Online Appendix – «Why Do Citizens Vote Against Their Basic Political Values?»

Article published in the Swiss Political Science Review

Author: Lukas Lauener

Selection of Vote Proposals for Pooled Data Set

Table A1 presents an overview of the 27 vote proposals that constitute the pooled data set and reports the correlations between vote decisions and attitudes along the corresponding value dimension. Three proposals figure twice in the table because they yield high correlation values for two value dimensions[1]. Observations for these proposals are doubled in the data set resulting in independent observations of value consistency in vote decisions for both value dimensions separately.

Table A1: Vote Proposals Chosen for the Pooled Data Set

Value dimension	Date of vote	Proposal	Type of proposal	Yes votes	Proposal in VOX	Correlation coefficient
Strong army vs. no army	06.06.1993	«40 military training areas are enough – environmental protection in the military, too»	Popular initiative	44.7%	491	-0.80***
	06.06.1993	«For a Switzerland without new fighter jets»	Popular initiative	42.8%	492	-0.81***
	26.11.2000	«Save on the military and total defence – for more peace and future-oriented jobs (redistribution initiative)»	Popular initiative	37.6%	723	-0.86***
	02.12.2001	«For a credible security policy and a Switzerland without army»	Popular initiative	21.9%	753	-0.76***
	22.09.2013	«Yes to the abolition of the compulsory military service»	Popular initiative	26.8%	1121	-0.74***
High vs. no income disparities	28.11.2010	«For fair taxes. Stop the abuse in the tax competition (tax fairness initiative)»	Popular initiative	41.5%	1043	-0.33***
	24.11.2013	«1:12 – For fair wages»	Popular initiative	34.7%	1131	-0.46***
	18.05.2014	«For the protection of fair wages (minimum wage initiative)»	Popular initiative	23.7%	1153	-0.42***
	30.11.2014	«End of tax privileges for millionaires (abolition of flat-rate taxation)»	Popular initiative	40.8%	1171	-0.36***
	14.06.2015	«Levy a tax on the inheritance of millions for our OASI (inheritance tax reform)»	Popular initiative	29.0%	1193	-0.35***

[1] These are the following proposals: «Federal resolution regarding the regular naturalisation and the facilitated naturalisation of young foreigners of the second generation», «For fair taxes. Stop the abuse in the tax competition (tax fairness initiative)» and «1:12 – For fair wages».

Equal opportunities for foreigners and Swiss citizens	12.06.1994	Federal resolution regarding the revision of the citizenship regulation in the constitution (facilitated naturalisation for young foreigners)	Mandatory referendum	52.8%	533	0.66***
	25.09.1994	Change in the Swiss Criminal Code / Military Criminal Code – prohibition of racial discrimination	Optional referendum	54.6%	542	0.59***
	26.09.2004	Federal resolution regarding the regular naturalisation and the facilitated naturalisation of young foreigners of the second generation	Mandatory referendum	43.2%	851	0.65***
	26.09.2004	Federal resolution regarding the acquisition of citizenship for foreigners of the third generation	Mandatory referendum	48.4%	852	0.57***
	09.02.2014	«Against mass immigration»	Popular initiative	50.3%	1143	-0.57***
Importance of environment vs. economy	07.06.1998	«For a protection of life and environment from genetic engineering (gene protection initiative)»	Popular initiative	33.3%	631	0.50***
	24.09.2000	«For a solar centime (solar initiative)»	Popular initiative	31.3%	711	0.39***
	18.05.2003	«For a car-free Sunday per season – an experiment for four years (Sunday initiative)»	Popular initiative	37.6%	813	0.42***
	30.11.2008	«Right of appeal for associations: End of hindrance politics – more growth for Switzerland!»	Popular initiative	34.0%	972	-0.38***
	28.02.2016	Federal law on the transit traffic on roads in the alpine region (restoration of the Gotthard tunnel)	Optional referendum	57.0%	1204	-0.44***
Free market vs. regulation	24.02.2008	Federal law on the improvement of the fiscal framework for entrepreneurial activities and investments (law on the reform of business tax II)	Optional referendum	50.5%	952	-0.50***
	28.11.2010	«For fair taxes. Stop the abuse in the tax competition (tax fairness initiative)»	Popular initiative	41.5%	1043	0.40***
	11.03.2012	Federal law on the price-fixing for books	Optional referendum	43.9%	1065	0.38***
	24.11.2013	«1:12 – For fair wages»	Popular initiative	34.7%	1131	0.51***
	28.09.2014	«For a public health insurance»	Popular initiative	38.2%	1162	0.38***

Open vs. isolated Switzerland	21.05.2000	Federal resolution on the approval of the sectoral treaties between the Swiss Confederation and the European Community	Optional referendum	67.2%	701	0.98***
	03.03.2002	«For the accession of Switzerland to the UNO»	Popular initiative	54.6%	761	0.97***
	26.09.2004	Federal resolution regarding the regular naturalisation and the facilitated naturalisation of young foreigners of the second generation	Mandatory referendum	43.2%	851	0.87***
	05.06.2005	Federal resolution on the approval and implementation of the bilateral treaties between CH and the EU on the association to Schengen and Dublin	Optional referendum	54.6%	871	0.92***
	25.09.2005	Federal resolution on the approval and implementation of the protocol on the expansion of the agreement on the free movement of persons between CH and the EU and on the approval of the revision of the compensatory measures regarding the free movement of persons	Optional referendum	56.0%	881	0.96***

Notes: The last column shows the Point-Biserial Correlation Coefficient. Levels of statistical significance: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05

Ambivalence Index

Typically, three or four arguments of both political camps, supporters and opponents of the proposal, are presented in the VOX surveys. Respondents express their approval of each argument on a scale from 0 to 3. I created an index of approval ranging from 0 to 1 for all arguments supporting the proposal. In doing so, each voter is assigned her personal rate of approving the arguments in favour of the proposal. Value 0 represents complete disagreement with them, whereas 1 stands for full agreement. The same procedure is applied to the counterarguments, creating an index of approval for them as well. Subtracting the absolute difference between both approval indexes from 1 results in a third index, namely the ambivalence index. It also ranges from 0 to 1 and reveals the degree of ambivalence towards the proposal for each individual in the data set. Table A2 contains four examples of how the two indexes of approval are computed and how they translate into the ambivalence index.

Table A2: Operationalisation of the Independent Variable «Ambivalence»

Description of voter	Approval points (arguments in favour)	Index of approval (arguments in favour)	Approval points (arguments against)	Index of approval (arguments against)	Absolute difference between indexes	Ambivalence index
1) Supports arguments of both sides to exact same degree (highly ambivalent)	10/12	0.83	10/12	0.83	0	1
2) Supports arguments of both sides to similar degrees (ambivalent)	8/12	0.67	10/12	0.83	0.16	0.84
3) Supports arguments of both sides to different degrees (somewhat ambivalent)	4/12	0.33	11/12	0.92	0.59	0.41
4) Supports clearly one side and objects to the other side (univalent)	0/12	0	12/12	1	1	0

For example, people are asked about their opinions on four arguments in favour of and four arguments against the proposal. Depending on their degree of approval, respondents can gain up to 12 points (3 points for each argument question) for the pro arguments. The same holds true for the contra arguments. These sums are then translated into approval indexes. The value of the ambivalence index is obtained when subtracting the absolute difference between the two approval indexes from 1. This procedure classifies respondents who support counterarguments but also arguments in favour of a specific proposal equally strongly (or weakly) as highly ambivalent voters. In this case, the difference between the two approval indexes amounts to a very small number. It can even be 0, when respondents support arguments from both sides to the exact same degree. In contrast, univalent people clearly support only one political camp. For instance, they strongly support all arguments in favour of a proposal and, simultaneously, strongly object to all counterarguments, or vice versa. In this case, the difference between the two approval indexes is rather large. It reaches the maximum of 1 for people who support counterarguments to the exact same degree as they object to arguments in favour of the proposal.

Value Consistent Vote Decision

In the following, I illustrate the computation of the dependent variable *value consistent vote decision*. The proposal which serves as an example is the popular initiative «Against mass immigration» which was put to the vote on 9 February 2014. This initiative is part of the sample of proposals in this study and strongly correlates with the value dimension «Equal opportunities for foreigners and Swiss citizens» (cf. Table A1).

Table A3 contains value characteristics of the indicator *value consistent vote decision* for four different people.

Table A3: Operationalisation of the Dependent Variable «Value Consistent Vote Decision» for the Mass-Immigration Initiative

Person	Description	Vote decision («Against mass immigration»)	Attitude towards «Equal opportunities for foreigners and Swiss citizens»	Value consistent vote decision
1	Supporter (consistent)	1 (=yes)	5 (=is for better chances for the Swiss)	1 (=yes)
2	Supporter (inconsistent)	1 (=yes)	1 (=is strongly for equal opportunities)	0 (=no)
3	Opponent (consistent)	0 (=no)	2 (=is for equal opportunities)	1 (=yes)
4	Opponent (inconsistent)	0 (=no)	6 (=is strongly for better chances for the Swiss)	0 (=no)

The surveyed person has either accepted (=1) or rejected (=0) the mass-immigration initiative. As identified through correlation analysis, the relevant value dimension for this proposal is the VOX question whether respondents agree to the statement that foreigners should have equal opportunities as Swiss citizens[2]. Answers to this statement are registered on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 6. A value of 1 specifies full agreement to equal opportunities for Swiss citizens and foreigners alike, whereas a value of 6 means strong support for the idea that Swiss citizens should have better chances than foreigners. Individual placements on this value dimension are found in the fourth column of Table A3. Respondents with the values 1 and 2 (strongly) agree to the political statement of equal opportunities and should, at least theoretically, vote against the initiative. On the other hand, respondents with the values 5 and 6 (strongly) wish that Swiss citizens have better chances than people holding a foreign passport. They should therefore rather cast a «yes» vote. Respondents who place themselves in the middle categories 3 and 4 have a rather vague attitude towards this political question. Therefore, they are excluded from the analysis as well as those respondents who refuse to reveal their stance on the political question or simply say «I don't know».

Camp Dominance Index

In order to estimate the dominance of one political camp over the other one, the number of newspaper advertisements of the more powerful camp, that is the camp which had more ads during the campaign, is put into proportion to the number of

[2] The exact wording of the question is: «Would you like a Switzerland with equal opportunities for foreigners, or a Switzerland with better chances for Swiss citizens?»

advertisements of the weaker camp. The variable *camp dominance* is then calculated by subtracting the obtained ration between both camps from 1. This results in an index with values ranging from 0 (=both camps were evenly represented during the campaign) to 1 (=one political camp completely dominated the other one). Arithmetical examples of how the dominance index is computed are presented in Table A4.

Table A4: Hypothetical Examples Illustrating the Operationalisation of «Camp Dominance»

Total number of newspaper advertisements	«Yes» camp	«No» camp	Weaker camp divided by more powerful one	Camp dominance index
100	50	50	1	0
200	125	75	0.6	0.4
350	70	280	0.25	0.75
50	50	0	0	1

More precisely, in all situations where only one political camp used newspaper advertisements during the vote campaign and the other one not, the value 1 was attributed to the variable «camp dominance». Had both political camps put the exact same amount of newspaper advertisements, the dominance index would yield a value of 0. In the sample of proposals analysed for this paper, this case did however not occur. The lowest value for campaign dominance (0.1) was found for the campaign on the optional referendum on the Gotthard tunnel which was put to the vote on 28 February 2016. In this campaign, the supporters published 592 advertisements and the opponents 530.

Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient and Random Effects of Varying Intercepts

The intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) estimates how much variance in the dependent variable *value consistent vote decision* is explained by the multilevel structure of the data[3]. Ultimately, the ICC serves as an indicator of how helpful proposals are as a level-2 group that clusters respondents. Around 3 to 11% of the total variation in outcomes for value consistent voting can be explained by differences between proposals. In contrast, 89 to 97% of the total variation stems from differences between respondents within the proposals. To a certain extent, proposals hence form

[3] The intra-class correlation coefficient for multilevel logistic models is calculated using the following approximation:

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_v^2}{\hat{\sigma}_v^2 + (\pi^2/3)}$$

The estimated variance of the level-2 residuals ($\hat{\sigma}_v^2$) is divided by the total variance ($\hat{\sigma}_v^2$ + the variance of the logistic distribution for level-1 residuals ($\pi^2/3$).

clusters of voters whose behaviour is more similar within the cluster than it is across them.