?” | All parties | Coded as 1 if mentioned UPND |
| Ethnic: disapprove | “Do you think that if someone from your ethnic group supported a candidate that others in your ethnic groupdid notlike they would riskHaving others think poorly of them ortheir household” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |
| Ethnic: harm | “Do you think that if a friend orsomeone from your ethnic groupsupported a candidate that others in your ethnic groupdid notlike they would riskSuffering material or physicalDamage” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |
| Family: disapprove | “Do you think that if a friend orsomeone from your family openlysupported a candidate that otherfriends or family members did notlike they would riskHaving others think poorly of them ortheir household” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |
| Family: harm | “Do you think that if a friend orsomeone from your family openlysupported a candidate that otherfriends or family members did notlike they would riskSuffering material or physicalDamage” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |
| Locality: disapprove | “Do you think that if a someone in your village/neighborhood openlysupported a candidate that otherliving in your village/neighborhood did notlike they would riskHaving others think poorly of them ortheir household” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |
| Locality: harm | “Do you think that if a someone in your village/neighborhood openlysupported a candidate that otherliving in your village/neighborhood did notlike they would riskSuffering material or physicalDamage” | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know/Refuse to Answer
 | Coded 1 if response 1 |

Table A4: OLS Regression of Constituency-level Change in PF Vote Share (High Urban Threshold)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** |
|  | Change in PF Vote Share | Change in PF Vote Share |
| Urban | -.058\*\*(.015) | -.043\*(.014) |
| Share Bemba | - | . 065\*(.022) |
| Share TongaShare Nyanja | -- | .017(.024).038(.026) |
| Share Lozi | - | .043\*(.015) |
| Ethnic Fractionalization2016 PF Vote Share | --.240\*\*\*(.020) | -.030(.042)-.283(.033) |
| *N* | 156 | 156 |
| *R*2 | .68 | .68 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are OLS regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors clustered by province. Constituencies with a population density >250 inh/km2 are classified as urban.

Table A5: Stated Vote Choice across Survey Waves

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2019 Baseline | ZEPS R1 | ZEPS R2 | ZEPS R3 |
| PF | 40.6 | 35.5 | 35.0 | 25.8 |
| UPND | 14.0 | 27.1 | 26.6 | 60.6 |
| Other | 5.5 | 1.4 | 6.3 | 3.3 |
| Non-response, of which… | 39.9 | 36.0 | 32.1 | 9.0 |
|  Don’t feel close to a political party | 14.1 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 0.9 |
|  Don’t vote | 11.5 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 0.1 |
|  Don’t know | 7.2 | 4.9 | 3.8 | 0.3 |
|  Refuse to answer | 7.1 | 23.4 | 21.4 | 9.0 |

Table A6: Robustness test classifying respondents in Chipata Central as urban

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | Party Switching from PF 2019-2021 | Party Switching from PF 2019-2021 (only 2019 PF Voters) |
| UrbanPoverty | .035(.195)-.202(.207) | .502(.258)-.439(.260) |
| Age | -.000(.007) | -.012(.009) |
| FemaleBembaChewaTumbukaTongaNgoni | .112(.190)-.025(.291).202(.280).635(.268)-.922\*(.454)-.401(.372) | .275(.251)-.249(.364).099(.354).607(.352).727(.747)-.306(.450) |
| Observations | 826 | 300 |
| Pseudo R2 | .023 | .036 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

Table A7: Robustness test classifying respondents in Chipata Central as urban

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Lungu Economic Performance | Lungu Corruption Performance | Lungu Infrastructure Performance |
| UrbanPoverty | -.534\*\*\*(.117).084(.118) | -.601\*\*\*(.124).086(.123) | .615\*\*\*(.138).051(.135) |
| Age | .022\*\*\*(.004) | .003(.005) | .001(.005) |
| FemaleBembaChewaTumbukaTongaNgoni | -.048(.113)-.129(.174)-.398\*(.174)-.109(.173)-1.136\*\*\*(.225).021(.193) | .052(.120)-.276(.188)-.219(.181)-.002(.178)-1.013(.246)-.080(.204) | .053(.131).264(.228)-.482\*(.194)-.531\*\*(.191)-.264(.232)-.392(.224) |
| *N* | 1,395 | 1,354 | 1,416 |
| *Pseudo R*2 | .048 | .032 | .031 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

Table A8: Logistic Regression of Intention to vote for PF with Interaction Effects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1)Vote for PF | (2)Vote for PF | (3)Vote for PF |
| Lungu Economic Performance | 1.591\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (.155) |  |  |
| Lungu Corruption Performance |  | 1.358\*\*\* |  |
|  |  | (0.154) |  |
| Lungu Infrastructure Performance |  |  | 1.482\*\*\* |
| Urban | -.591\*\*(.179) | -.549\*\*\*(.155) | (0.184)-.422(.322) |
| Lungu Economic Performance \*Urban | .234 |  |  |
|  | (.243) |  |  |
| Lungu Corruption Performance \*Urban |  | .196 |  |
|  |  | (0.242) |  |
| Lungu Infrastructure Performance \*Urban |  |  | -.443 |
|  |  |  | (.345) |
| ObservationsPseudo R2 | 1,492.13 | 1,444.10 | 1,517.06 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

Table A9: Logistic Regression of Intention to vote for PF

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1)PF Vote | (2)PF Vote | (3)PF Vote | (4)PF Vote |
| PF Rallies | .573\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | (.121) |  |  |  |
| UPND Rallies |  | -.482\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  | (.137) |  |  |
| PF ContactUPND Contact |  |  | .197(.147) |  |
|  |  |  |  | -.162(.170) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,288 | 1,287 | 1,289 | 1,289 |
| Pseudo R-squared | 0.013 | .008 | 0.01 | .001 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

Table A10: Logistic Regression of Intention to vote for PF

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Family: disapprove | -.024 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (.132) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family: harm |  | -.011 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (.161) |  |  |  |  |
| Locality: disapprove |  |  | -.107 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (.120) |  |  |  |
| Locality: harm |  |  |  | .027 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (131) |  |  |
| Ethnic: disapprove |  |  |  |  | .036 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (.141) |  |
| Ethnic: harm |  |  |  |  |  | .120 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | (.179) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,535 | 1,535 | 1,535 | 1.535 | 1,535 | 1,535 |
| R-squared | .03 | .00 | .00 | .04 | .07 | .00 |

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Note: Entries are logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.