Government and Opposition Eva Wegner, 'Local Level Accountability in a Dominant Party System'

Appendix

 Table A.1: Overview Variables (for municipalities won by the African National Congress in 2006)

| Variable | Definition | Source | N | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|-------------|--|--|-----|-------|---------|-------|------|
| Dependent \ | Variables | | | | | | |
| Wr | Share of 2006 Ward Councillors re-nominated in 2011 | Names of 2006 Councillors & Names of 2011 Electoral Candidates, Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) | 192 | 0.47 | 0.22 | 0 | 1 |
| Pr | Share of 2006 PR Councillors renominated in 2011 | -Names of 2006 Councillors & Names of 2011 Electoral Candidates, IEC | 192 | 0.46 | 0.27 | 0 | 1 |
| HSr | Share of 2006 Councillors re- nominated for high status positions in 2011 (as PR or DC councillors) | Names of 2006 Councillors & Names of 2011 Electoral Candidates, IEC | 192 | 0.32 | 2 0.16 | 0 | 0.88 |
| Explanatory | v Variables | | | | | | |
| chgV | Vote Share 2009 <i>minus</i> Vote Share 2004 (as % of registered Voters) | Electoral Results 2009 & Electoral Results 2006, Independent Electoral Commission | 192 | -0.05 | 0.09 | -0.19 | 0.27 |
| chgEl | 2011 Log of Households using electricity as main source of lighting <i>minus</i> 2007 Log of Households using electricity as main source of lighting | Census 2011 & Community Survey 2007, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.32 | 2. 0.27 | -0.40 | 1.37 |
| chgWa | 2011 Log of Households with access to tap water inside their house <i>minus</i> 2007 Log of Households with access to tap water inside their house | Census 2011 & Community Survey 2007, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.23 | 0.27 | -0.46 | 1.82 |
| chgSa | 2011 Log of Households with flush toilets <i>minus</i> 2007 Log of Households with flush toilets | Census 2011 & Community Survey 2007, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.26 | 0.35 | -0.52 | 1.89 |
| aud | Audit rating 2010 | Auditor General South Africa | 192 | 2.23 | 1.50 | 0 | 4 |
| comp | Margin of Victory in 2006<=0.25 | Electoral Results 2006, Independent Electoral Commission | | | | | |

Control Variables

| prov | South African Provinces | | 9 | | | | |
|------|--|--|-----|--------|--------|-------|------------|
| pop | Population size municipality | Census 2011, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 149405 | 151507 | 70037 | 75520 0 |
| Wsh | Share of White households in municipality | Census 2011, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.16 | 0.26 | 0 | 0.92 |
| Csh | Share of Coloured households is municipality | n Census 2011, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.41 |
| Ash | Share of African households in municipality | Census 2011, Statistics South Africa | 192 | 0.73 | 0.31 | 0.01 | 1 |

 Table A.2: Correlation Matrix

| | chgV | chgEl | chgWa | chgSa | aud |
|-------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-----|
| chgV | 1 | | | | |
| chgEl | 0.114 | 1 | | | |
| chgWa | -0.058 | 0.5356 | 1 | | |
| chgSa | -0.0028 | 0.5294 | 0.4746 | 1 | |
| aud | 0.2839 | 0.0225 | 0.002 | 0.0316 | 1 |

 Table A.3: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Changes in Access to Electricity

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Evolution Access Electricity | 0.103 | 0.051 | 0.064 |
| | (0.080) | (0.089) | (0.058) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.634 | 1.455 | 2.158 |
| Prob > F | 0.081 | 0.138 | 0.013 |
| r2 | 0.094 | 0.088 | 0.122 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.4: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Changes in Access to Sanitation

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|------------------|---|---|---|
| Evolution Access | 0.115*** | 0.094* | 0.073** |
| Sanitation | (0.041) | (0.057) | (0.032) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 2.126 | 1.743 | 2.480 |
| Prob > F | 0.015 | 0.056 | 0.004 |
| r2 | 0.115 | 0.100 | 0.139 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.5: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Access to Electricity with Competitiveness

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| Access to Electricity | 0.082 | 0.033 | 0.026 |
| | (0.082) | (0.089) | (0.060) |
| Electricity X Competitive | 0.013 | 0.373 | 0.436*** |
| | (0.209) | (0.286) | (0.140) |
| Competitive | -0.193* | 0.045 | -0.102 |
| | (0.102) | (0.131) | (0.065) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.847 | 1.634 | 3.165 |
| Prob > F | 0.032 | 0.069 | 0.000 |
| r2 | 0.132 | 0.112 | 0.165 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.6: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Access to Sanitation with Competitiveness

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| Access to Sanitation | 0.105** | 0.094* | 0.065** |
| | (0.043) | (0.055) | (0.031) |
| Sanitation X Competitive | -0.020 | 0.216 | 0.221 |
| | (0.235) | (0.345) | (0.175) |
| Competitive | -0.181** | 0.109 | -0.026 |
| | (0.091) | (0.125) | (0.073) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 2.406 | 1.811 | 2.410 |
| Prob > F | 0.003 | 0.036 | 0.003 |
| r2 | 0.150 | 0.118 | 0.149 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.7: Mean Margin of Victory in competitive vs uncompetitive municipalities

| | Competitive Municipalities | Uncompetitive Municipalities |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mean Ward Margin of Victory | 34% | 65% |
| Mean Municipality Margin of Victory | 11 % | 60% |

 Table A.8: Re-nomination, Voter Signals and Closeness of Electoral Race

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Difference Vote Share 0409 | 1.053* | -1.581** | -0.465 |
| | (0.632) | (0.688) | (0.462) |
| Difference Vote Share 0409X | -0.231 | 3.778*** | 1.118* |
| Closeness of Elections | (0.981) | (0.989) | (0.650) |
| Closeness of Elections | -0.298 | 0.002 | 0.024 |
| | (0.185) | (0.180) | (0.132) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.566 | 2.389 | 2.084 |
| Prob > F | 0.087 | 0.003 | 0.012 |
| r2 | 0.120 | 0.146 | 0.132 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.9: Re-nomination, Access to Water, and Closeness of Electoral Race

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Access to Water | 0.072 | 0.134 | -0.067 |
| | (0.118) | (0.140) | (0.088) |
| Water X Closeness of Elections | 0.001 | -0.021 | 0.464* |
| | (0.333) | (0.419) | (0.238) |
| Closeness of Elections | -0.140 | 0.099 | -0.065 |
| | (0.189) | (0.209) | (0.135) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.424 | 1.611 | 2.603 |
| Prob > F | 0.141 | 0.074 | 0.002 |
| r2 | 0.096 | 0.102 | 0.155 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.10: Re-nomination, Financial Management, and Closeness of Electoral Race

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Audits problematic | -0.138 | -0.193* | -0.090 |
| | (0.097) | (0.111) | (0.061) |
| Audits good | -0.061 | -0.077 | -0.114* |
| | (0.088) | (0.101) | (0.059) |
| Aud.problemXCloseness of Elections | 0.335 | 0.437 | 0.157 |
| | (0.234) | (0.311) | (0.159) |
| Aud. goodXCloseness of Elections | 0.173 | 0.213 | 0.250* |
| | (0.199) | (0.231) | (0.130) |
| Closeness of Elections | -0.259 | -0.053 | -0.090 |
| | (0.203) | (0.233) | (0.140) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.338 | 1.339 | 1.879 |
| Prob > F | 0.174 | 0.173 | 0.022 |
| r2 | 0.105 | 0.106 | 0.145 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.11: OLS Regression of 2011 Re-nominations on Voter Signals, Data Winsorized at 10th percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| Evolution vote share 0409 | 0.468 | 0.415 | 0.178 |
| | (0.331) | (0.432) | (0.246) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.993 | 1.595 | 2.097 |
| Prob > F | 0.023 | 0.090 | 0.016 |
| r2 | 0.122 | 0.091 | 0.107 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.12: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Changes in Access to Water, Data Winsorized at 10th percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 2011 | 2011 | High Status Jobs in 2011 |
| Evolution Access Water | 0.066 | 0.129** | 0.086** |
| | (0.057) | (0.064) | (0.041) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.855 | 1.719 | 2.302 |
| Prob >F | 0.038 | 0.060 | 0.007 |
| r2 | 0.114 | 0.100 | 0.125 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.13: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Audit Outcomes 2010, Data Winsorized at 10th percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Audits problematic | -0.008 | -0.015 | -0.029 |
| | (0.042) | (0.052) | (0.029) |
| Audits good | 0.000 | 0.012 | -0.005 |
| | (0.039) | (0.058) | (0.025) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 1.524 | 1.288 | 1.931 |
| Prob >F | 0.106 | 0.218 | 0.025 |
| r2 | 0.108 | 0.087 | 0.109 |

Reference (Omitted) Category: Disclaimer. Audits problematic: Adverse Opinion and Qualified

Opinion. Audits Good: Unqualified Opinion

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.14: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Voter Signals with Competitiveness, Data Winsorized at 10^{th} percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|--|--|--|---|
| Difference Vote Share 0409 | 0.557 | -0.308 | -0.088 |
| | (0.368) | (0.431) | (0.266) |
| Difference Vote Share 0409X Competitive | 0.565 | 2.333*** | 0.932*** |
| | (0.400) | (0.503) | (0.232) |
| Competitive | -0.208*** | 0.004 | -0.025 |
| | (0.063) | (0.088) | (0.047) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 2.263 | 3.456 | 3.523 |
| Prob > F | 0.006 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| <u>r2</u> | 0.168 | 0.188 | 0.156 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.15: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Access to Water with Competitiveness, Data Winsorized at 10^{th} percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Access to Water | 0.071 | 0.120* | 0.070 |
| | (0.060) | (0.065) | (0.043) |
| Water X Competitive | -0.003 | 0.076 | 0.248* |
| | (0.226) | (0.407) | (0.149) |
| Competitive | -0.156** | 0.114 | -0.023 |
| | (0.079) | (0.148) | (0.059) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 2.142 | 1.740 | 2.506 |
| Prob >F | 0.010 | 0.047 | 0.002 |
| r2 | 0.143 | 0.112 | 0.137 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.16: OLS Regression of Re-nomination on Audit Opinions with Competitiveness, Data Winsorized at 10^{th} percentile

| | Ward Counc. (2006) share re- nominated in 2011 | PR Counc. (2006) share re-nominated in 2011 | All Counc. (2006) share re-nominated for High Status Jobs in 2011 |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Audits problematic | -0.038 | -0.045 | -0.033 |
| | (0.042) | (0.050) | (0.031) |
| Audits good | -0.029 | 0.009 | -0.026 |
| | (0.039) | (0.061) | (0.027) |
| Aud.problem.XCompetitive | 0.226 | 0.338 | 0.048 |
| | (0.155) | (0.242) | (0.085) |
| Aud. goodXCompetitive | 0.143 | 0.146 | 0.115 |
| | (0.111) | (0.160) | (0.075) |
| Competitive | -0.249*** | 0.036 | -0.041 |
| | (0.085) | (0.160) | (0.070) |
| Observations | 192 | 192 | 192 |
| F | 2.308 | 1.638 | 1.793 |
| Prob > F | 0.003 | 0.059 | 0.032 |
| r2 | 0.154 | 0.119 | 0.126 |

Reference (Omitted) Category: Disclaimer. Audits problematic: Adverse Opinion and Qualified

Opinion. Audits Good: Unqualified Opinion

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

 Table A.17: Service Delivery and Electoral Competitiveness

| | Evolution Electricity | Evolution Water | Evolution Toilets |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Competitiveness (margin of | | | |
| victory below 25%) | -0.001 | 0.081 | -0.041 |
| • | (0.053) | (0.085) | (0.085) |
| N | 192 | 192 | 192 |

Notes: Provincial fixed effects and controls for population group shares and log of municipality population

Robust standard errors in parentheses.