**Appendix**

**Table A1: Determinants of Satisfaction with democracy (SWD) used in the literature**

|  | Article |
| --- | --- |
| **Categories** | Aarts and Thomassen (2008) | Anderson and Guillory (1997) | Berggren et al. (2004) | Bernauer and Vatter (2011) | Blais and Gelineau (2007) | Chang, Chu and Wu (n.d.) | Curini, Jou and Memoli (2012) | Farrell and McAllister (2006) | Henderson (2008) | Karp and Bowler (2001) | Kim (2009) | McAllister (2005) |
| ***Individual-level variables*** |
| Accountability | 🞊 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  | X |
| Policy/Representation | 🞊 | 🞊 | X | X | 🞊 | 🞊 | 🞊 |  | 🞊 | 🞊 | 🞊 | X |
| Voice/representation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| Well-being |  | X | X |  | X |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
| Engagement |  | X |  | C | C | X | C |  |  |  |  | X |
| Understanding (Information) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Efficiency/Effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  | X | C |  |  | X | X |  |
| Belief in democracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  | X |  |  |  |
| Fairness of procedures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Demographics |  | C | C | C | C |  | C | C | C | C | C |  |
| ***Institutional variables*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electoral system/rules | X |  | 🞊 |  |  |  |  | 🞊 | X |  | X | 🞊 |
| Party system |  |  | 🞊 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economic context |  |  |  | C |  |  | C | X | X |  |  |  |
| Welfare regime type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Democracy type |  | 🞊 |  | X |  |  | C |  | X |  |  |  |
| Direct democracy |  |  |  | 🞊 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government formation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal characteristics |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Democratic experience | X |  |  |  |  | X | C | X | X |  |  |  |
| Rule of law  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |

*Notes*: 🞊: Focus of the study/key independent variable; X: independent variable; C: control variable

**Table A2 – Correlation Matrix of Level 1 (Individual) Variables (ESS data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SWD | Interest | Winner | Closer to Party | Govt Explains | Income Feeling | Judgment of Health / Educ | Courts Fair | Govt Punished | Govt Responsive |
| SWD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Voted for Winner | 0.15 | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Closer to Party | 0.16 | 0.36 | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt Explains | 0.47 | 0.13 | 0.1 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Feeling | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.1 | 0.14 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health / Educ | 0.53 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.1 | 0.37 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |
| Courts Fair | 0.5 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.59 | 0.3 | 0.4 |  |  |  |
| Govt Punished | 0.32 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.52 | 0.16 | 0.24 | 0.45 |  |  |
| Govt Responsive | 0.37 | 0.1 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.45 | 0.19 | 0.29 | 0.37 | 0.28 |  |
| Left-Right Distance | 0.16 | 0 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.1 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A3 – Satisfaction with Democracy in Germany (2009) & Canada (2011): 0-1 scale** |
|  | **Germany** |  |  | **Canada** |  |  |
| **Category** | **Variable** | **b** | **se** | **Variable** | **b** | **Se** |
| Engagement | Interest in politics | **0.093**  | 0.032  | Interest in politics (0-10) | **0.028** | 0.014 |
|  |  |  |  | Interest squared (0-100) | **-0.003** | 0.001 |
|  | Political participation | -0.029  | 0.020  | Has been party member | -0.029 | 0.019 |
|  |  |  |  | Any civil society participation | 0.027 | 0.017 |
|  | Political knowledge | 0.002  | 0.022  | Politics too complicated | -0.015 | 0.027 |
| Represen-tation | Voted for party in gov’t coalition | **0.032**  | 0.018 | CPC vote (winner) | **0.086** | 0.021 |
|  |  |  |  | Local winner (voted for MP) | **0.030** | 0.017 |
| Voice | Parties not interested in what people think | 0.010  | 0.033  | Gov't doesn't care what people like me think | **-0.170** | 0.025 |
|  | A party represents my views | 0.014 | 0.017 | People like me No Say in Gov't | -0.037 | 0.025 |
|  | Satisfied with range of positions | **0.309**  | 0.027  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Policy | Left-Right (0-10) | **0.064** | 0.014  | Left-Right (0-10) | **0.039** | 0.015 |
|  | Left-Right squared | **-0.005**  | 0.001  | Left-Right squared | **-0.003** | 0.001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Well-being | Education | -0.011  | 0.026  | Education | 0.003 | 0.004 |
|  | Personal financial situation | -0.022 | 0.039  | Personal economic retrospection | **0.056** | 0.013 |
|  | Country’s economic situation | **0.135**  | 0.043  |  |  |  |
|  | Receive a fair share |  **0.112**  | 0.046  |  |  |  |
| Fairness of procedures | Fair and correct elections | **0.128**  | 0.032  | Electoral disproportionality ok | **0.060** | 0.019 |
|  | Just society | **0.256**  | 0.036  | Confidence in courts | **0.075** | 0.028 |
| Effectiveness/Efficiency |  |  |   | Gov't wastes a lot of $ | **-0.150** | 0.030 |
|  | \_Constant | -0.102  | 0.057  | \_Constant | **0.640** | 0.072 |
|  | N | 1216 |  |  | 1409 |  |
|  | Adj. R2 | 0.36 |  |  | 0.2 |  |

Source: German Longitudinal Election Study 2009 (Pre- and Post-election Cross-Section) and Canadian Election Study 2011 (Campaign Wave)

Notes: All variables coded on a 0-1 scale unless specified. In Germany, coalition government of CDU/CSU and FDP elected after grand coalition of CDU/CSU and SPD. In Canada, incumbent Conservative (CPC) minority government re-elected with majority

**Table A4 – Full Micro-Macro Model Estimates** **

**Measurement Details**

Individual data are drawn from European Social Survey[[1]](#endnote-1) 2012. The ESS Multilevel file includes data from many sources. See https://ess-search.nsd.no/

**Individual Variables (all variables rescaled to 0 to 1 interval)**

Satisfaction with Democracy: “And on the whole, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in [country]?” measured on a 10-point scale, extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied.

Engagement: Interest measured on a 5-point scale from Not At All to Very Interested.

Winner: Coded 1 if voted for a party included in the government formed in most recent election.

Voice: “Is there a particular political party you feel closer to than all the other parties?” Yes =1, No=0.

Transparency: “The government in [country] explains its decisions to voters.” 10-point scale from Does not apply at all to Applies completely.

Well-Being: “Which of the descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel about your household's income nowadays?” Living comfortably on present income = 1, Coping on present income=.66, Finding it difficult on present income=.33, Finding it very difficult on present income=0.

Effectiveness: Average of separate questions: “Please say what you think overall about the state of health [education] services in [country] nowadays?”. 10-point scale from Extremely Bad to Extremely Good.

Fairness: “The courts in [country] treat everyone the same?”. 10-point scale from Does not Apply at all to Applies Completely.

Accountability: “In country governing parties are punished in elections when they have done a bad job.” 10-point scale from Does not apply at all to Applies completely.

Responsiveness: “please tell me how often you think the government in [country] today changes its planned policies in response to what most people think?” 10-point scale from Never to Always.

Ideal Policy: Absolute value of difference between respondent’s self-placement on 0-1 left-right scale and the country average.

**Macro Variables**

Variable, [source], with minimum and maximum of the country averages.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Macro Variable | minumum | maximum |
| GDP per capita 2011, [IMF] | 12 | 70.1 |
| Corruption (TPI), [Transparency International] | 3.9 | 9.3 |
| GINI (inequality) coefficient, [OECD]  | 23.6 | 36.9 |
| Gov't Alternation from elections, last 10 years, [authors’ coding] | 0 | 3 |
| Social Expenditure percentage, [OECD] | 18 | 32.4 |
| Transparency, [Democracy Barometer] | 47.8 | 86.9 |
| Average number of Parties in government, last 10 years, [authors’ coding]  | 0.04 | 0.81 |
| Gender Inequality, [UNDP] | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Majority Gov't (2010-2012), [authors’ coding] | 0 | 1 |
| Non-Electoral government change[[2]](#footnote-1), [authors’ coding] | 0 | 11 |
| Effective Number of Parliamentary (ENP) Parties based on Seats, [Comparative Political Dataset (CPD)[[3]](#footnote-2)] | 2 | 8.4 |
| ENP based on Votes, [CPD] | 2.9 | 10.1 |
| ENP Seats \* Votes, [CPD] | 5.7 | 84.9 |
| Population per national MP, [authors’ coding] | 5 | 131 |
| District Magnitude (DM), [World Bank Database of Political Institutions mean district magnitude], then 1/(DM+1) | 0.008 | 0.5 |
| Economic growth (annual, 2010-12), [IMF] | -0.03 | 0.09 |
| Federal system, [Quality of Government] | 0 | 1 |

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Number of times the government has changed in the past ten years, not including government changes after elections. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. Comparative Political Dataset available at https://www.cpds-data.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)