

On-line appendix to “Citizens’ evaluations of the fulfillment of election pledges:  
evidence from Ireland”

Robert Thomson

This appendix reports several additional tests that are not included in the main text due to limited space. The analyses reported in Table 4 examine whether the effects found are driven by the inclusion of one of the four pledges. The four models presented in Table 4 are the same as Model 2 in Table 1, except that each excludes one of the four pledges. As discussed in the main text, excluding the police pledge means that the effect of “part fulfillment” on respondents’ evaluations becomes insignificant. This implies that respondents’ evaluations of the partly fulfilled hospitals pledge are not significantly more positive than their evaluations of the unfulfilled schools pledge. In addition, the effects of identification with an opposition party are insignificant if either the police pledge or the tax pledge is removed. The analyses reported in Table 3 also show that the effects of opposition party identification are particularly strong for these two pledges.

Table 5 reports analyses with interactions between information and performance, party identification and performance, and experience and performance. These models are the same as Model 1 in Table 3, but include interaction terms. There are no significant interactions between information and performance, or between party identification and performance. There is one significant interaction between experience and performance, which is also mentioned in the main text. The significant negative coefficient next to the interaction between “partly fulfilled” and “personal experience” implies the following: Respondents with experience of the issue are significantly less likely to say that a pledge

is at least partly fulfilled if it is in fact partly fulfilled, compared to respondents without experience. In other words, respondents with experience are more critical of performance than respondents without experience, even if the pledge is partly fulfilled.

Tables 6 and 7 report models with alternative measures of party identification and with controls for voting behavior in 2002. Table 6 uses a measure of party identification based solely on information from the 2002 survey, before respondents could have formed an opinion regarding the fulfillment of any of the pledges. As in the main analyses, governing party identification has a positive effect on respondents' evaluations of pledge fulfillment, even after controlling for the actual level of pledge fulfillment. Opposition party identification generally has a negative effect. These effects hold even if we control for voting behavior in 2002. Intriguingly, the effect of voting for one of the governing parties has a weak negative effect on respondents' evaluations of pledge fulfillment. Table 7 reports the same analyses with a measure of party identification using information from the 2004 survey only. The findings with respect to the party identification variables are substantively the same.

Finally, Table 8 re-examines Model 2 of Table 1 with the subset of respondents who answered all four pledge questions. It also includes controls for gender, age and education. Despite the lower number of observations, which affects the levels of significance of some of the coefficients, the results are substantively the same.

**Table 4. Factors affecting respondents' evaluation of pledge fulfillment: Robustness test excluding one of each of the four pledges**

	Model 1 Excluding police pledge (partly fulfilled)		Model 2 Excluding tax pledge (fully fulfilled)		Model 3 Excluding hospitals pledge (partly fulfilled)		Model 4 Excluding schools pledge (not fulfilled)	
	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not
<i>Actual performance</i>								
Partly fulfilled	-.08 (.08)	.05 (.31)	.92*** (.07)	1.96*** (.29)	2.08*** (.10)	3.33*** (.31)		
Fully fulfilled	2.24*** (.12)	4.81*** (.31)			2.24*** (.11)	4.81*** (.31)	1.35*** (.10)	2.88*** (.13)
("Not fulfilled" is the reference category) †								
Respondent's information resources	.16** (.06)	.20* (.11)	.12** (.05)	-.04 (.12)	.14** (.07)	.21** (.10)	.12** (.05)	.19** (.09)
<i>Respondent's party identification</i>								
Identifies with governing party	.69*** (.14)	1.21*** (.22)	.54*** (.12)	1.13*** (.22)	.49*** (.15)	1.15*** (.21)	.55*** (.12)	1.13*** (.19)
Identifies with Opposition party	-.26 (.17)	-.37 (.28)	-.15 (.13)	-.69 (.47)	-.36** (.16)	-.67*** (.25)	-.22* (.13)	-.50** (.24)
("No party i.d." is the reference category)								
Respondent's personal experience of the issue	-.21** (.10)	-.41** (.17)	-.59*** (.09)	-1.09*** (.25)	-.23** (.11)	-.36** (.17)	-.69*** (.09)	-.80*** (.15)
Constant	-1.34*** (.18)	-4.70*** (.49)	-1.14*** (.15)	-3.94*** (.49)	-1.25*** (.19)	-4.72*** (.44)	-.19 (.14)	-2.61*** (.27)
Wald chi2 (p-value)	690.67 (.00)		297.06 (.00)		789.24 (.00)		572.47 (.00)	
Log pseudolikelihood	-2238.27		-2518.01		-2411.41		-2752.56	
n	3,058		3,223		3,015		3,139	

Note: The dependent variable is the respondent's evaluation of the pledge as either "not", "partly" or "fully" fulfilled. "Not" fulfilled is the base outcome. Multinomial logit models. Beta coefficients with standard errors clustered by respondents in parentheses. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10. Model 1 has 1,143 respondents/clusters, Model 2 has 1,144, Model 3 has 1,130, and Model 4 has 1,144. † : In the fourth model, "excluding schools pledge" the reference category for the "fully fulfilled" coefficient consists of observations relating to the partly fulfilled pledges.

**Table 5. Factors affecting respondents' evaluation of pledge fulfillment: Interactions between actual performance and subjective factors**

	Model 1 Interactions with information	Model 2 Interactions with party ID	Model 3 Interactions with experience	Model 4 All two-way interactions
<i>Actual performance</i>				
Partly fulfilled	.96*** (.23)	.98*** (.08)	1.15*** (.08)	1.13*** (.24)
Fully fulfilled	2.28*** (.35)	2.65*** (.13)	2.66*** (.13)	2.35*** (.37)
("Not fulfilled" is the reference)				
Respondent's information resources	.10 (.09)	.12** (.05)	.13** (.05)	.10 (.09)
Partly fulfilled *information	.01 (.09)			.00 (.09)
Fully fulfilled *information	.14 (.13)			.14 (.13)
<i>Respondent's party identification</i>				
Identifies with governing party	.61*** (.11)	.56*** (.19)	.62*** (.11)	.59*** (.18)
Identifies with opposition party ("No party ID" is the reference category)	-.25* (.13)	-.21 (.23)	-.24* (.13)	-.20 (.22)
Partly fulfilled * governing party ID		.05 (.19)		.03 (.19)
Fully fulfilled * governing party ID		.23 (.35)		.14 (.35)
Partly fulfilled * opposition party ID		.03 (.21)		.03 (.21)
Fully fulfilled * opposition party ID		-.32 (.30)		-.36 (.30)
Respondent's personal experience of the issue	-.59*** (.08)	-.59*** (.08)	-.18 (.16)	-.19 (.16)
Partly fulfilled * personal experience			-.61*** (.18)	-.61*** (.18)
Fully fulfilled * personal experience			-.21 (.24)	-.19 (.25)
Constant	-1.04*** (.24)	-1.11*** (.15)	-1.23*** (.15)	-1.17*** (.24)
LR chi2 (p-value)	614.50 (.00)	607.32 (.00)	678.46 (.00)	661.49 (.00)
Log pseudolikelihood	-2482.05	-2481.56	-2476.88	-2474.98
n	4,145	4,145	4,145	4,145

Note: The dependent variable is the respondent's evaluation of the pledge fulfillment dichotomized: 0="not" fulfilled and 1="partly" or "fully" fulfilled. Logit models. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10. Standard errors clustered by 1,144 respondents.

**Table 6. Factors affecting respondents' evaluation of pledge fulfillment: Models with alternative measures of party identification with data from 2002 only and including vote choice in 2002**

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not
<i>Actual performance</i>				
Partly fulfilled	.96*** (.08)	2.00*** (.33)	.94*** (.09)	1.94*** (.33)
Fully fulfilled	2.42*** (.13)	4.97*** (.35)	2.39*** (.14)	4.83*** (.36)
("Not fulfilled" is the reference category)				
Respondent's information resources	.12** (.06)	.15 (.10)	.13** (.06)	.16 (.11)
<i>Respondent's party identification (2002 data only)</i>				
Identifies with governing party	.44*** (.13)	1.10*** (.21)	.42*** (.13)	1.13*** (.22)
Identifies with Opposition party	-.22 (.14)	-.62** (.25)	-.25* (.15)	-.66*** (.25)
("No party i.d." is the reference category)				
<i>Respondent's voting behavior in 2002 (opposition voters are the reference group)</i>				
Voted for a governing party			-.20** (.10)	-.29 (.18)
Respondent's personal experience of the issue	-.61*** (.09)	-.82*** (.16)	-.56*** (.10)	-.76*** (.17)
Constant	-1.16*** (.15)	-4.55*** (.49)	-1.09*** (.19)	-4.32*** (.50)
Wald chi2 (p-value)	637.94 (.00)		541.89 (.00)	
Log pseudolikelihood	-2671.61		-2321.44	
n	3,284		2,827	

Note: The dependent variable is the respondent's evaluation of the pledge as either "not", "partly" or "fully" fulfilled. "Not" fulfilled is the base outcome. Multinomial logit models. Beta coefficients with standard errors clustered by respondents in parentheses. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10. Model 1 has 903 respondents/clusters; Model 2 has 777 respondents/clusters.

**Table 7. Factors affecting respondents' evaluation of pledge fulfillment: Models with alternative measures of party identification with data from 2004 only and including vote choice in 2002**

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not
<i>Actual performance</i>				
Partly fulfilled	.99*** (.11)	1.98*** (.44)	.95*** (.11)	1.90*** (.44)
Fully fulfilled	2.61*** (.18)	5.20*** (.46)	2.51*** (.19)	4.99*** (.46)
("Not fulfilled" is the reference category)				
Respondent's information resources	.04 (.08)	-.03 (.16)	.03 (.09)	-.08 (.17)
<i>Respondent's party identification (2004 data only)</i>				
Identifies with governing party	.53*** (.15)	1.11*** (.27)	.50*** (.16)	1.11*** (.27)
Identifies with Opposition party (“No party i.d.” is the reference category)	-.30* (.17)	-1.11*** (.36)	-.27 (.19)	-1.28*** (.38)
<i>Respondent's voting behavior in 2002 (opposition voters are the reference group)</i>				
Voted for a governing party			-.03 (.12)	-.37 (.24)
Respondent's personal experience of the issue	-.65*** (.12)	-.75*** (.22)	-.55*** (.13)	-.71*** (.22)
Constant	-1.00*** (.23)	-4.17*** (.68)	-.99*** (.26)	-3.79*** (.70)
Wald chi2 (p-value)	415.29 (.00)		366.64 (.00)	
Log pseudolikelihood	-1528.04		-1358.95	
n	1,917		1,688	

Note: The dependent variable is the respondent's evaluation of the pledge as either "not", "partly" or "fully" fulfilled. "Not" fulfilled is the base outcome. Multinomial logit model. Beta coefficients with standard errors clustered by respondents in parentheses. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10. Model 1 has 526 respondents/clusters; Model 2 has 463 respondents/clusters.

**Table 8. Factors affecting respondents' evaluation of pledge fulfillment: Model with respondents who answered all four questions and with controls for demographic characteristics**

	Partly vs. not	Fully vs. not
<i>Actual performance</i>		
Partly fulfilled	.97*** (.08)	2.05*** (.34)
Fully fulfilled	2.49*** (.14)	5.09*** (.37)
("Not fulfilled" is the reference category)		
Respondent's information resources	.15** (.07)	.18 (.12)
<i>Respondent's party identification (2004 data only)</i>		
Identifies with governing party	.46*** (.14)	1.14*** (.24)
Identifies with Opposition party	-.22 (.16)	-.44 (.28)
("No party i.d." is the reference category)		
Respondent's personal experience of the issue	-.63*** (.10)	-1.04*** (.19)
<i>Demographics</i>		
Gender (1=female)	-.08 (.10)	-.26 (.18)
Age	.00 (.00)	.01 (.01)
Education	-.03 (.04)	-.09 (.07)
Constant	-1.20*** (.32)	-4.48*** (.68)
Wald chi2 (p-value)	589.66 (.00)	
Log pseudolikelihood	-2275.68	
n	2,821	

Note: The dependent variable is the respondent's evaluation of the pledge as either "not", "partly" or "fully" fulfilled. "Not" fulfilled is the base outcome. Multinomial logit model. Beta coefficients with standard errors clustered by 729 respondents in parentheses. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10.

The following questions from the Irish National Election Survey were used to construct the variables used in the analyses. The question codes from the Irish National Election Survey dataset are referred to in parentheses.

*Respondents' evaluations of pledge fulfillment (the dependent variable)*

From the 2007 survey:

“Before the 2002 General Election, the following promises were made by one or both of the parties who afterwards formed the government. For each of these, do you think the promise was fully met, partially met, or not met at all?

1. A Promise to increase the numbers of Gardai [police officers] by 2,000
2. A promise to take those on the minimum wage out of the income tax net
3. A promise to end waiting lists in our hospitals
4. A promise to ensure that the average size of classes for children under 9 is less than 20”

(v0885\_07, v0886\_07, v0887\_07, v0888\_07)

*Respondents' information resources*

From the 2007 survey:

“Which Government Department received the most money in last year’s budget?”

Answer categories: “Health”, “Social Welfare”, “Foreign Affairs” or “Transport”

(v0895\_07)

“Who was the Minister for Finance when the last Dail was dissolved?”



Answer categories: “Charlie McCreevy”, “Michael McDowell”, “Brian Cowen”, or “Martin Cullen”. (v0896\_07)

“What was the approximate rate of consumer price inflation in Ireland at the end of 2006?”

Answer categories: “2%”, “5%”, “15%” or “20%” (v0897\_07)

“What was the approximate percentage of women in the last Dail?”

Answer categories: “13%”, “21%”, “32%” or “40%” (v0899\_07)

### *Respondents’ party identification*

From the 2002, 2004 and 2007 surveys:

“Do you usually think of yourself as close to any political party?”

Answer categories: “Yes”, “No” or “Don’t know” (v0680\_02, v0680\_04, v0680\_07).

Respondents who answered “no” or “don’t know” were coded as non-identifiers. If “yes” then the following question was asked:

“Which party is that?” (v0681\_02, v0681\_04, v0681\_07).

The first party mentioned was coded as the party with which the respondent identified.

### *Respondents’ trust in parties*

From the 2002 survey:

“Q46. How much do you personally trust religious leaders? People who do not trust them at all would give a score of ‘0’. People who trust them a lot would give a score of ‘10’.

Other people would place themselves somewhere in between these two views. Where would you place yourself on this scale?”

Put a tick (✓) in one box on each line.

Do not trust at all											Trust a lot
Religious leaders	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

And how much do you trust the political parties?

Do not trust at all											Trust a lot
The political parties	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

(v0320\_02)

*Respondents' personal experience of the issue*

From the 2007 survey in relation to the pledge on police numbers:

“During the last 12 months, did you or a family member seek assistance from the authorities over a crime committed in your home, in your neighbourhood, or at work?”

(v0778\_07)

From the 2007 survey in relation to the pledge on taxation of low incomes:

“I would like to ask about the approximate level of net household income? This means the total income, after tax, PRSI and other statutory deductions, of all members of the household. It includes all types of income: income from employment, social welfare payments, child benefit, rents, interest, pensions etc. We would just like to know into which of four broad groups the total income of your household falls. I'd like to assure you once again that all information you give me is entirely confidential.”

Answer categories: “Under Euro 240 per week/ Euro 1050 per month”, “Euro 241-450 per week/ Euro 1051-2000 per month”, “Euro 451-700 per week/ Euro 2001-3000 per month”, “Euro 701-1000 per week/ Euro 3000-4330 per month” or “Euro 1000 or more/ Euro 4331 or more per month” (v0984\_07)

From the 2007 survey in relation to the pledge on hospital waiting times:

“During the last 12 months, did you or a family member go on a waiting list for or receive hospital treatment?” (v0740\_07)

From the 2007 survey in relation to the pledge on school classroom sizes for children under nine:

“Could you tell me (a) how many persons living in the household are aged less than 14 years; (b) 14 to less than 18 years; (c) 18 years of more.

(a) Less than 14 years \_\_\_\_\_” (v0990\_07)