**Appendix**

Table A1.Characteristics of the electoral system in each sample country

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Country** | **Year** | **Electoral system** | **Disproportionality** | **District Magnitude** | **Ballot****Control** | **Personal vote** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 2004 | Majoritarian (Alternative vote) | 8.6 | 0.67 | 2 | 1.33 |
| Belgium | 2003 | PR-open lists | 5.16 | 9.09 | 1 | 0.67 |
| Brazil | 2002 | PR-open lists | 3.07 | 3.70 | 2 | 1 |
| Bulgaria | 2001 | PR-closed lists | 7.82 | 100.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | 2004 | SMD plurality | 9.81 | 0.32 | 2 | 1.67 |
| Chile | 2005 | PR-open lists | 6.82 | 1.67 | 1 | 1 |
| Czech Republic | 2002 | PR-open lists | 5.73 | 7.15 | 1 | 0.33 |
| Finland | 2003 | PR-open lists | 3.16 | 6.65 | 1 | 0.67 |
| France | 2002 | Majoritarian (Runoff) | 21.95 | 0.17 | 2 | 1.67 |
| Germany | 2002 | MM proportional (dependent) | 4.61 | 25.51 | 0.99 | 0.83 |
| Great Britain | 2005 | SMD plurality | 16.73 | 0.16 | 2 | 1.67 |
| Hungary | 2002 | MM parallel (independent) | 8.2 | 3.15 | 0.91 | 0.76 |
| Iceland | 2003 | PR-closed lists | 1.85 | 14.29 | 0 | 0 |
| Ireland | 2002 | PR (Single transferable vote) | 6.62 | 2.38 | 1 | 1 |
| Israel | 2003 | PR-closed lists | 2.53 | 100.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Italy | 2006 | PR-closed lists | 3.61 | 3.70 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Japan | 2004 | Mixed parallel (independent) | 8.52 | 16.51 | 1.20 | 1 |
| Korea | 2004 | Mixed parallel (independent) | 12.39 | 3.78 | 0.37 | 0.31 |
| Mexico | 2003 | Mixed parallel (independent) | 4.74 | 3.32 | 0.60 | 0.80 |
| Netherlands | 2002 | PR-closed lists | 0.88 | 100.00 | 0 | 0.33 |
| New Zealand | 2002 | MM proportional (dependent) | 2.37 | 18.54 | 1.02 | 0.85 |
| Norway | 2001 | PR-closed lists | 3.22 | 5.00 | 0 | 0.33 |
| Peru | 2006 | PR-closed lists | 13.95 | 4.00 | 0 | 0.67 |
| Philippines | 2004 | MM proportional (dependent) | 6.52 | 1.78 | 1.80 | 1.50 |
| Poland | 2001 | PR-open lists | 6.33 | 2.69 | 1 | 0.67 |
| Portugal | 2002 | PR-closed lists | 4.6 | 4.54 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 2005 | PR-closed lists | 5.75 | 4.54 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | 2004 | PR-closed lists | 3.74 | 2.35 | 0 | 0 |
| Slovenia | 2004 | PR-open lists | 4.79 | 16.67 | 0.04 | 0.33 |
| Spain | 2004 | PR-closed lists | 4.25 | 1.92 | 0.01 | 0.34 |
| Sweden | 2002 | PR-open lists | 1.52 | 3.97 | 1 | 0.67 |
| Switzerland | 2003 | PR-open lists | 2.47 | 3.85 | 1 | 0.67 |
| Taiwan | 2001 | MM parallel (independent) | 3.75 | 5.55 | 0.84 | 1.40 |
| Taiwan | 2004 | MM parallel (independent) | 2.81 | 5.55 | 0.84 | 1.40 |
| United States | 2004 | SMD plurality | 2.99 | 0.23 | 2 | 1.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Sources*: Bormann and Golder (2013) dataset; Michael Gallagher’s webpage; Johnson and Wallack (2008) dataset.

Coding of control variables:

*Gender*: (male = 0) (female = 1).

*Age*: (18-24 = 1) (25-34 = 2) (35-44 = 3) (45-54 = 4) (55-64 = 5) (65 or more = 6).

*Education*: (primary completed = 1) (secondary completed = 2) (university degree = 3).

*Unemployed*: (employed = 0) (unemployed = 1).

*Politicians make difference*: ‘Some people say it makes a difference who is in power. Others say that it doesn't make a difference who is in power. Using the scale on this card, (where 1 means that it makes a difference who is in power and 5 means that it doesn't make a difference who is in power), where would you place yourself?’ We reversed the original scale in order that 1 means that ‘Politicians make no difference at all’ and 5 means ‘Politicians make a lot of difference’.

*Winner*: (not voted for a government/majority party = 0) (voted for a government/majority party = 1).

*Close to a political party*: ‘Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular political party?’ (No = 0) (Yes = 1).

Table A2. Descriptive statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Variable** | **Obs.** | **Mean** | **St. Dev.** | **Min.** | **Max.** | **Freq. (%)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD: Not at all satisfied |  |  |  |  |  | 11.10 |
| SWD: Not very satisfied |  |  |  |  |  | 32.12 |
| SWD: Fairly satisfied |  |  |  |  |  | 49.16 |
| SWD: Very satisfied |  |  |  |  |  | 7.61 |
| Corruption: It hardly happens at all |  |  |  |  |  | 5.51 |
| Corruption: No very widespread  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.40 |
| Corruption: Fairly widespread |  |  |  |  |  | 38.00 |
| Corruption: Very widespread |  |  |  |  |  | 33.09 |
| Disproportionality | 55036 | 5.85 | 3.96 | 0.88 | 21.95 |  |
| District Magnitude | 55036 | 15.46 | 29.23 | .15 | 100 |  |
| Ballot Control | 55036 | 0.78 | 0.70 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Gender: Male |  |  |  |  |  | 47.70 |
| Gender: Female |  |  |  |  |  | 52.30 |
| Age: 18-24 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.51 |
| Age: 25-34 |  |  |  |  |  | 18.21 |
| Age: 35-44 |  |  |  |  |  | 19.68 |
| Age: 45-54 |  |  |  |  |  | 18.14 |
| Age: 55-64 |  |  |  |  |  | 14.77 |
| Age: 65 or more |  |  |  |  |  | 17.68 |
| Education: Primary completed |  |  |  |  |  | 38.78 |
| Education: Secondary completed |  |  |  |  |  | 44.91 |
| Education: University degree |  |  |  |  |  | 16.30 |
| Unemployed: No |  |  |  |  |  | 93.94 |
| Unemployed: Yes |  |  |  |  |  | 6.06 |
| Politicians make difference: 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.64 |
| Politicians make difference: 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.13 |
| Politicians make difference: 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 19.63 |
| Politicians make difference: 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 24.28 |
| Politicians make difference: 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 36.33 |
| Winner: No |  |  |  |  |  | 51.08 |
| Winner: Yes |  |  |  |  |  | 48.92 |
| Closeness to a party: No |  |  |  |  |  | 52.88 |
| Closeness to a party: Yes |  |  |  |  |  | 48.12 |
| Distance from Government | 44987 | 2.07 | 1.65 | 0.02 | 8.29 |  |
| Average Party Extremism | 55036 | 1.87 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 4.84 |  |
| Age of Democracy | 55036 | 52.11 | 42.40 | 4 | 135 |  |
| CPI | 55036 | 3.61 | 2.09 | 0.3 | 7.4 |  |
| (log) GDP per capita | 55036 | 9.87 | 0.60 | 7.96 | 10.60 |  |
| GDP growth | 55036 | 2.48 | 2.40 | -1.65 | 8.40 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Sources*: CSES Module 2; Bormann and Golder (2013) dataset; Michael Gallagher’s webpage; Johnson and Wallack (2008) dataset Przeworski’s ACLP dataset; Transparency International; World Development Indicators.



**Figure A1** The relationship between perceived corruption (CSES) and Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) by Transparency International.

*Note:* We have reversed the scale of CPI so that higher values represent higher levels of corruption.