

Supplementary information and analyses for “Do voters reward rebellion? The electoral accountability of MPs in Britain”

This memo reports the supplementary information and statistical analyses that are described in the paper “Do voters reward rebellion? The electoral accountability of MPs in Britain”. The supplementary information is provided in Table A.1, which presents summary statistics for the main variables used in the statistical analyses.

The supplementary statistical analyses are all modifications of the model specification reported in Table 1 of the main paper. As noted in the main paper, the findings are robust to all these modifications. Specifically, the coefficient estimates for MP rebellion, respondent Blair evaluation and their interaction all maintain the same sign and significance levels, and are broadly similar in terms of magnitude. Table A.5 presents the full results of the models used for Figure 4 in the main paper. Finally, the last two tables present the variables, their coding and source (including BES question number).

Logarithmic transformation of the dependent variable

Because the measure of Labour MP rebelliousness used in the models presented in the main paper has a right-skewed distribution, in Model A.1 we instead estimate the effect of the logarithm of this variable. Because there are a small number of observations with zero rebelliousness we add a small constant, 0.1, to our measure of rebelliousness before computing the logarithmic transformation. The results are presented in Table A.2, Model A.1.

Exclusion of free votes in the House of Commons

In Model A.2 we check that results are robust to using a measure of MP rebelliousness that excludes free votes in the House of Commons. These are votes where the party does not give any formal

recommendation regarding voting behaviour, though there may nevertheless be informal pressure on MPs from the party leadership. To ensure that our results are not driven by the more qualified rebellion that occurs on free votes, we estimate a model excluding these votes.

Left-right self-placement of voters

In Model A.3 we use only left-right self-placement instead of spatial proximities to the main parties, to ensure that our results in the main paper are not driven by the dropping of a number of respondents who have missing observations on spatial proximity variables; spatial proximity variables have a relatively large number of missing observations compared to other controls in our models.

Conservative party or other party as main challenger in constituency

The Conservatives party was the main opposition party in the 2001-2005 Parliament. Unlike the Liberal Democrats and the Scottish and Welsh nationalists, they were also clearly positioned to the right of the Labour party. In Labour-held constituencies where the Conservatives are the main challenger, incentives to keep supporting a Labour MP may differ to constituencies where the main alternative is from the Liberal Democrats or one of the regionalist parties. We therefore estimate the model separately for constituencies where the Conservatives or one of the other parties is the main challenger (Table A.3, Models A.4 and A.5). Note that we have to drop some controls in these two models because of the smaller subsample sizes. There are no substantial differences in the results once Conservative (Model A.4) and non-Conservative (Model A.5) marginal seats are analysed separately.

Non-voting included

Constituents who are dissatisfied with the Labour Party leadership and therefore wish to withhold their vote from their local Labour MP may abstain from casting a vote altogether rather than cast a

vote for a rival candidate. We therefore also ran a model that included self-declared non-voting BES respondents and included a series of controls for propensity to turn out (Model A.6); the dependent variable here was the probability of voting Labour (1) versus voting for another party *and* not voting at all (0). Most turnout variables are additive indices of agreement with statements. Each question is a five-point Likert-scale, with answers coded as 0 to 4, with don't knows coded as the middle value together with 'neither agree nor disagree'. The answers to questions concerning the same topic are coded so the scoring is consistent and then summed to form an index. 'Individual benefits' is measured as the extent to which a voter agrees with three statements: 'Being active in politics is a good way to get benefits for me and my family'; 'I feel a sense of satisfaction when I vote'; and 'I would feel very guilty if I didn't vote in a general election'. 'Perceived costs' statements: 'It takes too much time and effort to be active in politics and public affairs'; and 'People are so busy that they don't have time to vote'. 'Social norms' statements: 'Most of my family around here usually vote in general elections'; and 'Most people around here usually vote in general elections'. 'Group benefits' statements: 'Being active in politics is a good way to get benefits for groups that people care about like pensioners or the disabled'; and 'When people like me vote, they can really change the way Britain is governed'. 'Civic duty' statements: 'It is every citizen's duty to vote in an election'; and 'I would be seriously neglecting my duty as a citizen if I didn't vote'. Relative deprivation statements: 'The government generally treats people like me fairly'; and 'There is often a big gap between what people like me expect out of life and what we actually get'. 'Trust' is measured on a 0-10 scale as the extent people can be trusted. 'Political efficacy' is measured as the respondent's perceived influence on politics and public affairs. 'Contacted by any party' is coded as 1 if the respondent says he or she was contacted in the past year by a political party. All turnout variables are from the pre-election survey.

Validity checks

The detailed results for the two validity checks reported in the main paper are presented in Table A.4. Model A.7 modifies Model 3 in the main paper by interacting MP rebelliousness with the difference in Labour and Blair evaluations instead of with Blair evaluation directly. Model A.8 modifies the main paper's Model 3 in the same way. Model A.9 adds a three-way interaction to Model 3, letting the impact of MP rebelliousness and Blair evaluation vary by the respondent's self-declared level of political attention.

Iraq rebellion

As referenced in the main paper, Table A.5 presents the full results of four hierarchical binary logistic regression models, two for each measure of voter opinion on the war. For each such measure, we present the model with and without the full range of controls, which are identical to those used in the previous section. The sole difference concerns campaign spending. In Models A.10 to A.13, this variable is measured as the difference between Labour spending and the spending of the main anti-Iraq war challenger (Liberal Democrats, Plaid Cymru or the SNP) in the percentage of the legal maximum. In all four models, the constituent term for respondent disagreement with the invasion has a large negative coefficient, indicating a strong negative effect of Iraq disapproval on the probability of voting Labour. This means that there is evidence that this issue had an important impact on voting decisions among Labour constituents in 2005. However, neither the coefficient on MP Iraq rebellion nor the interaction between MP Iraq rebellion and respondent Iraq disapproval is statistically significant. Figure 4 in the main paper provides a fuller interpretation of the interaction.

Table A.1 Summary statistics of main variables

| Continuous variables | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|---|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Blair evaluation | 0.76 | 3.29 | -5.00 | 5.00 |
| Rebelliousness | 1.40 | 1.84 | 0.00 | 13.88 |
| Difference in Labour and Blair evaluation | -0.32 | 1.80 | -8.00 | 9.00 |
| <i>Issue proximities</i> | | | | |
| Labour | -2.46 | 2.46 | -10.00 | 0.00 |
| Liberal Democrat | -2.32 | 2.23 | -10.00 | 0.00 |
| Conservatives | -3.29 | 2.75 | -10.00 | 0.00 |
| Age | 47.05 | 13.81 | 19.00 | 83.00 |
| Income | 6.10 | 3.14 | 1.00 | 13.00 |
| Spending gap to main challenger | 11.48 | 24.15 | -45.29 | 84.10 |
| Majority size | 0.25 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.69 |
| Years as MP (logged) | 2.15 | 0.56 | 0.69 | 3.69 |
| Binary variables | 1 | 0 | | |
| Labour vote | 0.44 | 0.56 | | |
| Iraq disapproval | 0.67 | 0.33 | | |
| Angry and disgusted with Iraq | 0.28 | 0.72 | | |
| Iraq rebel | 0.34 | 0.66 | | |
| <i>Party best on most important issue</i> | | | | |
| Labour | 0.27 | 0.73 | | |
| Liberal Democrat | 0.11 | 0.89 | | |
| Conservatives | 0.24 | 0.76 | | |
| Other party | 0.09 | 0.91 | | |
| <i>Party identification</i> | | | | |
| Labour | 0.42 | 0.58 | | |
| Liberal Democrat | 0.10 | 0.90 | | |
| Conservatives | 0.19 | 0.81 | | |
| Other party | 0.07 | 0.93 | | |
| Evaluation of MP care | 0.40 | 0.60 | | |
| Ex-minister | 0.16 | 0.84 | | |
| Main challenger from Left | 0.18 | 0.82 | | |
| Gender | 0.40 | 0.60 | | |
| Ethnicity | 0.06 | 0.94 | | |
| Manual worker | 0.21 | 0.79 | | |

Data from British Election Study internet survey 2005.

Table A.2. Robustness checks (1)

| | Model A.1 | | Model A.2 | | Model A.3 | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | Log (rebelliousness) | | Rebellions on | | Left-right self- | |
| | b | se | b | se | placement only | se |
| Blair evaluation | -0.32*** | 0.03 | -0.34*** | 0.03 | -0.38*** | 0.03 |
| Rebelliousness | | | | | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| Blair eval x rebelliousness | | | | | 0.03* | 0.01 |
| Rebelliousness (logged) | 0.21** | 0.10 | | | | |
| Blair eval x rebel. (logged) | 0.06* | 0.04 | | | | |
| Rebelliousness (whipped votes) | | | 0.06 | 0.05 | | |
| Blair eval x rebel. (whipped votes) | | | 0.04** | 0.02 | | |
| <i>Party identification</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | 1.53*** | 0.19 | 1.53*** | 0.19 | 1.72*** | 0.18 |
| Liberal Democrat | -0.63** | 0.30 | -0.66** | 0.29 | -0.65** | 0.27 |
| Conservatives | -1.15*** | 0.35 | -1.15*** | 0.35 | -1.19*** | 0.31 |
| Other party | -0.46 | 0.36 | -0.43 | 0.35 | -0.42 | 0.31 |
| <i>Issue proximities, tax-spend</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | 0.24*** | 0.05 | 0.24*** | 0.05 | | |
| Liberal Democrat | -0.11** | 0.05 | -0.12** | 0.05 | | |
| Conservatives | -0.15*** | 0.03 | -0.15*** | 0.03 | | |
| Left-right self-placement | | | | | 0.09** | 0.04 |
| <i>Party best on most important issue</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | 0.83*** | 0.22 | 0.84*** | 0.22 | 0.95*** | 0.21 |
| Liberal Democrat | -0.97*** | 0.28 | -1.00*** | 0.28 | -0.88*** | 0.26 |
| Conservatives | -0.80*** | 0.28 | -0.82*** | 0.28 | -1.02*** | 0.25 |
| Other party | -0.10 | 0.28 | -0.10 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| Age | -0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.01 |
| Gender | 0.61*** | 0.17 | 0.61*** | 0.17 | 0.53*** | 0.15 |
| Ethnicity | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.30 |
| Manual worker | 0.72*** | 0.20 | 0.70*** | 0.20 | 0.67*** | 0.18 |
| Income | -0.06** | 0.03 | -0.06** | 0.03 | -0.05* | 0.03 |
| Evaluation of MP care | 0.87*** | 0.17 | 0.87*** | 0.17 | 0.79*** | 0.15 |
| Spending gap to main challenger | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Majority size | -0.56 | 0.69 | -0.72 | 0.69 | -0.75 | 0.64 |
| Ex-minister | -0.19 | 0.24 | -0.19 | 0.24 | -0.16 | 0.22 |
| Years as MP (logged) | -0.06 | 0.16 | -0.05 | 0.16 | -0.07 | 0.15 |
| Main challenger from Left | -0.42* | 0.22 | -0.44* | 0.22 | -0.38* | 0.20 |
| Constant | -0.46 | 0.53 | -0.44 | 0.54 | -0.86 | 0.51 |
| σ_1 | 0.32 | | 0.33 | | 0.35 | |
| AIC | 1149 | | 1152.6 | | 1361 | |
| Deviance | 1095 | | 1098.6 | | 1311 | |
| no. of individuals | 1734 | | 1746 | | 2029 | |
| no. of groups | 331 | | 333 | | 333 | |

Data from British Election Study internet survey 2005. ***: $p < 0.01$; **: $p > 0.05$; *: $p < 0.1$.

Table A.3. Robustness checks (2)

| | Model A.4 | | Model A.5 | | Model A.6 | |
|---|------------------|------|------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| | Conservative | | Non-Conservative | | Non-voters included | |
| | challengers only | | challengers only | | | |
| | b | se | b | se | b | se |
| Blair evaluation | -0.39*** | 0.04 | -0.50*** | 0.09 | -0.36*** | 0.04 |
| Rebelliousness | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| Blair eval x rebelliousness | 0.03** | 0.02 | 0.07** | 0.03 | 0.03** | 0.02 |
| <i>Party identification</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | | | 1.53*** | 0.20 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | | | -0.65** | 0.30 |
| Conservatives | | | | | -1.09*** | 0.35 |
| Other party | | | | | -0.48 | 0.37 |
| <i>Issue proximities, tax-spend</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | 0.25*** | 0.05 | 0.45*** | 0.13 | 0.24*** | 0.05 |
| Liberal Democrat | -0.07 | 0.05 | -0.26* | 0.14 | -0.12** | 0.05 |
| Conservatives | -0.28*** | 0.04 | -0.07 | 0.07 | -0.16*** | 0.03 |
| <i>Party best on most important issue</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | 1.27*** | 0.24 | 1.07** | 0.48 | 0.78*** | 0.23 |
| Liberal Democrat | -1.54*** | 0.28 | -1.49** | 0.70 | -0.91*** | 0.28 |
| Conservatives | -1.38*** | 0.27 | -1.62* | 0.84 | -0.83*** | 0.29 |
| Other party | -0.67 | 0.28 | -0.22 | 0.55 | -0.11 | 0.28 |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Gender | 0.43** | 0.17 | 0.98** | 0.40 | 0.61*** | 0.17 |
| Ethnicity | -0.17 | 0.35 | 1.41** | 0.65 | 0.28 | 0.33 |
| Manual worker | 0.77*** | 0.21 | 0.71 | 0.47 | 0.67*** | 0.21 |
| Income | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.11* | 0.07 | -0.05* | 0.03 |
| Evaluation of MP care | 0.92*** | 0.17 | 1.18** | 0.43 | 0.85*** | 0.17 |
| Spending gap to main challenger | 0.01** | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Majority size | -1.58** | 0.78 | 3.45** | 1.38 | -0.42 | 0.70 |
| Ex-minister | -0.06 | 0.26 | -0.60 | 0.44 | -0.15 | 0.23 |
| Years as MP (logged) | 0.25 | 0.19 | -0.21 | 0.30 | -0.07 | 0.17 |
| Main challenger from Left | | | | | -0.40* | 0.22 |
| Turnout variables | no | | no | | yes | |
| Constant | -0.97 | 0.58 | -0.85 | 1.06 | 0.06 | 0.66 |
| σ_1 | 0.33 | | 0.00 | | 0.23 | |
| AIC | 1025.7 | | 256.7 | | 1127.6 | |
| Deviance | 981.7 | | 212.7 | | 1055.6 | |
| no. of individuals | 1415 | | 319 | | 1694 | |
| no. of groups | 264 | | 67 | | 331 | |

Data from British Election Study internet survey 2005. ***: $p < 0.01$; **: $p > 0.05$; *: $p < 0.1$.

Table A.4. Validity checks

| | Model A.7 | | Model A.8 | | Model A.9 | |
|---|--|------|---|------|--|------|
| | Difference Labour and Blair evaluation | | Difference Labour and Blair, full model | | Interaction with attention to politics | |
| | b | se | b | se | b | se |
| Blair evaluation | -0.80*** | 0.03 | -0.45*** | 0.04 | -0.23* | 0.14 |
| Rebelliousness | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.08* | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.15 |
| Blair eval x rebelliousness | | | | | -0.01 | 0.06 |
| Difference, Labour and Blair eval | 0.60*** | 0.04 | 0.21*** | 0.06 | | |
| Diff in eval x rebelliousness | 0.04** | 0.02 | 0.05* | 0.03 | | |
| Attention to politics | | | | | -0.13 | 0.05 |
| Blair eval x attention | | | | | -0.02 | 0.02 |
| Rebelliousness x attention | | | | | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Blair eval x rebel x attention | | | | | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| <i>Party identification</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 1.27*** | 0.20 | 1.59*** | 0.20 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -0.66** | 0.30 | -0.60** | 0.30 |
| Conservatives | | | -0.98* | 0.36 | -1.09*** | 0.36 |
| Other party | | | -0.44 | 0.36 | -0.35 | 0.36 |
| <i>Issue proximities, tax-spend</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 0.20*** | 0.05 | 0.25*** | 0.05 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -0.11** | 0.05 | -0.12** | 0.05 |
| Conservatives | | | -0.11*** | 0.04 | -0.18*** | 0.04 |
| Left-right self-placement | | | | | | |
| <i>Party best on most important issue</i> | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 0.67*** | 0.23 | 0.92*** | 0.23 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -0.98*** | 0.28 | -0.91*** | 0.28 |
| Conservatives | | | -0.82*** | 0.29 | -0.70*** | 0.29 |
| Other party | | | -0.07 | 0.28 | -0.07 | 0.28 |
| Age | | | -0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.01 |
| Gender | | | 0.64*** | 0.17 | 0.46** | 0.18 |
| Ethnicity | | | 0.04 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| Manual worker | | | 0.63*** | 0.20 | 0.64*** | 0.20 |
| Income | | | -0.06** | 0.03 | -0.05* | 0.03 |
| Evaluation of MP care | | | 0.75*** | 0.17 | 0.91*** | 0.17 |
| Spending gap to main challenger | | | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Majority size | | | -0.79 | 0.71 | -0.76 | 0.70 |
| Ex-minister | | | -0.21 | 0.24 | -0.19 | 0.24 |
| Years as MP (logged) | | | -0.08 | 0.17 | -0.06 | 0.17 |
| Main challenger from Left | | | -0.42* | 0.23 | -0.41* | 0.23 |
| Constant | 0.27*** | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.26 | 0.62 |
| σ_1 | 0.39 | | 0.34 | | 0.36 | |
| AIC | 2049.7 | | 1126.6 | | 1144 | |
| Deviance | 2037.7 | | 1070.6 | | 1082 | |
| no. of individuals | 2625 | | 1733 | | 1732 | |
| no. of groups | 333 | | 331 | | 331 | |

Data from British Election Study internet survey 2005. ***: $p < 0.01$; **: $p > 0.05$; *: $p < 0.1$

Table A.5. Specific policy accountability on the Iraq War, full results

| | Model A.10 | | Model A.11 | | Model A.12 | | Model A.13 | |
|---|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| | Iraq disapproval | | Iraq disapproval | | Angry and disgusted with Iraq | | Angry and disgusted with Iraq | |
| | Simple model | Full model | Simple model | Full model | Simple model | Full model | Simple model | Full model |
| | b | se | b | se | b | se | b | se |
| Iraq disapproval | -1.19*** | 0.11 | -1.10*** | 0.22 | | | | |
| Angry and disgusted with Iraq | | | | | -1.13*** | 0.12 | -0.93*** | 0.22 |
| Iraq rebel | -0.01 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.20 |
| Disapproval x rebel | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.37 | | | | |
| Angry and disgusted x rebel | | | | | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.36 |
| <i>Party identification</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 1.74*** | 0.19 | | | 1.76*** | 0.18 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -0.57* | 0.29 | | | -0.51* | 0.28 |
| Conservatives | | | -1.16*** | 0.35 | | | -1.25*** | 0.34 |
| Other party | | | -0.62* | 0.35 | | | -0.53 | 0.34 |
| <i>Issue proximities, tax-spend</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 0.30*** | 0.05 | | | 0.31*** | 0.05 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -0.06 | 0.05 | | | -0.11** | 0.05 |
| Conservatives | | | -0.17*** | 0.03 | | | -0.17*** | 0.03 |
| <i>Party best on most important issue</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Labour | | | 1.30*** | 0.22 | | | 1.29*** | 0.21 |
| Liberal Democrat | | | -1.09*** | 0.27 | | | -1.18*** | 0.27 |
| Conservatives | | | -1.04*** | 0.28 | | | -1.01*** | 0.27 |
| Other party | | | -0.23 | 0.27 | | | -0.25 | 0.26 |
| Age | | | -0.01* | 0.01 | | | -0.01** | 0.01 |
| Gender | | | 0.63*** | 0.17 | | | 0.52*** | 0.16 |
| Ethnicity | | | 0.09 | 0.31 | | | -0.02 | 0.30 |
| Manual worker | | | 0.63*** | 0.20 | | | 0.64*** | 0.19 |
| Income | | | -0.04 | 0.03 | | | -0.05 | 0.03 |
| Evaluation of MP care | | | 0.99 | 0.17 | | | 1.02 | 0.16 |
| Spending gap | | | 0.01 | 0.00 | | | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Majority size | | | -0.28 | 0.69 | | | -0.48 | 0.67 |
| Ex-minister | | | -0.19 | 0.23 | | | -0.27 | 0.23 |
| Years as MP (logged) | | | -0.03 | 0.17 | | | 0.03 | 0.16 |
| Main challenger from Left | | | -0.40* | 0.22 | | | -0.46** | 0.22 |
| Constant | 0.45*** | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.56 | -0.04 | 0.06 | -0.41 | 0.52 |
| σ_1 | 0.28 | | 0.40 | | 0.21 | | 0.41 | |
| AIC | 3289.9 | | 1182.8 | | 3578.8 | | 1254.8 | |
| Deviance | 3279.9 | | 1128.8 | | 3568.8 | | 1200.8 | |
| no. of individuals | 2543 | | 1681 | | 2707 | | 1751 | |
| no. of groups | 337 | | 332 | | 337 | | 333 | |

Data from British Election Study internet survey 2005. ***: $p < 0.01$; **: $p > 0.05$; *: $p < 0.1$

Table A.6. Variable description: Individual-level variables

| Variable Name | Brief description/coding | BES question number |
|--|---|--|
| Blair evaluation | 0 if strong dislike, 10 if strong like, rescaled to range from -5 (strongly like) to +5 (strongly dislike). | based on pre_q68 |
| Difference in Labour and Blair evaluation | Labour like-dislike scale – Blair like-dislike scale, positive values indicate preference for Labour over Blair | based on pre_q68 and pre_q84 |
| Labour party identification | 1 if yes, 0 if not. None, no party, don't know coded as 0 | based on pre_q29 and pre_q31 |
| Liberal Democrat party identification | 1 if yes, 0 if not. None, no party, don't know coded as 0 | based on pre_q29 and pre_q31 |
| Conservatives party identification | 1 if yes, 0 if not. None, no party, don't know coded as 0 | based on pre_q29 and pre_q31 |
| Other party identification | 1 if yes, 0 if not. None, no party, don't know coded as 0 | based on pre_q29 and pre_q31 |
| Labour issue proximity | absolute distance between own position and Labour position | based on pre_q118 and 119 |
| Liberal Democrat issue proximity | absolute distance between own position and Liberal Democrat position | based on pre_q118 and 120 |
| Conservatives issue proximity | absolute distance between own position and Conservatives position | based on pre_q118 and 121 |
| Labour best on most important issue | 1 if yes, 0 if no | based on pre_q4 |
| Liberal Democrats best on most important issue | 1 if yes, 0 if no | based on pre_q4 |
| Conservatives best on most important issue | 1 if yes, 0 if no | based on pre_q4 |
| Other party best on most important issue | 1 if yes, 0 if no | based on pre_q4 |
| Age | age, ascending | based on pre_q148 |
| Gender | 0 if male, 1 if female | based on pre_q180 |
| Ethnicity | 0 if white British, 1 if not | based on pre_q175 and pre_q174 |
| Manual worker | 1 if manual worker, 0 if not | based on pre_q168 (6 to 8 coded as manual, rest as non-manual) |
| Income | Range: 1 to 13 (less than 5000 GBP to over 70000 GBP) | based on pre_q163 |
| Evaluation of MP care | MP looks after constituency; 1 is yes, 0 if no or neutral | based on pre_q80 |
| Attention to politics | 0 to 10, with 10 high attention to politics | based on pre_q141 |
| Iraq disapproval | 0 if approved, 1 if disapproved | based on pre_q128 (1 and 2 coded as 0, 3 and 4 coded as |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | | 1) |
| Angry and disgusted with Iraq | 1 if angry and disgusted, 0 if not | based on pre_q28, coded 1 if voter is both angry and disgusted, 0 if not |
| Individual benefits | 0 if low, 8 if high; DKs coded as 3 for each item | sum of three items, satisfaction, activity and guilt, pre_q132+pre_q137+pre_q75 |
| Perceived costs | 1 if high cost, 10 if low cost, DKs coded as 3 for each item | sum of two items (effort of voting, most people too busy to vote), pre_q76+pre_q133 |
| Social norms | 0 if low, 8 if high; DKs coded as 3 for each item | sum of two items, neighbours and family, pre_q134+pre_q79 |
| Group benefits | 0 if low, 8 if high; DKs coded as 3 for each item | sum of two items, pre_q75 and pre_q135 |
| Civic duty | 0 if low, 8 if high; DKs coded as 3 for each item | sum of two items, both on duty, pre_q138+pre_q78 |
| Trust | scale of 1 to 10, 10 is high trust | based on pre_q131 |
| Political efficacy | self-assessed influence on politics, 0 low, 10 high | based on pre_q142 |
| Contacted by any party | 1 if contacted by any party in any way, 0 if not | based on pre_q44 series |

Table A.7. Variable description: constituency-level variables

| Variable name | Brief description/coding | Source |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Rebelliousness | (count of rebellions against government in Tapir0105, excluding "-" entries and including votes against Labour majority in unwhipped votes)/ (total number of divisions in Tapir data) | Tapir data |
| Rebelliousness (whipped votes only) | (count of rebellions on whipped votes according to Cowley and Stuart)/(total number of divisions in Tapir data – 64 free votes) | Cowley, P., Stuart, M., 2005b. Dissension amongst the Parliamentary Labour Party, 2001-2005: A data handbook and Tapir data |
| Iraq rebel | 0 if no or abstained, 1 if yes | based on division 117, 02-03 session, Tapir data |
| Spending gap to main challenger | difference between % of limit spent by Labour and biggest-spending challenger in constituency | hlps05pc for Labour spending, hldps05pc for Liberal Democrats, hcps05pc for Conservatives, hnps05pc for Nationalist parties (with largest of the latter three values used) (BES) |
| Majority size | majority size in % in 2001 | Benedetto/Hix dataset |
| Ex-minister | 1 if MP was a minister, 0 if not | Benedetto/Hix dataset |
| Years as MP | years spent as MP | Benedetto/Hix dataset |
| Main challenger from Left | second-largest party in 2001 either Lib Dem or Nationalist | battle01 (BES) |