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**A1 Descriptive Statistics**

In terms of the main dependent variable – voter defection, which refers to those who did not (report to) vote for the KMT – on average, nearly 45 per cent of the respondents did so in the 1983 survey. In the 1992 survey, the percentage of such respondents that did so increased to 52.9 per cent. The respondents of Taiwanese ethnicity account for approximately 86 per cent of the study population in both surveys.

Moreover, 66.5 per cent of the respondents claimed to be frequent media consumers in the 1983 survey, which is much higher than the share in the 1992 study population. For education, with an average of around four, most respondents had finished junior high school, which is expected given that the KMT government increased the number of compulsory school years from six to nine in 1968. In both surveys, most respondents came from moderately well-off households. In terms of age, on average, respondents in both samples were in their early thirties. Female and male respondents were somewhat equally represented in the 1983 and 1992 study populations.

Most of our covariates are marginally correlated with each other. In the 1983 survey, the correlation between our two information-related control variables is 0.51, which is modestly high. The correlation between age and education is quite high in the opposite direction, which, in fact, is to be expected because many of the elderly were born during the Japanese colonial period, during which education remained privileged for the elite class. Also, before 1968 compulsory education in Taiwan only required citizens to finish elementary school.

Panel A: 1983 Election Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Voter defection (=1) | 1,392 | 0.448 | 0.497 | 0 | 1 |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 1,392 | 0.855 | 0.352 | 0 | 1 |
| Share of Taiwanese | 1,392 | 0.867 | 0.061 | 0.737 | 0.956 |
| Media use (=1) | 1,392 | 0.665 | 0.472 | 0 | 1 |
| Education | 1,392 | 3.603 | 1.732 | 1 | 8 |
| KMT member (=1) | 1,392 | 0.236 | 0.425 | 0 | 1 |
| Public employee (=1) | 1,392 | 0.061 | 0.240 | 0 | 1 |
| Household income | 1,336 | 2.777 | 0.507 | 1.000 | 4.000 |
| Age | 1,390 | 4.530 | 2.794 | 1.000 | 9.000 |
| Male (=1) | 1,392 | 0.494 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |

Panel B: 1992 Election Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Voter defection (=1) | 1,003 | 0.529 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 1,003 | 0.857 | 0.350 | 0 | 1 |
| Share of Taiwanese | 1,003 | 0.887 | 0.095 | 0.627 | 0.993 |
| Media use (=1) | 1,003 | 0.388 | 0.488 | 0 | 1 |
| Education | 1,001 | 4.072 | 1.703 | 1 | 8 |
| KMT member (=1) | 1,003 | 0.198 | 0.399 | 0 | 1 |
| Public employee (=1) | 1,003 | 0.113 | 0.316 | 0 | 1 |
| Household income | 1,003 | 3.374 | 0.696 | 1 | 5 |
| Age | 1,003 | 4.652 | 2.781 | 1 | 9 |
| Male (=1) | 1,003 | 0.510 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |

Table A1: Summary statistics

Panel A: 1983 Election Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| (1) Taiwanese (=1) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2) Share of Taiwanese | 0.18 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Media use (=1) | -0.18 | 0.04 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) Education | -0.22 | -0.02 | 0.51 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) KMT member (=1) | -0.41 | -0.10 | 0.30 | 0.41 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| (6) Public employee (=1) | -0.22 | -0.02 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.29 | 1 |  |  |  |
| (7) Household income | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 1 |  |  |
| (8) Age | -0.11 | -0.01 | -0.29 | -0.53 | -0.05 | 0.02 | -0.21 | 1 |  |
| (9) Male (=1) | -0.10 | 0.01 | 0.22 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.16 | -0.02 | 0.02 | 1 |

Panel B: 1992 Election Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| (1) Taiwanese (=1) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2) Share of Taiwanese | 0.34 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Media use (=1) | -0.12 | -0.18 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) Education | -0.19 | -0.24 | 0.27 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) KMT member (=1) | -0.27 | -0.10 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| (6) Public employee (=1) | -0.23 | -0.09 | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.31 | 1 |  |  |  |
| (7) Household income | 0.01 | -0.12 | 0.15 | 0.39 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 1 |  |  |
| (8) Age | -0.01 | 0.07 | -0.14 | -0.62 | -0.03 | 0.08 | -0.25 | 1 |  |
| (9) Male (=1) | -0.07 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.10 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 1 |

Table A2: Correlation matrix

**A2 Survey Locations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| (a) 1983 Election | (b) 1992 Election |

Figure A1: Sampled townships in the surveys. We mark selected counties with black borders. Within each county, we mark townships included in the surveys with the color gold.

**A3 Study Sample**



(a) 1983 Election



(b) 1992 Election

Figure A2: Vote choices of survey respondents



(a) 1983 Election



(b) 1992 Election

Figure A3: Ethnic composition of survey respondents

**A4 Model Specification**

Although our dependent variable only takes the value of 0 and 1, we have decided to adopt the linear probability model (LPM), which employs the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Compared with logit and probit regressions, LPM allows us to interpret our key coefficients of interest straightforwardly, in particular the coefficient for the interaction term ([Hellviek,](#_bookmark65) [2009).](#_bookmark65) We define our baseline model as below:

*yit=β1(Taiwanesei)+ β2(Share of Taiwaneset)+ β3(Taiwanesei× Share of Taiwaneset)+Xiγ+δc+εit*, (1)

where *yit* refers to the vote choice of respondent *i* in township *t*. X*i* is a vector of control variables for each respondent. The coefficients of interests are *β*1 and *β*3. The fixed effects *δc* account for several constituency-specific factors. We cluster the standard errors by township.

We have also addressed several concerns regarding our choice of LPM over logit and probit models. We start by addressing the question of heteroscedasticity by rerunning the same analysis with heteroscedasticity-consistent robust standard errors, which do not change our substantive results (see Table A3). Next, we examine whether any of the predicted probabilities of voting for the opposition given by LPM fall outside of the interval between 0 and 1, another primary concern for the model. The proportions of fitted values below 0 and above 1 are very close to zero, suggesting that our LPM estimates can be largely treated as unbiased and consistent according to Horrace and Oaxaca (2006).

As suggested by Friedman and Schady (2012) and others, we also rerun the same analysis with the logit and probit regressions (Tables A4 and A5). We first find that the predicted probabilities given by all models are highly correlated. In terms of the estimates, we notice that Taiwanese ethnicity remains associated with voters’ defection in both elections across most models. More importantly, the interaction term’s estimated coefficients are only statistically significant for the 1983 election, as in the case of the baseline results.

Finally, as noted by Mood (2010), non-linear models, especially the logit model, can be problematic because the derived estimates can be affected by omitted variables, even when these variables are unrelated to the independent variable. Therefore, when there is a legitimate concern of omitted unmeasured confounders – which is perhaps the case for nearly every regression analysis based on non-experimental data – LPM can serve as an ideal alternative to the logit and probit regressions when one tries to estimate binary outcome variables. Moreover, since our analysis seeks to compare the coefficients based on different groups, [Breen, Karlson, and Holm (2018)](#_bookmark43) show that LPM is the better choice of model.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.255\*\*\* | 0.224\*\*\* | 0.104\*\*\* | 0.071\* | 0.286\*\*\* | 0.248\*\*\* | 0.212\*\*\* | 0.189\*\*\* |
|  | (0.034) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.043) | (0.045) | (0.055) | (0.047) | (0.053) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.038 |  | 0.031 |  | 0.048 |  | 0.024 |
|  |  | (0.038) |  | (0.037) |  | (0.032) |  | (0.030) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.074\*\* |  | -0.079\*\* |  | -0.052 |  | -0.036 |
|  |  | (0.034) |  | (0.033) |  | (0.039) |  | (0.037) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.170\*\*\* | -0.169\*\*\* |  |  | -0.109\*\*\* | -0.107\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.034) | (0.034) |  |  | (0.034) | (0.034) |
| Education |  |  | -0.015 | -0.016 |  |  | -0.003 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.011) | (0.011) |  |  | (0.013) | (0.013) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.207\*\*\* | -0.206\*\*\* |  |  | -0.213\*\*\* | -0.212\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.035) | (0.035) |  |  | (0.042) | (0.042) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.035 | 0.038 |  |  | -0.004 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.051) | (0.051) |  |  | (0.049) | (0.049) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.050\* | -0.048\* |  |  | -0.016 | -0.015 |
|  |  |  | (0.028) | (0.028) |  |  | (0.024) | (0.024) |
| Age |  |  | -0.020\*\*\* | -0.020\*\*\* |  |  | -0.011 | -0.011 |
|  |  |  | (0.006) | (0.006) |  |  | (0.007) | (0.007) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.090\*\*\* | 0.092\*\*\* |  |  | 0.088\*\*\* | 0.088\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.028) | (0.028) |  |  | (0.031) | (0.031) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,392 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.031 | 0.032 | 0.097 | 0.099 | 0.068 | 0.068 | 0.106 | 0.105 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A3: Estimates of voter defection (LPM with robust standard errors)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 1.157\*\*\* | 1.011\*\*\* | 0.555\*\*\* | 0.374\* | 1.275\*\*\* | 1.075\*\*\* | 1.030\*\*\* | 0.878\*\*\* |
|  | (0.182) | (0.195) | (0.208) | (0.223) | (0.228) | (0.257) | (0.242) | (0.271) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.215 |  | 0.228 |  | 0.296 |  | 0.200 |
|  |  | (0.206) |  | (0.228) |  | (0.202) |  | (0.204) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.359\* |  | -0.438\*\* |  | -0.308 |  | -0.261 |
|  |  | (0.191) |  | (0.213) |  | (0.214) |  | (0.218) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.727\*\*\* | -0.722\*\*\* |  |  | -0.505\*\*\* | -0.495\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.147) | (0.147) |  |  | (0.149) | (0.149) |
| Education |  |  | -0.066 | -0.072 |  |  | -0.012 | -0.015 |
|  |  |  | (0.052) | (0.052) |  |  | (0.061) | (0.061) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.968\*\*\* | -0.968\*\*\* |  |  | -0.992\*\*\* | -0.989\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.176) | (0.176) |  |  | (0.196) | (0.197) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.170 | 0.184 |  |  | -0.039 | -0.036 |
|  |  |  | (0.276) | (0.277) |  |  | (0.247) | (0.247) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.219\* | -0.216\* |  |  | -0.066 | -0.066 |
|  |  |  | (0.123) | (0.123) |  |  | (0.108) | (0.108) |
| Age |  |  | -0.092\*\*\* | -0.092\*\*\* |  |  | -0.050 | -0.052 |
|  |  |  | (0.027) | (0.028) |  |  | (0.034) | (0.034) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.393\*\*\* | 0.404\*\*\* |  |  | 0.407\*\*\* | 0.412\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.126) | (0.126) |  |  | (0.143) | (0.144) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,392 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Log Likelihood | -931.143 | -929.058 | -841.468 | -838.635 | -650.873 | -649.668 | -624.913 | -624.173 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 1,876.286 | 1,876.115 | 1,710.935 | 1,709.269 | 1,333.746 | 1,335.336 | 1,295.826 | 1,298.346 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A4: Estimates of voter defection (logit regression)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.703\*\*\* | 0.614\*\*\* | 0.330\*\*\* | 0.225\* | 0.784\*\*\* | 0.663\*\*\* | 0.640\*\*\* | 0.549\*\*\* |
|  | (0.107) | (0.116) | (0.123) | (0.132) | (0.136) | (0.156) | (0.145) | (0.164) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.129 |  | 0.133 |  | 0.170 |  | 0.113 |
|  |  | (0.122) |  | (0.132) |  | (0.116) |  | (0.119) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.219\* |  | -0.262\*\* |  | -0.177 |  | -0.148 |
|  |  | (0.112) |  | (0.122) |  | (0.125) |  | (0.128) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.448\*\*\* | -0.446\*\*\* |  |  | -0.312\*\*\* | -0.306\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.090) | (0.090) |  |  | (0.091) | (0.091) |
| Education |  |  | -0.041 | -0.044 |  |  | -0.009 | -0.011 |
|  |  |  | (0.031) | (0.031) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.037) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.586\*\*\* | -0.587\*\*\* |  |  | -0.600\*\*\* | -0.597\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.105) | (0.105) |  |  | (0.118) | (0.119) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.097 | 0.113 |  |  | -0.031 | -0.028 |
|  |  |  | (0.164) | (0.165) |  |  | (0.149) | (0.149) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.135\* | -0.134\* |  |  | -0.036 | -0.035 |
|  |  |  | (0.075) | (0.076) |  |  | (0.066) | (0.066) |
| Age |  |  | -0.056\*\*\* | -0.057\*\*\* |  |  | -0.032 | -0.033 |
|  |  |  | (0.017) | (0.017) |  |  | (0.020) | (0.021) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.244\*\*\* | 0.249\*\*\* |  |  | 0.246\*\*\* | 0.248\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.077) | (0.077) |  |  | (0.087) | (0.087) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,392 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Log Likelihood | -931.250 | -929.103 | -841.443 | -838.503 | -650.855 | -649.687 | -624.753 | -624.087 |
| Akaike Inf. Crit. | 1,876.499 | 1,876.205 | 1,710.886 | 1,709.007 | 1,333.710 | 1,335.375 | 1,295.506 | 1,298.175 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A5: Estimates of voter defection (probit regression)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Share of Taiwanese | |
| Ethnicity | Low | High |
| Probability |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 0.579 | 0.476 |
| Non-Taiwanese | 0.167 | 0.241 |
| Odds |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 1.378 | 0.907 |
| Non-Taiwanese | 0.200 | 0.317 |
| Log odds |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 0.320 | -0.098 |
| Non-Taiwanese | -1.609 | -1.147 |

(a) 1983 Survey

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Share of Taiwanese | |
| Ethnicity | Low | High |
| Probability |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 0.526 | 0.586 |
| Non-Taiwanese | 0.175 | 0.288 |
| Odds |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 1.109 | 1.416 |
| Non-Taiwanese | 0.212 | 0.404 |
| Log odds |  |  |
| Taiwanese | 0.104 | 0.348 |
| Non-Taiwanese | -1.553 | -0.908 |

(b) 1992 Survey

Table A6: Probability, odds, log odds of voter defection as a function of Taiwanese ethnicity and Share of Taiwanese

**A5 Robustness Checks**

Since our key explanatory variable is a binary indicator, we first apply an alternative specification suggested by [Brambor, Clark, and Golder](#_bookmark15) ([2006)](#_bookmark15). As one of the variables in the interaction term is a binary variable, the alternative specification includes two interaction terms: *Taiwanese × Share of Taiwanese* and *Non-Taiwanese × Share of Taiwanese* (Table [A6).](#_bookmark8) The substantive results remain largely the same – in the 1992 election, the relative size of the Taiwanese group no longer compromises the pro-opposition effect of Taiwanese ethnicity. Although the estimated coefficient of “Non-Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese” is statistically significant in Model (1), it is no longer the case once we include the control variables.

Next, we recode our explanatory variable, Taiwanese, by considering the ethnicity of a respondent’s mother. More specifically, we now consider respondents as Taiwanese only when both parents are of Taiwanese ethnicity (Table A7). In Table A8, we bring respondents from the Hakka and indigenous groups back to the study sample and carry out the same analysis. Finally, while both surveys include the representative sample of the voting population in their respective elections, we carry out the same analysis but only include respondents from counties chosen for both surveys (Table A9). In sum, we still find very similar results.

In Table A10, we include respondents from Taipei Municipality in our analysis. For the 1992 survey, the results are similar -- the interaction term’s coefficient is marginally significant only when we do not include the control variables. For the 1983 survey, the interaction term’s estimated coefficients, compared with the baseline findings, are no longer statistically significant. We offer the following two explanations: (1) the results may not be readily comparable with the main findings as the 1983 survey did not name the townships/districts from which the respondents were recruits. As a result, we could only use the population statistics of the entire municipality. (2) Given that the opposition has managed to create *tangwai* in Taipei Municipality prior to the 1983 supplementary election, ethnic voting against the KMT was no longer constrained by the relative group size of the Taiwanese people there.

In Table A11, we consider the non-linear influence of ethnic demography by including the squared share of Taiwanese in the regression analysis. Our main results still hold – and as we have argued that voters’ defection through shared ethnic ties is constrained solely by the relative group size in a linear or monotonic manner (the interaction term’s coefficient for the 1983 survey is negative and statistically significant when we include control variables). In other words, ethnically based ethnic defection is not driven by the visibility of Taiwanese ethnicity, which might be the strongest when the shares of the Taiwanese group and Mainlanders in the local population are relatively equal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | |  | 1992 Election | |
|  | (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.224\*\*\* | 0.071\* |  | 0.248\*\*\* | 0.189\*\*\* |
|  | (0.049) | (0.041) |  | (0.059) | (0.057) |
| Media use (=1) |  | -0.169\*\*\* |  |  | -0.107\*\* |
|  |  | (0.040) |  |  | (0.043) |
| Education |  | -0.016 |  |  | -0.004 |
|  |  | (0.012) |  |  | (0.013) |
| KMT member (=1) |  | -0.206\*\*\* |  |  | -0.212\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.039) |  |  | (0.042) |
| Public employee (=1) |  | 0.038 |  |  | -0.004 |
|  |  | (0.081) |  |  | (0.036) |
| Household income |  | -0.048\*\* |  |  | -0.015 |
|  |  | (0.022) |  |  | (0.022) |
| Age |  | -0.020\*\* |  |  | -0.011 |
|  |  | (0.008) |  |  | (0.007) |
| Male (=1) |  | 0.092\*\*\* |  |  | 0.088\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.021) |  |  | (0.031) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese | -0.036\*\*\* | -0.048\*\*\* |  | -0.003 | -0.013 |
|  | (0.012) | (0.013) |  | (0.018) | (0.021) |
| Non-Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese | 0.038\* | 0.031 |  | 0.048 | 0.024 |
|  | (0.021) | (0.021) |  | (0.030) | (0.028) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,335 |  | 1,003 | 1,001 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.032 | 0.099 |  | 0.068 | 0.105 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | |

Table A6: Estimates of voter defection (alternative model specification)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.251\*\*\* | 0.220\*\*\* | 0.100\*\* | 0.066 | 0.289\*\*\* | 0.253\*\*\* | 0.215\*\*\* | 0.194\*\*\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.052) | (0.048) | (0.045) | (0.047) | (0.058) | (0.049) | (0.056) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.039\* |  | 0.032 |  | 0.046 |  | 0.021 |
|  |  | (0.023) |  | (0.021) |  | (0.030) |  | (0.028) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.075\*\*\* |  | -0.080\*\*\* |  | -0.048 |  | -0.034 |
|  |  | (0.025) |  | (0.020) |  | (0.037) |  | (0.033) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.170\*\*\* | -0.168\*\*\* |  |  | -0.108\*\* | -0.106\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.042) | (0.040) |  |  | (0.043) | (0.043) |
| Education |  |  | -0.014 | -0.016 |  |  | -0.003 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.011) | (0.012) |  |  | (0.013) | (0.013) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.208\*\*\* | -0.207\*\*\* |  |  | -0.213\*\*\* | -0.211\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.040) | (0.038) |  |  | (0.041) | (0.042) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.033 | 0.036 |  |  | -0.004 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.082) | (0.082) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.036) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.050\*\* | -0.049\*\* |  |  | -0.016 | -0.016 |
|  |  |  | (0.023) | (0.022) |  |  | (0.022) | (0.022) |
| Age |  |  | -0.020\*\* | -0.020\*\* |  |  | -0.010 | -0.011 |
|  |  |  | (0.008) | (0.008) |  |  | (0.007) | (0.007) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.090\*\*\* | 0.092\*\*\* |  |  | 0.087\*\*\* | 0.088\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.021) | (0.021) |  |  | (0.031) | (0.031) |
| Observations | 1,390 | 1,390 | 1,333 | 1,333 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.030 | 0.032 | 0.096 | 0.099 | 0.069 | 0.068 | 0.106 | 0.105 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A7: Estimates of voter defection (alternative measure of Taiwanese ethnicity)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.254\*\*\* | 0.224\*\*\* | 0.101\*\* | 0.070\* | 0.309\*\*\* | 0.262\*\*\* | 0.227\*\*\* | 0.198\*\*\* |
|  | (0.052) | (0.046) | (0.042) | (0.039) | (0.041) | (0.054) | (0.041) | (0.052) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.039\* |  | 0.032 |  | 0.054\* |  | 0.026 |
|  |  | (0.022) |  | (0.020) |  | (0.030) |  | (0.027) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.071\*\*\* |  | -0.074\*\*\* |  | -0.066\* |  | -0.047 |
|  |  | (0.023) |  | (0.018) |  | (0.037) |  | (0.033) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.172\*\*\* | -0.170\*\*\* |  |  | -0.111\*\*\* | -0.108\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.042) | (0.041) |  |  | (0.042) | (0.042) |
| Education |  |  | -0.015 | -0.016 |  |  | 0.0003 | -0.001 |
|  |  |  | (0.010) | (0.011) |  |  | (0.011) | (0.011) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.207\*\*\* | -0.206\*\*\* |  |  | -0.244\*\*\* | -0.242\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.040) | (0.038) |  |  | (0.036) | (0.036) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.032 | 0.034 |  |  | -0.032 | -0.032 |
|  |  |  | (0.080) | (0.080) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.036) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.042\* | -0.041\* |  |  | -0.010 | -0.010 |
|  |  |  | (0.024) | (0.023) |  |  | (0.019) | (0.019) |
| Age |  |  | -0.020\*\* | -0.020\*\* |  |  | -0.008 | -0.009 |
|  |  |  | (0.009) | (0.009) |  |  | (0.007) | (0.006) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.092\*\*\* | 0.094\*\*\* |  |  | 0.092\*\*\* | 0.093\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.020) | (0.020) |  |  | (0.028) | (0.028) |
| Observations | 1,422 | 1,422 | 1,362 | 1,362 | 1,179 | 1,179 | 1,177 | 1,177 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.030 | 0.031 | 0.096 | 0.097 | 0.061 | 0.062 | 0.110 | 0.110 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A8: Estimates of voter defection (including the Hakka and indigenous groups)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.309\*\*\* | 0.270\*\*\* | 0.164\*\*\* | 0.122\*\*\* | 0.196\*\*\* | 0.161\*\* | 0.124 | 0.106\* |
|  | (0.059) | (0.063) | (0.030) | (0.032) | (0.074) | (0.065) | (0.075) | (0.060) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.018 |  | 0.004 |  | 0.012 |  | -0.062 |
|  |  | (0.023) |  | (0.025) |  | (0.066) |  | (0.067) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.053\* |  | -0.057\*\* |  | -0.087 |  | -0.051 |
|  |  | (0.028) |  | (0.024) |  | (0.065) |  | (0.063) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.159\*\*\* | -0.159\*\*\* |  |  | -0.073 | -0.077 |
|  |  |  | (0.061) | (0.061) |  |  | (0.061) | (0.063) |
| Education |  |  | -0.026 | -0.028 |  |  | 0.001 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.018) | (0.018) |  |  | (0.018) | (0.017) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.221\*\*\* | -0.218\*\*\* |  |  | -0.290\*\*\* | -0.289\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.062) | (0.060) |  |  | (0.063) | (0.062) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.168\*\*\* | 0.170\*\*\* |  |  | -0.054 | -0.065 |
|  |  |  | (0.059) | (0.059) |  |  | (0.043) | (0.042) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.059 | -0.058 |  |  | -0.020 | -0.019 |
|  |  |  | (0.039) | (0.037) |  |  | (0.030) | (0.027) |
| Age |  |  | -0.017 | -0.017 |  |  | -0.003 | -0.005 |
|  |  |  | (0.010) | (0.011) |  |  | (0.012) | (0.011) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.075\*\* | 0.077\*\*\* |  |  | 0.142\*\*\* | 0.153\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.029) | (0.030) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.037) |
| Observations | 820 | 820 | 780 | 780 | 419 | 419 | 418 | 418 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.042 | 0.042 | 0.116 | 0.118 | 0.037 | 0.038 | 0.096 | 0.102 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A9: Estimates of voter defection (only including same counties in both surveys)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.237\*\*\* | 0.226\*\*\* | 0.105\*\*\* | 0.087\*\* | 0.344\*\*\* | 0.291\*\*\* | 0.255\*\*\* | 0.224\*\*\* |
|  | (0.042) | (0.041) | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.036) | (0.049) | (0.035) | (0.047) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.001 |  | 0.005 |  | 0.072\*\* |  | 0.035 |
|  |  | (0.037) |  | (0.029) |  | (0.030) |  | (0.026) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.027 |  | -0.045 |  | -0.068\* |  | -0.049 |
|  |  | (0.043) |  | (0.030) |  | (0.036) |  | (0.033) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.170\*\*\* | -0.171\*\*\* |  |  | -0.132\*\*\* | -0.130\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.037) | (0.036) |  |  | (0.038) | (0.038) |
| Education |  |  | -0.001 | -0.001 |  |  | -0.004 | -0.005 |
|  |  |  | (0.015) | (0.016) |  |  | (0.012) | (0.011) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.220\*\*\* | -0.221\*\*\* |  |  | -0.233\*\*\* | -0.231\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.036) | (0.035) |  |  | (0.033) | (0.034) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.022 | 0.020 |  |  | -0.041 | -0.042 |
|  |  |  | (0.072) | (0.072) |  |  | (0.034) | (0.034) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.049\*\* | -0.049\*\* |  |  | -0.024 | -0.023 |
|  |  |  | (0.021) | (0.021) |  |  | (0.021) | (0.021) |
| Age |  |  | -0.018\*\* | -0.018\*\* |  |  | -0.011\* | -0.011\* |
|  |  |  | (0.008) | (0.008) |  |  | (0.006) | (0.006) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.094\*\*\* | 0.096\*\*\* |  |  | 0.090\*\*\* | 0.090\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.017) | (0.017) |  |  | (0.028) | (0.028) |
| Rural (=1) | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,573 | 1,573 | 1,352 | 1,352 | 1,347 | 1,347 |
|  | 0.036 | 0.035 | 0.098 | 0.098 | 0.072 | 0.073 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| Observations | 0.237\*\*\* | 0.226\*\*\* | 0.105\*\*\* | 0.087\*\* | 0.344\*\*\* | 0.291\*\*\* | 0.255\*\*\* | 0.224\*\*\* |
| Adjusted R2 | (0.042) | (0.041) | (0.034) | (0.034) | (0.036) | (0.049) | (0.035) | (0.047) |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |
| Table A10: Estimates of voter defection (including respondents from Taipei Municipality) | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.255\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.104\*\* | 0.071 | 0.286\*\*\* | 0.260\*\*\* | 0.212\*\*\* | 0.200\*\*\* |
|  | (0.054) | (0.055) | (0.044) | (0.046) | (0.048) | (0.058) | (0.050) | (0.059) |
| Share of Taiwanese group |  | -0.009 |  | 0.012 |  | 0.064 |  | -0.012 |
|  |  | (0.049) |  | (0.052) |  | (0.089) |  | (0.090) |
| Share of Taiwanese group (squared) | | -0.032 |  | -0.012 |  | 0.009 |  | -0.014 |
|  |  | (0.032) |  | (0.028) |  | (0.037) |  | (0.037) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.004 |  | -0.078\* |  | -0.088 |  | -0.048 |
|  |  | (0.047) |  | (0.046) |  | (0.092) |  | (0.089) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese (squared) | | 0.049 |  | 0.001 |  | -0.022 |  | -0.013 |
|  |  | (0.032) |  | (0.026) |  | (0.038) |  | (0.037) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.170\*\*\* | -0.170\*\*\* |  |  | -0.109\*\* | -0.109\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.041) | (0.039) |  |  | (0.043) | (0.044) |
| Education |  |  | -0.015 | -0.016 |  |  | -0.003 | -0.004 |
|  |  |  | (0.011) | (0.012) |  |  | (0.013) | (0.013) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.207\*\*\* | -0.205\*\*\* |  |  | -0.213\*\*\* | -0.213\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.041) | (0.040) |  |  | (0.041) | (0.042) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.035 | 0.038 |  |  | -0.004 | -0.006 |
|  |  |  | (0.082) | (0.083) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.036) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.050\*\* | -0.048\*\* |  |  | -0.016 | -0.016 |
|  |  |  | (0.023) | (0.023) |  |  | (0.022) | (0.022) |
| Age |  |  | -0.020\*\* | -0.020\*\* |  |  | -0.011 | -0.011 |
|  |  |  | (0.008) | (0.008) |  |  | (0.007) | (0.007) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.090\*\*\* | 0.093\*\*\* |  |  | 0.088\*\*\* | 0.091\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.021) | (0.021) |  |  | (0.031) | (0.031) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,392 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.031 | 0.032 | 0.097 | 0.098 | 0.068 | 0.066 | 0.106 | 0.104 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A11: Estimates of voter defection (including squared terms)

**A6 Non-responses and Perceived Electoral Integrity**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.144\*\*\* | 0.125\*\*\* | 0.040 | 0.017 | 0.042 | 0.029 | 0.020 | 0.024 |
|  | (0.033) | (0.027) | (0.039) | (0.036) | (0.035) | (0.040) | (0.048) | (0.048) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.005 |  | -0.006 |  | 0.010 |  | -0.009 |
|  |  | (0.024) |  | (0.027) |  | (0.028) |  | (0.026) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.050\*\* |  | -0.059\*\* |  | -0.023 |  | 0.002 |
|  |  | (0.022) |  | (0.028) |  | (0.035) |  | (0.034) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.189\*\*\* | -0.190\*\*\* |  |  | -0.208\*\*\* | -0.208\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.048) | (0.048) |  |  | (0.036) | (0.036) |
| Education |  |  | -0.022\* | -0.023\* |  |  | 0.023\*\* | 0.022\* |
|  |  |  | (0.012) | (0.012) |  |  | (0.011) | (0.011) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.094\*\*\* | -0.093\*\*\* |  |  | -0.095\*\*\* | -0.096\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.036) | (0.035) |  |  | (0.036) | (0.036) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.079 | 0.080 |  |  | 0.028 | 0.027 |
|  |  |  | (0.085) | (0.086) |  |  | (0.037) | (0.037) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.050\* | -0.049\* |  |  | -0.022 | -0.022 |
|  |  |  | (0.027) | (0.026) |  |  | (0.019) | (0.019) |
| Age |  |  | -0.017\*\*\* | -0.017\*\*\* |  |  | -0.006 | -0.006 |
|  |  |  | (0.006) | (0.006) |  |  | (0.005) | (0.006) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.070\*\*\* | 0.072\*\*\* |  |  | 0.043 | 0.044 |
|  |  |  | (0.026) | (0.026) |  |  | (0.029) | (0.029) |
| Observations | 1,392 | 1,392 | 1,335 | 1,335 | 1,003 | 1,003 | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.009 | 0.010 | 0.064 | 0.067 | 0.031 | 0.029 | 0.086 | 0.084 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A12: Estimates of non-responses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1983 Election | | | | 1992 Election | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.735\*\*\* | 0.485\*\*\* | 0.402 | 0.141 | 0.189\*\*\* | 0.206\*\* | 0.119\* | 0.140 |
|  | (0.235) | (0.156) | (0.255) | (0.203) | (0.062) | (0.086) | (0.066) | (0.087) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.594\*\*\* |  | 0.590\*\*\* |  | 0.002 |  | -0.016 |
|  |  | (0.065) |  | (0.074) |  | (0.059) |  | (0.061) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.525\*\*\* |  | -0.553\*\*\* |  | 0.037 |  | 0.032 |
|  |  | (0.092) |  | (0.099) |  | (0.051) |  | (0.046) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.247\*\* | -0.220\* |  |  | 0.048 | 0.046 |
|  |  |  | (0.114) | (0.118) |  |  | (0.060) | (0.060) |
| Education |  |  | -0.051 | -0.063\* |  |  | -0.013 | -0.012 |
|  |  |  | (0.037) | (0.036) |  |  | (0.027) | (0.027) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.339\*\* | -0.335\*\* |  |  | -0.158\*\* | -0.159\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.151) | (0.137) |  |  | (0.067) | (0.069) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | -0.433\*\*\* | -0.405\*\*\* |  |  | -0.058 | -0.059 |
|  |  |  | (0.119) | (0.110) |  |  | (0.077) | (0.077) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.006 | -0.001 |  |  | -0.018 | -0.018 |
|  |  |  | (0.088) | (0.082) |  |  | (0.046) | (0.046) |
| Age |  |  | -0.034 | -0.034 |  |  | -0.034\*\*\* | -0.034\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.022) | (0.023) |  |  | (0.012) | (0.013) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.171 | 0.189 |  |  | 0.168\*\*\* | 0.168\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.142) | (0.143) |  |  | (0.058) | (0.060) |
| Observations | 1,297 | 1,297 | 1,241 | 1,241 | 753 | 753 | 752 | 752 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.061 | 0.074 | 0.086 | 0.101 | 0.011 | 0.009 | 0.035 | 0.033 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A12: Estimates of perceived electoral integrity

**A7 DPP Branches, KMT Strength, and Voter Defection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Early Branches | | | | Late Branches | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.363\*\*\* | 0.317\*\*\* | 0.267\*\*\* | 0.250\*\*\* | 0.250\*\*\* | 0.251\*\*\* | 0.179\*\* | 0.188\*\* |
|  | (0.049) | (0.064) | (0.051) | (0.059) | (0.080) | (0.071) | (0.081) | (0.079) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.044 |  | 0.019 |  | 0.286\* |  | 0.215 |
|  |  | (0.034) |  | (0.030) |  | (0.164) |  | (0.160) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.007 |  | 0.001 |  | -0.352\*\* |  | -0.267\*\* |
|  |  | (0.043) |  | (0.038) |  | (0.141) |  | (0.133) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.123\*\* | -0.119\*\* |  |  | -0.062 | -0.063 |
|  |  |  | (0.052) | (0.053) |  |  | (0.071) | (0.072) |
| Education |  |  | -0.013 | -0.010 |  |  | 0.006 | 0.003 |
|  |  |  | (0.019) | (0.017) |  |  | (0.021) | (0.019) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.224\*\*\* | -0.223\*\*\* |  |  | -0.186\*\* | -0.172\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.051) | (0.052) |  |  | (0.073) | (0.079) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.021 | 0.021 |  |  | -0.136 | -0.113 |
|  |  |  | (0.038) | (0.037) |  |  | (0.103) | (0.091) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.030 | -0.029 |  |  | 0.024 | 0.012 |
|  |  |  | (0.023) | (0.024) |  |  | (0.040) | (0.038) |
| Age |  |  | -0.014 | -0.013 |  |  | -0.004 | -0.005 |
|  |  |  | (0.010) | (0.010) |  |  | (0.010) | (0.010) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.117\*\*\* | 0.113\*\*\* |  |  | 0.008 | 0.014 |
|  |  |  | (0.041) | (0.039) |  |  | (0.059) | (0.061) |
| Observations | 716 | 716 | 714 | 714 | 287 | 287 | 287 | 287 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.070 | 0.074 | 0.118 | 0.117 | 0.019 | 0.028 | 0.036 | 0.038 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | |

Table A14: Estimates of voter defection (split samples by the timing of DPP branch)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | KMT >= 50% | | | | | KMT < 50% | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.236\*\*\* | 0.126 | 0.151\* | 0.085 | 0.267\*\*\* | | 0.340\*\*\* | 0.197\*\*\* | 0.257\*\*\* |
|  | (0.083) | (0.091) | (0.080) | (0.094) | (0.063) | | (0.039) | (0.049) | (0.059) |
| Share of Taiwanese |  | 0.104\*\*\* |  | 0.062\* |  | | 0.071 |  | 0.091 |
|  |  | (0.033) |  | (0.033) |  | | (0.059) |  | (0.076) |
| Taiwanese x Share of Taiwanese |  | -0.106\*\*\* |  | -0.073\*\* |  | | 0.130 |  | 0.112 |
|  |  | (0.039) |  | (0.037) |  | | (0.091) |  | (0.072) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.166\*\* | -0.160\*\* |  | |  | -0.033 | -0.035 |
|  |  |  | (0.073) | (0.075) |  | |  | (0.067) | (0.070) |
| Education |  |  | 0.005 | 0.004 |  | |  | -0.021 | -0.019 |
|  |  |  | (0.019) | (0.020) |  | |  | (0.027) | (0.028) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.255\*\*\* | -0.248\*\*\* |  | |  | -0.139 | -0.142 |
|  |  |  | (0.065) | (0.068) |  | |  | (0.102) | (0.101) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | -0.023 | -0.017 |  | |  | -0.040 | -0.041 |
|  |  |  | (0.065) | (0.061) |  | |  | (0.083) | (0.084) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.030 | -0.028 |  | |  | 0.042 | 0.037 |
|  |  |  | (0.043) | (0.043) |  | |  | (0.042) | (0.046) |
| Age |  |  | -0.002 | -0.002 |  | |  | -0.012 | -0.013 |
|  |  |  | (0.011) | (0.011) |  | |  | (0.012) | (0.012) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.093\*\* | 0.091\*\* |  | |  | 0.197\*\*\* | 0.193\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.045) | (0.045) |  | |  | (0.045) | (0.046) |
| Observations | 472 | 472 | 472 | 472 | 170 | | 170 | 169 | 169 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.034 | 0.041 | 0.092 | 0.092 | 0.248 | | 0.243 | 0.261 | 0.255 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | | | | | | |

Table A16: Estimates of voter defection (split samples by the KMT’s vote shares in the 1990 township elections)

**A7 Analysis of 1995 Survey**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Taiwanese (=1) | 0.189\*\*\* | 0.146\*\*\* | 0.174\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* |
|  | (0.043) | (0.049) | (0.042) | (0.047) |
| Size of Taiwanese group |  | 0.083 |  | 0.083 |
|  |  | (0.087) |  | (0.086) |
| Taiwanese x Size of Taiwanese group | | -0.013 |  | -0.020 |
|  |  | (0.059) |  | (0.055) |
| Media use (=1) |  |  | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.117\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.036) | (0.037) |
| Education |  |  | 0.003 | 0.008 |
|  |  |  | (0.012) | (0.013) |
| KMT member (=1) |  |  | -0.122\*\*\* | -0.107\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.040) | (0.047) |
| Public employee (=1) |  |  | 0.038 | -0.005 |
|  |  |  | (0.050) | (0.053) |
| Household income |  |  | -0.064\*\*\* | -0.052\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.021) | (0.024) |
| Age |  |  | -0.001 | -0.0004 |
|  |  |  | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Male (=1) |  |  | 0.033 | 0.045 |
|  |  |  | (0.035) | (0.038) |
| Observations | 1,148 | 949 | 1,041 | 864 |
| Adjusted R2 | 0.028 | 0.032 | 0.054 | 0.053 |
| Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 | | | | |

Table A17: Estimates of voter defection; survey for the 1995 election

**A9 Randomized Tests**

We follow Erikson, Pinto, and Rader (2010, 2014), who conduct non-parametric randomized tests to study multilevel data in the United States. They propose estimating the coefficient of interest (in our case, it is the interaction term of Taiwanese ethnicity and the Taiwanese group’s relative size in the townships) by first randomly reshuffling the main explanatory variable in our data so that it no longer has the expected correlation with the outcome variable. Then we employ the same model specification – namely the baseline LPM –1,000 times to create the distribution of 1,000 estimated coefficients. Theoretically, the distribution will be centered on zero. Finally, we evaluate the probability that we observe the original estimated coefficient when the coefficient is presumed to be zero by the null hypothesis. As shown in Figures A4 and A5, the results are consistent with our main findings, as only the interaction coefficient for the 1983 election falls in the region that corresponds to the level of statistical significance at p<.01.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| (a) 1983 Election | (b) 1992 Election |

Figure A4: Randomization tests (Taiwanese ethnicity)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| (a) 1983 Election | (b) 1992 Election |

Figure A5: Randomization tests (interaction term)
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