



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Second-order electoral personalization. Intra-party preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands

Nagtzaam, M.A.M.

Citation

Nagtzaam, M. A. M. (2019, October 9). *Second-order electoral personalization. Intra-party preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/78476>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/78476>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:
<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/78476>

Author: Nagtzaam, M.A.M.

Title: Second-order electoral personalization. Intra-party preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands

Issue Date: 2019-10-09

Second-order electoral personalization

Intra-party preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands

Print:

Print service Ede

© 2019 Marijn A.M. Nagtzaam. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing from the proprietor.

© 2019 Marijn A.M. Nagtzaam. Alle rechten voorbehouden. Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand, of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enigerlei wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen, of op enige andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de rechthebbende.

Second-order electoral personalization

Intra-party preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op woensdag 9 oktober 2019
klokke 13:45 uur

door

Marijn Adrianus Marinus Nagtzaam-Mulders
Geboren te Ossendrecht in 1986

Promotoren:

Prof. dr. R.B. Andeweg

Prof. dr. J.J.M. van Holsteijn

Co-promotor:

Dr. T.P. Louwerse

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. G.A. Irwin

Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. R.A. Koole

Universiteit Leiden

Dr. T.A. Mickler

Universiteit Leiden

Prof. dr. J-B. Pilet

Université Libre de Bruxelles

Prof. dr. G. Rahat

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Acknowledgments

When reading some acknowledgments of (former) colleagues, as inspiration for writing my own acknowledgments, I noticed that most of them started their acknowledgments with the ‘academic part’, to end with the ‘friends and family part’. While I recognize there is some logic to that if you are writing an acknowledgment for your dissertation, I would like to start by thanking my parents, Rini and Gerrie, for all their love and support. I am very proud knowing that my mother will sit behind me when I defend my dissertation, and I hope that my father will be in the mind of many people present that day. He will certainly be in mine.

During the five years in which I have worked on my dissertation I was supervised by Rudy Andeweg and Joop van Holsteyn, and later on also by Tom Louwerse. I am grateful for their support. They always responded quickly to questions, gave useful (and extensive!) feedback and constantly helped and pushed me to improve this dissertation. In addition I would like to thank the Institute of Political Science in Leiden. It has been, and still is, a pleasure to work there and I am thankful for the opportunities the institute gave me.

My PhD position was part of the PartiRep 2 project, a project funded by the Belgian Federal Science Office (Belspo). I am grateful for the funding I received from this project, and for the PartiRep Election Study 2014 dataset provided by this project, which I used in one part of my study. I would like to thank Patrick van Erkel for the work we did together on the experiment that is part of this dissertation. I enjoyed working together, discussing the pros and cons of each decision we had to make for the experiment. During my PhD I presented work at the Politicologenetmaal, the ECPR general conference, and the ECPR Joint Sessions, and at the first Leuven-Montréal Winter School on Elections. I thank all participants in those events for their comments.

I now go back to the ‘friends and family part’. It is not possible to thank everybody in the way they deserve to be thanked. The advantage for them is that I will thank them in person. However, at least some names should definitely be mentioned here. First of all, Batsheva. I don’t know if I would have been ready to start a PhD without you. You have been an immense support, which I will never forget. Of course, also Hanneke and Jasmijn deserve recognition. You motivated and helped me, and it really helps to know that you two are always there for me. Anika and Jessica: thank you for all the fun we had as colleagues and as friends and that you agreed to be my *paranimfen*.

Finally, thank you Mirjam and Sem for your love and support and for reminding me of what is most important in life.

Contents

Acknowledgments	V
List of figures	IX
List of tables	X
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The personalization of politics	1
1.2 Second-order electoral personalization.....	2
1.3 Research questions and overview of the book	5
1.4 Case selection	8
1.4.1 The Belgian electoral system	10
1.4.2 The Dutch electoral system	13
1.4.3 Period of analysis	14
2 The constraints: the effects of a list vote and the number of votes	15
2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2 Studying the effects of electoral rules	17
2.3 Electoral rules and the influence on preference voting	18
2.3.1 The effect of a list vote	19
2.3.2 A single preference vote versus multiple preference votes	20
2.4 Methods and data	21
2.4.1 General outline of the experiment	21
2.4.2 Ballots and party lists	24
2.5 Results	25
2.6 Discussion and conclusion.....	35
3 The demand side: motivations for preference votes	39
3.1 Introduction.....	39
3.2 Expectations	40
3.2.1 The resource model	40
3.2.2 The identity model.....	41
3.2.3 The proximity model.....	42
3.2.4 Negative motivations: the effect of the first candidate on the list.....	43
3.3 Methods and data	45
3.3.1 Methods and data for the Netherlands	45
3.3.2 Methods and data for Belgium.....	49
3.4 Results	50
3.4.1 Preference voting in the Netherlands	50
3.4.2 Preference voting in Belgium	59
3.5 Discussion and conclusion.....	62
4 The supply side: what determines the popularity of candidates?	67
4.1 Introduction.....	67
4.2 Expectations	68
4.2.1 Socio-demographic factors.....	68
4.2.2 Ballot position	72
4.2.3 Political experience	73
4.2.4 Ideological differences	73
4.2.5 Party effects	76
4.3 Methods and data	77
4.3.1 Candidates included in the analyses	78

4.3.2	The dependent variable	79
4.3.3	Independent variables.....	81
4.3.4	Estimating a candidate's deviation from the party line	83
4.4	Results	86
4.4.1	Preference votes for Dutch candidates	86
4.4.2	Dutch candidates and where they receive their votes	89
4.4.3	Preference votes for Belgian candidates.....	91
4.5	Discussion and conclusion.....	96
5	The consequences: what's in it for a candidate?	101
5.1	Introduction.....	101
5.2	Candidates elected based on preference votes	103
5.3	Consequences for legislative behaviour.....	104
5.3.1	Expectations	104
5.3.2	Data and methods.....	105
5.3.3	Results.....	106
5.4	Consequences for the political career of a candidate.....	109
5.4.1	Expectations	109
5.4.2	Data and method	112
5.4.3	Results.....	116
5.5	Discussion and conclusion.....	126
6	Conclusion	131
6.1	Main findings of the study	131
6.1.1	A negative preference vote?	131
6.1.2	No role for ideology	133
6.1.3	Limited consequences of preference votes	134
6.2	Implications	135
6.3	The value of preference votes.....	136
6.4	Suggestions for further research	138
	Bibliography	141
	Appendices.....	153
A	General appendices	155
B	Appendices for chapter 2	157
C	Appendices for chapter 3	175
D	Appendices for chapter 4	181
E	Appendices for chapter 5	191
	Nederlandstalige samenvatting	201
	Curriculum Vitea	207

List of figures

Figure 1.1	Levels of preference voting in Belgium and the Netherlands	4
Figure 1.2	Overview of aspects discussed in the book	6
Figure 2.1	Types of votes cast.....	27
Figure 2.2	Types of preference votes cast	28
Figure 3.1	Distribution evaluation scores list-puller, party and difference.....	48
Figure 3.2	Effect evaluation list-puller.....	58
Figure 3.3	Effect difference between evaluation list-puller and party	58
Figure 4.1	Candidates elected out of list order and their vote share per municipality	70
Figure 5.1	Effects of preference votes on parliamentary behaviour.....	108
Figure 5.2	Distribution rank difference (the Netherlands)	113
Figure 5.3	Distribution rank difference (Belgium)	113
Figure 5.4	Effect of rank difference t_0 at list position $t+1$ (the Netherlands)	120
Figure 5.5	Effect of rank difference t at list position $t+1$ (Belgium)	121
Figure 6.1	The causes and consequences of preference voting	131
Figure B.1	Example of a ballot for group 1 and 2 (with list vote)	159
Figure B.2	Example of ballot for group 3 and 4 (without list vote)	159
Figure D.1	Policy positions of Dutch MPs per party per legislative period	185
Figure D.2	Policy positions of Belgian MPs per party per legislative period.....	186
Figure D.3	Effect of removing individual use of words in Wordscores.....	188
Figure D.4	Effect of excluding an MP's own text from the reference text.....	189
Figure E.1	Effects of preference votes on deviation in first legislative period	197
Figure E.2	Preference votes & deviation from the party (Plenary sessions)	199
Figure E.3	Preference votes & deviation from the party (Written questions).....	200

List of tables

Table 1.1	Example of distribution of seats within a party (Belgium).....	12
Table 2.1	Experimental groups (both in Belgium and the Netherlands)	22
Table 2.2	Coding of dependent variables.....	24
Table 2.3	Participants in Belgian experiment	26
Table 2.4	Participants in Dutch experiment.....	26
Table 2.5	Effect of list vote on votes for the list-puller.....	30
Table 2.6	Effect of list vote on votes for other candidates.....	30
Table 2.7	Effect of available number of preference votes on votes for list-puller.....	31
Table 2.8	Effect of available number of preference votes on votes for other candidates ..	31
Table 2.9	Voting for the list-puller.....	33
Table 2.10	Voting for other candidates.....	34
Table 3.1	Overview of the models for preference voting of Katz and André et al.	40
Table 3.2	Overview of expectations for the demand side	45
Table 3.3	Reported and actual preference votes (the Netherlands)	47
Table 3.4	Reasons for casting a preference vote	51
Table 3.5	Gender and casting a preference vote because the candidate is a woman	51
Table 3.6	Gender and casting a preference vote because the candidate is a man	51
Table 3.7	Region and casting a preference votes because someone is from this region	51
Table 3.8	The negative preference vote	53
Table 3.9	Evaluation score list-puller and casting a preference vote.....	53
Table 3.10	Preference voting in the Netherlands	55
Table 3.11	Party vote versus candidate vote (Belgium)	60
Table 3.12	Preference voting in Belgium	61
Table 3.13	Preference voting in Belgium including evaluation scores.....	61
Table 3.14	Summary of findings for chapter 3	62
Table 4.1	Summary of expectations for chapter 4	78
Table 4.2	Percentage of preference votes for Dutch candidates	80
Table 4.3	Percentage of preference votes for Belgian candidates	81
Table 4.4	Preference votes for Dutch candidates.....	87
Table 4.5	Electoral performance Dutch candidates in home district.....	90
Table 4.6	Average ‘home bonus’ per district	91
Table 4.7	Preference votes for Belgian candidates.....	92
Table 4.8	Percentage of preference votes within Belgian parties	96
Table 4.9	Summary of findings for chapter 4	97
Table 5.1	Effect of preference votes on legislative behaviour (the Netherlands)	107
Table 5.2	Effect of preference votes on legislative behaviour (Belgium)	107
Table 5.3	Rank difference and returning candidates (the Netherlands)	117
Table 5.4	Rank difference and returning candidates (Belgium).....	119
Table 5.5	Effect of preference votes on list position next election (the Netherlands)	120
Table 5.6	Effect of preference votes on list position next election (Belgium)	121
Table 5.7	Effects of preference votes on entering government (the Netherlands)	124
Table 5.8	Effects of preference votes on entering government (Belgium)	125
Table 6.1.	Overview of the findings of this study	132
Table A.1	Analysed elections, legislative periods, governments (Belgium)	156
Table A.2	Analysed elections, legislative periods, governments (the Netherlands)	156
Table B.1	Included and excluded respondents based on vote intention	157
Table B.2	Time spent on page with explanations of rules (country comparison)	168
Table B.3	Time spent on page with explanations of rules (choice comparison)	169

Table B.4	Effect of list vote on votes for the list-puller.....	170
Table B.5	Effect of list vote on voters for other candidates	171
Table B.6	Effect of available number of preference votes on votes for list-puller.....	172
Table B.7	Effect of available number of preference votes on votes for other candidates	173
Table B.8	Voting for list-puller & other candidates (with country dummy)	174
Table C.1	Descriptive statistics chapter 3 (the Netherlands)	176
Table C.2	Descriptive statistics chapter 3 (Belgium)	177
Table C.3	Preference voting in the Netherlands (including political knowledge)	178
Table C.4.	Preference voting in the Netherlands (including country or origin)	179
Table C.5.	Preference voting in the Netherlands (including member political party)	180
Table D.1	Analysed documents to measure positions of MPs (the Netherlands)	185
Table D.2	Analysed documents to measure positions of MPs (Belgium).....	186
Table D.3	Descriptive statistics for analysis chapter 4 (the Netherlands)	190
Table D.4	Descriptive statistics for analysis chapter 4 (Belgium).....	190
Table E.1	Rank difference for non-incumbents and incumbents (the Netherlands)	191
Table E.2	Rank difference for non-incumbents and incumbents (Belgium).....	192
Table E.3	Descriptive statistics for analyse chapter 5 (the Netherlands)	193
Table E.4	Descriptive statistics for analyse chapter 5 (Belgium)	194
Table E.5	Effect of deviation on preference votes after first legislative period	196
Table E.6	Effect of preference votes on deviation in first legislative period	197

