July 29, 2021

Codebook

Latin American Electoral Volatility Dataset: Presidential Elections

Scott Mainwaring, Yen-Pin Su, María Victoria De Negri, Krystin Krause, Peter Cummings, and Jenny Ng

Case Selection

Our estimates of volatility include Latin American electoral periods in all political regimes that meet three criteria:

1) At least two consecutive elections were carried out under this regime; otherwise, it is impossible to calculate electoral volatility.
2) The data for both elections of the electoral period must be available. This eliminated a few early electoral periods in Peru and Ecuador.
3) The Varieties of Democracy project (V-Dem) classified the second election in the election period as at least "somewhat free and fair."

Coding Rules for Electoral Volatility

We code only the first round of presidential elections. The first round gives a better idea of patterns of stability in electoral calculations by party leaders and voters' preferences. In the runoff, the pool has already narrowed to two candidates. This final choice does not reflect voters' preferences among an initial pool of options.

Coalitions in presidential elections present different coding challenges than coalitions in legislative elections. Usually, if there are interparty coalitions for assembly elections, the electoral authorities report a separate vote for each of the constituent parties of the coalition, so coalitions usually require no special attention; one allocates the coalition's votes to its member parties. In contrast, there is no good way of disaggregating the votes for a presidential candidate into the various parties that supported his/her candidacy.

Three general principles cut across the sixteen specific coding rules that follow. First, we primarily coded according to the party of the presidential candidate. In most situations, we gave 100% of a coalition's vote to the party of the presidential candidate. There is rarely a good way to divide a presidential candidate's votes among the different parties that supported her.

Second, as an exception to the first rule, we counted the electoral coalitions that a) ran together on at least two consecutive occasions *and* b) did not always field a presidential candidate from the same party as a continuity (i.e., as the same electoral force).

Third, we show electoral continuities when the underlying reality gives some reason to do so. We regarded thirty-three parties or coalitions as continuities from an earlier entity

with a different name. For example, we treated Mexico's Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD) as the continuation of the Frente Democrático Nacional, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas's electoral vehicle in 1988. We considered the Partido de la U (2010) as a continuity of Primero Colombia (2002-06), which Álvaro Uribe created in his successful bids for the presidency. To avoid overstating electoral discontinuities, we treated five independents with a well-known affiliation to a party as representing that party rather than as new entrants. Although there are many cases of very high volatility, this is a product of real changes in the party landscape, not of coding rules.

1. Except in cases in which two or more parties run together in at least two consecutive elections, we attribute 100% of the coalition's vote share to the presidential candidate's party and count the coalition partners as winning 0% of the vote.

2. Exception to Rule 1: In some cases, we don't know the candidate's party, or the candidate has no party, or the candidate is a member of a party that is not part of the coalition, or the candidate is the coalition candidate without an affiliation to any of the parties. In these cases, for calculating volatility from T_1 to T_2, we usually attribute the coalition votes in T_2 to the largest party of the coalition at T_1.[1] For example, Patricia Walsh in Argentina was the candidate of the Alianza Izquierda Unida in 1999 and 2003, a coalition of the Argentine Communist Party and the Movement of Socialist Workers (Movimiento de los Trabajadores Socialistas). She was an independent, so we count this coalition as the continuation of the Movimiento de los Trabajadores Socialistas because it was the only of the two parties in the 1999 and 2003 coalition that ran a presidential candidate in 1994.

3. In cases in which we could not identify the candidate's party, if the candidate has formed the coalition as a new personalistic electoral vehicle, or if this situation occurs in the founding election of a new competitive regime, or if all of the parties that make up the coalition are new (or the lesser splinters from another party), or if there is no clear antecedent party, we treat the coalition as a new entity. Examples include the FND and PDC coalition in Guatemala in 1944 because it was the first election of a new competitive regime; Pueblo Unido in Costa Rica in 1990 because it was a new coalition in which all of the parties were new; and Cuba in 1948.

Stable coalitions

4. As long as the presidential candidate of a coalition comes from the same party, we consistently attribute the votes to that party. Such coalitions are common. Examples include the Unidad Nacional in Peru (2001-06), both times led by the PPC; the PRSC-led coalitions in the Dominican Republic from 1978 on; the PT-led coalitions in Brazil since 2002; and the PSDB-led coalitions in Brazil since 1994.

5. If parties A and B (and other parties) form a coalition for at least two consecutive elections and the candidate does not always come from the same party, for the time of their partnership, we treat them as one entity, thus registering the stability of the coalition. Consider the example of Chile's Concertación coalition. From 1989 through 2009, it

[1] Rule 7a follows a similar logic, but for mergers of parties and new coalitions.

consisted of the Christian Democrats, the Socialists, and the center-left Party for Democracy. In 1989, 1993, and 2009, the presidential candidate came from the Christian Democrats; in 1999 and 2005,[2] from the Socialists. Treating the Socialists as a party that won 0% of the vote in 1989, 1993, and 2009, and the Christian Democrats as a party that won 0% in 1999 and 2005, would wrongly suggest great instability in 1999 and 2009 when in fact the same coalition remained intact.

6. Except for the founding election of a new competitive regime, the last election before a democratic breakdown, and the last election in the dataset, every election corresponds to two different electoral periods—first, as the second election in a period, and then as the first in the next period. For example, in Brazil, the 1955 election is the second of the 1950-55 period and then the first of the 1955-60 period. Sometimes Rule 1 applies to an election when it is the second of an electoral period and Rule 2 to the same election when it is the first of the subsequent period (or vice versa). In Brazil, the PSD ran on its own in 1950 and then ran with the PTB in 1955 and 1960. Because the coalition candidate in 1955, Juscelino Kubitschek, was a member of the PSD, for calculating volatility for 1950-55, following Rule 1 we compare the PSD's vote percentage in 1950 with the coalition's vote share in 1955 (i.e., we attribute all the coalition votes in 1955 to the PSD). For calculating volatility for 1955-60, we compare the coalition's vote share in the two elections, following Rule 2. Following Rule 1 for the PSD for 1950-55 and Rule #2 for the PSD/PTB coalition for 1955-60 produces the only sensible way of calculating volatility for each election. For 1950-55, we would get a misleading result if (by ignoring Rule #1) we gave the PSD a 0% vote share for 1955 even though the coalition candidate came from the PSD. For 1955-60, we would get a misleading result if (by ignoring Rule #2) we treated the coalition as a new entity in 1960.

Except when Rule #2 or 3 applies, (we don't know the candidate's party, or when the candidate has no party, or if the candidate is the coalition candidate without an affiliation to either of the parties), the key for coding coalitions and changes in coalitions is the party of the presidential candidate. Three additional rules involve more specific changes in coalitions. Rules 7 to 9 follow the logic of the first three rules and of coding primarily the party of the presidential candidate except where Rule 2, 3, or 4 applies.

New coalitions, party mergers, and coalitions that splinter

7. If two parties that each ran separate candidates in one election (T_1) form a coalition or merge for the next (T_2), to calculate volatility from T_1 to T_2, we designate 100% of the coalition's vote share in T_2 to the party of the presidential candidate and 0% to the other coalition members.[3] This rule also applies to coalitions that form again after a hiatus. For example, the RN/UDI coalition in Chile came together again in 2009 after a temporary divorce in 2005. For calculating volatility in the 1999-2005 electoral period, we compare the coalition's percentage in 1999 with the UDI's vote share in 2005 because the 1999 candidate was a member of UDI. For calculating volatility in the 2005-09 electoral period,

[2] The runoff rounds were held in 2000 and 2006, respectively.

[3]For example, in Brazil, after fielding its own candidate in 1989, the PFL supported the PSDB candidate in 1994 and 1998. We treat the PFL as getting 0% in 1994.

we compare RN's vote share in 2005 with the coalition vote share in 2009 because the 2009 candidate came from RN.

Likewise, if two parties that each ran separate candidates in one election (T_1) merge for the next (T_2), to calculate volatility from T_1 to T_2, we consider the coalition as the sequel to the party who ran the presidential candidate in T_2. We count the other party as winning 0% at T_2.

7a. In the situation described in Rule 7 (a new coalition or a merger of two or more parties), assuming that there is reasonable continuity from T1 to the new coalition or merged party at T2, we compare the T2 vote share with the T1 vote share of the party that ran the presidential candidate at T2.

8. Coalitions that splinter after two or more elections. If A and B (or more parties) run together N consecutive times (at least twice) and then splinter at T_{N+1}, for calculating volatility from $T_N$to T_{N+1}, we give 100% of the vote share in T_N to the party of the presidential candidate in that election.

9. Multiparty coalitions that partially splinter. (Rule 9 is necessary only if Rule 4 does not apply; that is, if the presidential candidate does not always come from the same party.)

a) A, B, and C form a coalition in T_N, where A or B field the presidential candidate and C supports the coalition (but runs no candidate). Then, in T_{N+1}, C supports a different coalition. For calculating volatility from $T_N$to T_{N+1}, we count the A+B coalition as being intact, thus receiving 100% of the vote share in T_{N+1}.

b) A, B, and C form a coalition in T_1, where C runs the presidential candidate. Then, in T_2, C runs on its own or with different partners. For calculating volatility from T_1 to T_2, we count C as receiving 100% of the coalition's vote share in T_1. In the aforementioned Peruvian case, if Unidad Nacional's candidate in 2001 had been a member of Cambio Radical, for calculating volatility from 2001 to 2006, we would have attributed 0% to Unidad Nacional and 100% of the coalition's vote to Cambio Radical in 2001.

Other Rules

10. If a formally independent candidate had a close affiliation to a party, we treat the candidate as coming from the party. Jorge Alessandri in Chile (1958 and 1970) was formally independent but was closely linked to the Liberal and Conservative parties in 1958 and to the Partido Nacional in 1970. He successfully ran for Senate on the Liberal Party ticket in 1956. It would overstate discontinuity on the right (and hence electoral volatility) to treat Alessandri as a new party in 1958.

11. For changes of party names, when there was reasonable continuity from one election to the next, we coded the new party label as if it were the same organization. The Brazilian Communist Party in 1992 changed its name to the Partido Popular Socialista, mainly in an attempt to shed the negative connotations of the Communist label after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In Colombia, Alvaro Uribe's electoral vehicle in 2006 and 2006, Primero Colombia, gave rise to the Partido de la Unión, more frequently known as the Partido de la U, created by Uribe's Minister of Defense and then close political ally Juan Manuel Santos. Moreover, Santos was Uribe's candidate in 2010. We treat the Partido de la U (2010) as a continuity of Primero Colombia.

12. If an independent candidate had the backing of several parties at T2, we treat that candidate as the successor to the largest of those parties at T1 or as a new entry, depending on how different/new the coalition is relative to coalitions in the previous election.

13. Party schisms: If a party splits from one election (T_1) to the next (T_2), to calculate volatility from T_1 to T_2, we compare the party with the higher vote share at T_2 with the pre-schism party at T_1. We count the smaller party at T_2 as new.

14. If minor candidates were grouped together in the original data source as "others," we treated them as one party. In almost all cases, however, we were able to treat them as separate candidates.

15. For one minor candidate in Argentina, the electoral authorities reported a separate vote for each party that formed a coalition to support a presidential candidate. Unless such a coalition lasted for at least two consecutive elections, we allocate the entire vote for the coalition to the party that won the largest vote share.

16. Vote pooling. If the electoral system pools votes of multiple candidates of the same party, we allocate all those votes to the party. Examples: Uruguay (the Ley de Lemas), Honduras.

Coding New Parties:

1) We consider a party as new if it meets two conditions:

a) It never ran or was part of a coalition that ran in any previous presidential election, **and**

b) It never ran in national congressional elections prior to the penultimate presidential elections.

Hence, we consider a party new at the presidential level at T+2 if it first ran in national congressional elections in T+1 and then ran in the presidential election at T+2. Our logic is that the party is still new at the presidential level. However, even if a party never ran a presidential candidate or was part of a coalition that ran one, if it ran in congressional elections prior to the penultimate presidential elections, we count it as an established party. For example, the Colombian Movimiento Alianza Social Indígena (ASI) ran for congressional elections in 1991 and 2002. It ran a presidential candidate for the first time in 2006. Because it had run in the 1991 constituent assembly/congressional elections, we count it as an established party in 2006. If its only previous congressional election had been 2002, we would have counted it as a new presidential party in 2006.

Note 1: If a party ran in an earlier coalition but we gave the vote share to another member of the earlier coalition, it still counts as an established party (that is, we still count it as having run in the earlier presidential or national congressional election).

Note 2: We take into account parties' experience both in the regime under consideration and in previous competitive regimes.

2) In cases in which a new competitive regime began and lower chamber elections preceded presidential elections by at least one year, we considered parties that did not compete in the antecedent lower chamber parties as new in the presidential elections. These cases include

Bolivia (the 1980 lower chamber elections preceded the 1985 presidential election) and Brazil (the 1986 lower chamber elections preceded the 1989 presidential election).

In the case of **coalitions**: The dominant criterion for deciding how to count a coalition is the status (new versus established) of the presidential candidate's party.

3) In most cases, the presidential candidate can be identified as a member of one party. If the president's party is a new entrant according to rule 1 above, we count the coalition as new. If that party is established, we regard the coalition as established.

4) If we are not able to identify the candidate's party, if the candidate is an independent, or he comes from a party that does not take part in the coalition:

a) if the coalition had run before, we treat the coalition as established.

b) if this is a first-time coalition and the largest party in the previous election is established, we treat the coalition as established. Example: Argentina 2007, Una Nación Avanzada coalition. In Peru, we treat Alianza por el Gran Cambio in 2011 as established. Although Pedro Pablo Kuczinski was an independent, the largest party in his coalition, the PPC, was established.

c) if this is a first-time coalition and all parties are new, we treat the coalition as new.

5) Independent candidates: We treat independent candidates who are not formally supported by a coalition or a party as new entries the first time they run for the presidency. US examples: John Anderson in 1976; Ross Perot in 1992. If they run again, we would count them as established.

6) Splinters/Factions: We treat the the largest party as the continuity, and any factions as new parties unless they previously existed as a party. e.g: Argentina 2003. We treat the FPV as the continuation of PJ, and Frente Movimiento Popular Unión y Libertad and Frente por la Lealtad as new parties.

7) We treat "Others" as established because we cannot determine which parties were included under this residual category.

We recorded this data beginning with the second election after the inauguration of a new competitive regime.

Party death

Beginning in the second election of a new regime, we track *party exits*, *Type A volatility* and *Type B volatility* (following Powell and Tucker 2014). We included the most recent elections for all countries, although we acknowledge that these values are subject to change in the future, as a party coded as dead may run again in future elections.

- *Party Exits*: If a party collapses in a given election, meaning that it never competes again in any other lower chamber election, neither individually nor in coalition, the value for that cell is its percentage of the vote in the previous election, i.e., the last election in which it won votes. For all parties that do not collapse permanently in a given election, the value for Party Exits = 0. (Note: We track party exits at each level separately. That is, a party could exit from the lower chamber electoral system but continue to compete in presidential elections, or vice versa.)

For coalitions: If a party that exited the system at T ran as part of a coalition in the previous presidential election (T-1), we allocate its vote % in its final election (T-1) according to the following rule: a) If the party ran *separately* in lower chamber elections at T-1, or if votes are allocated to specific parties even though they ran in a coalition (e.g. Brazil's open list PR system), we give the party the same vote share in the presidential coalition at T-1 as it won in the lower chamber coalition at T-1. That is, if it won 20% of the coalition's total lower chamber vote, we give it 20% of the coalition's presidential vote; b) If the party did *not run separately* in lower chamber elections at T-1, AND if votes are not allocated to specific parties within the lower chamber election, we use the temporally closest presidential or lower chamber election in which the party that eventually exited ran by itself and use the same method. Example: for Argentina, the PSP exited in 1999. In 1995, it ran as part of the FREPASO coalition for both the presidency and in lower chamber elections. We used the temporally closest election when the PSP ran on its own, namely, the 1993 lower chamber results to calculate its share of the 1995 presidential vote. FREPASO won 29.2% of the presidential vote in 1995. The final presidential or lower chamber election when the PSP ran alone was 1993 (lower chamber). In 1993, the PSP won 2.5% of the total vote won by the parties that formed FREPASO in 1995: Frente Grande won 3.38% (93.9%), PDC won 0.12% (3.3%), PI won 0.01 (0.3%), PSP 0.09 (2.5%), and PSD did not run independently. Therefore, we allocate 2.5% of FREPASO's 1995 presidential vote to the PSP, so PSP gets 0.73% (=2.5% * 29.2%).

In some cases, parties run in coalition with the same allies for more than one election: in Chile Partido Los Verdes (PV) ran in coalition with Partido Humanista in 1993, 1997, and 2001, and then disappears in 2002. So, the value for party exit in 2005 for PV is calculated based on the vote share gained by PV and PH in 1989, the last election in which PV ran independently, and we then assume that the 2001 vote share was divided among coalition partners in the same proportion that they won in 1989.

When we apply rule #15, whereby we have two columns for the electoral data in a given election, we compare column 2 of the first election with column 1 of the following one. For example: in 2011 in Perú, we gave the Gana Perú vote share to PNP in column 1 (row #56), and to Partido Socialista in column 2 (row #47), the party with the largest vote share in 2016. To calculate party exits in 2016, we compare 2011(2) to 2016 (so that it looks as if PNP did not run in 2011 or 2016 and only PSocialista ran both years). This way, we avoid coding as a party exit what was actually a coalition dissolution from one election to the next.

For party mergers: We coded the party with fewer votes in T1 as not competing (i.e., winning 0.0%) in election T2. If it did not compete in subsequent elections, we counted it as disappearing in election T2.

For mixed electoral systems: we use a weighted score to calculate the value for party exits (the same calculation made for new parties).

- *Type A volatility*: following the concept of Powell and Tucker (2014), it equals 1/2 of the vote share of all new parties in an election plus 1/2 of all Party Exits in that election.
- *Type B volatility*: also following Powell and Tucker (2014), it equals total volatility minus Type A volatility.

Codebook: Variables and Data Sources

ID VARIABLES

ctyid: Numeric country code.

country: country name.

elect_period: Electoral period.

election_year: The electoral year for which volatility was measured.

regime_id: Numeric regime code.

regime_elec: The number of the election in a given regime. This variable has no substantive meaning. It simply indicates the time sequence of the observations for a regime. It is used for specifying the panel structure and time structure of the data

DEPENDENT VARIABLES:

volatility: Total electoral volatility. This is Pederson's Index of electoral volatility (1979): the sum of the net change in the percentage of votes gained or lost by each party from one election to the next, divided by two.

newparties: Vote share of new parties in the second election of the electoral period. Also called (but not in the dataset file) extra-system volatility.

withinsv: Within system volatility. Equals (volatility-newparties).

COVARIATES

founding_elect: This is the year of the founding presidential election of a competitive regime that lasted at least two consecutive presidential elections. It is not always the same as the year when Mainwaring & Pérez-Liñán coded the inaugural year of democracy. In some cases, the founding election did not exactly match the establishment of democracy. For example, in Brazil, most analysts consider 1985 as the inauguration of the new regime. However, the first popular election for president took place in 1989. For Brazil, age_democracy = 5 for the 1989-94 electoral period.

birthyear: Years since the foundational presidential election of a regime until 2015, the end year of the dataset. For example, for Argentina 1991-95, birthyear = 32 since the foundational presidential election occurred in 1983. This is a cohort effect variable.

ln_birthyear: Natural log of the number of years since the foundational presidential election of a regime until 2014, the end year of the dataset.

age_democracy: The number of years from the founding presidential election of a new regime until the second election of an electoral period. For example, age_democracy for Argentina for the 1983-89 electoral period = 6. This is an aging effect.

ln_age_democracy: The natural log of age_democracy.

conc_elec: Is the presidential election concurrent with a legislative election? (0= No; 1= Yes). Based on the year of the second election of an electoral period.

runoff: Is there a runoff clause for that election? (0= No; 1= Yes). Based on the year of the second election of an electoral period.
Note: In some cases, the second round took place in Congress: Argentina in 1946 (Nohlen 1993: 9), Bolivia until 2009, except during the Revolución Nacional in 1956-64(Nohlen 1993: 71; Payne, Zovatto and Mateo Díaz 2007: 24), Chile until 1973 (Nohlen 1993: 237), Guatemala until 1993 (Nohlen 1993: 341), and Peru from 1931 until 1985 (Nohlen 1993: 519). We code these cases as 1.

Sources:
- McClintock, Cynthia. 2009. "Presidential-Election Rules in Latin America: Is Plurality or Runoff Better for Democracy?" Paper presented at the APSA 2009 Toronto Meeting.
- Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*.
- Payne, J. Mark, Daniel Zovatto G., and Mercedes Mateo Díaz. 2007. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America.* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.

Sources: See list below.

enp: Effective number of parties in the lower chamber in votes, based on the year of the first election of an electoral period. Calculated using Laakso and Taagepera's (1979) formula, measured in votes: 1 divided by the sum of the square of all parties' vote shares. For Cuba 1940 and 1944 we calculated ENP by share of seats, as vote share for those elections was unavailable.
For mixed-systems (Bolivia 1997-2009, Mexico, and Venezuela 1998) and for Ecuador 1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, and 1998, we calculated ENP using the sum of votes that parties received in both voting systems. In the case of Mexico 1988, there is no data for the plurality system, so we calculated ENP only based on the SM votes.
In almost all cases, when the presidential election took place on a different year from the parliamentary election, the ENP is calculated for the election immediately before the presidential election. The rare exception to this rule for nonconcurrent elections is when the election immediately before the presidential election took place before the inauguration of

the competitive regime. In these cases, ENP is calculated for the election immediately after the presidential election (Ecuador 1950, El Salvador 1985, and Panama 1994).
Sources: See below.

lag_polar: The level of ideological polarization for the year of the first election of an electoral period in a country. This measure was developed in Alvarez and Nagler (2004), Ezrow (2007), and Dalton (2008), and is calculated based on Singer's (2016) formula. First, ideological positions of each political party are drawn from Baker and Greene's (2011) estimates of the ideological position of the party's presidential candidate. Next, the mean ideology of all presidential candidates weighted by the party's vote share is subtracted from the ideology of each party's presidential candidate. Then, these differences are squared and weighted by the party's vote share in the presidential election. Finally, the square root of the sum of these differences is used as the estimate of ideological polarization in a country, as reflected in the formula below, in which i represents each party, V is the vote share, and LR is left-right ideology.

$$\text{Polarization} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{n} V_i \, (LR_i - LR_{mean})^2}$$

Values range from approximately 0 to 8.25, with higher values corresponding to a higher level of ideological polarization.

We computed party system polarization when 1) there are at least two parties with coded ideological scores (the data are either from Baker and Greene or Coppedge), and 2) when the total vote shares of the parties being included for calculation are more than 50%.

For parties in earlier periods in which the ideological scores are unavailable in Baker and Greene's (2011) dataset, we use the first available data point for the parties in the dataset. For presidential candidates whose ideological scores are unavailable but their parties are assigned ideological scores in the legislative elections in Baker and Greene's (2011) dataset, we use the legislative ideological score for the presidential ideological score.

Baker and Greene referred to a number of studies (including Coppedge's study) to code the ideological score for parties in Latin America. We did not do our own coding. In the absence of information to the contrary, we assumed that a party did not change its ideological position over time if it existed before Baker and Greene coded it. For presidential candidates whose ideological scores are unavailable in either Baker and Greene's presidential election dataset or legislative election dataset, we use Baker and Greene's coding rules to code the parties' ideological scores based on Coppedge's (1997) study. In Coppedge's (1997) study, each party is classified as left, center-left, center, center-right, or right. Based on Baker and Greene's coding rules for assigning parties with ideological scores, L = 5.7, CL = 7.9, C = 11.6, CR = 15, and R = 16.7.

For a party competing in earlier periods whose ideological scores are unavailable in Baker and Greene's datasets and Coppedge's (1997) study, we relied on historical information to check whether this party has a successor. If yes, we assign the ideological scores of a recent party to its predecessor party. The cases are:

Chile:

Nueva Acción Pública (NAP) (1932) was predecessor of Partido Socialista de Chile, so we assigned Partido Socialista de Chile's ideological score to NAP.

Costa Rica:

PR and PRNI (Costa Rica) were predecessors of Unificación Nacional, so we assigned Unificación Nacional's ideological score to PR and PRNI.

Agrícola (1923) was the predecessor of Partido Unión Nacional, so we assigned Unión Nacional's ideological score to Agrícola.

Ecuador:

Acción Demócrata Cristiana (1960) was a coalition of PCE and PSC, and the latter two parties happen to have the same ideological score based on Baker and Greene's study. Therefore, we assigned the ideological score of PCE (and PSC) to ADC.

References:
Alvarez, R. Michael, and Jonathan Nagler 2004 "Party System Compactness: Measurement and Consequences." *Political Analysis* 12 (1): 46–62.
Baker, Andy and Kenneth F. Greene. 2011. "The Latin American Left's Mandate: Free-Market Policies and Issue Voting in New Democracies."*World Politics* 63(1): 43-77.
Dalton, Russell J. 2008. "The Quantity and the Quality of Party Systems: Party System Polarization, Its Measurement, and Its Consequences." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (7): 899- 920.
Ezrow, Lawrence. 2007 "The variance matters: how party systems represent the preferences of voters." *Journal of Politics* 69 (1): 182-192.
Singer, Matthew. 2016. "Elite Polarization and the Electoral Impact of Left-Right Placements: Evidence from Latin America, 1995-2009."*Latin American Research Review* 51(2): 174-94.

polar: The level of ideological polarization for the year of the second election of an electoral period in a country.

The polarization score captures differences among parties rather than the ideological sharpness of each individual party, but it subsumes the first point; polarization can be high only if some parties adopt positions away from the center. Moreover, for our purposes, systemic polarization is more important than where individual parties locate themselves.

avg_polar: The average of **lag_polar** and **polar**.

gdp_per_capita2: Per capita GDP for the first year of the electoral period (constant 2010 US$).
Note: For Bolt and van Zanden (see below), data is in 1990 Int. GK$.
Sources:

- For each country that has electoral periods between 1960 and 2018, we use the World Development Indicators (WDI) data:

  World Bank. 2016. *World Development Indicators.* Washington, D.C: World Bank. Available at: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/home.aspx [accessed October 2017 and May 2019 - Variable: GDP per capita (constant 2010 US$)].

- For each country that has some electoral periods between 1950 and 1959, we multiply the pre-1960 Penn World Table (PWT) estimate * (WDI 1960 estimate/PWT 1960 estimate). The PWT data are from:

  Heston, Alan, Robert Summers and Bettina Aten.(2012). *Penn World Table Version 7.1*. Pennsylvania: Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania. [Variable: rgdpch, Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)].

  Note: Data for Chile begins in 1951, so we used Maddison data for 1950.

- For each country that has some electoral periods before 1950, we multiple the pre-1950 Maddison Project estimate * (WDI 1960 estimate/Maddison 1960 estimate). The Maddison Project data are from:

Bolt, J. and J. L. van Zanden (2013). The First Update of the Maddison Project; Re-Estimating Growth Before 1820. Maddison Project Working Paper 4. Database available from: http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/maddison-project/data.htm (accessed October 12, 2017.)The reason we added the WDI estimates is that they provide more recent coverage.
Note: For Costa Rica, we used 1920 data for the 1919-1923 electoral period, because the source's series begins in 1920 and there is no data available before that year.

ln_gdp2: Natural logarithm of the gross domestic product per capita (**gdp_per_capita2**), for the first year of the electoral period.

gdp_growth1: Short term GDP per capita growth. The geometric mean of per capita GDP growth, averaged per presidential term: from the year of the first election until the year before the next presidential election.

Sources:

- *For 1919-1950:*

  Bolt, J. and J. L. van Zanden (2013). *The First Update of the Maddison Project; Re-Estimating Growth before 1820*. Maddison Project Working Paper 4. Database available from: http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/maddison-project/data.htm (accessed February 10, 2014 and October 2017.)

- *For 1951-1960:*

Heston, Alan, Robert Summers and Bettina Aten. (2006) *Penn World Table Version 6.2*. Pennsylvania: Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania. [Variable: grgdpch, growth rate of Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)]

_____. (2012). *Penn World Table Version 7.1*. Pennsylvania: Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania. [Variable: rgdpch, Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)]

Note: The data for Chile and Ecuador begin in 1952, so we used Maddison data for 1950-51.

- *For 1961-2018:*

World Bank. 2021. *World Development Indicators.* Washington, D.C: World Bank. Available at: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/home.aspx (indicator name: GDP per capita growth (annual %)) [accessed March 2021].

Note: For Costa Rica 1919-23, we lack growth data for 1918-20, so the geometric mean was calculated with the available data (1921 and 1922).

infl_geomean1: The geometric mean of inflation for the presidential term, from the year of the first election in the electoral period to the year before the second election.
Note: For Colombia 1914-18, 1918-22, 1922-26, the geometric mean was calculated only with partial data, due to the lack of inflation data for 1913-16, 1918-19, and 1922-23.

Sources:

- *For most countries from 1916 to 1959:*

Mitchell, B.R. (1998). *International Historical Statistics: the Americas, 1750-2000.* 5th Ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Costa Rica 1919-1934: Based on the partial data found on La Nación (2012), we extrapolated inflation for the missing years.

La Nación. 2012. "100 años de inflación en Costa Rica," June 26, 2012. Available from: http://www.nacion.com/archivo/anos-inflacion-Costa-Rica_0_1277072294.html [accessed October 2017].

- *For most countries from 1960 to 1979:*

Bruno, Michael and William Easterly.1995. "Inflation Crises and Long-Run Growth, data set." Available at: http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/0,,contentMDK:20701015~pagePK:64214825~piPK:64214943~theSitePK:469382,00.html [accessed February 2014]

- *For most countries from 1980 to 2018*:

International Monetary Fund. 2020. "World Economic Outlook, Database October 2020."Washington, D.C: World Bank. Available at:

https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2020/October [Accessed March 2021. Variable: "Inflation, end of period consumer prices (Percent change)"].

Note: In some cases, the data begins after 1980, so we filled the gaps using Bruno and Easterly data instead. These cases are: Dom. Republic and Ecuador 1980; Peru 1981-81, Nicaragua 1984-1994, and Venezuela 1980-84. For Argentina 1983-1997, see below. For Argentina 2015, this source has no data, so we used Cavallo and Bertolotto 2018 (see below).

- *For Argentina 1983-1997*:

International Monetary Fund. 2016. "World Economic Outlook, Database October 2016." Washington, D.C: World Bank. Available at: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2016/October [Accessed December 2016. Variable: "Inflation, end of period consumer prices (Percent change)"].

Note: After the October 2016 report, the IMF began reporting inflation data for Argentina 1983-1997 as "non available". Thus, for this country and period we use the October 2016 report, whereas for the rest of the countries we use the latest reports.

- *For Argentina 2015*:

Cavallo, Alberto, and Bertolotto, Manuel. 2018. "Real Inflation Argentina." Available at: http://www.inflacionverdadera.com/argentina/english/ (Accessed May 27, 2021).

ln_infl1: Log of inflation. The natural log of the geometric mean of inflation, averaged per electoral period. There is no clear theoretical reason to expect an inflation rate of under 1% per year to affect electoral volatility differently than an inflation rate of 1% does. We therefore treated all of these cases the same as an inflation rate of 1%, meaning that we set the natural log equal to 0.
For 1950-1960 data, we calculated inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as reported by Mitchell (1998). For Costa Rica, the data reported include only San Jose and data for Colombia include only Bogotá.

party_id: Party identification, measured as the % of survey respondents who said they sympathized or felt very close to a political party. The last available data point of the electoral period.

Sources:
For 2006-present: Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). 2013. AmericasBarometer. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. Available from http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/free-access.php [Accessed December 2013; and June 2016].

Countries: Argentina 2008, 2010 and 2012; Bolivia 2008 and 2014; Brazil 2006, 2010, 2014 and 2018; Chile 2008, 2012 and 2016; Colombia 2006, 2010, 2014 and 2018; Costa Rica 2006, 2010, 2014 and 2018; Dom. Republic 2006, 2010 and 2016; Ecuador 2008, 2012 and 2016; El Salvador 2006, 2008, 2012, 2014, and 2018; Guatemala 2006, 2010, and 2014; Honduras 2008; Mexico 2006, 2008, 2012, 2014 and 2018; Nicaragua 2006; Panama 2008 and 2014; Paraguay 2008, 2012 and 2018; Peru 2006, 2010 and 2016; Uruguay 2008 and 2014; and Venezuela 2010.

For 1995-2003: Latinobarómetro. 2011. "Latinobarómetro Report 2011." Available from http://www.latinobarometro.org [Accessed December 2013 and January 2020].

Countries: Argentina 1995, 1997, and 2003; Bolivia 1997 and 2003; Brazil 1997 and 2003; Chile 1997 and 2003; Colombia 1997 and 2003; Costa Rica 1997; Ecuador 1996, 1997 and 2003; El Salvador 1997 and 2003; Guatemala 1997 and 2003; Honduras 1997 and 2003; Mexico 1997 and 2003; Nicaragua 1996 and 1997; Panama 1997 and 2003; Paraguay 1997 and 2003; Peru 1995; Uruguay 1997 and 2003; and Venezuela 1997.

con_corruption: Control of corruption. We take the value for the penultimate year of an electoral period from the World Bank Governance Indicators (when unavailable, we take the year before the penultimate year of an electoral period). Values range from approximately -2.5 to 2.5, with higher values corresponding to a better perception of corruption.

Source: Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi. 2010. "The Worldwide Governance Indicators". Available from: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home [Accessed January 8, 2020].

incumb_run: Is the incumbent president running for the second election of the electoral period? (0= No; 1= Yes).

term_length: The number of years betweentwo presidential elections.

indig_pop: Percentage of indigenous population in a country

Source: Raul L. Madrid. 2012. "Latin American Race and Ethnicity Database." University of Texas at Austin.

gr_ln_age_demo: The group mean of ln_age_democracy, which is calculated by taking the average of the value for ln_age_demo for all the observations within a regime.

gr_avg_polar: The group mean of the average of avg_polar.

gr_ln_gdp2: The group mean of ln_gdp2.

gr_gdp_growth1: The group mean of gdp_growth1.

gr_enp: The group mean of enp.

gr_ln_infl1: The group mean of ln_fl1.

gr_party_id: The group mean of party_id.

gr_con_corruption: The group mean of con_corruption.

dm_ln_age_demo: The demeaned ln_age_democracy, which is calculated by subtracting the value for ln_age_democracy from gr_ln_age_demo.

dm_avg_polar: The demeaned avg_polar.

dm_ln_gdp2: The demeaned ln_gdp2.

dm_gdp_growth1: The demeaned gdp_growth1.

dm_enp: The demeaned enp.

dm_ln_infl1: The demeaned ln_infl1.

dm_party_id: The demeaned party_id.

dm_con_corruption: The demeaned con_corruption.

List of sources used for presidential volatility

Argentina:

Honorable Cámara de Diputados de la Nación. "Elecciones Presidenciales (1983-1999). Total del país, totales por distrito y fórmula y participación electoral. Presentación de resultados." Available at: http://www1.hcdn.gov.ar/dependencias/dip/elecciones2003/resultadoselectorales.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013– Elections: 1983-1999].

Dirección Nacional Electoral. "Resultados de Elecciones desde 1983 a la fecha." Available at: http://www.mininterior.gov.ar/asuntos_politicos_y_alectorales/dine/infogral/resultados_historicos.php?idName=asuntos&idNameSubMenu=DINE&idNameSubMenuDer=DINEinfogral&idNameSubMenuDerNivel2=DINEinfogralResHis [Accessed April 23, 2013– Elections: 1983-1999].

Dirección Nacional Electoral. 2008. "Historia Electoral Argentina (1912-2007)." Ministerio del Interior, Subsecretaría de Asuntos Políticos y Electorales. Available at: http://www.mininterior.gov.ar/asuntos_politicos_y_alectorales/dinap/publicaciones/HistoriaElectoralArgentina.pdf [Accessed October 22, 2013– Elections: 1912-2007].

Dirección Nacional Electoral. 2015. "Resultados definitivos: Elecciones Nacionales 2015." Ministerio del Interior, Subsecretaría de Asuntos Políticos y Electorales. Available at: http://www.elecciones.gob.ar/admin/ckfinder/userfiles/files/P_V__DEFINITIVO%20x%20Distrito_GRALES_%202015(2).pdf [Accessed May 19, 2016– Elections: 2015].

Political Database of the Americas. 2011. Argentina: Resultados Elecciones Legislativas 2011. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Arg/leg11.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Election: 2011].

Bolivia:

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1978-1989].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press [Election: 1993-2002].

Órgano Electoral Plurinacional, Tribunal Supremo Electoral. "Elecciones Generales 2014." Available from: http://tse.oep.org.bo/images/elecciones_2014/Resultado%20de%20las%20elcciones%20generales%202014/FINALISIMA%20RESULTADOS.pdf (accessed Oct. 2015) [Election: 2014].

Political Database of the Americas. 2010. "Bolivia: Electoral Results." *Georgetown University and Organization of American States.* [Elections:2005, 2009].

Brazil

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1945-1960, 1989].

Political Database of the Americas. 1999. Brazil: Electoral Results. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at:

http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Brazil/brazil.html [Accessed October 24, 2013) [Elections: 1950-60].
Tribunal Superior Eleitoral. *Divulgacao de Resultados*. Available at: http://divulga.tse.jus.br/oficial/index.html [elections: 2014-2018]

Chile

Payne, Mark, et. al. 2002. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1989-1997]
Servicio Electoral, República de Chile. *Resultados Electorales*. Available at http://www.servel.cl/controls/neochannels/neo_ch44/neochn44.aspx [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2001 and 2005, and 2009 party data].
Servicio Electoral de Chile. Infografía de Resultados Electorales. Available at: http://historico.servel.cl/ss/site/infografiapresidentes-resultadosglobales.html?id=1392338409308(Accessed July 31, 2014) [Elections: 2013].
Servicio Electoral, República de Chile. 2017. "Elección de Presidente 2017." Available from: http://pv.servelelecciones.cl/ (accessed May 17, 2017) [Election: 2017].
Valenzuela, Germán Urzúa. 1992. *Historia política de Chile y su evolución electoral*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Jurídica de Chile. [Elections 1932-1970].

Colombia:

Jaramillo, Juan, and Beatriz Franco. 1993. "Colombia." In Dieter Nohlen, ed., *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*, pp. 135-182. San José, Costa Rica: Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos. [Elections: 1974-1990.]
Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press [Elections: 1914-1970].
Political Database of the Americas. "Colombia. Resultados electorales." Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Col/colombia.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 1994-2010].
Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil. 2014. "Elección de Presidente y Vicepresidente 1a Vuelta."Available at:http://www3.registraduria.gov.co/presidente2014/preconteo/1v/99PR1/DPR9999999_L1.htm(Accessed July 31, 2014) [Elections: 2014].
Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil. 2018. "República de Colombia: Elecciones Presidencia de la República." Available from: https://elecciones1.registraduria.gov.co/pre_pres_2018/resultados/html/resultados.html (accessed Feb. 22, 2019) [Election: 2019].

Costa Rica:

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1919-44 and 1953-1990].

Observatorio Electoral. Costa Rica: Elecciones presidenciales. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=costa_rica [Accessed November 23, 2013 -Elections: 1994-98].
Political Database of the Americas. 2010. Costa Rica: Resultados electorales. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/CR/cr.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2002-10].
Tribunal Supremo de Elecciones. 2014. "Resultados elecciones 2014." Available at: http://svr.tse.go.cr/aplicacionvisualizador/datos-definitivos.aspx [Accessed September 13, 2017) [Elections: 2014].
Tribunal Supremo de Elecciones. 2018. *Elecciones nacionales 2018: Resultados definitivos, 4 de febrero de 2018*. Available at: http://resultados2018.tse.go.cr/resultadosdefinitivos/#/presidenciales (accessed February 2019) [Elections: 2018]

Cuba:

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1940-48].

Dominican Republic:

Junta Central Electoral. 2016. *Elecciones 2016*. Available at: http://jce.gob.do/Elecciones-2016 (Accessed May 2018) [Elections: 2016].
Payne, J. Mark, Daniel Zovatto G., and Mercedes Mateo Díaz. 2007. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America.* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank. [Elections: 1978-1996 and 2004].
Observatorio Político Dominicano. "Resultados generales e indicadores." Available from: http://www.opd.org.do/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=736&Itemid=268 [Accessed October 31, 2013 – Elections: 2012].
Political Database of the Americas. "República Dominicana. Resultados electorales." Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/DomRep/domrep.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 2000 and 2008-2012].

Ecuador:

Consejo Nacional Electoral. "Elecciones 2013. 17 de febrero." Available at: http://resultados.cne.gob.ec/Results.html?RaceID=1&UnitID=1&IsPS=0&LangID=0 [Accessed Sep 2013 -Elections: 2013].
Consejo Nacional Electoral del Ecuador. 2017. *Resultados finales*. Available at: https://resultados2017.cne.gob.ec/frmResultados.aspx (accessed May 2018) [Elections: 2017]
Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1948-1960; 1979-1988].
Observatorio Electoral. República del Ecuador: Elecciones presidenciales 1978-1998. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=ecuador [Accessed May 23, 2013 -Elections: 1992].

Political Database of the Americas. 2011. “Republic of Ecuador: Electoral Results.” *Georgetown University and Organization of American States*. [Elections: 1992 to 2006].

El Salvador:

Payne, J. Mark et al. 2007. Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America. Wash DC: Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University [Elections: 1985-2000, 2006].

Political Database of the Americas. El Salvador. Resultados Elecciones Presidenciales 1984/Presidential Elections 1984. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: En: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/ElSal/salpres84.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Election: 1984-2009].

Tribunal Supremo Electoral. 2004. *Estadísticas de Elecciones 1994-2004*. San Salvador, El Salvador: Junta de Vigilancia Electoral. [Election: 2003]

Tribunal Supremo Electoral. 2014. “Escrutinio final 2014.” Available at:http://www.tse.gob.sv/2014/escrutiniofinal_1ray2davuelta/pres1/pais.html(Accessed July 31, 2014) [Elections: 2014].

Guatemala:

Base de Datos Políticos de las Américas. 1999. Elecciones Generales de Guatemala/Primera Ronda, 1990. Georgetown University y Organización de Estados Americanos. En: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Guate/guelep90.html [Accessed April 23, 2013].

Tribunal Supremo Electoral. Available at: http://www.tse.org.gt/memoria.php [Accessed April 23, 2013].

Tribunal Supremo Electoral (2015). “Elecciones Generales y al Parlamento Centroamericano 2015.” Available at: http://resultados2015.tse.org.gt/1v/resultados-2015/index.php (Accessed May 19, 2016) [Elections: 2015]

Gleijeses, Piero. 1991. *Shattered Hope: The Guatemalan Revolution and The United States, 1944-1954*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. [for details on coalitions in 1944 and 1950 elections]

Honduras:

Political Database of the Americas. Honduras. Resultados electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Hon/hon.html [Accessed April 23, 2013].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: a data handbook,* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, p.407.

Tribunal Superior Electoral. *Elecciones Generales 2017: Diputados por partido*. Available at: https://resultadosgenerales2017.tse.hn/ (Accessed May 2018)[Election 2017].

Mexico:

Instituto Federal Electoral. 2018. “Elecciones Federales 2018.” Available from: https://computos2018.ine.mx/#/presidencia/nacional/1/1/1/1 (accessed February 2019) [Election: 2018].

Observatorio Electoral. Estados Unidos Mexicanos: Elecciones presidenciales 1982-2000. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=mexico [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 1988-2000].

Political Database of the Americas. Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Resultados electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Mexico/mexico.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2006-2012].

Nicaragua:

Consejo Supremo Electoral. *Elecciones 2016*. Available at: http://www.cse.gob.ni/fri3/respres1.php (the link is broken, so accessed results from Wikipedia). [Election 2016].

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Election: 1984].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: a data handbook,* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, p.534.

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=nicaragua. [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1990 and 1996]

Panama:

Center on Democratic Performance, Election Results Archive. http://cdp.binghamton.edu/era/elections/pan04par.htm. [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 2004].

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Election: 1989].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: a data handbook,* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, p.529-534.

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=panama. [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1989, 1994, 1999]

Tribunal Electoral. Comisión de Estadísticas de Resultados Electorales. 2014. “Cuadro no. 2 votos obtenidos para candidatos por alianza y partido político en la República, según provincia, comarca, circuito electoral ypanameños residentes en el exterior: elecciones populares para presidente del 4 de mayo de 2014.”Available at: http://www.tribunal-electoral.gob.pa/html/fileadmin/user_upload/Elecciones/elecciones-2014/Cuadro_02_-_Presidente.pdf(Accessed July 31, 2014) [Elections: 2014].

Paraguay:
Adam Carr's Election Archive. http://psephos.adam-carr.net/countries/p/paraguay/paraguaydep2003.txt. [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 2003, 2009].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: a data handbook,* Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 434-437.
Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. República del Paraguay: Elecciones para la Cámara de Diputados. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=paraguay [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1993, 1998].
Tribunal Superior de Justicia Electoral. "Resultados de Elecciones 2013 para Presidente/Vicepresidente." Available from http://tsje.gov.py/e2013/resultados-elecciones-2013.html [Accessed December 2013 - Elections: 2013].
Justicia Electoral, República del Paraguay. 2018. "Resultados de Cómputo Definitivo - Elecciones Generales 2018." Available from: http://tsje.gov.py/resultados-de-computo-definitivo---elecciones-generales-2018.html (accessed February 2019) [Election: 2018].

Peru:
Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1939-45; 1956-62; 1980-1990].
Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales (ONPE). "Elecciones generales 2016: congresales". Available at: https://www.web.onpe.gob.pe/modElecciones/elecciones/elecciones2016/PRPCP2016/Resultados-Grafico-Congreso.html#posicion [Election 2016].
Political Database of the Americas. 2011. "Republic of Peru: Electoral Results." *Georgetown University and Organization of American States.* [Elections: 1995, 2000, 2001, 2006, 2011].

Uruguay:
Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: a data handbook,* Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 525-527.
Political Database of the Americas. 2011. Uruguay: Resultados Electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Uru/pre09.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Election: 2009].
"Evolución Electoral por Partido y por Departamento: 1942-2009 (en porcentajes)." Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de la República. *Microsoft Excel* file. Available at: http://cienciassociales.edu.uy/bancosdedatos/elecciones-legislativas-legislative-elections/ [Accessed June 2018].

Venezuela:
Corte Nacional Electoral. Resultados Electorales. Available at: http://www.cne.gov.ve/web/estadisticas/index_resultados_elecciones.php[Accessed April 23, 2013 and March 2019 - Elections: 2000 to 2018].

Consejo Supremo Electoral. Elecciones Presidenciales: Cuadro Comparativo 1958-2000. Available at http://www.cne.gov.ve/web/documentos/estadisticas/e006.pdf[Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 1993 and 1998].

Huneeus, Carlos, and Bernhard Thibaut. 1993. "Venezuela." In Dieter Nohlen, ed., *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*, pp. 653-82. San José, Costa Rica: Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos. [Elections: 1963-1988].

Political Database of the Americas. 2006. Venezuela: Resultados Electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Venezuela/pres06.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Election: 2006].

United States

Federal Elections Commission. "Election Results." Available at: https://transition.fec.gov/pubrec/electionresults.shtml [Accessed February 2016 – Elections: 1982-2012].

Federal Elections Commission. 2017. "Federal Elections 2016." Available at: https://transition.fec.gov/pubrec/fe2016/federalelections2016.pdf [Accessed April 23, 2018 – Election: 2016].

List of sources used for enp (data on lower chamber elections)

Argentina:

Bavastro, Roberto, Szusterman, Celia. 2001. "The Congressional Elections in Argentina." *Electoral Studies* 22, 2: 352-60. [Election: 2001]

Legislatina. Argentina: Elecciones a la Cámara de Diputados 1983-2007 (% sobre votos válidos). Available at: http://americo.usal.es/oir/legislatina/argentina.htm#ELECCIONES%20A%20LA%20C%C3%81MARA%20DE%20DIPUTADOS%201983-2001 [Election: 2007. Accessed April 22, 2013].

Ministerio del Interior, Presidencia de la Nación, Dirección Nacional Electoral. "Información Estadística Electoral". Available at http://www.elecciones.gob.ar/estadistica/estadistica.htm [accessed April 22, 2013 - Elections: 1983-95, 2003-05].

Payne, Mark, et. al. 2002. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America* Washington, DC.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1997 and 1999]

Payne, Mark, et. al. 2007. *Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America, Revised Edition* Washington, DC.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Election: 2003].

Political Database of the Americas. 2011. Argentina: Resultados Elecciones Legislativas 2011. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Arg/leg11.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Election: 2011].

Bolivia

[*Note: There are a few slight discrepancies between Nohlen's data, data from Gamarra and Malloy (who seem to be using total rather than valid), data from Payne et. al., and from Georgetown, but usually it is less than 2% point*s.]
Alpert, Alexandra, Miguel Centellas, and Matthew M. Singer. 2010. "The 2009 presidential and legislative elections in Bolivia." *Electoral Studies* 29: 746-65. [Election: 2009]
Georgetown University. *Political Database of the Americas* "Bolivia: Electoral Results." Accessed April 23, 2013.
Nohlen, Dieter. 1993.*Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1978-1989.]
Payne, Mark, et. al. 2002.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America* Washington, DC.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1989-1997].
Singer, Mathew. 2007. "The presidential and parliamentary elections in Bolivia, December 2005" *Electoral Studies* Vol. 26 No. 1 (March) pp. 200-2005. [Election: 2005].
Tribunal Supremo Electoral de Bolivia. "Procesos Electorales." Available at: http://www.oep.org.bo/. Accessed April 23, 2013. [Elections: 1997-2005 SMD data].
Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2003. "From Exclusion to Inclusion: Bolivia's 2002 Elections." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 35, 4: 751-75. [Election: 2002].

Brazil

Political Database of the Americas. 1999. Brazil: Eleições Legislativas / Legislative Elections. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Brazil/brazil.html [Accessed April 23, 2013) [Elections: 1966 to 1986, and 2010].
Nicolau Marconi, Jairo. 1998.*Dados Eleitorais do Brasil (1982-1996)*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: IUPERJ/UCAM.
_____. 2006. *Banco de dados eleitorais do BRASIL (1982-2006)*.Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: IUPERJ/UCAM. [Elections: 2002 and 2006].
Payne, Mark, et. al. 2002.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America* Washington, DC.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1986-1998].

Chile

Ministerio del Interior, República de Chile. *Sitio Historico Electoral*. Available at http://www.sitiohistorico.elecciones.gob.cl/ [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2001 and 2005 coalition data].
Payne, Mark, et. al. 2002.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1989-1997]
Servicio Electoral, República de Chile.*Resultados Electorales*. Available at http://www.servel.cl/controls/neochannels/neo_ch44/neochn44.aspx [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2001 and 2005, and 2009 party data].

Colombia

Alarcón Núñez, Oscar. 2006. "El Frente Nacional." *Credencial Historia* Edición 201, Septiembre. Available at: La Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango, Banco de la República de Colombia,

http://www.lablaa.org/blaavirtual/revistas/credencial/septiembre2006/frente.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013).
Nohlen, Dieter. 1993.*Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1974].
Payne, Mark, et. al. 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America, Revised Edition* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1978-2006].
Political Database of the Americas. 2010. Colombia: Elecciones legislativas de 2010 (Senado y Diputados). [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Col/leg10.html [Accessed April 23, 2013) [Elections: 2010].

Costa Rica

Nohlen, Dieter. *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook.* Oxford University Press: New York, 2005. [Elections: 1953-1978]
Payne, Mark J. et al. 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America*. Wash DC: Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University. [Elections: 1978-2002].
Political Database of the Americas. 2010. Costa Rica: Resultados electorales. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/CR/cr.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2006 and 2010].
Yashar, Deborah. 1995. "Cold War and Social Welfare: The Origins of Costa Rica's Competitive Party System." In Scott Mainwaring and Timothy Scully, Eds.,*Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America,* pp.72-99. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Wilson, Bruce M. 1998. *Costa Rica: Politics, Economics, and Democracy.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Cuba:

Nohlen, Dieter. 2005.*Elections in the Americas: A data handbook*, Volume I. Oxford: Oxford University Press [Elections: 1940 and 1944].

Dominican Republic

Junta Central Electoral. "Resultados elecciones anteriores." Available at: http://www.jce.gob.do/Dependencias/Elecciones/EleccionesAnteriores.aspx [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1978, 1982, 1986, 1990, 1994, 2006 and 2010].
Payne, Mark J. et al. 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America.* Wash DC: Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University. Expanded and updated edition. [Elections:1986, 1998, and 2002].

Ecuador

Note: Until 2002, there were two types of votes for the legislature: provincial and national votes. Provincial legislators wereelected every two years, while national legislators wereelected every four, so to calculate volatility in 1979, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, and 1998

we applied the same procedure as with mixed-systems. After a constitutional amendment passed in 1998, beginning with the 2002 elections only provinciallegislators are elected.
Consejo Nacional Electoral. Available at: http://www.cne.gob.ec/ [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 2006, 2009, and 2013].
Mejía, Andrés. 2002. *Gobernabilidad Democrática. Sistema electoral, partidos políticos y pugna de poderes en Ecuador. 1978-1998.* Quito: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.
Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1950].
Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data HandbookVol. II, South America* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [1998 national legislators and 2002 election].
Observatorio Electoral. República del Ecuador: Elecciones parlamentarias. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=ecuador [Accessed February 2014 -Elections: 1979-98].
Pachano, Simón. 2007. *La trama de Penélope. Procesos políticos e instituciones en el Ecuador*.Quito: FLACSO-Ecuador, International IDEA, Ágora Democrática – NIMD.
Peñaherrera, Blasco. 2002. *Trazos de Democracia. 22 años de elecciones 1978-2000*.Quito: Mariscal.

El Salvador
Payne, J. Mark et al. 2007. Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America. Wash DC: Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University [Elections: 1985-2000, 2006].
Political Database of the Americas. 2009. El Salvador. Resultados Elecciones Legislativas 2009. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/ElSal/.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Election: 1984-2009].
Tribunal Supremo Electoral. 2004.*Estadísticas de Elecciones 1994-2004.* San Salvador, El Salvador: Junta de Vigilancia Electoral. [Election: 2003]
Guatemala
Inter-Parliamentary Union. Guatemala: Congreso de la República (Congress of the Republic). Last elections. Available at: http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2129_E.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 2011].
Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data HandbookVol. II, South America* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Elections: 2003]
Observatorio Electoral. República de Guatemala: Elecciones para el congreso nacional. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=guatemala [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 1999].
Political Database of the Americas. Guatemala. Resultados electorales. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Guate/guate.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 1990, 1995].

Tribunal Supremo Electoral. 2007. "Memoria de las Elecciones Generales de 2007." Available from: http://www.tse.org.gt/memoria2007/index.html (accessed Jan. 2014) [Elections: 2007].

Honduras

Inter-Parliamentary Union. GUATEMALA: Congreso de la República (Congress of the Republic). Last elections. Available at: http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2129_E.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 2011].

Political Database of the Americas. Honduras. Resultados electorales. [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Hon/hon.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2001, 2003 and 2009].

Mexico

Gómez Tagle, Silvia. *La frágil democracia mexicana: partidos políticos y elecciones* D.F, Mexico: García y Valadés Editores, 1993.

Guerrero, Javier M. *Las elecciones del 88* D.F, México: Ediciones Quinto Sol, 1989.

Instituto Federal Electoral. "Resultados Electorales" available at: http://www.ife.org.mx/documentos/Estadisticas2006/diputados.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2006].

_____. "Atlas de resultados electorales federales, 1991-2012". Available at: http://siceef.ife.org.mx/pef2012/SICEEF2012.html#[Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2012].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005.*Elections in the Americas: A Data HandbookVol. I*.Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Election: 2003].

Observatorio Electoral. Estados Unidos Mexicanos: Resultados elecciones de diputados 1979-2000. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=mexico [Accessed April 23, 2013 -Elections: 1988, 1994, 2000].

Payne, Mark, et. al 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America, Revised Edition* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1994-2000]

Political Database of the Americas. 1999. Mexico, 1961-1991 Elecciones Legislativas (Diputados Federales) [Internet]. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Mexico/mexico.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 1970 to 1976].

Nicaragua

Inter-Parliamentary Union. Nicaragua: Asamblea Nacional. Available at: http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2235_A.htm [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 1984, 2001, 2006, and 2011].

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=nicaragua. [Accessed April 23, 2013– Elections: 1990 and 1996]

Panama

Center on Democratic Performance, Election Results Archive. http://cdp.binghamton.edu/era/elections/pan04par.htm. . [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 2004].

Legislatina. Panamá: Resultado elecciones legislativas 2009. Available at: http://americo.usal.es/oir/legislatina/panama.htm#Resultado_elecciones_legislativas_2009 [Election: 2009 - Accessed April 22, 2013].

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Election: 1960].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data HandbookVol. I* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Election: 1989].

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=panama. [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1994 and 1999]

Paraguay

Adam Carr's Election Archive. http://psephos.adam-carr.net/countries/p/paraguay/paraguaydep2003.txt. Accessed October 24, 2009 [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 2003, 2009].

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. República del Paraguay: Elecciones para la Cámara de Diputados. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=paraguay [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1993, 1998].

Peru

Observatorio Electoral Latinoamericano. República del Perú: Elecciones para la Cámara de Diputados. Available at: http://www.observatorioelectoral.org/informes/index/navegador.php?country=peru [Accessed April 23, 2013 – Elections: 1985-2000].

Political Database of the Americas. República del Perú: Resultados electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Peru/peru.html[Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2001 to 2011].

United States

Dave Leip's Atlas of US Presidential Elections. Available from: http://uselectionatlas.org/ [Accessed February 28, 2016 – Elections: 1972-2008]

Uruguay

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993. *Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1942, 1946, 1966].

Payne, Mark,et al. 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America*. Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University [Elections: 1984-2004].

Political Database of the Americas. República Oriental del Uruguay: Resultados electorales. Georgetown University and Organization of the American States. Available at:

http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Elecdata/Uru/leg09.html [Accessed April 23, 2013 - Election: 2009].

Venezuela

Carr, Adam. 2010. "Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela legislative elections of 26 September 2010. Available from: http://psephos.adam-carr.net/countries/v/venezuela/venezuela20101.txt (accessed Feb. 2014) [Election: 2010].

Corte Nacional Electoral. Resultados Electorales. Available at: http://www.cne.gov.ve/web/estadisticas/index_resultados_elecciones.php[Accessed April 23, 2013 - Elections: 2005 and 2010].

Nohlen, Dieter. 1993.*Enciclopedia Electoral Latinoamericana y del Caribe*. [Elections: 1968-1973].

Nohlen, Dieter, ed. 2005.*Elections in the Americas: A Data HandbookVol. II, South America* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Election: 2000].

Payne, Mark, et. al. 2007.*Democracies in Development: Politics and Reform in Latin America, Revised Edition* Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank and International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. [Elections: 1978-1998].

Country Notes

ARGENTINA

1946:

The Partido Laborista ran in coalition with UCR (Junta Renovadora) and the Partido Independiente. The vote share goes to the Partido Laborista, Juan Perón's party. This party was dissolved in 1947 and replaced by the Partido Peronista, later renamed Justicialista. Rule 1.

The Unión Democrática was a one-shot coalition of the UCR, the Socialist Party, Partido Demócrata Progresista, and the Communist Party. The vote share goes to the UCR, as the presidential candidate belonged to the UCR. Rule 1.

1951:

We treat the Partido Justicialista as a continuation of the Partido Peronista, as they are both Perón's parties. Rule 11.

P. Concertación Obrera had run in the 1948 legislative elections (http://redesperonismo.com.ar/archivos/CD1/PP/ajmechet.pdf) so it's a new party. Rule 2 for New Parties.

Partido Salud Pública ran for the first time in 1951 (Nohlen 1993) so it's a new party. Rule 2 for New Parties.

Party exits:

- UCR Lencinista, UCR Bloquista, and UCR Stgo. Del Estero, factions of the UCR, did not run again in 1951, so we code them as exiting.

1983:

The Alianza Demócrata Socialista (PDP and PSD) did not stay intact for the 1989 election. We give the vote share to PDP, the candidate's (Rafael Martínez Raymonda) party. Rule 1.

The Alianza Federal (Federal and MoLiPo) did not stay intact for the 1989 election. Francisco Manrique, the candidate, apparently belonged to the coalition, so we attribute the votes to the coalition. Rule 2.

1989:

Carlos Menem ran as the candidate for the Frente Justicialista Popular, which included the Partido Justicialista and a number of other smaller parties. The vote share goes to the Justicialista party, as Menem was a member of the PJ. The coalition did not remain intact for the 1995 elections. Rule 1.

The Confederación Federalista Independiente backed the UCR candidate, Eduardo Angeloz. By these votes go to the UCR. Rule 1

The UCeDe and the PDP ran together as the Alianza de Centro, backing Álvaro Alsogaray from UCedé. The vote share goes to the UCeDe, the candidate's party. The coalition did not stay together for the 1995 election. Rule 1.

The vote share for the Alianza Izquierda Unida (PCA and MAS), which dissolved in 1991, goes to MAS, because the candidate (Néstor Vicente), did not belong to either party (he belonged to the Izquierda Democrática Popular) and MAS was the largest party in 1983. Rule 2.

The PSP and the PSD backed the same candidate under the Alianza Unida Socialista. This coalition did not continue through the 1995 presidential elections, as both the PSP and the PSD joined the FREPASO coalition in 1994. The vote share goes to the PSP, as the presidential candidate belonged to the PSP. Rule 1.

The Partido Humanista and the Partido Verde formed the Frente Humanista Verde. This coalition did not continue through the 1995 presidential elections, so the vote share goes to the PH, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Acuerdo Popular: to the best of our knowledge, it ran for the first time in 1989. We treat it as a new party.

Blanco de los Jubilados: it had run in the 1987 legislative elections for the first time. Because it never ran in national congressional elections prior to the penultimate presidential elections, we treat it as a new party.

Partido Humanista was registered in 1985 and ran in the 1985 and 1987 legislative elections (the latter, in coalition). We treat it as a new party, because this is the first time it fielded a presidential candidate and it could not have run in congressional elections before the 1983 presidential ones (it was the first year of the regime).

Partido Federal had run in the 1983 presidential elections in coalition. We treat it as established.

Party exits:

- P. Demócrata Progresista ran in coalition with UceDé, so it does not exit.
- Partido Intransigente (PI), Frente de Izquierda Popular, and Alianza Federal run for the last time in 1983.
- Confederación Nacional de Centro was a coalition, but because we do not know its composition, we code it as exiting in 1989.

1995:

In the 1995 election, the UCeDé joined the PJ to back Carlos Menem. The vote share goes to the PJ, Menem's party, because although this coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, both times the candidate came from the PJ. Rule 4.

The presidential candidate for the FREPASO coalition (PAIS, FG, PDC, PI, PSP, and PSD) came from the PAIS party. We attribute FREPASO's votes to PAIS, which was a new party in 1995. PAIS left FREPASO shortly after the 1995 election, while the rest of the coalition joined the UCR in 1999 to form the ALIANZA coalition, which backed the UCR candidate, de la Rúa. While some members of FREPASO continued after the fall of the de la Rúa government in 2001, the Frente Grande did not survive intact and many of its supporters subsequently backed the Kirchner government. Rule 1.

FUP and the Partido Obrero backed Jorge Altamira, from the PO. Because this coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to the PO, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

FREPASO was created in 1994, so we treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Socialista de los Trabajadores (MST) was registered in 1992 so we treat it as a new party.

Movimiento por la Dignidad y la Independencia (MODIN) ran for the first time in the 1991 legislative elections and fielded a presidential candidate for the first time in 1995. We treat it as a new party.

Alianza Sur was a party created in 1994 by F. Solanas, a dissident from Frente Grande. We treat it as a new party.

Corriente Patria Libre was a district party from Córdoba, founded in 1987, after the 1987 legislative elections, so we treat it as a new party.

Democrático de Participación (MODEPA): to the best of our knowledge, it ran for the first time in the 1991 legislative elections. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Frente de los Jubilados was known as Partido Blanco de los Jubilados. It is the same party. (See: https://www.dateas.com/es/bora/2007/07/12/partido-frente-de-los-jubi-507563). We treat it as established.

Partido Socialista Auténtico was registered as a national party 1989 and ran for the first time that year in a few districts, at the presidential and congressional level. We treat it as established.

Party exits:

- P. Demócrata Progresista did not run again at the presidential level after 1989, so we code it as exiting in 1995. In the previous election PDP had run in coalition with UceDé. Following our rules, because PDP had run separately in the 1995 lower chamber elections (gaining 0.90%), we calculate its party exit vote share as a proportion of the votes it won in the 1995 lower chamber election in relation to Ucedé's vote share (3.20%).
- Unión de Centro Democrático (UCeDe) runs in coalition with PJ.
- Partido Socialista Popular (PSP) runs in the FREPASO coalition.
- To the best of our knowledge, Acuerdo Popular disappeared after the 1989 elections.

1999:

Both the UCR and FREPASO backed Fernando de la Rúa in the 1999 election under the ALIANZA coalition. The vote share goes to the UCR because de la Rúa was affiliated with the UCR and the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Eduardo Duhalde ran for president as part of the Concertación Justicialista, which was made up of the PJ and the UCeDé. The vote share goes to the PJ as this coalition's candidates always came from the PJ. Rule 4.

The Alianza Izquierda Unida included the Partido Comunista Argentino and the Movimiento Socialista de los Trabajadores. Both parties ran together in two consecutive elections (1999 and 2003) as part of this coalition. The candidate in both 1999 and 2003 was Patricia Walsh. Because she was an independent, we count the coalition as the continuation of the MST (1995) because it was the only of the two parties in the 1999 and 2003 coalition that ran a presidential candidate in 1994 (the Partido Comunista did not run a candidate in 1995). Rule 2.

Frente de la Resistencia had only run in the 1997 legislative elections, so we treat it as a new party.

Alianza Social Cristiana: To the best of our knowledge, this is its first election. We treat it as a new party.
Acción por la República was created in 1997. We treat it as a new party.
Partido de los Trabajadores Socialistas (PTS) was founded in 1988 and participated in legislative elections since 1993, so we treat it as established.

Party exits:
- FREPASO ran in coalition with UCR.
- Unión de Centro Democrático (UCeDe) ran in coalition with PJ.
- Partido Federal runs again in coalition in 2011, so we don't code it as exiting.
- Partido Socialista Popular (PSP) exits in this election. In the previous election this party had run in coalition with FREPASO, but this was a new party, so we calculate its 1995 vote share as a proportion of the votes it won in the 1993 lower chamber elections.
- Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS), Frente de los Jubilados, Fuerza Republicana, Alianza Sur, Corriente Patria Libre, and Democrático de Participación (MODEPA) ran for the last time in 1995.

2003:
The PJ split into factions during the 2003 presidential elections, with each faction supporting their own candidate. The Frente para la Victoria formed around Néstor Kirchner, the Frente por la Lealtad formed around Carlos Menem, and the Frente Movimiento Popular Unión y Libertad formed around Adolfo Rodriguez Saá. These factions are coded as separate parties with their own vote share with the exception of Frente para la Victoria. We code the Frente para la Victoria as a continuation of the PJ. Rule 11.
Menem's Frente por la Lealtad included the UCeDé, but the vote share goes to the Frente por la Lealtad as Menem belonged to the PJ. This coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Afirmación para una República Igualitaria (ARI) was created in 2002, so we treat it as a new party.
Alianza Movimiento Federal para Recrear el Crecimiento was created in 2002, so we treat it as a new party.
Popular de la Reconstrucción ran for the first time in the 2001 legislative elections, so we treat it as a new party.
Confederación para que Se Vayan Todos was registered in March 2003, so we treat it as a new party.
Alianza Frente Movimiento Popular / Alianza Frente Justicia, Unión y Libertad (FREJULI): As a faction of PJ created to back A. Rodríguez Saá, we treat it as a new party.
Frente por la Lealtad: As a faction of PJ created to back C. Menem, we treat it as a new party.
Unión Popular had run in the 1987 legislative elections, so we treat it as established.

Party exits:
- Unión de Centro Democrático (UCeDe) ran in Menem's Frente por la Lealtad coalition.

- FREPASO disappeared after the 2001 crisis. In the previous election this party had run in coalition with UCR, both at the presidential and the lower chamber levels. Because Frepaso did not run separately at the 1999 lower chamber elections, we use the temporally closest election, which were the 1997 lower chamber elections.
- Partido de los Trabajadores Socialistas (PTS) ran again in coalition in 2007.
- Frente de la Resistencia and Acción por la República ran for the last time in 1999.

2007:

Roberto Lavagna ran for president under the Una Nación Avanzada alliance, which included anti-Kirchner PJ members and the UCR, as well as some other minor parties. Because it did not remain intact for the following elections and Lavagna was the coalition's candidate, we give the UNA votes to UCR, the largest party in the previous election. Rule 2.

Elisa Carrió (from ARI) ran as part of the Confederación Coalición Cívica, which included ARI and PAIS. The Coalición Cívica continued in 2011, and because Carrió was again its candidate, the 2007 vote share goes to ARI/CCC. Rule 4.

We code FREJULI as a continuation of the Frente Movimiento Popular Unión y Libertad because they were coalitions supporting the candidacy Adolfo Rodriguez Saá and Alberto Rodríguez Saá, respectively. The brothers were both PJ politicians who could not run under the PJ label due to internal conflicts within the PJ. Rule 11.

The vote share for the Alianza Frente PTS-MAS Izquierda Socialista goes to PTS, as the presidential candidate was a member of the PTS and the coalition did not survive for the following elections. Rule 1.

Movimiento Socialista de los Trabajadores (MST): In 2007 it ran alone. We treat it (Vilma Ripoll was the candidate) as the successor to the Alianza Izquierda Unida coalition.

The Partido Humanista and the Partido Comunista formed the Alianza Frente Amplio hacia la Unidad Latinoamericana for the 2007 elections. The vote share for this coalition goes to the PH because the candidate, Luis Alberto Ammann, was a member of the PH and the coalition did not survive for the following elections. Rule 1.

We code the Confederación Lealtad Popular as a continuation of Unidos o Dominados and Alianza Social Cristiana because all three parties supported the candidacy of Juan Ricardo Mussa, a politician with Peronist leanings who created each of these parties in order to run for president. Rule 11.

Jorge Omar Sobisch ran as an independent candidate. He tried to get the anti-Kirchner currents within the PJ to support him, but never gained their support. Four parties supported him (Movimiento de las Provincias Unidas, Unión Popular, Movimiento Acción Vecinal, Movimiento por la Dignidad y la Independencia). The electoral register recorded separate votes for each of these four parties. We gave his vote share (1.40%) to the Movimiento de las Provincias Unidas on the grounds that it won a larger vote share (0.80%) than any of the other three parties. Rule 15. Movimiento de las Provincias Unidas: the party formed a coalition with other three parties. For purposes of calculating electoral volatility, we treat the coalition as a separate entity (i.e., it gets its own line in the Excel sheet) (Rule 3). However, because Unión Popular, the largest party in 2003 of the four that formed the coalition in 2007, was an established party, we treat MPU as established (Rule 4b for New Parties).

Partido Trabajadores por el Socialismo (PTS): It was created in 1988 and had run in the 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2005 legislative elections (http://www.mininterior.gov.ar/asuntos_politicos_y_alectorales/dine/infogral/RESULTADOS%20HISTORICOS/2005.pdf). By Rule 1b we treat it as established.

Movimiento Independiente de Jubilados y Desocupados: it ran for the first time in 2007 [http://andytow.com/atlas/totalpais/index.html].

Party exits:

-Unión de Centro Democrático (UCeDe) ran for the last time at this level in 2003, in coalition with Menem's Frente por la Lealtad. Following our rules, because it had run separately in the 2003 lower chamber elections, we calculate its party exit vote share as a proportion of the votes it won in the 2003 lower chamber election in relation to Menem's Frente por la Lealtad vote share … But Menem's faction/party did not exist in 2001 and did not run at the lower chamber level in 2003. So how do I calculate this??

- Partido Socialista runs again in 2011, in the Frente Amplio Progresista coalition.
- Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC) runs again in 2015, in the Alianza Unidos por una Nueva Alternativa (UNA).
- Movimiento de Integración y Desarrollo (MID), Movimiento por la Dignidad y la Independencia (MODIN), Confederación para que Se Vayan Todos, and Frente por la Lealtad (C. Menem) ran for the last time in 2003.

2011:

The Unión para el Desarollo Social, a coalition of UCR, Partido Federal and other provincial parties, backed Ricardo Alfonsín (from UCR) in the 2011 elections. The vote share for Alfonsín goes to the UCR, because the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

The Frente Amplio Progresista, a coalition of Partido Socialista, Partido GEN, Libres del Sur and Partido Socialista Auténtico, backed Hermes Binner (PS) as their candidate in the 2011 elections. Although it ran again in 2015 under the name "Alianza Progresistas", the presidential candidates came from different parties. Hence, we treat this coalition as one entity and as an established party, given that the Partido Socialista was established. Rule 5. (We cannot apply Rule 6 because the PS did not run on its own in the 2007 elections.)

The Alianza Compromiso Federal backed the candidacy of Alberto Rodríguez Saá in the 2011 election. Composed mainly of dissident members of the PJ who call themselves Peronismo Federal, we code this alliance as a continuation of FREJULI, the candidate's party. Rule 11.

We treat the Coalición Cívica ARI as a continuation of ARI/Confederación Coalición Cívica, as the candidate (E. Carrió) remained the same in 2011. Rule 11.

The Alianza Frente de Izquierda y de los Trabajadores (FIT) was a coalition of the PO, the PTS and Izquierda Socialista. Although it ran again in 2015, the presidential candidates came from the PO in 2011 (Jorge Altamira) and in 2015 from PTS (N. del Caño). Hence, we treat FIT as one entity and as an established party, given that the Partido Obrero was established. Rule 5. We also apply Rule 6, because the PO had run on its own in 2007: hence, we give the 2007(1) votes to PO, and the 2007(2) votes to FIT.

Party exits:
- Partido Socialista runs in the Frente Amplio Progresista coalition.
- Partido Trabajadores por el Socialismo (PTS) runs in the FIT coalition.
- Partido Socialista Auténtico (PSA) runs in the Frente Amplio Progresista coalition.
- Partido Humanista, Movimiento Socialista de los Trabajadores, Confederación Lealtad Popular, Alianza Movimiento Federal para Recrear el Crecimiento, Popular de la Reconstrucción, Movimiento de las Provincias Unidas, and Movimiento Independiente de Jubilados y Desocupados ran for the last time in 2007.

2015

The Alianza Frente para la Victoria, a coalition of PJ and many other parties, backed Daniel Scioli. The vote share goes to the PJ, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

The Alianza Cambiemos was a new coalition of PRO, UCR and CC-ARI that backed Mauricio Macri, from PRO. We give the vote share to PRO, the candidate's party, which was established in 2005 and which had not run in the previous presidential elections. Rule 1.

The Alianza Unidos por una Nueva Alternativa (UNA), a coalition of Frente Renovador, Partido Demócrata Cristiano, Unión Popular, UNIR and Tercera Posición, backed Sergio Massa, from the Frente Renovador. We give the vote share to the Frente Renovador, the candidate's party. Rule 1. We treat the Frente Renovador, the candidate's party, as a new party in the presidential election.

The Alianza Frente de Izquierda y de los Trabajadores runs again, but this time backing Nicolás del Caño, from PTS. We treat FIT as one entity. Rule 5.

The Alianza Compromiso Federal again backed the candidacy of Alberto Rodríguez Saá, so we continue to code this alliance as a continuation of FREJULI of the FMP, the candidate's party. Rule 4.

The Alianza Progresistas runs again, but this time backing Margarita Stolbizer, from Partido GEN. We treat the Progresistas as one entity. Rule 5.

We treat PRO as an established party, because it had run in several legislative elections before the 2011 presidential one.

Party exits:
- Partido Trabajadores por el Socialismo (PTS) runs again in the FIT coalition.
- Partido Socialista Auténtico (PSA) runs again in the Alianza Progresistas coalition.
- Partido Socialista runs in the Alianza Progresistas coalition.
- Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC) runs in the Alianza Unidos por una Nueva Alternativa (UNA).
- UCR and Coalición Cívica ran in the Cambiemos coalition.- Unión Popular ran in the UNA coalition.
- Partido Federal ran for the last time in 2011, in coalition with UCR. Following our rules, because it had run separately in the XXXX lower chamber elections…

BOLIVIA

1956: *There were no coalitions.*

1960: *There were no coalitions.*
PRA ran for the first time in a national election in 1960 (Nohlen 1993) so we treat it as a new party.

1964: *There were no coalitions.*
UCN and FBA ran for the first time in a national election in 1964 (Nohlen 1993) so we treat them as new parties.

1985:
Isaac Sandoval Rodríguez ran as a candidate for Izquierda Unida, a coalition that brought together the MBL, PCB, and dissidents of the PS-1. The coalition is coded as a political party because the candidate came from the coalition in itself, and it continued as a coalition for multiple elections. The MBL split off following the 1989 elections, and the entire coalition fell apart in the late 1990s.
The MNR has been called the ADRN, MNRA, and the MNRH at different points in its history.
The FPU was a coalition that included the MIR-BL and the Bolivian Communist Party. It fell apart after the 1985 elections, and the MIR-BL/MBL joined the IU. Some claim that the FPU was a precursor to the IU, but Gamarra and Malloy (1995) and Gamarra (1998) write that the FPU paved way for the Alianza Patriótica, which fell apart before the 1989 elections. The IU was a smaller alliance founded in 1985 that gained from MBL defection from the FPU, but was not a successor of the FPU. The vote share for the FPU in the 1985 election goes to the MIR-BL/MBL because the FPU candidate, Antonio Araníbar Quiroga, was a member of the MBL. Rule 1.

Following rule 4 for new parties, because lower chamber elections preceded presidential elections by five years, we considered parties that did not compete in the 1980 lower chamber parties as new in the 1985 presidential elections.
Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario de Izquierda (MNRI), founded in 1971, had been a member of UDP from 1979-80. We treat it as established.
Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC) had run in the FDR-NA coalition in the 1980 lower chamber elections. We treat it as established.
Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR) was created in the 1930s and ran for the last time before these elections in 1962. We treat it as established.
Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario Vanguardia 9 de Abril (MNRV) was founded in 1985 (Gamarra and Malloy 1995: 426). We treat it as a new party.
Izquierda Unida (IU) was a coalition founded by Isaac Sandoval in the mid-80s to contest the 1985 elections. It was composed of Eje de Convergencia Patriótica (EJE), POR Trotskista-Posadista, Movimiento al Socialismo Unzaguista (MAS-U), and other minor leftwing groups. Because we found no evidence that any of these parties ever ran before, we treat IU as a new party in 1985.
Movimiento Revolucionario Tupaj Katari de Liberación (MRTKL) was founded in 1985 (Gamarra and Malloy 1995: 427). We treat it as a new party.
Movimiento Revolucionario Tupaj Katari (MRTK) had taken part in the UDP coalition in 1980. We treat it as established.

MIR-Bolivia Libre, a splinter from MIR, was created in 1985 and ran in coalition with PCB. We treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Nacionalista Rev. de Izquierda Uno (MNRI-1): a splinter from MNRI, it ran for the first time in 1985. We treat it as a new party.

Acción Cívica Popular (ACP), Fuerza Nacional Progresista (FNP), Acción Humanista Revolucionaria (AHR), and Alianza Renovadora Nacional (ARENA): to the best of our knowledge, they ran for the first time in 1985.

1989: *There were no coalitions.*

Conciencia de Patria was created in 1988 and ran for the first time in 1989 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conscience_of_the_Fatherland)

Frente Unido de Liberación Katarista (FULKA): was created in 1988 and ran for the first time in 1989 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katarist_United_Liberation_Front).

Mov. de Izquierda Nacional (MIN) had run in coalition with MNR-U in 1980 (Nohlen 1993), so we treat it as established.

1993:

The MNR and the MRTKL ran in coalition in support of the candidacy of Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada. The vote share goes to the MNR as this was a one-time coalition and the candidate was a member of the MNR. Rule 1.

Hugo Banzer ran under a coalition called the Acuerdo Patriótico, which constituted an alliance between the MIR and the ADN. The vote share for the AP goes to the ADN because, although the coalition remained intact for the following election, with a change of name, the candidate (Banzer) always came from the same party, AND. Rule 4.

Carlos Serrate Reich, candidate for VR-9 in 1993, had been the presidential candidate for MNRV in 1985.

Unidad Cívica Solidaridad was created in 1989 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civic_Solidarity_Union) and ran for the first time in 1993.

Alianza de Renovación Boliviana (ARBOL) was created in 1993 (dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/1963528.pdf)

Alternativa del Socialismo Democrático (ASD) was created in 1992 and ran for the first time in 1993. We treat it as a new party (see: http://nuso.org/media/articles/downloads/2476_1.pdf), [4]

Movimiento Federalista Democrático only ran in 1993 (http://www.bo.undp.org/content/dam/bolivia/docs/Mutaciones-Del-Campo-Politico-en-Bolivia.pdf, page 70).

[4] According to Payne et al., ASD was the name adopted by Vanguardia Socialista de Bolivia (VSB) in 1993. However, according to two other sources, the ASD was a new party created in 1992 by Efraín Quicañez Aguilar, as a splinter from PCB. Hence, we treat ASD and VSB as two distinct parties. (Sources: *http://nuso.org/media/articles/downloads/2476_1.pdf* and *http://www.revistasbolivianas.org.bo/scielo.php?pid=S1997-44852012000100012&script=sci_arttext*).

Organización Nacional de Independientes (ONI): to the best of our knowledge, this was a new party.
Movimiento Katarista Nacional (MKN) was a new party in 1993 (Madrid 2012: 42).
Eje de Convergencia Patriótica had been taking part in the IU since 1985. We treat it as established.

1997:
Members of the ASP, including Evo Morales and Alejo Véliz, were unable to register their movement as a political party for the national elections. Instead, they joined the election lists of the IU. The vote share goes to the IU.
Hugo Banzer (from ADN) ran under the Compromiso por Bolivia coalition in 1997, with the support of the PDC and NFR. The vote share goes to the ADN because this was Banzer's party and the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.
CONDEPA ran with MP in a coalition, backing Remedios Loza Alvarado, from CONDEPA. The vote share goes to CONDEPA because it was the candidate's party. Although the coalition remained intact for the following election, the candidate always came from CONDEPA. Rule 4.
MIR and Nueva Mayoría (NM) ran in coalition, backing the MIR candidate, Jaime Paz Zamora. The vote share goes to the MIR because the candidate, Paz Zamora, was a member of the MIR and the coalition did not stay intact for the next election. Rule 1.

Partido Democrático Boliviano (PDB) was created in 1986 (http://www.idea.int/es/publications/politics_within/loader.cfm?csmodule=security/getfile&pageid=19997, page 90). It had run in coalition with MNR in the 1989 presidential elections, so we treat it as established.
Eje de Convergencia Patriótica (EJE) runs as "Eje Pachakuti". It is the same party (See: http://www.pensamientocritico.org/herdoa0112.pdf, page 99).
Vanguardia Socialista de Bolivia (VSB) took part in 1993 only in the legislative elections, so it is a new party in presidential elections.

2002:
Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada ran with the support of the MNR and the MBL. The vote share goes to the MNR because Sánchez was a member of this party and because the coalition did not remain intact for the next election. Rule 1.
The MIR allied with the FRI in the 2002 elections. The vote share goes to the MIR because the Candidate, Jaime Paz Zamora, was a member of the MIR and the coalition did not stay intact for the next election. Rule 1.
The UCS allied with the FSB in support of Johnny Fernández, a member of the UCS. The vote share goes to the UCS because Fernández was a UCS member and because the coalition did not last beyond 2002. Rule 1.

We code the MAS as a new party rather than as the sequel to the IU (Izquierda Unida). Evo Morales helped create the Asamblea para la Soberanía de los Pueblos (ASP). The ASP unsuccessfully sought registration as a party for the 1997 elections, but then some of its members including Evo ran on the IU ticket. After the elections, Morales was expelled from the ASP. He went on to form the MAS. Because

Morales was expelled from the ASP, we did not treat the MAS as the successor to the ASP (and hence to the IU).

Nueva Fuerza Republicana was created in 1996 (http://www.bo.undp.org/content/dam/bolivia/docs/Mutaciones-Del-Campo-Politico-en-Bolivia.pdf, page 78) and ran in coalition with AND in 1997 (op. cit., page 80). We treat it as established.

Partido Socialista was created in 1971 (http://www.bo.undp.org/content/dam/bolivia/docs/Mutaciones-Del-Campo-Politico-en-Bolivia.pdf, page 68) and ran in the Izquierda Unida coalition in 1997. We treat it as established.

Movimiento Ciudadano Para el Cambio (MCC): I found no evidence that it ran before the 2002 elections.

Partido Libertad y Justicia: I found no evidence that it ran before the 2002 elections.

Movimiento Indígena Pachakuti (MIP) was created in 1996 (http://www.idea.int/es/publications/politics_within/loader.cfm?csmodule=security/getfile&pageid=19997, p. 187) but ran for the first time in 2002 (http://www.bo.undp.org/content/dam/bolivia/docs/Mutaciones-Del-Campo-Politico-en-Bolivia.pdf, 168)

2005:

The presidential candidate for PODEMOS, Jorge Quiroga Ramírez, had been a leader of Acción Democrática Nacional (ADN) and was Banzer's vice president from 1997-2001.While Alcántara (2011) codes PODEMOS as a new party, we consider it a continuation of the ADN, as many of Banzer's supporters joined Quiroga in PODEMOS after he founded the party following Banzer's death. Rule 11.

Frente de Unidad Nacional was created in 2003 (http://www.idea.int/es/publications/politics_within/loader.cfm?csmodule=security/getfile&pageid=19997, page 95), so we treat it as new.

Frente Patriótico Agropecuario de Bolivia (FREPAB) was created in 2000 (http://www.bbc.co.uk/spanish/specials/1419_Bol_candidatos/page8.shtml), but participated for the first time in national elections in 2005 (http://www.contextolatinoamericano.com/documentos/el-derrumbe-del-sistema-de-partidos/#), so we treat it as new.

Unión Social de los Trabajadores de Bolivia (USTB) participated for the first time in national elections in 2005 (http://www.contextolatinoamericano.com/documentos/el-derrumbe-del-sistema-de-partidos/#), so we treat it as new.

2009:

The coalition Alianza por el Consenso y Unidad Nacional (UN-CP) is counted under UN because Samuel Doria Medina was the president of Unidad Nacional (UN) and it did not remain intact. Rule 1.

The Plan Progreso para Bolivia – Convergencia Nacional (PPB-Convergencia) was a coalition of Nueva Fuerza Republicana (NFR), Plan Progreso para Bolivia (PPB), Autonomía para Bolivia (APB), Partido Popular (PP), and Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR). Its vote share is counted for the Nueva Fuerza Republicana

because the coalition's 2009 presidential candidate, Manfred Reyes Villa, was the leader of the NFR and it did not remain intact. Rule 1.

Alianza Social runs for the first time in national elections in 2009 (https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?cid=DD4AE68FE1789A6A&resid=DD4AE68FE1789A6A!138&app=Word) , so we treat it as new.

Movimiento de Unidad Social Patriótica was created in 2006 (www.lostiempos.com/media_pdf/2009/12/05/84579_pdf.pdf), so we treat it as new.

Agrupación GENTE: I found no evidence that it ran before the 2009 elections, so we treat it as new.

Pueblos por la Libertad y Soberania (Pulso): I found no evidence that it ran before the 2009 elections, so we treat it as new.

Bolivia Social Demócrata (BSD): I found no evidence that it ran before the 2009 elections, so we treat it as new.

2014*:*

There were no coalitions.

The Partido Verde de Bolivia (PVB) was founded in 2007, and this is the first year it ran in national elections.

The Movimiento Sin Miedo (MSM) was founded in 1999. It ran in a coalition with MAS in 2005 and 2009, so we treat it as established.

BRAZIL

1945*: There were no coalitions.*

1950:

The PTB/PSP coalition backed the PTB candidate, Getúlio Vargas. Because this coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election, we code the vote share for the PTB, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

The PSD/PR/POT/PST coalition backed the PSD candidate, Cristiano Machado. Because this coalition that did not remain intact for the subsequent election, we code the vote share for the PSD, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

The UDN/ PDC/PL/PRP coalition backed the UDN candidate, Eduardo Gomes. The vote share goes to UDN, the candidate's party, because although the coalition remained intact across two elections, the candidate came from UDN in both 1950 and 1955. Rule 4.

PTB had run in the 1945 presidential elections, so we treat it as established.

1955:

The UDN/PDC/PL/PSB coalition backed the UDN candidate, Juarez Távora. The vote share for 1955 (1) goes to UDN, the candidate's party (Rule 4). The vote share for 1955 (2) goes to the coalition because it remained intact in 1960 (Rule 5). Its presidential candidate was formally an independent but was fairly linked to the UDN (Rule 10).

The PSD/PTB coalition backed the PSD candidate, Juscelino Kubitschek. By Rule #6, we give the 1955(1) votes to the PSD. We give the vote share for 1955 (2) to the coalition because it remained intact for the 1960 election, and because in the 1960 election the candidate was not affiliated to either party. Rule 5.

PSP had run in the 1950 presidential elections with PTB, and PRP had run in the 1950 presidential elections in coalition with UDN and other parties. We treat them as established.

1960:

The UDN/PDC/PL/PTN/PR coalition backed the winning candidate, Jânio Quadros. In his presidential run, Quadros was not formally a member of any of the parties, though he had close connections to the UDN and the PDC. We count Quadros as being a candidate of the UDN. Because the UDN/PDC/PL coalition remained intact (with the addition in 1960 of the small PTN and PR), we consider this coalition a continuity of the 1955 one. Rule 10.

The PSD/PTB coalition backed Henrique Teixeira Lott, a Marshall who was not affiliated with any party. Although the composition of the coalition slightly changed from 1955 to 1960, the two main parties remained, so we treat it as a continuation of the PSD/PTB coalition. We gave the vote share to the coalition as a whole because the candidate was not affiliated to either party. Rule 5.

1989:

The PRN, PSC, PTR, and PST supported Fernando Collor de Mello, but because the coalition did not remain intact and Collor de Mello was associated with the PRN, the vote share goes to the PRN. Rule 1.

The PT, PSB, PC do B supported Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. The coalition did not remain intact for the 1994 election and da Silva was associated with the PT, so we give the vote share to the PT. Rule 1.

The PL and PDC supported Guilherme Afif Domingos, but because the coalition did not remain intact and Domingos was associated with the PL, we give the vote share to the PL. Rule 1.

The PSD and PDN supported Ronaldo Caiado. The coalition did not remain intact for the 1994 election and Caiado was associated with the PSD, so we give the vote share to the PSD. Rule 1.

Following rule 4 for new parties, because lower chamber elections preceded presidential elections by three years, we considered parties that did not compete in the 1986 lower chamber parties as new in the 1989 presidential elections.

Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira (PSDB) was founded in 1988. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Social Democrático (PSD): the party "created in 1987 is not the same party as the one that existed between 1944 and 1965" (Mainwaring, Meneguello, and Power 2000: 181). We treat the 1989 PSD as a new party.

Partido de Reedificaçao da Ordem Nacional (PRONA) was founded in 1989. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Social Progressista (PSP) has no relation to the PSP that disappeared in 1965. This one was created in 1987. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Liberal Progressista (PLP) was created in 1989. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Verde (PV) was founded in 1986 but ran for the first time in national elections in 1989, although it wasn't officially registered. We treat it as a new party.

1994:

The PSDB, PFL, and PTB supported the candidacy of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, from PSDB. Although the coalition remained intact for the subsequent elections, we give the vote share to the PSDB because the candidate always came from the same party, PSDB. Rule 4.

PSC had run in coalition with PRN, PTR, and PST in 1989. By Rule 1 we treat it as established.

1998:

The coalition of the PSDB, PFL, and PTB that elected Cardoso in 1994 was joined by the PP, PSD, and PSL to support Cardoso in the 1998 election. We give the vote share in 1998 to the PSDB because the candidate always came from the same party, PSDB. Rule 4.

The PT ran in coalition with PCB and PSB, backing the PT candidate Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. The coalition did not remain intact for the following elections, so we give the vote share to PT, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

PCB/PPS, PV, and PMN had run in 1989, so we treat them as established.

PTN, founded in 1945 and dissolved in 1965, was refounded in 1995: although it retained the original name, we consider it a new party that ran for the first time in 1998.

PSN (Partido Solidarista Nacional, later Partido da Solidariedade Nacional, and renamed Partido Humanista da Solidariedade, PHS, in 2000) was created in 1995 (http://www.tse.jus.br/arquivos/tse-historico-partidos-politicos), so its first elections were in 1998.

PTdoB (Partido Trabalhista do Brasil): although it ran for lower chamber elections in 1990, by Rule 2 we code it as new, as it did not run in the 1994 presidential elections and its first presidential election was in 1998.

2002:

Luis Inácio Lula da Silva (from PT) ran with the support of the PT, PL, PC do B, PMN, PCB, and PV. We give his vote share to PT because, although it remained intact in subsequent elections, the candidate always came from the same party, PT. Rule 4.

José Serra (from PSDB) ran with the support of the PSDB, PMDB, PP, and PFL. We give the vote share to the PSDB because the candidate always came from the PSDB. Rule 4.

Anthony Garotinho ran with the support of the PSB, PGT, and PTC. We give his vote share to the PSB because he was a member of the PSB and the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.
Ciro Gomes ran with the support of the PPS, PDT, and PTB. We give the vote share to the PPS because he was a member of the PPS and the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

PSB had run in coalition in the 1989 and the 1994 presidential elections. By Rule 1 we code it as established.
PCO (Partido da Causa Operária) was officially registered in 1997 and ran for the first time in 2002, so we treat it as new.

2006:
The PT, PRB, and PC do B supported the candidacy of Lula da Silva from PT. We give the vote share to PT because, although it remained intact in subsequent elections, the candidate always came from the same party, PT. Rule 4.
The PSDB and PFL formed a coalition in support of the PSDB candidate, Geraldo Jose Alckmin. We give the vote share to the PSDB because the candidate always came from the same party, PSDB. Rule 4.
Heloisa Helena, a member of PSOL, ran with the support of PSOL, PCB, and PSTU. We give the vote share to PSOL because she was a member of PSOL and the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

PDT had run in 1994, and PSL (Partido Social Liberal) had run in coalition in 1998, so we treat them as established.
Partido Republicano Progressista(PRP): although it was registered in 1991, these were its first national elections, so we treat it as new.
PSOL (Partido Socialismo e Liberdade) was registered in 2005 and ran for the first time in 2006, so we treat it as new.

2010:
Dilma Rousseff (from PT) ran with the support of the PT, PMDB, PC do B, PRB, PSB, PSC, PTC, and PTN. The vote share goes to PT because, although it remained intact in subsequent elections, the candidate always came from the same party, PT. Rule 4.
José Serra (from PSDB) ran with the support of the PSDB, DEM, PTB, PPS, PMN and PTB. The PFL became DEM in 2007. We give the vote share to the PSDB because the candidate always came from the same party, PSDB. Rule 4.

PV had run in 1998, so we treat it as established.
PSTU had run in 2002, so we treat it as established.
PCB (Partido Comunista Brasileiro): in 1992 the old PCB was dissolved and the largest faction became the PPS. A smaller faction tried to keep the original name and was finally registered as a different party in 1996. It ran in coalition in the 2006 elections.

PRTB (Partido Renovador Trabalhista Brasileiro) was created in 1997 and ran for the first time in presidential elections in 2010, but it had run in congressional elections in 2002 and 2006: following Rule 1b, we code it as established.

2014. *All parties were established.*

2018.
Although there were many coalitions, election results are presented by party.
Partido Trabalhista Nacional (PTN) was renamed Podemos (PODE). It's the same party.
Partido Social Democrata Cristão (PSDC) was renamed Democracia Cristã (DC). It's the same party.
The Partido do Movimento Democrático Brasileiro (PMDB) reverted to its former name, Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB). It's the same party.
Patriota (PATRI) had run under the Change Brazil coalition in the 2014 presidential elections. It's an established party.
Partido Pátria Livre (PPL) had run under the United for Brazil coalition in the 2014 presidential elections. It's an established party.

CHILE
1932:
The Partido Liberal, Partido Radical, Partido Social Republicano, Partido Radical Socialista, and Partido Democrático backed the Partido Liberal candidate, Arturo Alessandri Palma. We code the vote share for the PL because this coalition did not remain intact for the 1938 election. Rule 1.
The Nueva Acción Pública united with other parties with socialist tendencies and became the Partido Socialista in 1933.
Enrique Zañartu Prieto ran with the support of the Partido Liberal Democrático and the Partido Liberal Unido. We give the vote share for the PLD because the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election and the candidate was a member of the PLD. Rule 1.

1938:
The Frente Popular coalition, which included the radical, communist, socialist, democratic, and radical socialist parties backed Pedro Aguirre Cerda, from the P. Radical. The Frente Popular disbanded after the 1938 elections, but was reborn as the Alianza Democrática for the 1942 elections. We code the Alianza Democrática as a continuation of the Frente Popular. Rule 11. Notwithstanding the survival of the coalition, we give the vote share to the Partido Radical (PR), because the candidate always came from the same party, the PR. Rule 4.
The PL, PC, and PD supported the candidacy of Gustavo Ross Santa María. We give the vote share to the PL, because the coalition did not remain intact for the next election and the candidate belonged to the PL. Rule 1.
Carlos Ibáñez del Campo ran as a candidate for the APL, but renounced his position and backed Aguirre Cerda after the Matanza del Seguro Obrero. Despite his resignation

from the election, he still received 112 votes, which gave him 0.03 percent of the vote share.

APL was created in 1938 for these elections, so we code it as a new party.
The Partido Radical had run in coalition in the 1932 elections (Rule 1), so we code it as established.

1942:
Ibáñez ran with the support of his own party, the APL, as well as support from the PL and the PCon. The vote share goes to the APL because it was his party and because the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
The Alianza Democrática de Chile was the continuation of the Frente Popular (Rule 11). The vote share goes to the PR because, although the coalition remained intact across two elections, the candidate always came from the PR. Rule 4.

1946:
Eduardo Cruz-Coke Lassabe ran as the PCon candidate but was also backed by the Falange Nacional. We give the vote share to the PCon because the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
The PL, PRD, and PAL supported Fernando Alessandri Rodríguez's candidacy. The vote share goes to the PL because it was the candidate's party and because the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

1952:
We code Carlos Ibáñez del Campo as a candidate of the APL coalition. Although he was backed by a coalition that included the PSP, PAL, PDP, PRDo and the PF, this coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. Ibáñez was not a member of any of the parties that supported him. The APL was a coalition created solely for the purposes of supporting Ibáñez in the 1938, 1942, and 1952 elections. Ibáñez was not closely enough associated with any party to treat the APL as the continuation of a specific party. Rule 3.
The Frente Nacional del Pueblo (FRENAP) coalition (Partido Socialista de Chile and Partido Comunista) backed Salvador Allende, from the PSC. Although it remained intact for two consecutive elections (with a change of name to the Frente de Acción Popular, FRAP), because the candidate always came from the Partido Socialista, we give to votes to this party. Rule 4.
The PCT and PRM supported the PL candidate, Arturo Matte Larraín. The coalition did not remain intact, so the vote share goes to the PL. Rule 1.
The PR, PCSC, FN, and PDCH supported Pedro Enrique Alfonso Barrios. The coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election, and the vote share goes to the candidate's party, the PR. Rule 1.

The PDC was created in July 1958, so these were its first national elections, so we code it as new.

1958:

Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez had the backing of the right, including the PCU, PL, PAL, MONAP, PRDo and the CP. This coalition did not remain intact. We give the vote share to the Liberal Party. He had previously been a member of the Liberal Party, but by 1958, he was more closely associated with the Conservatives. Still, there is sufficient continuity from the Conservative Party in 1952 to Alessandri's campaign in 1958 to treat them as a continuity. Rule 10.

As noted above, we give the FRAP's votes to the Partido Socialista de Chile because the candidate always came from this party. Rule 4.

Antonio Zamorano Herrera (Independent) ran for the presidency for the first time, so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

1964:

The PDC candidate, Eduardo Frei Montalva, also ran with the support of the PCU, PL, and AN. The coalition did not remain intact, however, so the vote share goes to the PDC. Rule 1.

The PR ran in conjunction with the CP. The coalition did not remain intact (the CP disbanded in 1965), and the vote share for Julio Durán Neumann goes to the PR, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

We give the FRAP's votes to the Partido Socialista de Chile because the candidate (Allende) always came from this party. Rule 4.

1970:

Unidad Popular was the new name of FRAP, the coalition between PSC and PCC that backed Allende, from the PSC. Notwithstanding the survival of the coalition for more than two consecutive elections, because the candidate always came from the same party we give the votes to the PSC. Rule 4.

Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez once again ran as an independent candidate, this time with the support of the PN and DR. We treat Alessandri as the candidate of the Partido Nacional because of his well known linkages to it (Rule 8). The Partido Nacional was created in 1966 as a merger of the Liberal and Conservative Parties and Acción Nacional. We treat the Partido Nacional as the continuation of the Partido Liberal. Rule 11.

The PDC ran its candidate, Radomiro Tomic Romero, with the support of PADENA. The vote share goes to the PDC. Rule 1.

1989:

The vote share for the Concertación candidate, Patricio Aylwin, goes to the Concertación coalition. Aylwin was a member of the PDC, but we code the Concertación as a party because the coalition remained intact in subsequent elections and the candidate did not always come from the same party. Rule 5.

We consistently treated the Partido por la Democracia and the Partido Socialista de Chile as one party because for all practical purposes, this is the reality. They have not run separate presidential candidates.

The vote share generated by the candidacy of Hernán Büchi Buc goes to the coalition Democracia y Progreso, which consisted of the UDI (Büchi's party) and the RN. The coalition changed its name over the course of subsequent elections, but the UDI and the RN remained as key members. It retained the name Democracia y Progreso from 1989-1992, became Participación y Progreso in 1992, was renamed Unión por el Progreso de Chile in 1993 (adding the Partido Nacional, Unión de Centro Centro, and Partido del Sur), Unión por Chile in 1996 (including the Partido del Sur but without the PN or PUCC), Alianza por Chile in 2000 (without Partido del Sur), Alianza in 2004, Coalición por el Cambio in 2009 (adding Chile Primero from 2009-2010), Coalición in 2012, and Alianza in 2013. We code all these coalitions as continuations of the original Democracia y Progreso coalition between the UDI and the RN.

1993:

The Concertación backed Eduardo Frei, from PDC. We give the vote share to the Concertación. Rule 5.

The Unión por el Progreso de Chile coalition backed Arturo Alessandri Besa, an independent with close links to RN (Rule 10). We give the vote share to the coalition. Rule 5.

The Partido Humanista took part in the Concertación coalition in 1989, so we treat it as established.

Independientes (José Piñera Echenique): it was his first time running for president (he had run for Municipal elections in 1992), so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

Independientes (Manfred Max Neef): it was his first time running for office, so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

1999:

The Unión por Chile backed Joaquín Lavín, from UDI. We give the vote share to the coalition. Rule 5.

The Concertación backed Ricardo Lagos, from PPD. We give the vote share to the Concertación. Rule 5.

The Independent category includes the vote share for independent candidate Sara María Larraín Ruiz-Tagle. Because it was her first time running for president, we treat her as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

2005:

The candidacy of Tomás Hirsch Goldschmidt, a member of the Partido Humanista, was supported by the Juntos Podemos Más coalition, which included The Partido

Comunista, Partido Humanista, and the Izquierda Cristiana. The Juntos Podemos Más coalition dissolved after the 2009 presidential election, but it remained intact for two consecutive elections. By Rule #1, for the 2005 (1) election, we give the vote share for Hirsch Goldschmidt to the Partido Humanista, and by Rule 4, for the 2005 (2) election, we give the vote share to the Juntos Podemos Más coalition. Rule 6.

The Alianza coalition (which we code as a continuation of Democracia y Progreso) originally put forward the UDI politician Joaquín Lavín as its candidate for the 2005 presidential election. The RN independently named Sebastián Piñera as its candidate, with the support of some Alianza members. We treat Lavín's 2005 vote as the successor to the coalition (1999 (2)) because the coalition candidate in 1999, also Lavín, was a member of UDI. We give Piñera's 2005(1) vote share to the RN. Rule 8.

The Concertación backed Michelle Bachelet, from the PSC. We give the vote share to the Concertación. Rule 5.

Renovación Nacional (RN) had run in the Unión por el Progreso de Chile before, so we treat it as established.

2009:

The Concertación backed Eduardo Frei, from the PDC. We give the vote share to the Concertación. Rule 5.

Coalición por el Cambio backed the RN candidate, Sebastián Piñera. We treat the RN/UDI coalition in 2009 (1) as the continuation of RN in 2005 (2) because Piñera was a member of RN. Also, because in 2005 the candidate also came from RN (Piñera), to calculate 2005-09 volatility, in 2009 (1) we give the vote share to RN, and to calculate 2009-13 volatility in 2009 (2) we give the vote share to Coalición por el Cambio. Rules 7 and 6.

Marco Enríquez Ominami (Independent): had run in the 2005 legislative elections, but it was his first time running for president, so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

2013.

The Alianza backed the UDI candidate, Evelyn Mattei. We give the vote share to the Alianza. Rule 5.

The Concertación, now labeled Nueva Mayoría (with the addition of Partido Comunista de Chile, Izquierda Ciudadana and Movimiento Amplio Social) backed Michelle Bachelet. We give the vote share to the Concertación/Nueva Mayoría. Rules 5 and 7a.

We treat *Si Tú Quieres Chile Cambia* (Partido Progresista, Partido Liberal, and other minor parties), as a successor of the independent candidacy of Marco Enríquez Ominami of 2009. Ominami created the Partido Progresista in 2010.

We added two new independent candidacies (Franco Parisi and Tomás Jocelyn) and two new political parties (Partido Igualdad and Partido Regionalista de los Independientes).

Partido Ecologista Verde de Chile (PEV) was officially recognized as a party in 2008, and participated in the Nueva Mayoría para Chile coalition in the 2009 elections. Thus, we treat it as established.

Partido Regionalista de los Independientes was created in 2006 and ran for the first time in the 2009 lower chamber elections, so we treat it as a new party.

Franco Parisi Fernández: First time running for office, so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

Tomás Jocelyn: Ran in many legislative elections before this presidential one but this was his first time running for president, so we treat him as a new contender. Rule 5 for new parties.

2017

Partido Progresista was created by Ominami in 2010, and took part in the 2013 elections under the *Si Tú Quieres Chile Cambia* coalition. In 2017 the party runs on its own.

Chile Vamos was a coalition that backed the independent candidate Sebastián Piñera. Piñera had belonged to RN until winning the 2009 elections and taking office, when he had to renounce to his party affiliation. Because he did not reaffiliate, he is an independent but his connection to RN is evident. We give the vote share to Chile Vamos, which we treat as a continuation of the 2013 Alianza. Rule 5.

Nueva Mayoría, now labelled La Fuerza de la Mayoría, backs the independent candidate Alejandro Guillier Álvarez. We give the vote share to the Nueva Mayoría/ La Fuerza de la Mayoría. Rules 5 and 2.

Frente Amplio (FA) was a new coalition created in 2016 among leftist parties which backed the independent candidate, Beatriz Sánchez Muñoz. We give the votes to the coalition.

Unión Patriótica (UPA) was founded in 2015 and ran for the first time in 2017.

PAIS is a new party, founded in 2016 (Although the acronym is the same as the one used by the defunct Partido Amplio de Izquierda Socialista, the current PAIS bears no relationship with that party.)

José Antonio Kast Rist ran as an independent. We treat his as a new contender because this is his first time running for the presidency.

COLOMBIA

Note: Although the first election of the regime took place in 1910, "the collecting of electoral data begins with the first direct presidential elections held in the 20th century" (Nohlen 2005), i.e., the 1914 elections.

1914: *There were no coalitions or new parties.*

1918:

Unión Republicana was a coalition formed by dissident members of PC and PL that backed Guillermo Valencia, a member of the PC. It was banned after the 1918 elections and its members were forced to return to their original parties. Because it did not survive for two consecutive elections and the candidate's party was the PC, which received the largest vote share, we treat Unión Republicana as a new entity.

1922: *There were no coalitions or new parties.*

1926: *There were no coalitions or new parties.*

1930:

The PC was divided into two factions, one backing Guillermo Valencia Castillo, who obtained the largest vote share, and Alfredo Vásquez Cobo. Following Rule 13 for party schisms, we give Valencia's vote share to PC and treat Vásquez Cobo as a new entity.

1934: *There were no coalitions.*

The Partido Comunista de Colombia was founded in 1930 and these are its first presidential elections, so we code it as new.

1938: *There were no coalitions.*

1942:

The PL was divided into two factions, one backing Alfonso López Pumarejo, who obtained the largest vote share, and Carlos Arango Vélez. Following Rule 13 for party schisms, we give López Pumarejo's vote share to PC and treat Arango Vélez as a new entity.

1946:

The PL was divided into two factions, one backing Gabriel Turbay, who obtained the largest vote share, and Jorge Eliécer Gaitán Ayala. Following Rule 13 for party schisms, we give Gabriel Turbay's vote share to PC and treat Jorge Eliécer Gaitán Ayala as a new entity.

1970:

Note: Although the 1970 elections were held under the National Front agreement, they were competitive at least in the sense that no party won a decisive majority. We include the 1970-74 electoral period because: a) the 1970 election was competitive; and b) electoral volatility for the 1970-74 electoral period was not constrained by the rules of the National Front.

ANAPO had run in Giraldo's ticket in 1966, so we treat it as established.
Following Rule #6 for new parties, we code Betancour's and Sourdís' factions as new parties.

1974:

UNO, a coalition formed mainly between MOIR, the Partido Comunista, and ANAPO dissidents, backed Hernando Echeverry Mejia, from the Movimiento Amplio Colombiano (MAC), a splinter of ANAPO. In 1978 MOIR left the coalition. We give the votes to the coalition. Rule 2. We treat UNO as an established party, because one of its members, the PCC, had a long history in running for national elections.

1978:

The Partido Conservador ran with the Movimiento Nacional coalition in 1978 and 1982. Because the candidates came from the Partido Conservador, we allocate the votes to it. Rule 4.

UNO: in 1978 it consisted of the Partido Comunista and ex-anapistas. It backed Julio César Pernía, who came from a dissident sector of ANAPO. We give the vote share to the coalition. Rule 2.

Frente por la Unidad del Pueblo (FUP) was a coalition that backed a candidate who came from a dissident sector of ANAPO. By Rule 3 we code the coalition as established.

Mov. De Renovación Nacional (MRN) ran for the first time in 1978 (Nohlen 1993). We code it as new.

Unión Obrera y Socialista (UNIOS) ran for the first time in 1978 (Nohlen 1993). It was a coalition of the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores, the Organización Comunista Ruptura, La Liga Comunista Revolucionaria y La Unión Revolucionaria Socialista. Its candidate, Luz del Socorro Ramírez, belonged to the PST, a party founded in 1977, so we treat it as a new party. Rule 3 for new parties.

1982:

The Frente Democrático was a coalition between Firmes and UNO that backed the Firmes candidate, Gerardo Molina Ramírez. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, we give the vote share to Firmes. Rule 1. Also, FIRMES (the candidate's party) ran for the first time in 1982, so we code it as new entity.

Nuevo Liberalismo (NL) was founded in 1979, so we treat it as a new party.

1986:

The Partido Conservador ran with the Movimiento de Participación Nacional and backed Álvaro Gómez Hurtado, from the PC. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, we give the vote share to the PC. Rule 1.

The Unión Patriótica was a coalition of several parties, especially the Communists (PCC). It backed PCC's Jaime Pardo Leal. The coalition initially ran in the following (1990) elections, but it decided to withdraw because of the violent attacks against its members. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to PCC. Rule 1.

Movimiento Unitario Metapolítico (MUM) ran for the first time in 1986, so we treat it as a new party.

1990:

The PC changed its name to *Partido Social Conservador* (PSC) in 1987, but it remained the same. Rule 11.

Movimiento de Salvación Nacional (MSN), Alianza Democrática-M19 (AD-M19), Partido Nacional Cristiano(PNC), Partido Natural, Partido Social Demócrata Colombiano, and Movimiento de Orientación Ecológica ran for the first time in 1990.

1994:

Andrés Pastrana ran under the *Nueva Fuerza Democrática (NFD)* ticket, but we give his vote share to his party, the PC because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

The AD-M19 candidate ran in the Compromiso Colombia coalition, but we count the votes as belonging to AD-M19 PC because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Mov. De Concentración Cívica Nacional, Convergencia Nacional, Mov. De Alternativa Democrática nacional, Mov. Jorge Eliecer Gaitán (JEGA), Compromiso Cívico Cristiano, Protestemos, Frente Moral, Movimiento Nacional Progresista, and Movimiento Cristiano Independiente ran for the first time in 1994.

1998:

Andrés Pastrana ran under the *Gran Alianza para el Cambio*, but we give his vote share to his party, the PC because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Noemí Sanín, a dissident of the PC, funded and ran under the *Movimiento Sí Colombia* ticket in these elections, its first.

Fuerza Colombia, Unión Cristiana (UC), Mov. Nacional Comunidades Negras, Mov. Participación Popular, and Ciudadanos en Formación all ran for the first time in 1998.

2002:

Although Álvaro Uribe's former party was the *PLC*, for these elections he could not garner enough support from the PLC, so he formed a different party, *Primero Colombia* and ran against the Liberal Party. Thus, we give the vote share to *Primero Colombia*. (Note: Alcántara considers Primero Colombia and all subsequent Uribe parties, including El Partido de la "U" as a continuation of the PCC. We do not follow this coding because Uribe was originally from the PLC.)

Luis Eduardo Garzón began his campaign for the presidency as the candidate for the Frente Social y Político (FSP), his party, but he was eventually picked up as the official candidate of Polo Democrático Independiente, a coalition of FSP and several other leftist parties. We give the vote share to FSP, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

We treat the PDA as a continuation of the PDI and we give Garzón's vote share to the PDI. Rule 11.

Primero Colombia, Partido Verde Oxígeno, and Frente Social y Político (FSP) ran for the first time in presidential elections in 2002.

Mov. Defensa Ciudadana had only taken part in the previous legislative elections (1998), so we treat it as a new party.

2006: *There were no new coalitions.*

Polo Democrático Alternativo was the continuation of Polo Democrático Independiente, a coalition that backed FSP's candidate in 2002. Because this coalition turned into a party in 2003, absorbing its former parties, we treat PDA as the continuation of FSP.

Movimiento Alianza Social Indígena (ASI), Movimiento Reconstrucción Democrática Nacional, and Movimiento Político Comunal y Comunitario had run for the first time in the 2002 legislative elections. Because they had never run in presidential elections, we treat them as new parties (Rule 1b for new parties).

Movimiento Nacional de Reconciliación ran for the first time in 2006. New party.

2010:

We treat the Partido de la "U" as a continuation of Primero Colombia, as both were Uribe's parties. The Partido de la U candidate, Juan Manuel Santos, served in Uribe's government and was Uribe's candidate. Rule 11.

Partido Verde was formerly known as Opción Centro, a party founded in 2005 that participated in the 2006 legislative elections for the first time. Accordingly, we treat PV as a new party. (See: http://www.alianzaverde.org.co/Transparencia/Historia.aspx)

Partido Cambio Radical, Movimiento la Voz de la Conciencia, and Alianza Social Afrocolombiana ran for the first time in 2010.

Movimiento Apertura Liberal had run in the 1998 legislative elections. Because these took place before the penultimate presidential elections (2006), we treat MAL as established.

2014.

Alianza Verde was a coalition of Partido Verde and the Movimiento Progresista, backing a PV candidate. We give the coalition votes to Partido Verde, the candidate's party. Rule 1, because this coalition dissolves before the next election.
Polo Democrático and Unión Patriótica ran in coalition. We give the votes to PD, the candidate's party. Rule 1, because this coalition dissolves before the next election.

We treat Centro Democrático as a new political party founded by former President of Colombia, Álvaro Uribe.

2018.
Alianza Verde, Movimiento Compromiso Ciudadano (MCC) and Polo Democrático Alternativo ran together in the Coalición Colombia coalition, backing an MCC candidate. We give the coalition votes to MCC, the candidate's party.
Colombia Humana (CH) ran in coalition with MAIS, backing a CH candidate.
In this election, Movimiento #Mejor Vargas Lleras ran in coalition with Cambio Radical, Ante Todo Colombia and Partido de la U, backing Vargas Lleras. We give the coalition votes to Movimiento #Mejor Vargas Lleras, the candidate's party.
Partido Liberal and Alianza Social Independiente ran together in coalition, backing a PL candidate. We give the coalition votes to PL, the candidate's party.

Movimiento Compromiso Ciudadano (MCC) had run in the 2010 senate elections, so it's an established party.
Partido Somos Región Colombia was formerly known as Alas Equipo Colombia, a party that ran in the 2006, 2010, and 2014 lower chamber elections. It's an established party.
Movimiento #Mejor Vargas Lleras was the electoral vehicle of Germán Vargas Lleras, formerly from Cambio Radical. We treat it as a new party.
Movimiento Todos Somos Colombia (MTSC), formerly FUNECO, had run in the 2014 legislative election for the first time. It's a new party.
Partido de Reivindicación Étnica was created in 2018. It's a new party.
Colombia Humana (CH), formerly Movimiento Progresistas, was founded in 2011 and ran in coalition with Alianza Verde in 2014. It's an established party.

COSTA RICA
1919: *There were no coalitions.*

1923:
Partido Agrícola and Partido Reformista ran for the first time, so we treat them as new.
Partido Republicano, founded in 1901, had run in previous presidential and congressional elections, so we treat it as established.

1928:

Partido Unión Nacional (PUN) This was the heir of Partido Agrícola created in 1926, and later members of Reformista and Republicano Histórico parties also joined.[5] We treat PUN as the continuation of the Agrícola.

1932:

Partido Republicano Nacional (PRN) was created in 1932 as an electoral vehicle to back the candidacy of Ricardo Jiménez Oreamuno. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Nacionalista was a new party.

Unión Republicana was founded in 1931.[6] We treat it as a new party

1936:

Partido Nacional and Bloque de Obreros y Campesinos were new parties.[7]

1940:

Confraternidad Guanacasteca, a regional party, was created in 1937 and ran for the first time in the 1938 legislative elections. Hence, we treat it as a new party.

Bloque de Obreros y Campesinos changes its name in 1943 and becomes Partido Vanguardia Popular (PVP). It is the same party.

1944:

"Bloque de la Victoria" was a coalition of Partido Republicano Nacional and Vanguardia Popular backing Teodoro Picado Michalski, from PRN. We give the votes to PRN, the candidate's party.

Partido Demócrata (PD) was the name of the party founded by Cortés in 1941 and should not be confused by the party of the same name that had run in 1919. We treat it as a new party.

1953:

Partido Unión Nacional ran with Partido Demócrata, backing the PD candidate, [8] so we give the votes to PD.

1958:

Partido Unión Nacional ran with PRN. We give the votes to PUN, the candidate's party.

---

[5] Oconitrillo García, Eduardo. 2004. *Cien años de política costarricense: 1902-2002, de ascensión esquivel a Abel Pacheco*. p. 59.

[6] Salazar Mora, Orlando, and Jorge Mario Salazar Mora. 1991. *Los partidos políticos en Costa Rica*, page 53.

[7] Salazar Mora and Salazar Mora 1991: 62.

[8] Hernández Naranjo, Gerardo. 2009. *El Sistema De Partidos De Costa Rica 1953-2006*, page 14. (Available from: http://www.mep.go.cr/sites/default/files/descargas_etica/sistema_partidos_costa_rica_1953al2006.pdf. Accessed September 2017).

PUN had run in coalition with PD in 1953, so we treat it as established.
Partido Independiente, a splinter from PLN, was founded in 1958.

1962: *There were no coalitions.*
Acción Democrática Popular (PADP) was created in 1962 and only ran in these elections. It is a new party.
Partido Republicano (PR) ran for the first time in 1958 in alliance with PUN, and ran as Partido Republicano Nacional Independiente (PRNI) in 1953 (Fernando Sánchez 2007:92). It is an established party.

1966:
The Partido Unificación Nacional was a coalition between the Partido Republicano Nacional (PR) and the Partido Unión Nacional, backing José Joaquín Trejos Fernández, who was not affiliated to any party. Unificación Nacional is treated as the continuation of the Partido Republicano Nacional (the larger of the two in 1962) for 1966 (1), following Rules 6 and 12. Because the coalition remained stable for more than two consecutive elections (1966, 1970 and 1974), and the candidates did not always come from the same party, for purposes of calculating electoral volatility, we treat Unificación Nacional as a separate entity for 1966 (2) (i.e., it gets its own line in the Excel sheet) (Rule 5). However, because PR, the larger party in 1962, existed prior to the formation of this new coalition, we treat the coalition as established (Rule 4b for New Parties).

1970:
The Unificación Nacional coalition runs again, this time backing PUN candidate Mario Echandi Jiménez. Rule 5.

Demócrata Cristiano (PDC), Partido Acción Socialista (PASO), and Frente Nacional ran for the first time in 1970 (Nohlen 1993).

1974:
The Unificación Nacional coalition runs again, this time backing Fernando Trejos Escalante, who was the coalition's candidate and was not affiliated to any party. Rule 12.

Partido Renovación Democrática (PRD), a splinter from PLN, was a new party in 1974.
Partido Nacional Independiente (PNI) and P. Socialista Costarricense (PSC) were also new parties.

1978:
Rodrigo Carazo Odio (from the Partido Demócrata Cristiano) won the 1978 elections supported by a coalition of parties dubbed the Coalición Unidad. The Coalición Unidad initially included the Partido Republicano Calderonista, the Partido

Demócrata Cristiano de Costa Rica, Partido Renovación Democrática, and Partido Unión Popular. Because the coalition ran for more than two consecutive elections and the candidates did not always come from the same party, by Rule 5, we give the votes for 1978 (2) to the coalition, and by Rule 6 we give the 1978(1) votes to PDC, the candidate's party, because PDC had run on its own in the previous elections.

Pueblo Unido was a coalition of various Marxist political parties (Partido Vanguardia Popular, Partido Socialista Costarricense, and Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo) founded prior to the 1978 elections. The coalition backed Rodrigo Gutiérrez Sáenz, from Vanguardia Popular (VP). Although the coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, following Rule 4, VP receives the vote share because the candidate came from this party in both elections. (Rule 6 does not apply here because PVP did not participate on its own in the previous elections.)

Vanguardia Popular had been founded as Bloque de Obreros y Campesinos in 1931, and after taking part in several elections, it became illegal in 1949. We treat it as established.

Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores (PSOT) (PSOT) ran for the first time in 1978 (Nohlen 1993), so it is a new party.

1982:

Coalición Unidad ran again, backing Calderón Fournier, who belonged to the Partido Unión Nacional. By Rule 5, we give the 1982 votes to the coalition.

Pueblo Unido again backed Rodrigo Gutiérrez Sáenz, from VP. Following Rule 4, VP receives the vote share because the candidate came from the same party in the 1978 and 1982 elections.

Movimiento Nacional ran for the first time in 1982 (Nohlen 1993).

1986:

The four member parties of Coalición Unidad (Renovación Democrática, Republicano Calderonista, Demócrata Cristiano and Unión Popular) merged to form the Partido Unidad Social Cristiana in 1983. (https://www.tse.go.cr/unidadsocialcristiana.htm).We code the PUSC as a continuation of the Coalición Unidad (1982). Rule 11.

The Vanguardia Popular broke away from the Pueblo Unido coalition and joined the Frente Amplio Democrático in the Alianza Popular coalition for the 1986 elections. It backed Rodrigo Gutiérrez Sáenz, from Vanguardia Popular. The coalition did not stay intact for the next presidential election, so the vote share goes to the Vanguardia Popular. Rule 1.

The Pueblo Unido coalition backed Álvaro Montero Mejía, from the Partido Socialista Costarricense. Because the coalition disbanded right after the elections, we give the vote share to the PSC, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Alianza Nacional Cristiana ran for the first time in these elections (Nohlen 1993).

1990:

The original Pueblo Unido disappeared after the 1986 elections, after the Vanguardia Popular broke away just before the 1986 elections. However, a new coalition between the Partido del Pueblo Civilista and the Partido Democrático Popular formed under the same name for the 1990 elections. This coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Because the candidate, Víctor Daniel Camacho Monge, belonged to the coalition and was not affiliated to either party, and because both parties were new,[9] by Rule 3 we give the vote share to the coalition.

Partido del Progreso and Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores ran for the first time in 1990 (Nohlen 1993).

1994:

Fuerza Democrática was a party founded through a fusion of Partido del Progreso with other leftist groups. We code Fuerza Democrática as a continuation of Partido del Progreso. Rule 11.

Unión Generaleña (PUGEN) took part in the 1986 legislative elections, so we treat it as an established party (Nohlen 1993).

1998:

Vanguardia Popular adopts the name Pueblo Unido, but it does not run in coalition. We consider the Pueblo Unido in 1998 and 2002 as the continuation of Vanguardia Popular. In 2004 VP again takes its former name.Rule 11.

Partido Unión Generaleña changed its name to Partido Unión General. We treat them as one and the same.

Mov. Libertario, Partido Integración Nacional, Partido Renovación Costarricense (PRC), Nuevo Partido Democrático, and Rescate Nacional ran for the first time in 1998.

2002:

Walter Coto Molina, from the Partido Social Costarricense (PSC), ran as the Coalición Cambio 2000 candidate, a coalition formed by the Vanguardia Popular (under the name Pueblo Unido), the Partido Social Costarricense and the Partido Acción Democrática Alajuelense (PADA). The coalition did not remain intact for the next election, so we code the vote share for the Partido Social Costarricense (PSC), the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Partido Social Costarricense was created by Walter Coto Molina before these elections, so it is a new party.

[9] They were both created in 1988. See:http://www.tse.go.cr/partidos_cancelados.htm

Partido Acción Ciudadana (PAC), Partido Independiente Obrero, and Patriótico Nacional ran for the first time in 2002.

2006:

The Izquierda Unida coalition (MAPU, MTC, PPC, PRT, PST, and Vanguardia Popular) backed Humberto Vargas Carbonell from Vanguardia Popular.Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections we give the vote share to VP, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Partido Unión Nacional (PUN) was founded in the early 20th century and participated in several elections until 1970. It was revived in 2004. Although it is more than 15 years since the last time the party ran, since there was no regime change, we treat the 2006 party as the same one, based on the official sources (See: http://www.atlas.iis.ucr.ac.cr/docs/RFuerzaIzquierda//files/assets/common/downloads/publication.pdf).

Unión Patriótica, Alianza Democrática Nacionalista, Patria Primero, and Unión para el Cambio ran for the first time in 2006.

2010: *There were no coalitions.*

Accesibilidad Sin Exclusion and Frente Amplio ran for the first time in legislative elections in 2006. By rule 1b we code as new.

Alianza Patriótica, formerly Partido Acción Democrática Alajuelense, changed its label in 2008 (http://www.tse.go.cr/alianzapatriotica.htm) and become in national party. Because it had run in congressional elections in 1994, 1998 and 2006, we code as established.

2014: *There were no coalitions.*

Patria Nueva, Nueva Generación, Partido de los Trabajadores, and Partido Avance Nacional ran for the first time in this presidential election.

Restauración Nacional had run for congressional elections in 2006 and 2010. By rule 1b we it code as established.

2018:

Partido Republicano Social Cristiano was founded in 2014 and ran at the national level for the first time in this election. It's a new party.

Alianza Demócrata Cristiana was founded in 2012 and ran in the 2014 legislative elections. By the rules, we treat it as a new party.

CUBA

1940:

Coalición Socialista Popular: UCR, Acción Progresista (AP), Partido Democrático Republicano (PDR), Conjunto Nacional Democrático (CND) and the Partido Liberal (PL). It supported the candidacy of Fulgencio Batista, who belonged to no

particular party but to the coalition in itself. We give the votes to the coalition, as it remained intact for two elections. Rule 3.

The Communist party adopted the name Unión Revolucionaria Comunista (UCR) in 1939, and became the Partido Socialista Popular (PSP) in1944.Rule 11.

The Frente de Oposición (ABC, the Partido Revolucionario Auténtico (PRC[A]), and Partido Republicano [PR]) supported the candidacy of Ramón Grau San Martín, from the Partido R. Auténtico. Although the coalition remained intact for the next two elections, we give the votes to the PRC(A) because the candidate always came from the same party (Rule 4).

1944:

The Alianza Auténtico-Republicana (Partido Auténtico (PRC(A)), and Partido Republicano (PR) supported the candidacy of Ramón Grau San Martín, from the Partido R. Auténtico. Although the coalition remained intact for the next two elections, we give the votes to the PRC(A) because the candidate always came from the same party (Rule 4).

The Coalición Socialista Popular included the Partido Socialista Popular (PSP) and Partido Popular Cubano (PPC). It supported the candidacy of Carlos Saladriga, from PSP. Although there was a change in the coalition members, the main party (UCR, then called PSP) was Batista's party and the candidate was handpicked by him. Accordingly, we allocate the votes to the PSP. Rule 3.

1948:

The Alianza Auténtico-Republicana: the Partido Auténtico (PRC(A)), and Partido Republicano (PR) supported the candidacy of Carlos Prío Socarrás, from the PRC(A).By Rule 4 we give the vote share to the PRC(A).

Coalición Liberal-Democrática: Partido Liberal (PL) and Partido Democrático Republicano (PDR). It supported the candidacy of Ricardo Núñez Portuondo. Because no information has been found as to the party of the candidate, and because they were both new parties, by Rule 3 we give the vote share to the coalition.

We treat the PSP as the continuation of the Coalición Socialista Popular of 1940-44. The PSP was the lead party in this coalition in 1940-44. Rule 8.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Although there were several coalitions between 1978 and 1996, and 2004, Payne et al. 2007 provide data at the party level.

1978: -

1982:

The Partido Reformista became the Partido Reformista Social Cristiano (PRSC) after it merged with the Partido Revolucionario Social Cristiano in March 1982, before the

elections.[10] We treat the PRSC as a continuation of PR, the party of the presidential candidate.

Partido Nacional de Veteranos y Civiles (PNVC), Unión Patriótica Anti-imperialista (UPA), Partido Acción Nacional (PAN), Bloque Socialista (BS), Partido Acción Constitucional (PAC), and Movimiento por el Socialismo (MPS) all ran in 1982 for the first time. They are new parties.

1986:

Partido Liberal La Estructura (LE) was created in 1986. We treat it as a new party. (See: http://www.diariolibre.com/noticias/divisiones-en-el-prd-pld-y-prsc-han-creado-12-partidos-otros-siete-surgieron-como-aliados-LODL358470).

Fuerza Nacional Progresista (FNP), Partido Demócrata Nacionalista (PDN), Partido del Pueblo Dominicano (PPD), Partido Popular Cristiano (PPC), and Partido Unidad Democrática (UD) all ran for the first time in 1986, so they are new parties.

1990:

Partido Revolucionario Independiente (PRI), a splinter from PRD, ran for the first time in 1990. We treat it as a new party.

Partido de los Trabajadores Dominicanos (PTD) was created in 1980 but ran for the first time in 1990, so we treat it as a new party.

Partido Comunista de la República Dominicana (PACOREDO) was founded in 1966, but according to Nohlen (2005: 251), it ran for the first time in 1990. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Demócratico Institucional (PDI) ran for the first time in 1990. We treat it as a new party.

1994:

Movimiento Independiente Unidad y Cambio (MIUCA) was created in 1990, but ran for the first time in 1994. We treat it as a new party.

Bloque Institucional Socialdemócrata (BIS) and Partido Renacentista Nacional (PRN) ran for the first time in 1994. We treat them as new parties.

1996:

Concertación Democrática (CD): to the best of our knowledge, it ran for the first time in 1996.

2000:

UNIDO and Nueva Alternativa ran for the first time in 2000.

[10] In this case, Payne et al. (2007) give an incorrect date. They state that this fusion occurred in 1985, but the official party documents show that it was completed in March 1982, before the 1982 elections (See: http://americo.usal.es/oir/opal/Documentos/Rep%20Dominicana/Partido%20Reformista%20Social%20Cristiano/ESTATUT_DECLARA_PRINCIPIOS.pdf).

2004:

Partido de Unidad Nacional (PUN), Unión Demócrata Cristiana (UDC), Fuerza de la Revolución (FR), and Alianza Por la Democracia (APD) ran for the first time in the 2002 legislative election, so we treat them as new parties.

Partido por la Auténtica Democracia (PAD), Movimiento de Solidaridad Nacional (MSN), Alianza Social Dominicana (ASDom), and Partido Humanista Dominicano (PHD) ran for the first time in these elections.

Partido Liberal de la República Dominicana (PLRD) was the old Partido La Estructura (LE). It changed its name at some point before the 2004 presidential elections, so we treat it as its continuation (Nohlen 2005: 250).

2008:

The PRSC ran in coalition with PHD. Because the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent elections, we give the vote share to the candidate's party, PRSC. Rule 1.

The PRD ran in the PRD/PVUD/ASD/MODA coalition, backing the PRD candidate, Miguel Vargas. Because the coalition remained intact in subsequent elections, always fielding a PRD candidate (Rule 4), we give the vote share to the "PRD and allies" coalition.

The PLD ran in the PLD/BIS/APD/PTD/UDC/PLRD/FNP/PUN/PQDC/PRN/PDP/PPC coalition, backing the PLD candidate, Leonel Fernández. Because the coalition remained intact in subsequent elections, always fielding a PLD candidate, we give the vote share to the "PLD and allies" coalition. Rule 4.

Partido Revolucionario Social Demócrata (PRSD) was created in 2005 and ran for the first time in the 1006 legislative elections. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Alianza Popular (PAP): to the best of our knowledge, it ran for the first time in 2008.

2012:

The PRSC supported the PLD candidate, Danilo Medina. We givethe PRSC 0% in 2012 and give the votes to the PLD. Rule 7.

The PRD ran in the PRD/MODA/PRSD/PHD/PDI/ASD coalition, backing the PRD candidate, Hipólito Mejía. Because the coalition remained intact in subsequent elections, always fielding a PRD candidate (Rule 4), we give the vote share to the "PRD and allies" coalition.

The PLD ran in the PLD/BIS/PTD/UDC/PLRD/FNP/PUN/PQDC/PDP/PPC/PRSC/PCR/PAL/PASOVE coalition, backing the PLD candidate, Danilo Medina. Because the coalition remained intact in subsequent elections, always fielding a PLD candidate, we give the vote share to the "PLD and allies" coalition. Rule 4.

Alianza PAÍS (ALPAIS) was established on 15 October 2009, and was recognized in 2011. It's a new party.

Partido Dominicanos por el Cambio (DXC) was founded in 2010 and ran for the first time in the legislative elections that year.

Frente Amplio (FRENTE) is the new name adopted by MIUCA. We treat it as MIUCA's continuation.

2016

The Partido Revolucionario Moderno (PRM) was formed in 2014 by members expelled from the PRD. It's a new party.

PQD and PQDC, Partido Quisqueyano Demócrata Cristiano, are one and the same party (http://es.scribd.com/doc/78659433/Historia-Del-Partido-Quisqueyano-Democrata-Cristiano-PQDC#scribd).

ECUADOR

1948:

The Partido Liberal Radical Ecuatoriano (PLRE)/Partido Socialista Ecuatoriano (PSE) coalition supported Alberto Enríquez Gallo, a military from the PSE. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to PSE. Rule 1.

1952:

The Federación Nacional Velasquista (FNV)/ Acción Revolucionaria Nacionalista Ecuatoriana (ARNE) coalition supported the FNV candidate, J. M. Velasco Ibarra. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to FNV. Rule 1.

Alianza Democrática Nacional (ADN) and Federación Nacional Velasquista (FNV) ran for the first time in this election.

1956:

The Alianza Popular was a coalition among the Partido Social Cristiano (PSC), Partido Conservador Ecuatoriano (PCE), and ARNE that supported the PSC candidate, Camilo Ponce. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to PSC. Rule 1.

The Frente Democrático Nacional was a coalition among PLRE, PSE and PC. It supported the PLRE candidate, Raúl C. Huerta. The coalition stayed intact for the 1960 elections, but because the candidate came from PLRE in both elections, we give the votes to the PLRE (Rule 4).

The Movimiento Popular Independiente was a coalition among some dissident members of the PLRE and velasquista groups. We count it as a new entrant because the coalition did not remain intact. The FNV also ran in 1952, so we cannot count the MPI as a continuation of the FNV.

Concentración de Fuerzas Populares (CFP), Movimiento Popular Independiente, and Partido Social Cristiano (PSC) ran for the first time in this election.

1960:

Because the PLRE/Frente Democrático Nacional coalition backed a PLRE candidate, by Rule 4 we give the votes to the PLRE.

The Concentración de Fuerzas Populares/Partido Socialista Ecuatoriano/Partido Comunista supported Antonio Parra. The candidate (then the rector of the National University) was probably not affiliated to any party. By Rule 11, we count Parra as the continuation of the Concentración de Fuerzas Populares. It was the only of the three parties that backed Parra in 1960 that also ran a candidate in 1956.

Acción Demócrata Cristiana (ADC) participated for the first time in these elections, so we code as new.

1979:

The Partido Social Cristiano candidate, Sixto Durán Ballén, was part of the Frente Constitucionalista, a coalition among PSC, the Partido Conservador, and other minor parties. The coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, but because the candidate always came from PSC, we give the vote share to the party (Rule 4).

Concentración de Fuerzas Populares and Democracia Popular ran in coalition, backing Jaime Roldós Aguilera, from CFP. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to CFP. Rule 1.

The Frente Amplio de Izquierda was a coalition of six Marxist groups led by the Communists. Because the coalition stayed intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share for René Mauge (from the Communist Party, PCE) goes to the PCE, as the candidate came from the same party. Rule 4.

1984:

The Frente Amplio de Izquierda (FADI) again backed René Mauge, from PCE. The vote share goes to the PCE, as the candidate came from the same party. Rule 4.

The Frente de Reconstrucción Nacional candidate, León Febres-Cordero, came from PSC. The coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, but because the candidate always came from PSC, we give the vote share to the party. Rule 4.

Izquierda Democrática ran with Pueblo, Cambio y Democracia, backing Rodrigo Borja, from ID. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to ID. Rule 1.

Movimiento Popular Democrático (MPD) ran for the first time in congressional election in 1979 but for the first time in this presidential election (Nohlen 1993). Following rule 1 we code as new.

Partido Demócrata (PD) and Democracia Popular (DP) ran for the first time in 1984, so we code as new.

1988:

APRE was in a coalition with PSE and others, according to Dieter Nohlen's encyclopedia, but Frank Vargas, the presidential candidate, was part of APRE. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to APRE. Rule 1.

FADI joined forces with MPD in the 1988 election. The candidate, Jaime Hurtado, was affiliated with MPD, and because the coalition did not stay intact for the next presidential election, the vote share goes to the MPD. Rule 1.

Partido Roldosista Ecuatoriano (PRE) and Coalición Nacional Republicana (CNR) ran for the first time in this election.

Acción Popular Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana (APRE) had run in the 1979 elections for provincial deputies, so we treat it as established.

1992:

In 1988, Sixto Durán Ballén was the presidential candidate for the PSC. However, in 1992 he broke with that party and formed the Partido Unidad Republicana. Thus, Ballén's vote share goes to the PUR in 1992. This was a new party.

FADI backed the PCE candidate Gustavo Iturralde, and because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to PCE. Rule 1.

Partido Assad Bucaram (PAB) ran for the first time in this presidential election.

1996:

Ricardo Noboa ran as an independent supported by the Partido Liberal Radical Ecuatoriano and Frente Radical Alfarista. We gave his 3.02% vote share to the Partido Liberal Radical Ecuatoriano, the only of the two parties that supported him in 1996 that also ran a candidate in 1992. Rule 2.

Izquierda Democrática ran in coalition with the Partido Acción Popular Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana (APRE), backing the APRE candidate, Frank Vargas Pazzos. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to APRE. Rule 1.

Movimiento Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik-Nuevo País (MUPPNP), Movimiento Unión Cívica Independiente, and Movimiento Insurgencia Transformadora Independiente ran for the first time in this presidential election.

1998:

Álvaro Noboa, a member of the PRE, ran as part of a coalition between the PRE, APRE, UPL, and CFP. The coalition did not remain intact after the 1998 election, and we give Noboa's vote share to the PRE. Rule 1.

Movimiento Independiente para una República Auténtica (MIRA) ran for the first time in this election.

2002:

Lucio Gutiérrez led the Partido Sociedad Patriótica 21 de Enero. His party was in a coalition with MUPPNP in 2002, but the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. We therefore give his vote share to the PSP. Rule 1.

León Roldós Aguilera was an independent supported by the PS-FA, DP, PCE, and CFP. For 2002 (1), we treat his 15.43% vote share as the continuation of DP, which in 1998 was the largest of the four parties that supported him in 2002 (Rule 2). For 2002 (2), we treat his vote share as the predecessor to CFP, which was the only of the four parties that supported him in 2002 that ran a candidate in 2006. Rules 12 and 6.

Partido Sociedad Patriótica 21 de Enero, Movimiento Patria Solidaria, Partido Renovador, Institucional Acción Nacional (PRIAN), Movimiento Independiente Amauta Jatari (MIAJ), Partido Libertad, and Movimiento Transformación Social Independiente (MTSI) ran for the first time in this presidential election.

2006:

Alianza PAIS was originally a coalition that represented more than 30 political parties, including Movimiento PAIS (Rafael Correa's party) and the PS-FA. The coalition remained intact with a few changes in the member parties for the subsequent election. Because the candidate was always Correa, we give the coalition's vote share to his party (Rule 4).

Alianza PAIS, Movimiento de Reivindicación Democrática (MRD), Alianza ALBA-Tercera República (ATR), Movimiento Revolucionario Participación Popular (MRPP) ran for the first time in this presidential election.

Integración Nacional Alfarista (INA), formerly Alfarismo Nacional, had run in the 1996, 1998, and 2002 so we code it as established.

2009:

Izquierda Democrática and Red Ética y Democracia ran in coalition, backing Martha Roldós, from RED.Because the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election, we give the vote share to RED. Rule 1.

Red Ética y Democracia (RED) ran for the first time in the 2006 legislative elections. We treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Triunfo Mil (MTM), Movimiento Tierra Fertil (MTF), Movimiento Integración y Transformación Social (MITS), and Movimiento Independiente Justo y Solidario (MIJS) ran for the first time in this presidential election.

2013:

The Unidad Plurinacional de las Izquierdas was a coalition of 10 leftist parties (Movimiento Popular Democrático, Pachakutik, RED, and 7 other minor parties) that backed Alberto Acosta Espinosa. The candidate was not affiliated to any particular party but was rather the coalition candidate. By Rule 2 we give the vote share to RED, the largest presidential party in the 2009 election (and the only one that ran a candidate).

Creando Opportunidades (CREO) and Movimiento SUMA ran for the first time in this election.

Ruptura 25 ran for the first time in coalition in ALIANZA PAIS in 2009 in presidential election. We treat it as established.

2017:

Acuerdo Nacional por el Cambio (ANC) was a coalition of leftist parties: Izquierda Democrática, Movimiento Unidad Popular, Movimiento de Unidad Plurinacional Pachakutik, and several provincial parties, backing Paco Moncayo, from Izquierda Democrática. We give the coalition votes to ID, the candidate's party.

Movimiento Fuerza Compromiso Social was founded in 2016 and ran for the first time in national elections in 2017. It's a new party.

Fuerza Ecuador (FE) is the new party created by Abdalá Bucaram in 2015 to replace the defunct Partido Roldosista Ecuatoriano. We treat the FE as a continuation os the PRE, as there is an obvious continuation between them (in fact, even the same number was used for this party).

Movimiento Unión Ecuatoriana was founded in 2014 and ran for the first time in national elections in 2017. It's a new party.

EL SALVADOR

1984: *There were no coalitions.*

1989:

PDC ran in coalition with Acción Democrática (AD), backing the PDC candidate Fidel Chávez Mena. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to PDC. Rule 1.

Convergencia Democrática was a coalition of MNR, MPSC, and PSD that backed Guillermo Ungo, from the MNR (Mov. Nacional Revolucionario). Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, we give the vote share to MNR. Rule 1.

Unidad Popular (UP) was a coalition of PAISA, PL and PPS. The candidate, Hugo Barrera, did not belong to any of the parties, but to ARENA, so he was the coalition's candidate. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the UP votes to PPS, the largest party in the previous election. Rule 2.

Partido Acción Renovadora (PAR) ran for the first time in presidential election in 1960 so we code as established.

Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario (MNR): founded in 1967, it ran for the first time in the 1968 congressional elections, so we code as established.

Movimiento Auténtico Cristiano (MAC) was created in 1989 and ran for the first time in that year's presidential elections. Thus, we treat it as new.

1994:

The FMLN ran as part of a leftist coalition alongside the Convergencia Democrática, which backed Rubén Zamora Rivas, from CD. Because of the unusual circumstances of the 1994 election, we attribute Zamora's vote share to the FMLN even though he was not a member of the party. The FMLN was by far the largest party in the coalition. This was the first election in which the FMLN competed after a sanguinary civil war, and this fact led the FMLN to forego having its own candidate. It would understate continuity in 1999 to treat the FMLN as a new party in that year. In 1994, the FMLN was a new party.

Movimiento de Unidad (MU) and Movimiento de Solidaridad Nacional (MSN) ran for the first time in this election.

1999:

The FMLN allied with the USC for this election, backing Facundo Guardado, from FMLN.Because the coalition did not remain intact for the 2004 election, the vote share goes to the FMLN. Rule 1.

The CDU was a coalition between the PD, PPL, MUDC, FE, and the CD backing Rubén Zamora, from CD. The coalition lasted until 2003. Because the candidate came from a coalition (CD) within this coalition, for purposes of calculating electoral volatility, we treat the coalition as a separate entity (i.e., it gets its own line in the Excel sheet, line #16) (Rule 3). However, because the party that led the coalition existed prior to the formation of this new coalition, we treat the coalition as established (Rule 4b for New Parties).

Partido Pueblo Unido Nuevo Trato (PUNTO) and Liga Democrática Republicana (LIDER) ran for the first time in this election.

2004:

The Partido Demócrata Cristiano technically ceased to exist in 2004 after not being able to gain the 3 percent vote share necessary to remain an official political party, but was allowed to continue as a party due to an official decree. The decree was declared unconstitutional and the PDC was officially disbanded in 2011. A few months later the PDC was replaced by the Partido de la Esperanza, which we consider as a continuation of the PDC. Rule 11.

The CDU ran in coalition with PDC, backing Héctor Silva, who did not belong to either party but was the coalition's candidate. However, because he had close links to CDU we give the vote share to the CDU. Rule 10.

2009: *There were no coalitions*.

2014.

Former president Elías Antonio Saca founded GANA, a defection of ARENA. His candidacy was also backed by Partido de la Concertación Nacional and Partido Demócrata Cristiano. The alliance of GANA, PCN and PDC was called Unidad. Because Elías Antonio Saca is member of GANA, we give the vote share to the presidential candidate's party. Rule 1.

Partido Salvadoreño Progresista and Fraternidad Patriota Salvadoreña ran for the first time in this election.

GUATEMALA

1944:

Juan José Arévalo Bermejo was supported by the FUPA, a coalition of Arevalist parties including the Frente Popular Libertador and the Partido Renoción Nacional, the two most important parties. The coalition disbanded after the 1944 election but a successor party/coalition emerged as the Partido Acción Revolucionario in 1950. Because Arévalo was not tied to any particular party, we give the vote share to FUPA. Rule 2.

FND ran in coalition with PDC, backing Adrián Recinos, who did not belong to either party but was the coalition's candidate. For this reason, and because this was the founding election of the competitive regime, we give the vote share to the FND+PDC coalition. Rule 3.

1950:

FUPA disbanded in 1945, and the FPL and PRN joined together briefly to form the Partido Acción Revolucionario, which ran in coalition with PS and PIN, backing Jacobo Árbenz, from PAR. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to PAR. We treat the PAR as the continuation of the FUPA. Rule 11.

Miguel Ydígoras Fuentes founded the Partido Reconciliación Democrática Nacional in 1950, but the National Electoral Committee disbanded this party later that year. Ydígora's supporters founded the Partido Unificación Democrática a few months later, which ran in coalition with PUA and PRDN and backed Ydígoras. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to the PUD. Rule 1.

The FPL officially nominated Victor Manuel Giordani to the presidency, but factions within the FPL backed Arbenz. Other FPL members supported Jorge Garcia Granados, while still others backed Manuel Galich. We give Manuel Giordani's vote share to the FPL. According to Gleijeses (1991), Galich threw his support behind Arbenz on election day, but his name was still on the ballot and he won a

small percentage of the vote. We code his vote share as a belonging to a separate FPL faction.

Frente Popular Libertador (FPL), Partido de Harmonía Social, Frente Revolucionaria Autentica de Orientación Socialista, Unión Popular, Independiente (Alejandro Valdizón), Partido Unificación Democrática (PUD), and Partido del Pueblo (PP) ran for the first time in this election.

1985:

The Movimiento de Liberación Nacional was allied with the Partido Institucional Democrático for the 1985 elections. The vote share for this alliance goes to the MLN because the candidate, Mario Sandoval Alarcón, was a member of the MLN and the coalition did not remain intact for the 1990 election. Rule 1.

The Partido Revolucionario (PRG) and the Partido Democrático de Cooperación Nacional (PDCN) backed Jorge Serrano Elías as their candidate in the 1985 elections. The vote share for Serrano goes to the PDCN because he was a member of that party at the time. Rule 1.

The coalition among FUN, PUA and MEC backed Lionel Sisniega, from PUA. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections we give the vote share to PUA, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

1990:

Jorge Serrano Elías had been a candidate for the Partido Democrático de Cooperación Nacional in 1985. Shortly after his loss in the 1985 elections, Serrano broke away from PDCN and founded the Movimiento de Acción Solidaria and ran as the MAS candidate in the 1990 elections.

The MLN ran in coalition with the FAN in the 1990 elections, backing Luis Ernesto Sosa Dávila. Because the candidate's party is unknown, the vote share goes to the MLN because the coalition did not survive and MLN was the largest party. Rule 3.

José L. Schlotter, an old leader from Democracia Cristiana, broke with the party because he did not approve of the candidate chosen. He was backed by the PSD-AP5 coalition, which did not remain intact for the 1995 elections. The vote share goes to the PSD, the largest party in 1985. Rule 2.

Movimiento de Acción Solidaria (MAS), Partido de Avanzada Nacional (PAN), and Frente Unido de la Revolución (FUR) ran for the first time in this election. We code them as new parties.

Movimiento Emergente de Concordia (MEC) had only run in local elections, so we code it as a new party.

1995:

The Unión del Centro Nacional, the Democracia Cristiana Guatemalteca, and the Partido Socialista Democrático supported Fernando Andrade Diaz-Duran's candidacy in the 1995 elections. There is no indication that Andrade was a member of any of these parties in particular. The vote share goes to the DCG, the biggest (in 1990) of the

three parties supporting Andrade. The coalition did not remain intact for the 1999 elections. Rule 3.

The FUN and PID ran together to back the candidacy of Héctor Alejandro Gramajo Morales, a coalition that did not remain intact for the 1999 elections. The vote share goes to the FUN, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

The PCN and MPL ran together in a coalition to back Carlos Alfonso González Quezada. Because the coalition did not remain intact in the 1999 elections, and because there is no indication in the sources which party claimed the candidate as its own, we give the vote share to the coalition, because both parties were created in 1991 and were entering a presidential election for the first time.[11] Rule 3.

Alianza Popular 5 (AP-5): We treat it as an established party, because it had run in 1990 in coalition with PSD.

Frente Democrático Nueva Guatemala (FDNG) was originally named Partido Revolucionario (PR). In 1995 it changed its name, but FDNG is an obvious continuity of PR.

Frente Republicano Guatemalteco (FRG) had run for the first time in the 1990 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we treat it as an established party, because it ran before the 1994 legislative elections.

Partido Libertador Progresista (PLP) was created in 1990 and ran for the first time in that year's legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we treat it as an established party, because it ran before the 1994 legislative elections.

Frente de Unidad Nacional (FUN) had run for the first time in the 1985 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we treat it as an established party.

Unión Democrática (UD) had run for the first time in the 1994 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we code it as a new party.

Partido de Desarrollo Integral Auténtico (DIA) ran for the first time in this election, we code it as a new party.

Partido Reformador Guatemalteco (PREG) had run for the first time in the 1994 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we code it as a new party.

Cambio Histórico Nacional (CAMHINA) was founded in 1994 (Azpuru et al 2007: 414), and ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Partido del Pueblo (PDP) ran for the first time in this election.

Fuerza Democrática Popular (FDP) had run for the first time in the 1994 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we code it as a new party.

Movimiento de los Descamisados (MD) had run for the first time in the 1994 legislative election. By rule 1.b for new parties, we code it as a new party.

1999:

[11]Blanco, Ligia, and Adrián Zapata. 2007. "La contribución del proceso de paz a la construcción de la democracia en Guatemala." In Azpuru de Cuestas, Dinorah (ed.), Construyendo la democracia en sociedades posconflicto: un enfoque comparado entre Guatemala y El Salvador, pp. 291-510. Guatemala: Centro Internacional de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo, p. 415.

The URNG and DIA formed a coalition for this election, backing Álvaro Colom. The coalition did not last, and we give Colom's vote share to the URNG because at the time Colom was affiliated with the URNG. Rule 1.

The UD allied itself with La Organización Verde, but the coalition did not remain intact for the 2003 election. The vote share goes to UD, the only existing party in 1995, as there is no indication in the sources which party claimed the candidate as its own (Rule 2).

Acción Reconciliadora Democrática (ARDE) was originally named Movimiento de Acción Solidaria (MAS). In 1996 it changed its name, but as ARDE is an obvious continuity of MAS we do not consider it a new party.

Unión Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG), the former guerrilla organization, turned into a political party in 1998 and ran in these elections for the first time.

Alianza Reconciliadora Nacional (ARENA) was created in 1994, but ran for the first time in this election (ASIES 2004: 188). We treat it as a new party.

Acción Democrática (AD) ran for the first time in these elections.

2003:

The Gran Alianza Nacional was an alliance formed for the 2003 election by the Partido Patriota, Movimiento Reformador, and Partido Solidaridad Nacional. The GANA candidate, Óscar Berger Perdomo, had been a presidential candidate in the 1999 elections as part of the Partido de Avanzada Nacional. After his defeat in 1999, Berger temporarily left politics. In 2002, he won the primary elections to become the PAN presidential candidate for the 2003 elections, but he withdrew from the party due to internal party politics. Berger then sought outside support for his candidacy and affiliated himself with the GANA alliance. After announcing his candidacy for president supported by GANA, Berger was officially expelled from the PAN. The PP and the PSN pulled their support from GANA early in Berger's administration, and GANA became an official party rather than an alliance in 2005. The vote share for Óscar Berger goes to GANA rather than to any one party in the 2003 coalition, because all parties were new and the candidate was the coalition's candidate. Rule 3.

Although the runner-up in the 2003 election, Álvaro Colom Caballeros had placed third in the first round of the 1999 elections as a candidate for the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca, he founded UNE (Unidad Nacional de la Esperanza) shortly after his defeat as the URNG candidate, and ran as the UNE candidate for president in 2003 and 2007. The URNG ran a different candidate in 2003, so we treat the UNE as a new party in 2003.

Partido Unionista (PU): founded in 2002, it ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Democracia Social Participativa (DSP) and Movimiento Social y Político Cambio Nacional (MSPCN) ran for the first time in this election.

Unión Nacional (UN): the party was created in 1990 as Partido Frente de Avance Nacional (FAN), and ran in the 1990 elections in coalition with MLN. Later, it changed its name to Partido de Unidad Nacionalista (UN), and in 2001 it adopted the name Unión Nacional (ASIES 2004: 49-50). We treat it as an established party.

2007:

Rigoberta Menchú ran with the support of a coalition between her party, WINAQ, and the Encuentro por Guatemala. The coalition did not remain intact for the 2011 elections, and the vote share goes to Menchú's party, WINAQ. Rule 1.

GANA turned into a party in 2005, so we treat the party as a continuation of the coalition.

Partido Patriota (PP) had run in the GANA coalition in 2003. We code it as established.

Centro de Acción Social (CASA) and Movimiento Político WINAQ ran for the first time in this election.

Alianza Nueva Nación (ANN) had run in the 2003 legislative elections. We treat it as a new party.

2011:

Harold Caballeros was backed by a coalition between VIVA and Encuentro por Guatemala. The vote share goes to VIVA, which was founded by Caballeros. The coalition did not run again in 2015. Rule 1.

Rigoberta Menchú ran for a second time in 2011 with the backing of WINAQ, URNG-MAIZ, and the ANN within a coalition called Frente Amplio. The vote share goes to Menchú's party, WINAQ . Rule 4.

Visión con Valores (VIVA), Libertad Democrática Renovada (LIDER), Compromiso, Renovación y Orden (CREO), and Acción de Desarrollo Nacional (ADN) ran for the first time in this election.

2015

CREO and Partido Unionista (PU) ran in coalition, backing Roberto González Díaz-Durán. We give the votes to CREO, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

WINAQ and URNG-MAÍZ ran in coalition, backing Miguel Ángel Sandoval. We give the votes to URNG-MAIZ, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Frente de Convergencia Nacional (FCN-NACION) was created in 2008 but ran for the first time in parliamentary elections in 2011, when it did not field a candidate for the presidency. We treat it as a new party.

FUERZA was created in 2011 and was a new party in 2015.

Los Verdes, a party founded in 1995, was renamed TODOS in 2012. We treat TODOS as a continuation of Los Verdes, an established party.

Encuentro por Guatemala (EG) had run in the 2007 legislative elections, so we treat it as an established party.

Frente Republicano Guatemalteco (FRG) was renamed Partido Republicano Institucional (PRI) in 2013. We treat PRI as a continuation of FRG.

HONDURAS

Note: Although a competitive regime was in place between 1957 and 1963, we do not include it because a military coup ousted president Villeda Morales in October 1963,

before he had completed his term. The military also canceled the elections called for that same month. Hence, we could only include the 1957 election, which is not enough to calculate volatility.

1981:

Three independent candidates ran in the 1981 elections – Delgado Pérez, Mayorga Madrid, and López López. Because the sources don't give their individual vote shares, we treat them as one entity ("Independents").

1985:

The PLH could not decide on a single candidate, and fielded four separate candidates – José Simón Azcona del Hoyo, Oscar Mejía Arellano, Efraín Bu Girón, and Carlos Roberto Reina. Although each of these candidates came from different factionsof the PLH, we code the vote share all the PLH candidates as belonging to the PLH because there was vote pooling similar to that allowed by Uruguay's Ley de Lemas.

Both the PLH and the PNH ran multiple candidates in the 1985 election. Although the PNH candidate Rafael Leonardo Callejas Romero won the highest percentage of votes from any single candidate, the PLH candidates put together won more than 50 percent of the vote, and therefore the PLH candidate with the highest vote share became president. As with the PLH, we code the vote share of all PNH candidates put together as belonging to the PNH.

1989: *There were no coalitions.*

1993: *There were no coalitions.*

1997: *There were no coalitions.*

Partido de Unificación Democrática (PUD): it was founded in 1992 and legally recognized in 1993, but the first time contesting elections was 1997. We treat it as a new party.

2001: *There were no coalitions.*

2005: *There were no coalitions.*

2009: *There were no coalitions.*

2013: *There were no coalitions.*

Libertad y Refundación (LIBRE), Partido Anti-Corrupción (PAC), and Alianza Patriótica were new parties, created after the 2009 crisis.

2017:

Libre and PINU parties formed the Opposition Alliance against Dictatorship, backing candidate Salvador Nasralla, from the Partido Anticorrupción. So the candidate belonged to a party that did not take part in the election. Therefore, we give the LIBRE+PINU votes to LIBRE, the largest party in 2013. Rule 2.

Frente Amplio was created as Frente Amplio Político Electoral en Resistencia (FAPER) in 2009 and took part in the 2013 lower chamber elections for the first time. It's a new party.

Partido Va Movimiento Solidario (VAMOS) was created in June 2016. It's a new party.

MEXICO

1988:

The Frente Democrático Nacional (FDN) was a coalition among dissident members of the PRI and many smaller parties (PPS, PMS, PFCRN, PARM, PVEM) that backed Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. He was a dissident PRI member who garnered the support of PARM, and then the rest of the coalition. Although this coalition as such did not remain intact, it is the predecessor of the PRD, a party created by Cárdenas in 1989. Because the candidate is the same and because of other important continuities from the FDN (1988) to the PRD, we count this coalition as the predecessor to the PRD.Rule 11.

1994:

We treated the PRD as the continuation of FDN.Rule 11.

Independientes: these are under the category "candidatos no registrados." Because the sources don't give their individual vote shares, we treat them as one entity ("Independents").

Partido del Frente Cardenista de Reconstrucción Nacional (PFCRN) (formerly Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores), Partido Popular Socialista (PPS), and Partido Auténtico de la Revolución (PARM) had run in the FDN coalition in 1988, so we code them as established.

Partido del Trabajo (PT) and Partido Verde Ecologista de Mexico (PVEM) ran for the first time in the 1991 legislative elections. We treat them as new parties.

2000:

Vicente Fox (PAN) ran in the *Alianza por el Cambio* ticket, a coalition formed by PAN and PVEM. According to the rules, we give all votes to PAN, the candidate's party. The coalition broke apart a year after Fox took office. Rule 1.

Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas Solórzano (PRD) ran as part of the Alianza por México coalition, consisting of the PRD, PT, PSN, Convergencia, and PAS. Although a coalition called Alianza por México competed in the 2006 elections, it did not include any of the same members and did not field the same candidate, so we consider that this coalition did not remain intact. Therefore, we give Cárdenas's vote share to his party, the PRD. Rule 1.

Democracia Social (DS) and Partido Centro Democrático (PCD) ran for the first time in this election.

2006:

Andrés López Obrador (PRD) ran in the *Coalición por el Bien de Todos* ticket, a coalition formed by PRD, PT and CV. According to Rule 4, we give all vote share to PRD, the candidate's party, because although the coalition remained intact for the next election, the candidate came from the PRD on both occasions.

Roberto Madrazo (PRI) ran in the *Alianza por México* ticket, a coalition formed by PRI and PVEM. We give all vote share to PRI, the candidate's party. Although the coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections (with a different name), the candidate came from PRI on both occasions (Rule 4).

Partido Alternativa Socialdemócrata y Campesina (Alternativa): was created in early 2005. We treat it as a new party (See: http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/notas/424768.html).

Nueva Alianza was created in 2005. We treat it as a new party.

2012:

Enrique Peña Nieto (PRI) ran in the *Compromiso por México* ticket, a coalition formed by PRI and PVEM. Following Rule 4, we give the votes to PRI. This coalition did not remain exactly the same for the 2018 elections.

Andrés López Obrador (PRD) ran in the *Movimiento Progresista* ticket, a coalition formed by PRD, PT and Movimiento Ciudadano.[12] By Rule 4 we give the vote share to PRD, the candidate's party. This coalition did not survive for the 2018 elections.

2018:

National Regeneration Movement (MORENA), Labor Party (PT), and Social Encounter Party (PES) ran together in the Juntos Haremos Historia coalition, backing a MORENA candidate. Following Rule 1, we give the votes to MORENA, the candidate's party.

PAN, PRD and MC ran together in the Por México al Frente coalition, backing a PAN candidate. Following Rule 1, we give the votes to PAN, the candidate's party.

PRI, PANAL, and PVEM ran together in the Todos por México coalition, backing a candidate that was not affiliated to any of the parties. By Rule 2, we give the coalition votes to PRI, the largest in the previous election.

Movimiento Regeneración Nacional (MORENA) ran for the first time in the 2015 legislative elections. Following the rules, we treat it as a new party in 2018.

Jaime Rodríguez Calderón ran for the presidency for the first time as an independent candidate. By rule 5 for new parties, we treat him as a new entrant.

NICARAGUA

1984: *There were no coalitions.*

[12] Movimiento Ciudadano was the new name of the Partido Convergencia, changed in 2011.

1990:

Violeta Chamorro ran with the support of the Unión Nacional Opositora, a coalition of opposition parties formed to contest Daniel Ortega's candidacy (PLI (Partido Liberal Independiente) and Alianza Popular Conservadora (APC), Movimiento Democrático Nicaragüense (MDN), Partido Liberal (PL), Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN), Partido de Acción Nacional Conservadora (PANC), Partido Democrático de Confianza Nacional (PDCN), Partido Liberal Constitucionalista (PLC), Partido Nacional Conservador (PNC), Partido Social Demócrata (PSD), Partido Socialista Nicaraguense (PSN), Partido Integracionalista Centroamericano (PICA), Partido Popular Social Cristiano (PPSC) and Partido Comunista de Nicaragua (PCdeN)). The coalition fell apart during Chamorro's presidency. Because Chamorro was not associated with any one party, for the purposes of calculating volatility for 1984-90, we treat the UNO as the successor to the Partido Liberal Independiente. In 1984, it won the most votes of the many parties that supported Chamorro in 1990. Rule 2.

Partido Social Cristiano (PSC) was founded in 1959 and ran many times in elections in previous regimes. We treat it as established.

Movimiento de Unidad Revolucionaria (MUR), Partido Unionista Centroamericano (PUCA), Partido Liberal Independiente por la Unidad Nacional (PLIUN), Partido Revolucionario de los Trajadores (PRT), and Partido Social Conservatismo (PSOC)ran for the first time in this election.

1996:

The Alianza Popular Conservadora, the Partido de Acción Nacional Conservadora, and the Partido Conservador Nacional, formerly part of the Unión Nacional Opositora, merged to form the Partido Conservador Nacionalista in 1992. Most of the liberal parties that had supported the UNO in the 1990 elections formed the Partido Liberal Constitucionalista (PLC).

The PLC, PLIUN, PLN and PALI ran in the Alianza Liberal coalition, backing Arnoldo Alemán, from the PLC. By Rule 11, because of the continuities between the UNO coalition and the PLC, we treat the PLC (1996) as a continuation of UNO (1990). Because the coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, we give the 1996 vote share to UNO/Alianza Liberal.

The PAN and ASR formed a coalition called Pan y Fuerza to support Francisco José Mayorga Balladares. Because the sources don't say to which party the candidate was affiliated, we give the vote share to PAN, the only of the two parties that existed in the previous election. Rule 2. We treat it as an established party.

The PCS was part of the Alianza Unidad along with the MUR and the PSD. The candidate, Alejandro Serrano Caldera, belonged to MUR. We give the vote share to MUR because the coalition fell apart shortly after the 1996 elections. Rule 1.

The Alianza UNO-96 was a coalition among PND, MAC, and MDN. It backed Alfredo César Aguirre, who was not affiliated to any of the parties but was the coalition's candidate. The coalition did not remain intact for the 2001 elections, but because none of the parties had run on its own in 1990, we give the vote share to Alianza

UNO-96 (Rule 3.) We treat UNO-96 as an established party, because MDN had run in the UNO 1990 coalition.

Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN), Acción Nacional Conservadora (ANC), Alianza Popular Conservadora (APC) had run in UNO in 1990.

Partido Liberal Independiente (PLI) had been running in legislative elections since 1984.

Partido Conservador Nicaragüense (PCN): According to Nohlen (2005: 492) the PCN that contested these elections was "one section of the conservatives." The PCN was founded in the 19th century, and although this was just a section, we treat it as an established party, because it is the only party that is a continuation of the Conservatives. Rule 6 for New Parties.

Movimiento Acción Renovadora (EL MAR), Partido Democrático Nigaragüense (PADENIC), Movimiente Renovación Nacional (MORENA), Partido Acción Democrática (PAD), Partido de Unidad Liberal (PUL), Partido Justicia Nacional (PJN), Camino Cristiano Nicaragüense (CCN), Proyecto Nacional (PRONAL), Partido Resistencia Nicaragüense (PRN), P. Unidad Nicaraguense Obreros, Campesinos y Prof. (PUNOCP), Partido Integración América Central (PIAC), and Movimiento de Renovación Sandinista (MRS) ran for the first time in this election.

2001: *There were no coalitions.*

2006:

The Alianza Liberal Nicaragüense party was founded in 2005 by members of the Partido Liberal Constitucionalista who opposed Arnoldo Alemán's control of the PLC. The ALN was known as the Movimiento de Salvación Liberal until 2006, when it was joined by several other parties: Movimiento Democrático Nicaragüense (MDN), the Partido Social Conservador (PSC), Alianza por la República, Partido Conservador de Nicaragua (PCN), Partido Liberal Independiente (PLI), Partido de Resistencia Nicaraguense (PRN), and Partido Camino Cristiano Nicaragüense (PCCN). It backed Eduardo Montealegre, the founder of ALN, and it did not remain intact for the following election. We treat the votes for the coalition as votes for ALN, the candidate's party. Rule 1.The ALN was a new party in 2006 (Rule 3 for New Parties).

MUR changed its name to PAC, Partido de Acción Ciudadana, in 2004.

Partido Conservador Nicaragüense (PCN) now ran under the label "Partido Conservador de Nicaragua". It is the same party.

Alternativa por el Cambio (AC) ran for the first time in this election.

2011:

Alianza por la República (APRE) ran for the first time in this election.

2016: There were no coalitions and all parties were new.

PANAMA

1956:

The Coalición Patriótica Nacional (CPN) began as a coalition in 1952, but it reorganized as a party in its own right in 1953.

1960:

The PLN, PR, TPN, and MLN formed the Unión Nacional Opositora to support the candidacy of Roberto Francisco Chiari Remón. Chiari was a member of the PLN, and although the UNO remained intact for the 1964 elections, we give his vote share to the PLN because the candidate always came from the same party, PLN (Rule 4).

A coalition of parties, the Alianza Popular, backed the candidacy of Víctor Florencio Goytía, including the PRCL, PPN, PD, and PREN. A former member of the PLN and PLN presidential candidate in 1956, Florencio Goytía founded the PRCL in 1959. We give his vote share to the PRCL because the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

Partido Resistencia Civil Liberal (PRCL) was founded in 1959 as an electoral vehicle. We code it as a new party.

1964:

For the 1964 elections, the UNO included the PLN, PR, MLN, PALA, PAD, PPN, PN, and PIR. Because the coalition candidate (Marco Aurelio Robles) belonged to the PLN, following Rule 4 we give the vote share to PLN.

The Alianza Nacional Opositora backed the candidacy of Juan de Arco Galindo, from CPN. The coalition included the CPN, TPN, PREN, PRCL, PD, and PCN. We give its vote share to the CPN because it was the candidate's party and the coalition did not remain intact. Rule 1.

Partido Panameñista (PP) and Partido Socialista (PS) were founded in the 1930's and participated in several elections. We treat them as established parties.

Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC): it was created in 1960 and ran for the first time in this election.

Partido Acción Radical (PAR) and Partido Reformista Nacional (PRN) ran for the first time in this election.

1989:

In December 1988 a schism developed in PPA, the main opposition party. The Electoral Tribunal recognized and allowed the use of PPA's symbols to a small pro-government faction led by Hildebrando Nicosia, who then ran as the presidential candidate. But a majority of the PPA's hierarchy supported the ADOC coalition, and Guillermo Endara (from the pre-schism PPA) ran as its candidate. This majority PPA group was forced to run under the banner of the "Partido Liberal Auténtico"

(PLA).[13] We treat the small PPA faction as a new party ("PPA (1)"), and the majority faction running in ADOC under the PLA banner as a continuation of the original PPA.

ADOC was a coalition of PDC, MOLIRENA, and PLA. The vote share goes to PLA(PPA), the candidate's party, because the coalition did not remain intact in the following election. Rule 1.

Carlos Alberto Duque Jaén (from the PRD) ran with the support of the coalition COLINA, a coalition of PRD, PALA, PL, PR, PPR, PPP, PAN, and PDT. The vote share goes to PRD because the coalition did not remain intact in the following election. Rule 1.

1994:

Ernesto Pérez Balladares ran with the support of the coalition Alianza Pueblo Unido, which included the PRD, PALA, and PLR.The vote share goes to the PRD because Pérez Balladares was a co-founder of the PRD and the coalition did not remain intact in the following election. Rule 1.

The coalition Alianza Democrática, which included the Arnulfistas, the PL, PLA, and UDI, supported the candidacy of Mireya Moscoso. The vote share goes to the Arnulfistas because Moscoso was a member of the PA and the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. Rule 1.

Partido Arnulfista (PA) was the former Partido Panameñista.

Rubén Dario Carles was supported by the coalition Cambio '94 (MOLIRENA, MORENA, PRC). The coalition did not remain intact for the 1999 election. The vote share goes to MOLIRENA because the candidate was a member of MOLIRENA. Rule 1.

The Concertación Nacional (PS, MUN) supported the candidacy of Samuel Lewis Galindo. The vote share goes to the PS because Galindo was a founding member of the PS and the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. Rule 1.

Movimiento Liberal Republicano Nacionalista (MOLIRENA) had run in coalition in 1989, so we code it as established.

Movimiento Papa Egoró (MPE), Partido Solidaridad (PS) and Panameñista Doctrinario (PPD) ran for the first time in this election. (See: http://biblio.juridicas.unam.mx/libros/4/1990/14.pdf)

1999:

Mireya Moscoso, a member of the PA, was supported by the Unión por Panamá, a coalition that included the PA, MOLIRENA, the PDC, and MORENA. The vote share goes to the PA because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Martín Torrijos, a member of the PRD, ran as part of the Alianza Nueva Nación, which included the PRD, PLN, PS, and MPE. The vote share goes to the PRD, the

[13] Source: "The May 7, 1989 Panamanian Elections." National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and National Republican Institute for International Affairs, 1989. Available from http://www.cartercenter.org/documents/electionreports/democracy/FinalReportPanama1989.pdf (Accessed November 2013).

candidate's party, because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Alberto Vallarino, a member of the PDC, ran as part of the Alianza Acción Opositora, which included the PDC, PL, PRC, and PNP. The vote share goes to the PDC, the candidate's party, because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

2004:

The Patria Nueva coalition, which included the PRD and the PP, backed Martín Torrijos for the 2004 elections. The vote share goes to the PRD because it was the candidate's party and the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

José Miguel Alemán ran with the support of the Visión de Patria, a coalition that included the PA, MOLIRENA, and the PLN. The vote share goes to the PA because it was the candidate's party and the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections. Rule 1.

Cambio Democrático was created in 1998 and ran for the first time in the 1999 legislative election. We code it as a new party. Rule 1.b for new parties.

2009:

Renamed the Partido Arnulfista in 1990, the Partido Panameñista returned to its original name in 2005. The Partido Panameñista originally ran its own candidate in the 2009 elections, Juan Carlos Varela, but the party eventually supported Ricardo Martinelli, the Cambio Democrático candidate, joining the Alianza por el Cambio (MOLIRENA, PAN, CD, UP). The vote share goes to the CD because this was the candidate's party and the coalition did not remain intact after the election. Rule 1.

The coalition Un País Para Todos brought together the PRD, PP, and the PL in support of Balbina Herrera. The vote share goes to the PRD. There were some continuities in the 2004 Patria Nueva coalition, but the candidate always came from the PRD. Rule 4.

Vanguardia Moral de la Patria was a splinter from PP, created in 2007. We treat it as a new party.

2014:

The Partido Panameñista and the Partido Popular backed Juan Carlos Varela. Since Juan Carlos Varela is member of the Partido Panameñista, we attribute 100% of the coalition's vote share to the presidential candidate's party. Rule 1.

Cambio Democrático and the Movimiento Liberal Republicano Nacionalista backed José Domingo Arias. Since Arias is member of Cambio Democático, we attribute 100% of the coalition's vote share to the presidential candidate's party. Rule 1.

Frente Amplio por la Democracia was founded in 2013. (See: http://www.tribunal-electoral.gob.pa/html/fileadmin/user_upload/Partidos_politicos/FAD/FAD.pdf)

The three independent candidates (Juan Jované, Esteban Rodríguez, and Gerardo Barroso had never run for the presidency before, so we code them as new.

PARAGUAY
1989: *There were no coalitions.*

1993:
The Democracia Cristiana formed an alliance with the Partido Humanista de Paraguay called the Social Democratic Coalition in 1993. The vote share goes to the Democracia Cristiana because the candidate, Ricardo Canese, was a member of the PDC, and the coalition did not remain intact in subsequent elections (the Partido Humanista ran their own candidates in the 2003 and 2008 elections). Rule 1.

Partido Encuentro Nacional (PEN): founded in 1991, it ran for the first time in this presidential election (http://tsje.gov.py/partidos/ver/22-partido-encuentro-nacional.html).
Partido de los Trabajadores (PT) and Partido Liberal (PL) ran for the first time in this election.

1998:
Domingo Laino (PLRA) ran in coalition with Encuentro Nacional (PEN). Because this coalition did not remain intact for the 2003 election, we give the vote share to PLRA, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

The Unión Nacional Cristiana was also known as the Partido Blanco (PB), and ran for the first time in this election.

2003:
The Unión Nacional de Ciudadanos Éticos (UNACE) grew out of a faction within the Colorado Party, but was registered as an independent party in 2002. It was a new party in the 2003 elections.
Partido Humanista de Paraguay had run in coalition in the 1993 elections, so we code it as established.
Movimiento Patria Querida (MPQ) was founded in 2000 as Movimiento Patria Querida, and ran for first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.
Partido Patria Libre, formerly Corriente Patria Libre, took part in a national election for the first time in 2003, so we code it as a new party.
Movimiento Fuerza Democrática Independiente (MFDI) was created for the 2003 elections. We treat it as a new party.
Partido Frente Amplio was created in 2002, so we treat it as a new party.

2008:

The Alianza Patriótica para el Cambio (APC) was a coalition of PLRA, PRF, PDC, and MOPOCO, that backed Fernando Lugo of the PDC. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, we give the vote share to the PDC (Rule 1).

Movimiento Tetã Pyahu (MTP): created in 2007, it ran for the first time in this election (http://tsje.gov.py/noticias/leer/321-fueron-reconocidos-mas-sectores-politicos.html). We treat it as a new party.

2013:

Two coalitions, the Frente Guasú and Avanza Pais, have some continuities with the 2008 APC (Lugo's 2008 coalition). Although Fernando Lugo joined the Frente Guasú, we regard it as a new coalition and treat Avanza País as the continuation of the APC. Avanza País was a coalition of parties that splintered from the Frente Guasú and backed Mario Ferreiro, who had no party affiliation but was rather the coalition's candidate. By Rule 2 we give Avanza País's 2013 votes to the PDC, which in 2008 was Lugo's party and hence the party of the candidate of Avanza País.

Notwithstanding Lugo's affiliation with the Frente Guasú, the members changed significantly in relation to the 2008 APC. Many parties left the APC in 2009 (PLRA in particular) and many minor parties entered the F. Guasú coalition before the 2013 election. For purposes of calculating electoral volatility, we consider the Frente Guasú as a new coalition that backed Aníbal Carrillo Iramain, who was not affiliated to any particular party but was rather the coalition's candidate. Coding Avanza País rather than the Frente Guasú as the successor to the APC results in a lower volatility score than the reverse decision because the former won a higher vote share in 2013. By Rule 3 we give the vote share to the coalition, because none of the parties had run on its own in 2008. Following Rule 4b for New Parties, we treat Frente Guasú as established, because PPS and PFG, the largest parties in 2008 (in the Alianza Patriótica para el Cambio coalition), had run in presidential elections before 2013.

Efraín Alegre (PLRA) ran in the Alianza Paraguay Alegre ticket, a coalition formed by PLRA, Partido Democrático Progresista (PDP), Partido Encuentro Nacional (PEN), and Partido Social Demócrata (PSD). Because this was a one-time coalition, we give the votes to PLRA, the candidate's party. (Rule 1).

Movimiento Kuña Pyrenda): to the best of our knowledge these are the first elections for which it ran. We treat as a new party. Because this was a one-time coalition, we give the votes to PLRA, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

2018:

Gran Alianza Nacional Renovada (Ganar) was a coalition of PLRA and Frente Guasú, in itself a coalition, backing a PLRA candidate.

Partido del Movimiento Patriótico Popular (PMPP) had taken part in the Frente Guasú in the 2013 lower chamber election. It's a new party.

Mov. Soberanía Nacional, Mov. Artistas del Paraguay, Partido Social Democrático Herederos, Mov. Reserva Patriótica, and Mov. Cívico Nacional Unámonos were created in 2016/17. They are all new parties.

Partido Verde Paraguay (PVP). Was created in 2005, but, to our knowledge, it ran for the first time in the 2013 lower chamber elections. We treat it as a new party.

PERU

1939:

Manuel Prado Ugarteche was supported by the Coalición Conservadora, which included the Partido Conservador del Peru and the Movimiento Democrático Peruano, and some minor sectors. Because this coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election, we give the votes to Coalición Conservadora, the candidate's party. Rule 1. APRA was proscribed. It did not support either candidate, so it would be a mistake to treat either candidate as the precursor to the FDN in 1945.

1945:

We treat Unión Revolucionaria as a continuation of the Frente Patriótico. Rule 11.

Created in 1944 in opposition to President Prado, the Frente Democrático Nacional (FDN) was a coalition among the Partido del Pueblo (really the Aprista, which was banned from using this name), its main party, and Acción Peruana, Partido Socialista Peruano (PSP), Acción Democrática Peruana, Juventud Independiente, and the Partido Sindicalista. They supported J. Bustamante y Rivero, who was not affiliated to any party. Because the coalition did not stay intact for at least two consecutive elections, for purposes of calculating electoral volatility, we treat the coalition as a separate entity (i.e., it gets its own line in the Excel sheet) (Rule 3). However, because the PDP was really the APRA disguised under a different name, we treat PDP as an established party because APRA existed prior to the formation of this new coalition and had run in the 1931 presidential elections (Rule 4b for New Parties).

1956:

We treat the coalition between Unidad Nacional (UN) and Convivencia Democrática (CD) as a new entrant, as it ran only once in coalition in this founding election of a new competitive regime and the candidate, Hernando de Lavalle, belonged to the coalition (Rule 3).

1962:

We treat Acción Popular (AP) as a continuation of the Frente Nacional de Juventudes Democráticas (FJD) because they were both created and led by F. Belaúnde Terry. (Rule 11)

The Partido Socialista del Perú (PSP) was founded in 1928 and ran for the first time in 1931. We code it as established.

The Partido Aprista Peruano (PAP) ran an alliance party (Frente Democrático Nacional) in 1945. We code it as established.

Unión Nacional Odriísta (UNO) and Movimiento Social Progresista (MSP) ran for the first time in this election.
Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC) participated for the first time in the 1956 legislative election, so we code it as a new party.
Frente de Liberación Nacional (FLN) was founded in 1961 and ran for the first time in this election.

1980:
Unidad de Izquierda (UI) was a coalition of Partido Comunista (PCP) and Partido Socialista Revolucionario (PSR). We treat it as a new entity in 1980. This coalition goes on to participate in the Izquierda Unida coalition in 1985.
UNO ran as UN in 1980, but it is the same party (Nohlen 2005).

1985:
Izquierda Unida (IU) was a coalition of several left-wing parties (UDP, PCP, UNIR, PSR, PCR, and FOCEP) backing Alfonso Barrantes, from UDP. It did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, suffering an internal fracture before the 1990 elections, so we give the IU vote share to UDP, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Frente Democrático de Unidad Nacional (FDUN): this is the first time it runs. We treat it as a new party. (http://www.infogob.com.pe/Partido/ficha.aspx?IdOrgPol=104445&IdTab=1)
Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST) was founded in 1971 and participated in the 1978 constituent assembly elections with FOCEP. We treat it as a new party in 1985.
Partido de Avanzada Nacional (PAN) and Movimiento 7 de junio (M7J) ran for the first time in this election.

1990:
The Izquierda Unida coalition broke into two parties in 1987, Izquierda Socialista and Izquierda Unida. Alfonso Barrantes Lingán, founder of the IU, ran on the Izquierda Socialista (IS) ticket, while Henry Pease Garcia ran on the IU ticket. We treat IS and IU as new parties in 1990.
Mario Vargas Llosa ran with the support of the FREDEMO coalition, which included the ML, AP, and PPC. The vote share goes to the Movimiento Libertad because Vargas Llosa was the founder of the ML and because the FREDEMO coalition dissolved following the 1990 elections. Rule 1.

Movimiento Libertad was founded in 1987 and was a new party in these elections.
Cambio 90: it was founded in 1990. We treat it as a new party.
Frente Popular Agrícola Fia del Perú (FREPAP) ran for first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.
Unión Democrática (UD) ran for first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

1995: *There were no coalitions.*

País Posible: had run in the 1993 municipal elections, but ran for the first time at the national level. We treat it as a new party.

Unión por el Perú (UPP) ran for first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Cívico Nacional OBRAS ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Independiente Nuevo Perú had run in the 1993 municipal elections, but ran for the first time at the national level. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Reformista de Perú ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Alternativa Perú Puma ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Paz y Desarrollo ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Frente Independiente Reconciliación Nacional ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

2000:

País Posible (1995) and Perú Posible are the same party; only the name changed. In both years, the presidential candidate was Alejandro Toledo. (Rule 11)

Fujimori ran with the support of a coalition of Cambio 90, Nueva Mayoría, and Vamos Vecino. The vote share goes to Cambio 90 because Fujimori was associated with that party and because the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. (Rule 1)

Avancemos ran in the 1995 legislative elections under the label "Renovación". We code it as a new party.

Solidaridad Nacional ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Somos Perú ran for the first time in 1998 and 1999 in municipal elections, so we code it as a new party.

2001:

The PPC formed a coalition with Solidaridad Nacional (SN) and several other parties. The coalition, Unidad Nacional, backed PPC leader Lourdes Flores. The vote share goes to PPC because it remained intact for the 2006 election, and the candidate was Flores again. (Rule 4). One of its members, Cambio Radical, left the coalition before the 2006 elections, and Renovación Nacional, another ally, left it after the elections. Because the presidential candidate (Lourdes Flores) on both occasions came from PPC, we consider the coalition as intact in 2006.

Solución Popular was an electoral coalition between Movimiento Vamos Vecino and Con Fuerza Perú. The former had been running since 1998, on its own at the municipal level and in coalition at the national level. And the latter was a new party, created for these elections. Because the candidate was the coalition's candidate, we treat Solución Popular as a new entity.

Frente Independiente Moralizador (FIM) had run in the 1995 legislative elections, so we code it as an established party.

Renacimiento Andino, Todos por la Victoria, and Proyecto País ran for the first time in this election.

2006:

The Alianza por el Futuro was a coalition of three fujimorista parties, Cambio 90, Nuevo Mayoría, and Sí Cumple. The vote share of this coalition goes to Cambio 90because the coalition did not remain intact for the 2011 elections. Rule 1.

Valentín Paniagua Corazao was the candidate for the Frente de Centro, but represented one specific party from the coalition, Acción Popular (AP). The vote share goes to the AP because the Frente de Centro did not remain intact for the 2011 election (Rule 1).

Humala ran with the support of the UPP, but the vote share goes to the Partido Nacionalista Peruano (PNP), Humala's party, because the coalition did not remain intact for the 2011 election (Rule 1).

Concertación Descentralista was a coalition of Partido Movimiento Humanista Peruano and Partido por la Democracia Social-Compromiso Perú that backed the PDS candidate Susana Villarán. Because the coalition did not remain intact, we give the vote share to PDS, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

Unidad Nacional ran again, backing PPC candidate Lourdes Flores. We give PPC the UN votes. (Rule 4).

Fuerza Democrática was a coalition formed by Fuerza Democrática and Fuerza Loretana, both new parties (Fuerza Democrática ran for the first time in municipal elections in 2002, after the penultimate legislative elections; Fuerza Loretana was created in 2005). Hence, we treat the coalition as a new party.

Con Fuerza Perú ran for the first time in 2001 in the Solución Popular coalition, and in regional elections in 2002. We treat it as an established party.

Partido Reconstrucción Democrática was formerly known as Todos por la Victoria. It is the same party.

Restauración Nacional was founded in 2005, and ran for the first time in this election, so we treat it as a new party.

Alianza para el Progreso ran for the first time in 2002, in municipal and regional elections, so we treat it as a new party.

Partido Justicia Nacional (PJN): ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Socialista (PS) ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Movimiento Nueva Izquierda (MNI) ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Avanza País- Partido de Integración Social ran for the first time in local elections in 2004 and 2005. We treat it as a new party

Perú Ahora ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Resurgimiento Peruano ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Progresemos Perú ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Y se Llama Perú ran for the first time in this election. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Nacionalista Peruano was founded in 2005, so we code it as a new party.

Partido Renacimiento Andino had run for the first time in the 2001 legislative election, so we code it as a new party.

2011:

Humala ran on the Gana Perú ticket, which was a coalition of several leftist parties, but the vote share goes to the PNP, Humala's party. Rule 1.

In 2008, the PPC and SN ended the Unidad Nacional coalition. For 2011, the PPC integrated a new coalition called Alianza por el Gran Cambio, with Alianza para el Progreso, Partido Humanista, and Restauración Nacional. The candidate for Alianza por el Gran Cambio was Pedro Pablo Kuczynski, who was not affiliated to any party. Following Rule 2, we give the coalition votes to PPC, the largest party in the previous elections. .

Keiko Fujimori (Fuerza 2011) ran with the support of Renovación Nacional. We give the vote share to Fuerza 2011, the candidate's party. We treat Fuerza 2011 as a continuation of her father's party, Cambio 90. Rule 11.

Alejandro Toledo (Perú Posible) ran in the Alianza Perú Posible ticket, a coalition of PP, Acción Popular and Somos Perú. We give the vote share to Perú Posible, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Luis Castañeda Lossio (Partido Solidaridad Nacional) ran in the Alianza Solidaridad Nacional ticket, a coalition of Partido Solidaridad Nacional, Cambio 90, Siempre Unidos, Todos por el Perú, and Unión por el Perú. We give the vote share to Partido Solidaridad Nacional, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Partido por la Democracia Social-Compromiso Perú changed its name to Partido Descentralista Fuerza Social but it is the same party. (See: http://web.archive.org/web/20140513133628/http://www.fuerzasocial.pe/pds-cp/quienes-somos).

Fonavistas del Perú, Despertar Nacional, Partido Político Adelante (PA), Fuerza Nacional, and Justicia, Tecnología, Ecología were all new parties.

2016:

Alianza Popular was a coalition of Partido Aprista Peruano and Partido Popular Cristiano backing Alan García, from the Aprista. We give the coalition votes to the candidate's party.

Frente Amplio was a coalition of leftist parties formed in 2013, which includes: Ciudadanos por el Cambio, Movimiento de Afirmación Social (MAS), Tierra y Libertad, Fuerza Social, Patria Roja, Sembrar and Partido Socialista. The coalition backed Verónika Mendoza, from Movimiento Sembrar. We give the coalition votes to Sembrar, the candidate's party (created in 2015). We don't treat it as a new party because some members of the coalition were established.

Frente Esperanza was created in 2015. It's a new party.

Partido Democracia Directa was created in 2013. It's a new party.

Fuerza 2011 changed its name to Fuerza Popular. It's the same party.

Progresando Perú was created in 2011. It's a new party.

Partido Político Orden was created in 2012. It's a new party.

Peruanos Por el Kambio (PPK) was a new party, registered in 2014. Although it was also created by Kuczinski, who had put together the Alianza por el Gran Cambio coalition in 2011, this is a new party, because all the parties taking part in the AGC coalition in 2011 left and formed their own coalitions in 2016.

UNITED STATES
1976: We consider Eugene McCarthy (independent) a new party (Rule 5 for new parties).

1980: We consider John Anderson (Independent) a new party (Rule 5 for new parties).
The Citizens Party registered with the Federal Elections Commission at the end of 1979, and ran for the first time in 1980. We treat it as a new party.

1984-88: *No new parties.*

1992: We consider Ross Perot (Independent) a new party (Rule 5 for new parties).

1996: The Reform Party was founded by Ross Perot in 1995, so we treat the party as the continuation of Perot's independent candidacy in 1992.
The Green party was the "Association of State Green Parties", an organization of state Green Parties that ran for the first time in 1996 and then evolved into the Green Party of the United States. We treat it as a new party in 1996.

2000: *No new parties.*

2004: Ralph Nader (Independent) had run for president as a member of the Green Party in 2000, but in 2004, he ran as an independent. We consider him as a new party in 2004. (The Green Party fielded a different candidate).

2008-12: *No new parties.*

2016: The Constitution Party (previously known as the US Taxpayer's Party), founded in 1991, ran many times in federal elections, although its results were listed under "others". It's an established party.
Evan McMullin (Independent), ran for the first time. We treat him as a new party.

URUGUAY
1942:
The Unión Cívica became the Partido Demócrata Cristiano in 1962. We consider the PDC a continuation of the UC. Rule 11. This party is not to be confused with the Unión Cívica that broke away from the PDC in 1971.

1946: *There were no coalitions.*

1950: *There were no coalitions.*

1954:

In 1951, Uruguay abolished the office of the president, ruling instead with a nine-member Consejo Nacional. We do not include the 1954, 1958, and 1962 elections because there were no presidential elections. In the general elections for those years, voters cast a single ballot that was used to determine the Consejo Nacional del Gobierno, the Cámara de Representantes, and the Cámara de Senadores.

1966:

We code the Frente Izquierda de Liberación (FIDEL) as a continuation of the PCU. It consisted of the PCU and other independent sectors on the left. Rule 11.

The Movimiento Cívico Cristiano was a splinter faction of the PDC created in 1966. It's a new party (it disappeared after this election; Row #8).

1971:

The Frente Amplio is a coalition of PCU, PDC and several leftist parties backing Líber Seregni, the coalition's candidate. The sources treat the FA votes as PDC votes, but we give the votes to PCU, the largest party in 1966 (Row #6). Rule 2.

Unión Radical Cristiana (URC) was a splinter of PDC created in 1971. It's a new party (Row #10). (It later became Unión Cívica and ran in 1984).

1984:

The Frente Amplio, banned by the 1973 dictatorship, returns for the first democratic elections. It is a coalition of leftist and center-left parties, including the PCU, PDC, MPP, AU, PS, PC, AP, VA, NE, PVP, PR, and other smaller leftist groups. We treat it as a party because it remained intact for more than two consecutive elections and acquired the characteristics of a party more than a coalition (Row #6). The candidate (J. Crottogini) was the coalition candidate, with no affiliation to any of the parties. Rule 4.

Both the PC and the PN ran more than one president/vice president pairs in the 1984 elections. Because of vote pooling, we combine the vote shares for Julio María Sanguinetti and Jorge Pacheco and give it to the PC, and combine the vote share for Alberto Zumarán, Dardo Ortiz, and Juan Carlos Payssé and give it to the PN. The same holds true for the 1984-2009 elections. We combine the vote shares of all candidates from a given party and attribute it to that party.

1989:

The Frente Amplio backed Liber Seregni, the coalition candidate. We use Rule 4 because this is a stable coalition and the candidate came from the same party in 1984 and in 1989. Rule 4.

Between 1986 and 1989 the Frente Amplio becomes a party (a "unified party of coalition"). According to Lanzaro (2001: 37) "el Frente Amplio se desenvuelve como *catch-all* party y habiéndose iniciado como una coalición de partidos, pasa luego a ser un partido de coalición –convirtiéndose de hecho en un

conjunto unificado…". Also, "ni los nuevos, ni los viejos integrantes [de la coalición], aunque guarden el nombre y su estructura, constituyen estrictamente partidos autónomos: son fracciones de un conglomerado complejo, con su identidad propia… comparable al de otros ruedos partidarios, aunque con ese signo coalicional que todavía le es propio y que con los años puede presentar distintas composiciones", and "…hay una filiación frentista genérica..." (Lanzaro 2001: 45-6).[14]

Nuevo Espacio (NE) was a coalition formed in 1989 by moderate left parties that withdrew from the Frente Amplio: Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC), Unión Cívica (UC), and Partido por el Gobierno del Pueblo (PGP). Because Batalla was not affiliated to any of the parties and because the coalition did not remain intact (NE turned into a party before the 1994 elections), we give the NE votes to UC, the largest party in 1984 (Row #10). The coalition did not remain intact: PDC returns to Frente Amplio, UC runs alone and PGP merges with PC. Rule 2.

Partido Verde (PV) ran for the first time in these elections (Nohlen 2005: 498). We treat it as a new party.

1994:

The Frente Amplio became part of the Encuentro Progresista-Frente Amplio coalition in 1994, backing Tabaré Vázquez, from the Frente Amplio.We code this coalition as a continuation of the FA because the FA was the dominant party in the coalition when the EP was still a separate entity. The EP ran in coalition with FA in 1999 and then joined the Frente in 2005. Rule 4.

Nuevo Espacio turned into a party in 1994. Because this party is not formed by the same parties as the 1989 coalition, we treat it as a new party.

1999:

The Encuentro Progresista-Frente Amplio coalition once again backed Tabaré Vázquez. Rule 4.

2004:

Nuevo Espacio joined the EP-FA coalition in 2004, which backed Tabaré Vázquez, from the FA. We use Rule 1 because this is a one-time coalition that is dissolved after the elections and the candidate comes from the FA. Rule 1.

Partido de los Trabajadores (PT) had participated in the 1984 elections, so we treat it as established.

Partido Independiente (PI) was created in 2002, so it was a new party.

[14] Lanzaro, Jorge. 2001. "El Frente Amplio: Un partido de coalición, entre la lógica de la oposición y la lógica de gobierno." *Revista Uruguaya de Ciencia Política* 12: 35-67. See also Chasquetti, Daniel. 2007. "Uruguay 2006: éxitos y dilemas del gobierno de izquierda." *Revista de Ciencia Política* 27: 249-263.

Partido Intransigente ran for the first time in presidential election in this year. http://americo.usal.es/oir/opal/elecciones/Elecc_Uruguay_2004_Sacchi.pdf

2009: *There were no coalitions.*
Partido Asamblea Popular was created in 2006 and ran for the first time in 2009. We treat it as a new party.

2014: *There were no coalitions.*
The Partido Ecologista Radical Intransigente (PERI) was created in 2013, with former FA members and independents. We treat it as a new party.

VENEZUELA
1958:
The URD ran in coalition with the PSV and MENI, backing Wolfgang Larrazábal of the URD. Although the coalition remained intact for two consecutive elections, by Rule 4 we give the votes to URD because the candidate came from this party on both occasions.

1963:
The URD was in a coalition with the PSV and MENI. The vote share goes to the URD because the candidate (Jóvito Villalba) came from this party (Rule 4).

Independientes Pro Frente Nacional (IPFN): to the best of our knowledge, it was a new party.
Frente Democrático Popular (FDP) was founded in 1962, it was a new party.
Acción Democrática Oposición (AD-OP) ran for the first time in this election. It later used the name "Partido Revolucionario Nacionalista (PRIN)".
Movimiento de Acción Nacional (MAN) was founded in 1960.

1968:
Copei ran in a coalition with the MDI, but the vote share goes to Copei because Rafael Caldera was from Copei and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
AD ran in a coalition with API, AIR, and OPIR. The vote share goes to AD because Gonzalo Barrios was from AD and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
MEP ran in a coalition with PRIN and OPINA. The vote share goes to MEP because Luis Beltrán Prieto Figueroa founded the MEP after splitting from the AD in 1967 and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
The URD ran in a coalition with FDP, FND, and MENI. There was some continuity in the membership of this coalition from 1963 to 1968. The vote share goes to the URD because Miguel Ángel Burelli Rivas was part of the URD (Rule 4).

Frente Nacional Democrático (FND) was the new name adopted by IPFN. It's the same party.

Movimiento Electoral del Pueblo (MEP) was founded in 1967, so it was a new party.
Partido Socialista Venezolano (PSV) had run in coalition in the 1963 election, so we code it as established.

1973:
The AD ran in a coalition with the PRN. The vote share goes to the AD because Carlos Andrés Pérez was a member of AD and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
Copei ran in coalition with the FPD and MPI. The vote share goes to Copei because Leonardo Fernández was a member of COPEI and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
The MEP ran in a coalition with the PCV. The vote share goes to the MEP because Jesus Paz Galarraga was a member of the MEP and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.

Movimiento Democrático Independiente (MDI) ran for the first time in a presidential election in coalition in 1968. Following rule 1b we code it as established.
Opina Nacional (OPINA) ran for the first time in a presidential election in coalition in 1968. Following rule 1b we code it as established.
Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS) was founded in 1971, so it was a new party in 1973.
Partido Nacional Integracionista (PNI) and Partido Socialista Demócratico (PSD) ran for the first time in this election.

1978:
Copei ran in coalition with URD, FDP, and OPINA. The vote share goes to Copei because Luis Herrera Campins was a member of Copei and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
MAS ran in coalition with the VUC. The vote share goes to MAS because José Vicente Rangel was the official MAS candidate. He had previously represented the URD in Congress and would run as the MEP candidate in the 1983 elections. The coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.
The CC ran in coalition with the MDT. Diego Arria was affiliated with the CC, and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election, so the vote share goes to the CC. Rule 1.

Cruzada Cívica Nacionalista (CCN) had run in congressional elections in 1968 and 1973. We code it as established.
Partido Comunista Venezolano (PCV) ran many times before this election (1946-58 and 1973), so we code it as established.
Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR), Causa Común (CC), Mov. Renovación Nacional (MORENA), and Frente Unidad Nacionalista (FUN) ran for the first time in this election.

1983:

AD ran in coalition with the URD and VOI. Jaime Lusinchi was a member of AD, and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election, so the vote share goes to AD. Rule 1.

Copei ran in coalition with ICC, NGD, CIMA, FUN, and MIO. Rafael Caldera was a member of Copei, and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election, so the vote share goes to Copei. Rule 1.

MAS ran in coalition with MIR and IRE. Teodoro Petkoff was affiliated with MAS, and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election, so the vote share goes to MAS. Rule 1.

MEP ran in coalition with the PCV, NA, LS, GAR, and SI. José Vicenten Rangel was affiliated with MEP, and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election, so the vote share goes to MEP. Rule 1.

Movimiento de Integridad Nacional (MIN) was founded in 1977 and ran in congressional elections in 1978. Although it also tried to run for the presidency, its candidate died before the elections. We code it as a new party.

Rescate Nacional (RN), and Confianza Nacional (CONFE) ran for the first time in this election.

La Causa Radical (LCR) had run in the 1978 parliamentary elections. It's a new party.

1988:

MAS and MIR supported Teodoro Petkoff in 1988. At this point, MIR was beginning its merger with MAS, and following the 1988 elections most MIR members were integrated into MAS. The vote share goes to MAS, the candidate's party. Rule 1 (the MAS was the larger of the two parties in 1983; the MIR did not run a candidate that year).

Eduardo Fernández (COPEI) ran with the support of MIN, ICC, FNP, and VTV. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to COPEI, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

Carlos Andrés Pérez (AD) ran with the support of PN and VTV. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to AD, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

Ismenia Villalba (URD) ran with the support of IRE. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to URD, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

Edmundo Chirinos (PCV) ran with the support of MEP. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to PCV, the candidate's party. Rule 1.

Liga Socialista (LS) ran in coalition in the 1983 elections, so we treat it as established.

Nueva Generación Democrática (NGD) ran in coalition in the 1983 elections, so we treat it as established.

Organización Renovadora Auténtica (ORA): was created in 1987 and ran for the first time in these elections. We treat it as a new party.

La Nueva República (LNR): I found no evidence that it ran before these elections. We treat it as a new party.

1993:

Rafael Caldera (Convergencia Nacional) ran with the support of MAS, URD, MEP, MIN, PCV, and 10 other minor countries. The vote share goes to Convergencia, the candidate's party, because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections (Rule 1). Convergencia Nacional (CN) was created in 1993. We treat it as a new party.

Claudio Fermín (AD) ran with the support of ICC, FDP, IRE, and several other small parties. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to AD, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

Oswaldo Álvarez Paz (COPEI) was backed by Renovación, Voluntarios, Paz, Senco and GE. Because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections the vote share goes to COPEI, the candidate's party (Rule 1).

1998:

The PRVZL (Proyecto Venezuela) ran with the support of AD, COPEI, and PQAC. Henrique Salas Römer was a member of the PRVZL, and because the coalition did not remain intact for two consecutive elections, the vote share goes to PRVZL (Rule 1). We treat Proyecto Venezuela as a new party rather than the successor to AD or COPEI because they decided to support him late in the day, just a few days before the election. Until that time, Salas Römer was running against the AD candidate.

Luis Alfaro Ucero ran with the support of ORA, URD, RENACE, VU, ICC, FIN, and ONDA. His party, the AD, originally supported Alfaro, but the AD pulled their support and backed Henrique Salas Römer just before the election. Because Alfaro was expelled from AD before the election, we do not consider him AD's candidate. Thus, we follow Rule 2 (because the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election): the coalition counts as the successor to the ORA, the biggest of these partiesin the 1993 elections.In any case, Alfaro won only 0.4% of the vote, so our calculation of volatility would not change at all if we gave his votes to AD rather than ORA.

Irene Sáez Conde ran with the support of IRENE, FD, La Llave, and PQAC. The vote share goes to IRENE because it was Sáez Conde's party and the coalition did not remain intact in the subsequent election. Rule 1.

Hugo Chávez (MVR) ran with support of several parties. We give the vote share to his party, MVR. Rule 1.

Movimiento Quinta Republica (MVR): it was created by H. Chávez in 1997 and ran for the first time in 1998. We treat it as a new party.

Proyecto Venezuela (PRVZL): it was created in 1998 and ran for the first time that year. We treat it as a new party.

Apertura y Participación Nacional (APN): it was created in 1997 and ran for the first time in 1998. We treat it as a new party.

Integración, Renovación y Nueva Esperanza (IRENE): it was created in 1998 and ran for the first time that year. We treat it as a new party.

2000:

Both Hugo Chávez and Francisco Arias Cárdenas ran with the support of coalitions. We give Chávez's vote share to his party, the MVR. Rule 4.

We give Arias' vote share to the LCR, which was the candidate's party and because the coalition did not remain intact for the subsequent election. Rule 1.

Encuentro: I found no evidence that it ran before these elections. We treat it as a new party.

2006:

Hugo Chávez ran with the support of 24 parties, including his own MVR. We give his vote share to the MVR. Rule 4.

Manuel Rosales, the main opponent of Chávez, ran in a coalition of 43 parties, the main parties being Un Nuevo Tiempo (UNT) and Primero Justicia (PJ) (measured in vote share). We treat Rosales's coalition in 2006 as basically similar to the 2012 Mesa de la Unidad Democrática (MUD). Because in 2012 the candidate came from a different party, we apply Rule 5.

Un Nuevo Tiempo (UNT): it was registered as a national party in 2005, so we treat it as a new party.

JOVEN: I found no evidence that it ran before these elections. We treat it as a new party.

Nuevo Orden Social (NOS): I found no evidence that it ran before these elections. We treat it as a new party.

2012:

In 2012 Chávez ran under the *Gran Polo Patriótico* coalition, but his party was PSUV. The PSUV is coded the same as the MVR because the MVR dissolved in 2007 and formed the PSUV. Rule 4.

The main coalition opposing Chávez was *Mesa de la Unidad Democrática* (MUD), a coalition of Primero Justicia, UNT, and 18 other parties. This coalition was basically the same as the 2006 coalition of PJ, UNT and other minor parties. Its candidate, Henrique Capriles, came from *Primero Justicia*, so we give the votes to the coalition (Rule 5). Also, by Rule 6 we give the 2012(2) votes to PJ, the presidential candidate's party in 2013.

Reina María Sequera (Poder Laboral) was supported by Unidad Democrática. Although the coalition remained intact for the 2013 election we give the votes to PL, the candidate's party (Rule 4).

Poder Laboral had run for the first time in the 2005 legislative elections. We treat it as an established party.

Partido Democrático Unidos por la Paz: I found no evidence that it ran before these elections. We treat it as a new party.

Partido Socialismo y Libertad (PSL) ran for the first time in this election.

2013:

Nicolás Maduro (PSUV) ran with the support of many parties. We give the vote share to his party, PSUV.Rule 4.
Henrique Capriles once again ran under the *Mesa de la Unidad Democrática*. Because he was the candidate on both occasions (2012 and 2013), by Rule 4 we give the votes to PJ, his party.

Nueva Visión Para mi País (NUVIPA) ran for the first time in this election.
Unidad Democrática ran for the first time in the 2010 legislative elections, so we code it as established.

2018: *There were no coalitions.*
Movimiento Esperanza por el Cambio was created in 2018. It was a new party.
Unidad Política Popular 89 splintered from PSUV in 2016. It's a new party.