

## **Appendix**

Candidate surveys in all four countries were conducted via postal surveys that were sent after the elections to all candidates representing viable parties. Other details pertaining to the individual country studies are discussed below.

### *Germany*

Due to the high number of candidates in Germany's 2002 general election (n=3542), questionnaires were sent to candidates of parties represented in the *Bundestag* that ran in the single member constituencies (n=1468). The original questionnaire was mailed to all 1468 candidates after the election. The return rate was 51% (n=746). The response rate differed by party ranging from 40% for the CDU to 59% for the FDP.

### *New Zealand*

In 1999 the New Zealand candidate study surveyed all 452 candidates from the six parties that were represented in parliament. Surveys were mailed after the election, with a 62% response rate (n=280). Responses ranged from 40% from NZ First to 72% from ACT. Descriptive data from New Zealand in Table 1 also includes two items from the 2002 NZ candidate survey of the eight parliamentary parties (n=512). The 2002 response rate was 59% (n=304) ranging from 45% for National, to 65% for United Future.

### *Netherlands*

Following the May 2002 election in the Netherlands, postal surveys to all 330 candidates representing each of the ten parties achieving parliamentary representation. The response rate was 58% (N=191).

### *Australia*

The 2001 Australian Candidate Survey candidates from the top six parties. The response rate was 58% (n=477). See Gibson et al. (2002) for details.

**Question Wording: Affect toward electoral institutions.**

Satisfied with democracy:

*Australia, Germany, the Netherlands, and New Zealand (1999)*

“On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in the (country)?” Very satisfied and fairly satisfied coded as 1, other responses = 0.

Elections reflect voters views:

*Germany and New Zealand (2002)*

“Thinking about how elections in [country] work in practice, how well do you think they ensure that the views of MPs accurately reflect the views of voters?” Very well, quite well, not very well, not well at all. First two responses coded 1, others = 0.

*Australia*

“Thinking about how elections in Australia work in practice, how well do elections ensure that the views of voters are represented by MPs?” Very well, quite well, not very well, not well at all. First two responses coded 1, others = 0.

PR system fair:

*Germany and Netherlands:*

“The [German / Dutch] electoral system is much fairer than the plurality systems used in Britain and the United States.” Agree coded 1, neutral or disagree = 0.

*New Zealand 1999*

“MMP is much fairer than the old First Past the Post system” Agree, neutral, or disagree. Agree = 1, neutral or disagree = 0.

**Question Wording: Support for changing electoral institutions:**

Adopt term limits

*Germany, Netherlands*

“The number of terms that MPs can serve in [Parliament] should be limited by law.” Agree, neutral or disagree. Agree = 1. Other responses = 0.

## **Question Wording: Support for changing electoral institutions:**

### Adopt term limits

*New Zealand (1999)*

“In New Zealand, do you think we should or shouldn’t...Have a law that limits the number of terms that MPs can serve in Parliament?” Definite Yes, and Yes coded 1, neutral and negative responses coded 0.

### Use Referendums and Initiative

*Australia, New Zealand (1999)*

“Overall do you think that initiatives and referendums are good things, bad things or don’t you think they make much difference?” Good things coded as 1, other as 0.

*Germany, Netherlands*

“What is your opinion about citizen initiatives?” Good coded as 1; don’t know, bad coded 0.

### Change rules on compulsory voting.

*Germany, Netherlands,*

“Do you agree or disagree with the following....Voting should be compulsory. Strongly agree and agree coded 1, neither, disagree and strong disagree coded 0.

*New Zealand (2002)*

“There should be a law (as in Australia) that requires citizens to vote during a general election.” Agree, Neutral, disagree.

*Australia*

“Do you think that voting at the Federal elections should be compulsory, or do you think that people should only have to vote if they want to?” Favour vote if want to, and strongly favor vote if want to are coded as 1; strongly favour compulsory voting, favour compulsory voting coded 0.

**Table 2 (alt):** Affect Towards the System and Electoral Process (w/o postmat)

	<i>Satisfaction with Democracy</i>		<i>Elections Work Well</i>	
	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
Winner	1.34 *** (8.43)	1.16 *** (7.07)	1.78 *** (11.06)	1.61 *** (9.76)
Government party	1.16 *** (8.49)	1.19 *** (8.33)	1.26 *** (9.24)	1.28 *** (9.15)
Ideology		1.54 *** (6.25)		1.20 *** (4.53)
Female	-0.01 (0.05)	0.14 (1.11)	0.07 (0.51)	0.23 (1.61)
Age	-0.01 (1.58)	-0.01 ** (2.01)	0.00 (0.30)	0.00 (0.09)
Germany	-0.28 * (1.81)	-0.20 (1.22)	-1.21 *** (7.41)	-1.17 *** (7.00)
Netherlands	-0.23 (1.05)	-0.22 (0.99)		
Australia	-0.56 *** (3.40)	-0.58 *** (3.45)	-1.39 *** (8.14)	-1.44 *** (8.22)
Constant	0.64 ** (2.42)	0.11 (0.39)	0.17 (0.60)	-0.29 (0.95)
% correct	63	71	72	72
Observations	1670	1596	1465	1405

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses

**Table 3(alt):** Attitudes Toward Institutional Change (w/o postmat)

	<i>Term Limits</i>		<i>Initiatives</i>		<i>Compulsory Voting</i>	
	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
Winner	-1.35 *** (8.75)	-1.19 *** (7.33)	-0.95 *** (6.79)	-0.78 *** (5.30)	-0.54 *** (3.68)	-0.59 *** (3.90)
Government party	0.38 *** (2.80)	0.19 (1.31)	0.04 (0.32)	-0.07 (0.52)	0.31 ** (2.42)	0.33 ** (2.56)
Ideology		-1.51 *** (4.74)		-1.76 *** (6.22)		0.37 (1.49)
Female	0.61 *** (4.19)	0.50 *** (3.29)	0.16 (1.20)	-0.06 (0.42)	-0.31 ** (2.37)	-0.27 ** (2.02)
Age	0.01 * (1.90)	0.01 ** (2.19)	0.00 (0.22)	0.00 (0.48)	0.02 *** (3.54)	0.02 *** (3.66)
Germany	1.82 *** (10.51)	1.75 *** (9.74)	1.87 *** (11.24)	1.78 *** (10.34)	-1.07 *** (7.08)	-0.50 *** (3.98)
Netherlands	0.76 *** (3.40)	0.81 *** (3.49)	0.99 *** (4.72)	1.03 *** (4.71)	-1.01 *** (4.60)	-0.48 ** (2.33)
Australia			1.44 *** (8.24)	1.41 *** (7.86)	-0.95 *** (5.85)	
Constant	-1.84 *** (5.34)	-1.25 *** (3.29)	0.11 (0.35)	0.77 ** (2.24)	-0.93 *** (3.36)	-1.63 *** (6.01)
% correct	69	70	75	74	74	73
Observations	1185	1128	1648	1569	1677	1600

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses

Satisfied with Democracy, by nation

	Netherlands		Germany		New Zealand		Australia	
Winner	1.02 **	(0.46)	0.75 ***	(0.24)	0.72 *	(0.41)	1.52 ***	(0.43)
Government party	0.01	(0.52)	1.33 ***	(0.20)	1.91 ***	(0.41)	2.34 ***	(0.52)
Ideology (Right is positi	1.11	(0.95)	3.76 ***	(0.49)	0.51	(0.48)	-0.54	(0.55)
Female	0.05	(0.38)	-0.01	(0.22)	-0.27	(0.30)	0.3	(0.24)
Age	-0.01	(0.02)	-0.01 *	(0.01)	0.00	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
Postmaterial	0.28	(0.35)	-0.58 ***	(0.19)	0.00	(0.00)	-1.09 ***	(0.21)
Constant	0.27	(0.95)	-0.50 **	(0.44)	-0.05	(0.61)	0.66	(0.47)
Pseudo R2	0.05		0.18		0.17		0.22	
n	163		698		293		442	

Logistic regression estimates. Std errors in parentheses

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10

Adopt Term Limits, by nation

	Netherlands		Germany		New Zealand	
Winner	-1.00 **	(0.45)	-1.18 ***	(0.20)	-1.29 ***	(0.47)
Government party	0.67	(0.51)	0.01	(0.19)	0.26	(0.37)
Ideology (Right is positi	-1.07	(0.98)	-2.21 ***	(0.45)	-0.33	(0.83)
Female	0.75 **	(0.37)	0.63 ***	(0.21)	0.17	(0.31)
Age	-0.01	(0.02)	0.02 **	(0.01)	0.02	(0.02)
Postmaterial	-0.05	(0.34)	0.30	(0.18)	0.05	(0.30)
Constant	0.25	(0.96)	0.51	(0.40)	-1.77 *	(0.93)
Pseudo R2	0.05		0.20		0.04	
n	163		698		267	

Logistic regression estimates. Std errors in parentheses

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10

Use Refs and Initiatives, by nation

	Netherlands		Germany		New Zealand		Australia	
Winner	-0.68 ^	(0.47)	-0.99 ***	(0.24)	-0.29	(0.32)	-0.48 ^	(0.32)
Government party	-0.27	(0.50)	-0.90 ***	(0.31)	-0.91 ***	(0.33)	-0.51 ^	(0.36)
Ideology (Right is positi	-3.71 ***	(1.07)	-3.45 ***	(0.68)	-0.76	(0.73)	0.23	(0.62)
Female	0.89 *	(0.46)	-0.25	(0.27)	-0.45 ***	(0.27)	0.3	(0.28)
Age	0.01	(0.02)	-0.01	(0.01)	0.02 ^	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
Postmaterialism	-0.05		1.06 ***	(0.29)	-0.24	(0.27)	0.35 ^	(0.22)
Constant	2.17 **	(1.06)	3.91 ***	(0.65)	-0.16	(0.81)	1.29 **	(0.53)
Pseudo R2	0.24		0.23		0.05		0.04	
n	163		698		267		441	

Logistic regression estimates. Std errors in parentheses

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10 ^p<.10 (one-tail)

Compulsory Voting, by nation

	Netherlands		Germany		New Zealand		Australia	
Winner	-0.41	(0.49)	-0.21	(0.22)	-1.34 ***	(0.36)	-0.92 **	(0.38)
Government party	0.18	(0.57)	-0.08	(0.20)	0.24	(0.29)	0.72 **	(0.35)
Ideology (Right is positi	-0.76	(1.08)	-0.56	(0.45)	-0.25	(0.46)	1.56 ***	(0.58)
Female	0.37	(0.41)	-0.26	(0.23)	-0.34	(0.27)	-0.4	(0.28)
Age	0.02	(0.02)	0.01	(0.01)	0.02 **	(0.01)	0.02 *	(0.01)
Postmaterialism	0.12	(0.39)	-0.39 **				-0.09	(0.21)
Constant	-1.82	(1.08)	-1.08 **	(0.43)	-0.95 *	(0.57)	-2.49 ***	(0.52)
Pseudo R2	0.03		0.01		0.10		0.08	
n	163		698		294		445	

\*\*\*p<.01; \*\*p<.05; \*p<.10