
**Parties, institutions and the politics of law and order: Online Appendix**

**Figure A.1: Government positions on law and order**



Note: Ideological position of the government on law and order according to the manifesto data set and the cabinet shares of the government parties.

**Table A.1: Party position and position of constituency**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Party Name** | **Party position  (Manifesto)** | **Position of the Constituency (ESS)** | **Party Name** |
| **Belgium** | | | |
| Groen/Ecolo | 4,68 | 6,05 | Groen/Ecolo |
| SPA/PS | 5,53 | 6,85 | NVA |
| CD&V/CDH | 8,18 | 6,9 | CD&V/CDH |
| VLD/MR | 9,4 | 6,92 | SPA/PS |
| NVA | 13,67 | 7,19 | VLD/MR |
| **Denmark** | | | |
| EL | 2,99 | 3,16 | EL |
| SD | 5,61 | 4,15 | RV |
| RV | 5,69 | 5,38 | SF |
| KF | 7,25 | 5,76 | SD |
| SF | 7,69 | 5,85 | KF |
| DF | 9,75 | 6,19 | V |
| V | 12,62 | 7,06 | DF |
| EL | 2,99 | 3,16 | EL |
| **Germany** | | | |
| B‘90\Die Grünen | 1,22 | 5,31 | B‘90\Die Grünen |
| Die Linke\PDS | 1,74 | 6,67 | SPD |
| FDP | 1,79 | 6,96 | Die Linke\PDS |
| SPD | 4,15 | 6,99 | FDP |
| CDU\CSU | 5,83 | 7,09 | CDU\CSU |
| **Spain** | | | |
| PNV | 0,64 | 6,65 | PNV |
| IU | 1,11 | 7,06 | IU |
| CiU | 3,24 | 7,67 | PSOE |
| PSOE | 3,38 | 7,73 | CiU |
| PP | 6,09 | 8,06 | PP |
| **Sweden** | | | |
| V | 1,02 | 5,43 | V |
| C | 3,24 | 5,6 | MP |
| S | 3,82 | 6,34 | C |
| MP | 4,04 | 6,44 | FP |
| KD | 5,57 | 6,51 | KD |
| M | 6,56 | 6,71 | M |
| FP | 6,72 | 6,75 | S |
| SD (2010) | 8,82 | 8,39 | SD |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **United Kingdom** | | | |
| LIB | 5,75 | 7,4 | LIB |
| CON | 7,93 | 7,42 | LAB |
| LAB | 8,18 | 7,8 | CON |

Note: Party Position Manifesto: Mean of the party positions according to the coded manifestos during the period 1995-2008;   
Ideological Position Constituency: Mean for the agreement on the question: “Much harsher sentences for people who break the law” for different groups of voters (discrimination by means of the recall question (“what party did you vote for in the last national election”)). Source: European Social Survey 5 (2010) in different countries (re-scaled on a 1-10 scale).

**Table A.2: Variables (see Fig.2), measurement and data sources**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Operationalization** | **Descriptive statistics** | **Data Source** |
| **Dependent variable** | | | |
| Public Spending on Law and Order | Public Spending in % of GDP | Mean=1.57, SD=0.36, Min=0.74, Max=2.61 | OECD National Accounts Database, Eurostat, national sources |
| **Main independent variable** | | | |
| Ideological Position of Incumbent parties | Mean position of government using the partisan position on law-and-order (Chapel Hill, Manifesto Research Group) weighted by cabinet seats | Manifesto: Mean=5.76, SD=4.18, Min=0.70, Max=19.34 | Party position:  Manifesto research group  Cabinet Seats: Own calculation |
| **“Big trends”, socio-economic structures and developments** | | | |
| De-industrialisation | Civilian labour force employed in the 3rd sector minus labour force employed in the 1st and 2nd | Mean=39.87, SD=11.97,  Min=2.11, Max=59.56 | OECD Labour force statistics database |
| Globalisation | Openness of the economy in current prices, measured as total trade (sum of import and export) as a percentage of GDP | Mean=86.68, SD=53.11 Min=22.98, Max=319.55 | [Armingeon, et al. 2010](#_ENREF_1) |
| Terror 9/11 | Dummy-variable for terrorist attacks after 2001 | Mean=0.5, SD=0.5 Min=0, Max=1 | Own calculation |
| Income inequality | Gini index (total population) | Mean=0.29, SD=0.04, Min=0.21, Max=0.38 | OECD Social and Welfare Statistics |
| Welfare state retrenchment | Unemployment insurance replacement rate | Mean=0.60; SD=0.14 Min=.27, Max=.80 | [Scruggs 2013](#_ENREF_8) |
| Unemployment | Unemployment rate as a percentage of civilian labour force | Mean=6.96, SD=3.284, Min=1.73, Max=22.96 | Armingeon et al. 2010 |
| **Direct societal inputs into the political system** | | | |
| Crime rate | Total crimes registered by the police per inhabitants | Mean=7049, SD=2731,  Min=1939, Max=15004 | Eurostat  European Sourcebook of Crime, ([Killias, et al. 2010](#_ENREF_5)) |
| Homicide rate | Total homicides per inhabitants | Mean= 1.61, SD=1.15 Min=0.4, Max=8.1 | UNODC, national sources |
| Fear of crime | Weighted country aggregates for the “standard fear of crime”-question | Mean=1.99, SD=0.22, Min=1.53, Max=2.37 (here: mean) | Eurobarometer, European Social Survey, National surveys |
| **Specific political institutions** | | | |
| Media system | 3 types of media systems: liberal, polarized-pluralist, democratic corporatist | Dummy variables | [Hallin and Mancini 2004](#_ENREF_4) |
| Institutional constraints | Index of institutional barriers | Mean=2.82, SD=1.20, Min=1, Max=5 | [Schmidt 1996](#_ENREF_7) |
| Corporatism | Degree of Corporatism | Mean=3.05, SD=1.26, Min=1.25, Max=5 | [Siaroff 1999](#_ENREF_9) |
| Party system | Effective number of legislative parties | Mean=3.87, SD=1.50, Min=1.94, SD=9.07 | Armingeon et al. 2010 |
| Judicial review | Dummy-variable if judicial review | Mean=2.25, SD=1.02, Min=1, Max=4 | [Lijphart 2012](#_ENREF_6) |
| Election of judges | Dummy-variable for countries with direct election of actors in the justice system | Mean=0.05, SD=0,22 Min=0, Max=1 | Own calculation |
| **Broad regime concepts: Welfare state regimes, VoC-approach, type of democracy** | | | |
| Regime type | 4 regime types: Social-democratic, conservative-corporatist, liberal, mediterranean | Dummy variables | [Ferrera 1996](#_ENREF_2) |
| Varieties of Capitalism | Coordination Index | Mean=0.56, SD=0.29, Min=0, Max=1 | [Hall and Gingerich 2004](#_ENREF_3) |
| Type of democracy | Executive-parties-dimension (71-96) | Mean=0.32, SD=0.92, Min=-1.48, Max=1.67 | [Lijphart 2012](#_ENREF_6) |
| **Budgetary context** | | | |
| Debt ratio (also lagged levels) | Debt ratio in % of GDP | Mean=60.49, SD=26.54, Min=7.65, Max=135.40 | OECD National Accounts Database |
| Budget balance (also lagged levels) | Budget balance in % of GDP | Mean=-0.12, SD=4.01  Min=-9.67, Max=18.77 | OECD National Accounts Database |
| **Control for automatic influence** | | | |
| GDP growth rate | GDP growth | Mean=2.94, SD=1.88 Min=-3, Max=11.5 | Armingeon et al. 2010 |

**Table A.3: Further regression models using „underlying variables“**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| Law-and-order spending t-1 (LDV) | 0.991\*\*\* | 0.971\*\*\* |
| (68.30) | (81.85) |
|  |  |  |
| Ideological position government | 0.000721 | 0.000488 |
| (1.18) | (0.60) |
|  |  |  |
| Election of judges | 0.0224\* |  |
| (1.91) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Judicial review | -0.00720\*\*\* |  |
| (-2.70) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Effective no. of parties |  | -0.00119 |
|  | (-0.51) |
|  |  |  |
| Institutional constraints |  | -0.00517\*\* |
|  | (-2.30) |
|  |  |  |
| Media system democratic-corporat. | -0.0344\*\*\* |  |
| (-5.15) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Media system polarized-pluralist. | -0.0121 |  |
| (-0.80) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Corporatism |  | -0.00373 |
|  |  | (-0.98) |
|  |  |  |
| Crime rate | 0.00000181 |  |
| (1.47) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Homicide rate |  | 0.00888\*\*\* |
|  | (2.68) |
|  |  |  |
| Fear of crime |  | 0.0932\*\*\* |
|  |  | (4.47) |
|  |  |  |
| Budget balance t-2 | 0.00131 | 0.00229\* |
| (0.95) | (1.73) |
|  |  |  |
| Deindustrialisation | -0.0000646 | 0.000272 |
|  | (-0.17) | (0.75) |
|  |  |  |
| Unemployment | -0.00171 | -0.00375\*\*\* |
|  | (-1.22) | (-3.01) |
|  |  |  |
| Dummy Terror 9/11 | -0.0133 | -0.0133 |
|  | (-1.36) | (-1.30) |
|  |  |  |
| Economic growth | -0.0140\*\*\* | -0.0140\*\*\* |
| (-5.06) | (-6.92) |
|  |  |  |
| Constant | 0.0985\*\*\* | -0.0565 |
|  | (2.66) | (-0.94) |
| *R*2 | 0.972 | 0.977 |
| *N* | 244 | 263 |

**Table A.4: Regression equations for interaction effects**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** |
| Law-and-order spending t-1 (LDV) | 0.963\*\*\* | 0.976\*\*\* | 0.975\*\*\* |
| (74.63) | (50.81) | (51.02) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Ideological position government | 0.00338 | 0.00296 | 0.00308 |
| (1.64) | (1.52) | (1.13) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Judicial review | -0.00146 |  |  |
|  | (-0.30) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Judicial review \*ideological position | -0.000943 |  |  |
| (-1.32) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Institutional constraints |  | -0.00109 | -0.00564\*\* |
|  |  | (-0.21) | (-2.20) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Institutional constraints \*ideological position |  | -0.000805 |  |
|  | (-1.26) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Debt ratio |  | -0.000416\*\* | -0.000257 |
|  |  | (-2.04) | (-0.92) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Debt ratio \*ideological position |  |  | -0.0000384 |
|  |  | (-0.97) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Election of judges | 0.0401\*\* |  |  |
|  | (2.34) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effective no. of parties | -0.00149 | 0.00195 | 0.00253 |
|  | (-0.49) | (0.88) | (1.19) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Crime rate | 0.00000176 |  |  |
|  | (1.05) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Homicide rate |  | 0.0112\*\*\* | 0.0102\*\*\* |
|  |  | (3.01) | (2.89) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fear of crime | 0.0786\*\*\* | 0.0735\*\*\* | 0.0770\*\*\* |
|  | (4.06) | (3.26) | (3.35) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Budget balance t-2 | 0.00180 |  |  |
|  | (1.28) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Deindustrialisation | 0.000410 |  |  |
|  | (1.10) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Openness economy |  | 0.0000714 | 0.0000742 |
|  |  | (0.72) | (0.75) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Inequality (gini) | 0.217 | 0.137 | 0.136 |
|  | (1.64) | (1.13) | (1.10) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment | -0.00161 | -0.00284\* | -0.00282\* |
|  | (-1.10) | (-1.94) | (-1.91) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Dummy terror 9/11 | -0.0163 | -0.0123 | -0.0101 |
|  | (-1.64) | (-1.16) | (-0.94) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Economic growth | -0.0125\*\*\* | -0.0151\*\*\* | -0.0151\*\*\* |
|  | (-5.46) | (-5.95) | (-5.91) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -0.127\*\*\* | -0.0816\*\* | -0.0871\*\* |
|  | (-3.51) | (-2.56) | (-2.13) |
| *R*2 | 0.977 | 0.977 | 0.977 |
| *N* | 257 | 263 | 263 |

Note: *t* statistics in parentheses; \* *p* < .1, \*\* *p* < .05, \*\*\* *p* < .01

**References**

Armingeon, Klaus, Sarah Engler, Potolidis Panajotis, Marlène Gerber, and Philipp Leimgruber. 2010. Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2008.

Ferrera, Maurizio. 1996. The “Southern” Model of Welfare in Social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy* 6: 17-37.

Hall, Peter, and D.W. Gingerich. 2004. *Varieties of Capitalism and Institutional Complementarities in the Macroeconomy: An Empirical Analysis (MPIfG Discussion Paper 04/5)*. Cologne: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies.

Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Killias, Martin, Marcelo F. Aebi, Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay, Gordon Barclay, Beata Gruszcynska, Stefan Harrendorf, Markku Heiskanen, Vasilika Hysi, Jörg-Martin Jehle, Olena Shostko, Paul Smit, and Annveig Dorisdottir. 2010. *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics - 2010*. Den Haag: WODC.

Lijphart, Arend. 2012. *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Schmidt, Manfred G. 1996. When parties matter: A review of the possibilities and limits of partisan influence on public policy. *European Journal of Political Research* 30: 155-183.

Scruggs, Lyle. 2013. Welfare State Entitlements Data Set: A Comparative Institutional Analysis of Eighteen Welfare States, Version 2.0. <http://cwed2.org/> (8.5.2013)

Siaroff, Alan. 1999. Corporatism in 24 industrial democracies: Meaning and measurement. *European Journal of Political Research* 36: 275-305.