



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Rain falls on all of us (but some manage to get more wet than others) : political context and electoral participation

van Egmond, M.H.

Publication date
2003

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Egmond, M. H. (2003). *Rain falls on all of us (but some manage to get more wet than others) : political context and electoral participation.*

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

list of figures

Figure 1-1	Turnout Rates - Sweden, the Netherlands and Great Britain, Parliamentary Elections 1970-2000	3
Figure 1-2	Turnout - Sweden, the Netherlands and Great Britain Compared, Parliamentary Elections between 1970 and 2000.	5
Figure 2-1	The Netherlands - Predicted Turnout Levels, Deviation from Actual Turnout	28
Figure 3-1	Electoral Participation and Turnout Explained by Individual Characteristics	32
Figure 3-2	Turnout Explained by Contextual Characteristics	33
Figure 3-3	Electoral Participation and Turnout Explained by Individual and Contextual Characteristics	34
Figure 3-4	Electoral Participation and Turnout Explained by Individual and Contextual Characteristics, Allowing for Individual Variation in Contextual Influence	36
Figure 4-1	Effects of a Close Election Race	51
Figure 4-2	Closeness and Turnout - Hypothesized Relationship	54
Figure 4-3	USA - Presidential Elections	58
Figure 4-4	USA - Turnout per State in 2000 Presidential Elections Compared to 1996 Turnout, Battleground versus Non-Battleground States	59
Figure 4-5	Great Britain - Two Largest Parties	60
Figure 4-6	The Netherlands - Two Largest Parties	61
Figure 4-7	The Netherlands - Parties and Coalitions	62
Figure 4-8	Ireland - Fianna Fáil vs. 50%	63
Figure 4-9	Sweden - Two Blocs	65
Figure 4-10	Norway - Two Blocs	65
Figure 4-11	Germany - Two Largest Parties	66
Figure 4-12	Germany - Coalition vs. 50%	67
Figure 4-13	Closeness and Turnout - Between-Countries Comparison	69
Figure 4-14	Closeness and Turnout - Deviation from Average Country Turnout	71

Figure 5-1	Great Britain - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters, and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters	96
Figure 5-2	Great Britain - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters with High Involvement , and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters with High Involvement	97
Figure 5-3	Great Britain - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters with Low Involvement, and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters with Low Involvement	98
Figure 5-4	Great Britain - Predicted Turnout Levels, Deviation from Actual Turnout	100
Figure 6-1	Sweden - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters, and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters	112
Figure 6-2	Sweden - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters with High Involvement, and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters with High Involvement	113
Figure 6-3	Sweden - Predicted Chance to Vote for Different Categories of Voters with Low Involvement, and Deviation from Chance Predicted for Base Category Voters with Low Involvement	114
Figure 6-4:	Sweden - Predicted Turnout Levels, Deviation from Actual Turnout	116

