

Uneven Social Policies: The Politics of Subnational Variation in Latin America
Sara Niedzwiecki

Online Appendix Chapter 4

Table 1: Brazil. Hausman test

Table	Estratégia Saúde da Família		
	4.3.A	4.3.B	4.3.C
Chi2	14.30	11.65	9.28
Prob>chi2	.006 ^a	.11	.51

Note: The column numbers correspond to Table 4.3 in Chapter 4. Regressions in 4.2, 4.3.D, and 4.3.E are excluded because they include non-changing variables (distance to the capital) and cannot be analyzed through a fixed effects model.

^a For this model in which the Hausman test is significant, below I run a fixed effects regression.

Table 2. Fixed effects model for regression for which Hausman test is significant (Regression 4.3.A in Chapter 4)

Estratégia Saúde da Família Implementation	4.3.A	
Opposition alliances	.08	(1.54)
Middle opposition	-6.76***	(1.55)
Time trend	2.68***	(.14)
Hospital beds	-16.70***	(2.49)
R ²	.41	
Rho	.77	
Sigma_u	17.69	
Sigma_e	10.01	
States	27	
Observations	483	

Note: *** ≤ 0.01 ; ** $p \leq 0.05$; * $p \leq 0.1$ Standard errors in brackets.

Table 3: Argentina. Hausman Test

Table	Asignación Universal por Hijo		Plan Nacer	
	4.4.A	4.4.B	4.5.A	4.5.B
Chi2	.27	.91	7.02	8.93
Prob>chi2	.87	.82	.13	.18

Note: The column numbers correspond to Tables 4.4 and 4.5 in Chapter 4. Regressions 4.4.C, 4.4.D, 4.4.E, 4.5.C, 4.5.D, and 4.5.E are excluded because they include non-changing variables (distance to the capital) and cannot be analyzed through a fixed effects model.

Table 4: Brazil. VIF Test Bolsa Família

Bolsa Família	VIF	1/VIF
Opposition alliances	3.15	.32
Middle opposition	2.76	.36
Births in private homes	4.05	.25
GDP per capita	7.12	.14
Time trend	5.90	.17
Ideology governor	1.53	.66
Public hospital beds	1.97	.51
ESF implementation	3.91	.26
Paved roads	3.70	.27
Poverty rate	7.88	.13
Distance to capital	2.47	.40
Population density	4.28	.23
Peti coverage	1.51	.66
Informality rate	7.51	.13
Transfer municipalities	7.32	.14
Transfers to states	2.46	.41
Mean VIF	4.22	

Table 5: Brazil. VIF Test Estratégia Saúde da Família

Estratégia Saúde da Família	VIF	1/VIF
Opposition alliances	2.50	.40
Middle opposition	2.54	.39
Births in private homes	3.12	.32
Time trend	14.44 ⁺	.07
Hospital beds	2.84	.35
Ideology governor	1.44	.69
BF implementation	5.44	.18
Paved roads	3.14	.32
Informality rate	6.51	.15
GDP per capita	11.34 ^a	.09
Hospital spending (GDP)	1.27	.79
Poverty rate	8.06	.12
Distance to capital	2.30	.44
Population density	3.46	.29
Health professionals	4.81	.21
Transfer to municipalities	9.71	.10
Transfers to states	2.98	.34
Mean VIF	5.05	

^a The variables Time trend and GDP per capita reach VIFs larger than 10 and are therefore excluded from the regression below to check for robustness of the results.

Table 6: Brazil. Regression excluding VIFs larger than 10 in Table 3

Estratégia Saúde da Família	Prais-Winsten PCSE	
Opposition alliances	.87	(1.12)
Middle opposition	-.73	(1.40)
Births in private homes	-.94***	(.16)
Hospital beds	-1.91	(2.02)
Ideology governor	-.55	(.62)
BF implementation	.18***	(.04)
Paved roads	.14**	(.06)
Informality rate	.40***	(.12)
Hospital spending (%GDP)	-.004	(.003)
Poverty rate	.22**	(.10)
Distance to capital	.001	(.002)
Population density	-.08***	(.02)
Health professionals	620	(623)
Transfer to municipalities	.02***	(.01)
Transfers to states	-.001	(.002)
R ²	.97	
Rho	.73	
States	27	
Observations	296	

Note: *** $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p \leq 0.05$; * $p \leq 0.1$ Absolute values of standard errors in parentheses.

Table 7: Argentina. VIF Test. Asignación Universal por Hijo

Asignación Universal por Hijo	VIF	1/VIF
Opposition	1.36	.74
Births in private homes	1.46	.68
Time trend	2.32	.43
GDP per capita	10.85 ^a	.09
Distance to capital	5.41	.18
Population density	3.91	.26
Underemployment rate	1.89	.53
Plan Nacer implementation	2.01	.50
Transfers to provinces	2.19	.46
Provincial taxes	14.96 ^a	.07
Paved roads	3.82	.26
Employment program	1.43	.70
Mean VIF	4.30	

^aThe variables GDP per capita and provincial taxes per capita reach VIFs larger than 10 and are therefore excluded from the regression below (Table 6) to check for robustness of the results.

Table 8: Argentina. VIF Test. Plan Nacer

Plan Nacer	VIF	1/VIF
Opposition	1.50	.67
Births in private homes	2.76	.36
Time trend	2.97	.34
GDP per capita	12.65 ^a	.08
AUH implementation	3.09	.32
Paved roads	6.43	.16
Distance to capital	4.85	.21
Population density	12.17 ^a	.08
Health centers	3.96	.25
Health spending	2.33	.43
Lack of health insurance	5.93	.17
Health professionals	9.54	.10
Transfers to provinces	3.20	.31
Provincial taxes	26.06 ^a	.04
Mean VIF	6.96	

^aThe variables GDP per capita, population density, and provincial taxes per capita reach VIFs larger than 10 and are therefore excluded from the regression below (Table 6) to check for robustness of the results.

Table 9. Argentina. Regressions excluding VIFs larger than 10 in Table 7

Asignación Universal por Hijo	Prais-Winsten PCSE	
Opposition	-23.13**	(9.32)
Births in private homes	-14.69***	(3.74)
Time trend	34.12***	(5.56)
Distance to capital	-.04	(.05)
Population density	-.001	(.002)
Underemployment rate	-10.36	(9.23)
Plan Nacer implementation	-1.57**	(.63)
Transfers to provinces	20.14*	(10.96)
Paved roads	-4.34***	(.55)
Employment program	.00	(.00)
R ²	.81	
Rho	.47	
Provinces	24	
Observations	93	

Note: *** $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p \leq 0.05$; * $p \leq 0.1$ Absolute values of standard errors in parentheses.
 This regression excludes GDP per capita and provincial taxes per capita due to VIFs higher than 10.

Table 10 Argentina. Regressions excluding VIFs larger than 10 in Table 8

Plan Nacer	Prais-Winsten PCSE	
Opposition	1.26	(1.04)
Births in private homes	-.26	(.57)
Time trend	2.74***	(.69)
AUH implementation	-.01	(.01)
Paved roads	-.20*	(.10)
Distance to capital	-.005**	(.002)
Health centers	-4767	(5218)
Health spending	-.16	(.20)
Lack of health insurance	.20**	(.09)
Health professionals	-1370**	(672)
Transfers to provinces	-.19	(.99)
R ²	.95	
Rho	.64	
Provinces	24	
Observations	114	

Note: *** $p \leq 0.01$; ** $p \leq 0.05$; * $p \leq 0.1$ Absolute values of standard errors in parentheses.
 This regression excludes GDP per capita, population density, and provincial taxes per capita due to VIFs higher than 10

Table 11: Argentina. Determinants of Asignación Universal por Hijo implementation measured as coverage as a percentage of targeted population (2009-2015), excluding the province of La Pampa. Prais-Winsten Panel Corrected Standard Errors (PCSE)

	4.4.A	4.4.B	4.4.C	4.4.D	4.4.E
Opposition	-43.28*** (12.64)	-37.56*** (12.50)	-37.17** (17.62)	-42.61*** (7.01)	-37.06*** (6.18)
Births in private homes	-12.87** (5.29)	-18.52** (7.37)	-22.50*** (8.30)	-20.88*** (5.66)	-14.61*** (4.84)
Time trend	8.74*** (.90)	10.75*** (1.72)	10.86*** (1.99)	9.27*** (1.87)	23.69*** (6.13)
GDP per capita		-1.31* (.67)	-2.03*** (.64)	-6.39*** (.91)	-4.29*** (1.25)
Distance to capital			.02** (.01)	.02 (.02)	-.02 (.03)
Population density			.01*** (.002)	-.01* (.003)	-.005** (.002)
Underemployment rate			-4.61 (5.63)	-16.87*** (5.52)	-13.94** (5.78)
Plan Nacer implementation				-.89 (.80)	-1.80*** (.65)
Transfers to provinces				18.40* (9.70)	13.94** (6.74)
Provincial taxes				116*** (17.60)	75.98*** (25.26)
Paved roads					-2.20*** (.82)
Employment program ^a					-.00 (.00)
R ²	.69	.73	.71	.88	.90
Rho	.86	.91	.43	-.11	-.42
Provinces	23	23	23	23	23
Observations	161	161	140	88	88

Note: *** p≤0.01; ** p≤0.05; * p≤0.1 Absolute values of standard errors in parentheses.

^a Employment program: Plan Jefes y Jefas de Hogar Desocupados

Table 12: Argentina. Determinants of Asignación Universal por Hijo implementation measured as coverage as a percentage of targeted population (2009-2015), excluding the province of Santa Cruz. Prais-Winsten Panel Corrected Standard Errors (PCSE)

	4.4.A	4.4.B	4.4.C	4.4.D	4.4.E
Opposition	-39.52*** (13.05)	-31.97*** (11.69)	-34.79** (14.24)	-29.63*** (8.40)	-17.30** (8.71)
Births in private homes	-12.49** (5.79)	-20.64*** (8.06)	-21.81** (8.78)	-25.23*** (5.14)	-20.49*** (5.01)
Time trend	8.58*** (1.07)	11.44*** (1.91)	12.69*** (2.21)	5.75*** (1.46)	-21.44*** (4.39)
GDP per capita		-1.85** (.75)	-1.89*** (.69)	-4.23*** (1.37)	-1.36 (.95)
Distance to capital			-.01 (.02)	-.05*** (.01)	-.10*** (.02)
Population density			.004 (.002)	-.005** (.002)	-.002 (.003)
Underemployment rate			-6.22 (6.16)	-16.51*** (5.54)	-12.23** (6.23)
Plan Nacer implementation				1.62*** (.62)	.78 (.63)
Transfers to provinces				41.39*** (12.15)	42.63*** (10.27)
Provincial taxes				79.83*** (23.62)	18.82 (19.32)
Paved roads					-2.40*** (.68)
Employment program ^a					.00 (.00)
R ²	.63	.69	.68	.86	.85
Rho	.91	.96	.94	-.63	-.57
Provinces	23	23	23	23	23
Observations	161	161	140	89	89

Note: *** p≤0.01; ** p≤0.05; * p≤0.1 Absolute values of standard errors in parentheses.

^a Employment program: Plan Jefes y Jefas de Hogar Desocupados