Supplementary Materials for: Performance Voting and Knowledge of Cabinet Composition

David Fortunato
University of California, Merced
dfortunato@ucmerced.edu

Randolph T. Stevenson
Rice University
stevenso@rice.edu

1 Questions used to create Figure 1

- Eastern European Countries (CZ, PL, SL) are from the Party Systems and Electoral Alignments in East Central Europe Study. The exact (translated) question wording is: "To (the best of your) knowledge, which parties are the government parties today?" (The Slovak wording in the Autumn 1994 post-election survey was: "To your knowledge, which parties participated in the Moravcik-government?"). We do not include Hungary in 1993 and 1994 in the chart because of the extreme volatility in the party system in the period between the first and second elections (1990 and 1994 respectively) results in a situation that is not likely comparable to the other case, which were much more stable even during their period of early party system consolidation (74% of Hungarian respondents cannot name the cabinet parties in both 1993 and 1994). Likewise we exclude Poland in 1993 since the timing of the survey relative to the election in that year made the question ambiguous (80% cannot name the cabinet parties).

- The New Zealand survey (NZ) was conducted between July 13 and July 23, 1998 (one month before the National and New Zealand First Party cabinet fell). See Karp and Bowler (2001) for more information on this survey.

- The Dutch Survey (NL) asked: "According to you, which party or parties are currently part of the cabinet?" The number given is the percentage that successfully named the PVDA, VVD, and D66, and these three parties, as constituting the cabinet. 68% of the failures — 25% of the whole sample — were respondents who incorrectly placed the CDA in the cabinet. 96% of respondents correctly omitted all minor parties (all parties except the PVDA, CDA, D66, and VVD) from the cabinet.

- The UK survey was one we commissioned from the Center for Experimental Social Science at Oxford University. It asked respondents to identify each of eight parties as being PM, in the cabinet but not PM, in the opposition, or having no seats in the legislature. The number reported here, however, is limited to responses about the Conservatives, Labour, and the Liberal Democrats. Thus, the number is the percentage of respondents who could not place those three parties in their correct roles.

2 Logistic model to predict which respondents do not know the composition of the cabinet

Table 1: Dependent variable: Respondents who incorrectly identify the cab/opp status of all of the FIVE main parties = 1

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Highest level of education achieved	-0.077	-2.940
Interest in Politics	-0.178	-2.550
General Political Knowledge	-4.378	-14.700
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.014	-0.330
Age in Years	0.007	0.350
Age squared	0.000	-0.570
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.493	-4.130
Household income	-0.010	-0.520
Constant	2.254	4.910
N		1837
Log-Likelihood		-888

3 Multivariate logistic estimates; economic voting for different samples of respondents, the Netherlands 1988

Table 2: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
All Respondents other than those answering DK to the party composition question

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	0.644	1.670
Thought economy stayed the same	0.411	1.070
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.310	-4.840
Age in Years	0.004	0.820
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.255	-1.940
Highest level of education achieved	-0.153	-5.560
Household income	-0.012	-0.560
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.359	-9.810
Identifies as a catholic	0.128	0.740
Identifies as reformed	-0.057	-0.230
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.765	-2.010
Constant	1.839	3.600
N		1387
Log-Likelihood		-717

Table 3: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
Respondents who correctly identify the cab/opp status of all of the FIVE main parties

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	1.020	2.020
Thought economy stayed the same	0.650	1.280
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.264	-3.400
Age in Years	0.009	1.530
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.033	-0.200
Highest level of education achieved	-0.142	-4.250
Household income	0.011	0.400
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.422	-9.250
Identifies as a catholic	-0.019	-0.090
Identifies as reformed	-0.186	-0.620
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.417	-0.990
Constant	1.063	1.630
N		1022
Log-Likelihood		-493

Table 4: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
Respondents who correctly identify the cab/opp status of all of the THREE main parties

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	0.989	2.040
Thought economy stayed the same	0.604	1.240
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.286	-3.720
Age in Years	0.009	1.720
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.065	-0.410
Highest level of education achieved	-0.146	-4.460
Household income	0.006	0.230
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.414	-9.330
Identifies as a catholic	-0.041	-0.190
Identifies as reformed	-0.209	-0.700
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.415	-1.000
Constant	1.156	1.840
N		1057
Log-Likelihood		-511

Table 5: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
Respondents who correctly identify the CDA as being in the opposition

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	0.868	1.890
Thought economy stayed the same	0.519	1.120
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.277	-3.730
Age in Years	0.006	1.200
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.101	-0.650
Highest level of education achieved	-0.154	-4.860
Household income	0.007	0.290
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.412	-9.530
Identifies as a catholic	-0.027	-0.130
Identifies as reformed	-0.124	-0.440
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.424	-1.070
Constant	1.462	2.410
N		1095
Log-Likelihood		-540

4 Replication of Duch 2001 model with DPES 1998 Data

Table 6: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
All Respondents other than those answering DK to the party composition question

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	-1.062	-1.23
Thought economy was better * Political interest	3.470	2.07
Thought economy stayed the same	-1.221	-1.40
Thought economy stayed the same * Political interest	3.338	1.98
Political interest	-3.864	-2.35
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.306	-4.75
Age in years	0.006	1.31
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.197	-1.45
Highest level of education achieved	-0.137	-4.77
Household income	0.004	-0.17
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.367	-9.93
Identifies as a Catholic	0.118	0.69
Identifies as reformed	-0.036	-0.14
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.746	-1.95
Constant	3.515	3.85
N		1387
Log-Likelihood		-713

Table 7: Dependent variable: Reported Vote for PM=1
Respondents who correctly identify the cab/opp status of all of the FIVE main parties

Covariate	coefficient	t-ratio
Thought economy was better	-0.461	-0.38
Thought economy was better * Political interest	2.468	1.26
Thought economy stayed the same	-0.994	-0.80
Thought economy stayed the same * Political interest	2.704	1.37
Political interest	-3.055	-1.60
Frequency of Church Attendance	-0.253	-3.26
Age in years	0.011	1.89
Gender (Male =1 , Female = 0)	-0.001	-0.00
Highest level of education achieved	-0.129	-3.73
Household income	0.016	-0.58
Left-right Self Placement (higher numbers are right)	-0.431	-9.34
Identifies as a Catholic	-0.035	-0.16
Identifies as reformed	-0.182	-0.61
Identifies as Calvinist	-0.420	-1.00
Constant	2.727	2.15
N		1022
Log-Likelihood		-491

References for Supplemental Materials

Karp , J.A., Bowler., S., 2001. Coalition government and satisfaction with democracy: An analysis of New Zealand's reaction to proportional representation. European Journal of Political Research 40, 57-79. **[14S]**