



## 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*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

#### **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.

# appendix

The appendix contains technical details on the variables and datasets used, as well as additional tables referred to in the text.

## Variables and Data

### *The Netherlands*

The analyses of Chapter 2 are based on data gathered for the Dutch Parliamentary Election Studies (DPES, referred to in Dutch as NKO). The DPES are an enterprise of the Dutch political science community united in Dutch Electoral research foundation SKON (before 1989: NKO). Data is archived at the NIWI/Steinmetz Archive in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. In the table below, Study ID numbers refer to the Steinmetz Archive. All election studies are titled Dutch Parliamentary Election Study (followed by year of election).

Table 1 The Netherlands - DPES Studies Overview

<i>Year</i>	<i>Principle Investigators</i>	<i>Steinmetz Archive ID</i>
<b>1972</b>	NKO: L.P.J. de Bruyn, J.W. Foppen	P0353
<b>1977</b>	NKO: G.A. Irwin, J. Verhoef, C.J. Wiebrens	P0354
<b>1981</b>	NKO: C. van der Eijk, B. Niemöller, A. Th. J. Eggen	P0350
<b>1982</b>	NKO: C. van der Eijk, M.J. Koopman, B. Niemöller	P0633A
<b>1986</b>	NKO: C. van der Eijk, G.A. Irwin, B. Niemöller	P0866
<b>1989</b>	SKON: H. Anker, E.V. Oppenhuis	P1000
<b>1994</b>	SKON: H. Anker, E.V. Oppenhuis	P1208
<b>1998</b>	SKON: K. Aarts, H. van der Kolk, M. Kamp	P1415

The variables employed in the analyses of Chapter 2 are defined as follows.

#### Age

Age in years

#### Female:

Coded zero for men, 1 for women

#### Class

Based on EGP-index (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992). If not available from original DPES dataset, based on Nieuwbeerta & Ganzenboom, (1996).

#### Education

Two dummy indicators distinguish primary, secondary and tertiary level education.

Base category is primary education. Dummy indicators are contrast coded:

- Secondary level dummy-indicator signifies education at least secondary level (scored positive for respondents with secondary and tertiary level education)
- Tertiary level dummy-indicator scored positive for tertiary level education

Parameter estimates for the dummy indicators indicate the influence of an additional level of education (e.g., secondary vs. primary, tertiary vs. secondary). To assess the influence of tertiary level education compared to primary level education, the parameters estimates for secondary and tertiary level education need to be added up. Respondents for which no information on educational level was ascertained were added to the base (primary) category, while an additional dummy variable was coded positive for this group (zero for respondents for which the educational level was ascertained).

#### Lowest Income Quartile

Coded positive for respondents with household income within lowest quartile (determined per sample), zero for all other respondents.

Respondents for which no income was ascertained were coded zero (base category), while an additional dummy variable was coded positive for this group (zero for respondents for which income was ascertained).

#### Religion

Four dummy-variables indicating Catholic, Dutch Reformed, Calvinist and 'other' religions. Scored positive where applicable, zero if not applicable. Base category is 'not religious'.

#### Church attendance:

Dummy-indicators signifying church attendance on weekly or monthly basis. Scored positive where applicable, zero if not applicable

#### Union member

Scored positive if labor union member, zero for all other respondents.

#### Party attachment

Coded positive if respondent expressed a preference for a political party.

#### Political interest

Five-point, additive index-score, based on Mokken-scales of four separate items. (Anker & Oppenhuis, 1995, pp. 323-330).

#### Political efficacy

Five-point, additive index-score, based on Mokken-scales of four separate items. (Anker & Oppenhuis, 1995, pp. 323-330).

#### Government collapse

Coded positive if election followed after the collapse of the government coalition, zero for all other elections.

#### Time since previous election

Time since previous parliamentary election in years, divided by 4. Four years is the normal Parliamentary term in the Netherlands.

#### Coalition seeks re-election

Coded positive if incumbent coalition made an expressed wish to continue after the election, zero for all other elections.

### Closeness of the election

Defined as 1 divided by the gap between the two largest parties in last NIPO opinion poll before the election.

### Great Britain

Data used for the analyses of Chapter 5 are from the British Election Studies (BES, also referred to as British General Election Studies BGES).

Table 2 Great Britain - BES Studies Overview

<i>Year</i>	<i>Principle Investigators</i>	<i>Data ID</i>
<b>1970</b>	D. Butler, D.E. Stokes	ICPSR 7250
<b>1974 Feb</b>	I. Crewe, B. Särivik, J. Alt	ICPSR 7868
<b>1974 Oct</b>	I. Crewe, B. Särivik, J. Alt	ICPSR 7870
<b>1979</b>	I. Crewe, B. Särivik, D. Robertson	ICPSR 8196
<b>1983</b>	A. Heath, R. Jowell, J.K. Curtice, E. Field	ICPSR 8409
<b>1987</b>	A. Heath, R. Jowell, J.K. Curtice	ESRC 2568
<b>1992</b>	A. Heath, R. Jowell, J.K. Curtice, J. A. Brand, J.C. Mitchell	ESRC 2981
<b>1997</b>	A. Heath, R. Jowell, J.K. Curtice, P. Norris	ESRC 3887

*ICPSR=Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor (Mi) USA*  
*ESRC= ESRC Data Archive, University of Essex, Colchester (UK)*

The variables employed in the analyses of Chapter 5 are defined as follows.

#### Age

Age in years

#### Female:

Coded zero for men, 1 for women

#### Education

Predicted value (Y-hat) of electoral participation in OLS regression model with education indicators as predictive variables (cf. note 12, Chapter 5).

All available education indicators per BES survey were turned into dummy-variables and entered as independent variables in the OLS regression model.

#### Political interest

Predicted value (Y-hat) of electoral participation in OLS regression model with political indicators as predictive variables (cf. operationalization of Education, above). "Don't know" and "no answer" codes on political interest indicator questions were recoded to the lowest political interest score on the variable concerned, before introduction into the OLS regression model.

#### Income

Standardized respondents' household income. Transformed by taking the natural log of the respondents' income after dividing by the mean survey income. An exception is the 1983 survey for which only a subjective 'perceived distance to average income' is ascertained, (far below average income, below, average, above, far above average

income). The variable was recoded from 1 to 6, respectively, before transformation as noted above. Respondents for which no income information was ascertained were coded as having a mean income. A separate dummy-indicator was coded positive if no income was ascertained, zero for all respondents for which income was ascertained.

#### Voter categories.

These are based on party evaluation scores, with dummy variables being constructed to indicate the three categories of voters. For the national level, the two largest parties are invariably Labour and the Conservatives. For the constituency level, the actual election outcome in the constituency was used to determine the two largest parties.

The Base category is the complement of the other three categories defined. Operationalization for the different surveys are as follows.

1970

Party evaluation score, 0-100 scale.

#### Convinced voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 80 or greater for one leading party, and equal or smaller than 50 for other leading party.

#### Confounded voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 80 or greater for both leading parties.

#### Condemned voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 50 or lower for both leading parties.

1974 February, 1974 October, 1979, 1997

Party evaluation score, 0-10 scale.

#### Convinced voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 8 or greater for one leading party, and equals or smaller than 5 for other leading party.

#### Confounded voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 8 or greater for both leading parties.

#### Condemned voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 5 or lower for both leading parties.

1983

No party evaluation score for all parties was included. Therefore, indicators were constructed using strength and direction of (positive and negative) party identification.

#### Convinced voter

Coded positive if respondent expressed strength of party identification as 'fairly strong' or 'very strong' for one leading party, and 'very strongly against' the other leading party.

#### Confounded voter

Coded positive if respondent expressed strength of party identification 'fairly strong' or 'very strong' for one leading party, and 'not really against' other leading party.

#### Condemned voter

Coded positive if 'very strongly against' both leading parties.

1987, 1992

Party evaluation score, five-point scale (strongly in favor, in favor, neither in favor or against, against, strongly against).

Convinced voter

Coded positive if strongly in favor of one leading party, and against or strongly against other leading party.

Confounded voter

Coded positive if strongly in favor of both leading parties.

Condemned voter

Coded positive if against or strongly against both leading parties.

Closeness

Defined as 1 divided by the gap between the largest parties. Opinion poll data used for the national level, actual constituency outcomes at the constituency level.

### *Sweden*

Data used for the analyses of Chapter 6 are from the Swedish election studies. All data identification refers to the Swedish Social Science Data Service (SSD) in Göteborg, Sweden

Table 3 Sweden - Swedish Election Studies Overview

<i>Year</i>	<i>Principle Investigators</i>	<i>SSD Data ID</i>
<b>1979</b>	S. Holmberg	0089
<b>1982</b>	S. Holmberg	0157
<b>1985</b>	S. Holmberg, M. Gilljam	0217
<b>1988</b>	S. Holmberg, M. Gilljam	0227
<b>1991</b>	S. Holmberg, M. Gilljam	0391
<b>1994</b>	S. Holmberg, M. Gilljam	0570
<b>1998</b>	S. Holmberg	0750

The variables employed in the analyses of Chapter 6 are defined as follows.

Age

Age in years

Female

Coded zero for men, 1 for women

Education

Comparable to analyses of Chapter 2. Two dummy indicators distinguish primary, secondary and tertiary level education. Base category is primary education. Dummy indicators are contrast coded:

- Secondary level dummy-indicator signifies education at least secondary level (scored positive for respondents with secondary and tertiary level education)
- Tertiary level dummy-indicator scored positive for tertiary level education

Parameter estimates for the dummy indicators indicate the influence of an additional

level of education (e.g., secondary vs. primary, tertiary vs. secondary). To assess the influence of tertiary level education compared to primary level education, the parameters estimates for secondary and tertiary level education need to be added up.

#### Income

Comparable to analyses of Chapter 5. Standardized respondents' household income. Transformed by taking the natural log of the respondents' income after dividing by the mean survey income.

#### Political interest

Six-point Mokken scale constructed using two four-point items: reading political news in the papers, and self-declared political interest. Missing values were recoded to the lowest score per item for political interest.

#### Political cynicism

Six-point Mokken scale constructed using two four-point items: whether the respondent believed parties are only concerned about people's votes, not what they think, and whether members of parliament pay attention to the views of ordinary people. Missing values were recoded to the middle score per item.

#### Party attachment

Coded positive if respondent considered themselves close to a political party, zero if not.

#### Voter categories

Based on an eleven-point party evaluation scores (-5 to +5), dummy variables indicating the three categories of voters were constructed.

Base category is complement of three categories distinguished.

#### Convinced voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 4 or 5 for at least one of the parties of one bloc, and minus 3 to minus 5 for at least one of the parties from the other bloc.

#### Confounded voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is 4 or 5 for at least one of the parties of either bloc.

#### Condemned voter

Coded positive if evaluation score is no higher than zero for any of the parties in either bloc.

#### Closeness

Defined as 1 divided by the gap between the largest parties, opinion poll data used.

## Tables

Table 4 Great Britain - Closeness at Constituency Level Per Election. Figures are Percentages of Respondents per Sample

<b>Election</b>	<b>Gap</b>	<b>% Respondents</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>	<b>Election</b>	<b>Gap</b>	<b>% Respondents</b>	<b>Cumulative %</b>
1970	<1 %	4.5	4.5	1983	<1 %	1.9	1.9
	1 - 2 %	1.3	5.8		1 - 2 %	0.9	2.8
	2 - 3 %	2.5	8.3		2 - 3 %	2.5	5.3
	3 - 4 %	5.6	13.9		3 - 4 %	3.4	8.7
	4 - 5 %	5.0	18.9		4 - 5 %	3.6	12.3
	5 - 6 %	0.0	18.9		5 - 6 %	3.3	15.6
	6 - 7 %	3.0	21.9		6 - 7 %	2.9	18.4
	7 - 8 %	4.6	26.5		7 - 8 %	1.1	19.5
	8 - 9 %	3.8	30.3		8 - 9 %	2.0	21.5
	9 - 10 %	0.0	30.3		9 - 10 %	2.0	23.5
>10 %	69.7	100.0	>10 %	76.5	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>			
1974Feb	<1 %	3.3	3.3	1987	<1 %	1.6	1.6
	1 - 2 %	1.4	4.7		1 - 2 %	1.4	3.0
	2 - 3 %	3.3	8.0		2 - 3 %	3.2	6.2
	3 - 4 %	2.1	10.1		3 - 4 %	2.6	8.7
	4 - 5 %	3.8	13.9		4 - 5 %	1.6	10.3
	5 - 6 %	5.5	19.4		5 - 6 %	2.1	12.4
	6 - 7 %	3.5	22.9		6 - 7 %	1.6	13.9
	7 - 8 %	4.3	27.2		7 - 8 %	2.8	16.7
	8 - 9 %	3.1	30.3		8 - 9 %	3.5	20.2
	9 - 10 %	3.1	33.4		9 - 10 %	1.9	22.1
>10 %	66.6	100.0	>10 %	77.9	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>			
1974Oct	<1 %	1.7	1.7	1992	<1 %	4.4	4.4
	1 - 2 %	4.1	5.8		1 - 2 %	2.9	7.3
	2 - 3 %	2.4	8.2		2 - 3 %	1.9	9.2
	3 - 4 %	3.0	11.2		3 - 4 %	3.9	13.1
	4 - 5 %	1.5	12.7		4 - 5 %	1.3	14.4
	5 - 6 %	2.5	15.2		5 - 6 %	2.8	17.2
	6 - 7 %	2.4	17.6		6 - 7 %	2.9	20.2
	7 - 8 %	1.4	19.0		7 - 8 %	2.8	22.9
	8 - 9 %	.9	19.9		8 - 9 %	4.7	27.7
	9 - 10 %	.7	20.6		9 - 10 %	3.2	30.9
>10 %	79.4	100.0	>10 %	69.1	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>			
1979	<1 %	1.9	1.9	1997	<1 %	0.5	.5
	1 - 2 %	3.7	5.6		1 - 2 %	1.1	1.6
	2 - 3 %	2.5	8.1		2 - 3 %	2.7	4.2
	3 - 4 %	1.5	9.5		3 - 4 %	4.8	9.1
	4 - 5 %	2.1	11.6		4 - 5 %	1.5	10.6
	5 - 6 %	.2	11.7		5 - 6 %	3.0	13.6
	6 - 7 %	.6	12.3		6 - 7 %	5.8	19.4
	7 - 8 %	3.1	15.4		7 - 8 %	1.3	20.7
	8 - 9 %	1.6	17.1		8 - 9 %	0.8	21.6
	9 - 10 %	3.1	20.2		9 - 10 %	4.1	25.7
>10 %	79.8	100.0	>10 %	74.3	100.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>			



Table 5

## Great Britain - National/Constituency Level Interactions

<i>National level:</i>	<i>Convinced</i>		<i>Convinced</i>	
	<i>Convinced</i>		<i>Condemned</i>	
<i>Constituency level:</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>s.e.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>s.e.</i>
<b>Age</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.001</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>0.193</b>	<b>0.040</b>	<b>0.193</b>	<b>0.040</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>0.008</b>
<b>Political interest</b>	<b>0.230</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.231</b>	<b>0.008</b>
<b>Income</b>	<b>0.261</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.262</b>	<b>0.029</b>
<i>Income missing-dummy</i>	-0.110	0.061	-0.111	0.061
<b>Constituency level:</b>				
<b>Closeness</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.004</b>	0.002	0.004
<b>Convinced voter</b>	<b>0.358</b>	<b>0.104</b>	<b>0.162</b>	<b>0.071</b>
<i>Convinced*Closeness Interaction</i>	0.371	0.320	0.231	0.180
<b>Confounded voter</b>	0.149	0.156	0.152	0.155
<i>Confounded*Closeness Interaction</i>	-0.108	0.484	-0.124	0.484
<b>Condemned voter</b>	-0.153	0.082	<b>-0.216</b>	<b>0.094</b>
<i>Condemned*Closeness Interaction</i>	0.029	0.085	0.020	0.059
<b>National level:</b>				
<b>Closeness</b>	<b>0.179</b>	<b>0.038</b>	<b>0.191</b>	<b>0.038</b>
<b>Convinced voter</b>	<b>0.459</b>	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.262</b>	<b>0.070</b>
<i>Convinced*Closeness Interaction</i>	0.153	0.128	<b>0.282</b>	<b>0.107</b>
<b>Confounded voter</b>	-0.116	0.180	-0.099	0.181
<i>Confounded*Closeness Interaction</i>	0.392	0.856	0.506	0.873
<b>Condemned voter</b>	<b>-0.422</b>	<b>0.119</b>	<b>-0.385</b>	<b>0.122</b>
<i>Condemned*Closeness Interaction</i>	0.153	0.160	0.152	0.160
<b>Interaction: National Convinced * Constituency Convinced voters:</b>				
<b>Interaction effect</b>	<b>-0.490</b>	<b>0.151</b>		
<i>Interaction * Constituency closeness</i>	0.230	0.201		
<i>Interaction * National closeness</i>	-0.274	0.395		
<b>Interaction: National Convinced * Constituency Condemned voters:</b>				
<b>Interaction effect</b>			0.152	0.160
<i>Interaction * Constituency closeness</i>			0.389	0.234
<i>Interaction * National closeness</i>			1.301	1.278
<b>Constant</b>	<b>-0.550</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>-0.544</b>	<b>0.070</b>
<b>Variation level 3 (constituency)</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.019</b>
<b>Variation level 2 (election)</b>	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.028</b>
<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>11703</b>		<b>11717</b>	
<b>R<sup>2</sup><sub>dicho</sub></b>		<b>.189</b>		<b>.189</b>

Standard errors in italics. Bold figures indicate statistical significance at  $p < .05$ .

Actual election outcomes used for constituency level closeness, opinion poll data used for national level closeness.

Table 6

## Great Britain - Prediction Model

	'Prediction model'		'Individual context'	
	B	s.e.	B	s.e.
<b>Age</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.001</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>0.190</b>	<b>0.040</b>	<b>0.197</b>	<b>0.040</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>0.075</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>0.008</b>
<b>Political interest</b>	<b>0.232</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.232</b>	<b>0.008</b>
<b>Income</b>	<b>0.249</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.260</b>	<b>0.030</b>
<b>Income missing – dummy</b>	-	-	-0.112	0.061
<b>National level:</b>				
<b>Closeness</b>	<b>0.219</b>	<b>0.037</b>	<b>0.212</b>	<b>0.038</b>
<b>Convinced voter</b>	<b>0.387</b>	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.385</b>	<b>0.059</b>
<b>Convinced interaction</b>	<b>0.211</b>	<b>0.103</b>	<b>0.220</b>	<b>0.104</b>
<b>Confounded voter</b>	-	-	-0.054	0.183
<b>Confounded interaction</b>	-	-	0.741	0.889
<b>Condemned voter</b>	<b>-0.439</b>	<b>0.095</b>	<b>-0.495</b>	<b>0.112</b>
<b>Condemned interaction</b>	-	-	0.159	0.160
<b>Constant</b>	<b>-0.558</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>-0.544</b>	<b>0.071</b>
<b>Variation constituency level</b>	<b>0.056</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.055</b>	<b>0.020</b>
<b>Variation election level</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.028</b>
<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>11236</b>		<b>11229</b>	
<b>R<sup>2</sup> dicho</b>		<b>.188</b>		<b>.188</b>

Standard errors in italics. Bold figures indicate statistical significance at  $p < .05$ . Prediction model is re-estimation of model containing statistically significant parameter estimates only.

Opinion poll data used for national level closeness.

Table 7

## Sweden - Prediction Model

	'Prediction model'		'Individual context'	
	B	s.e.	B	s.e.
<b>Age</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>0.324</b>	<b>0.065</b>	<b>0.346</b>	<b>0.065</b>
<b>Education</b>				
<b>Middle vs. Lower</b>	<b>0.287</b>	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.284</b>	<b>0.080</b>
<b>High vs. Middle</b>	<b>0.332</b>	<b>0.091</b>	<b>0.345</b>	<b>0.091</b>
<b>Income</b>	<b>0.233</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.230</b>	<b>0.029</b>
<b>Political Interest</b>	<i>0.256</i>	<i>0.025</i>	<b>0.279</b>	<b>0.025</b>
<b>Political Cynicism</b>	<i>-0.082</i>	<i>0.023</i>	<b>-0.088</b>	<b>0.023</b>
<b>Party Attachment</b>	<i>0.665</i>	<i>0.074</i>	<b>0.720</b>	<b>0.074</b>
<b>Closeness</b>	<i>0.610</i>	<i>0.207</i>	<b>0.431</b>	<b>0.189</b>
<b>Convinced voters</b>	<i>0.330</i>	<i>0.081</i>	<b>0.279</b>	<b>0.119</b>
<b>Convinced Interaction</b>			<b>0.124</b>	<b>0.126</b>
<b>Confounded voters</b>			<b>-0.129</b>	<b>0.202</b>
<b>Confounded Interaction</b>			<b>0.481</b>	<b>0.418</b>
<b>Condemned voters</b>	<i>-0.662</i>	<i>0.074</i>	<b>-0.359</b>	<b>0.106</b>
<b>Condemned Interaction</b>			<b>0.160</b>	<b>0.102</b>
<b>Constant</b>	<i>1.123</i>	<i>0.188</i>	<b>1.091</b>	<b>0.197</b>
<b>Variation level 2 (election)</b>	<i>0.022</i>	<i>0.016</i>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.010</b>
<b>Likelihood</b>	<i>-4120</i>		<b>-3953</b>	
<b>R<sup>2</sup> <i>dicho</i></b>		<i>.205</i>		<b>.209</b>

Standard errors in italics. Bold figures indicate statistical significance at  $p < .05$ . Prediction model is re-estimation of model containing statistically significant parameter estimates only.