Downloaded from UvA-DARE, the institutional repository of the University of Amsterdam (UvA)
http://dare.uva.nl/document/206194

File ID	206194
Filename	Appendix

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):

Type	Dissertation
Title	Versatile citizens: media reporting, political cynicism and voter behavior
Author	M.L. Adriaansen
Faculty	Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Year	2011
Pages	168
ISBN	978-90-5335-370-7

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:
http://dare.uva.nl/record/368292

Copyright

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)

Appendix

Appendix A: Introduction, Main Concepts of this Dissertation

Appendix B: Chapter 1, Survey Characteristics

Appendix C: Chapter 1, Exact Wording of the Questions

Appendix D: Chapter 1, Coding Scheme

Appendix E: Chapter 2, Strategic and Substantive News

Appendix G: Chapter 2, Political Cynicism Scale

Appendix H: Chapter 3, Overview of All Effects in the SEM

Appendix I: Chapter 4, News Paper Items About Education Policies

Appendix J: Chapter 4, News Paper Items About Cycling Policies

Appendix A: Introduction, Main Concepts of this Dissertation

Strategic news coverage: covers of gains and losses, power struggles between political actors, the performance of political actors, and public perception of their performance. Also includes "horse race" news or game-oriented news; words of warfare and (sports) games are often used.

Substantive news coverage: provides information about present and future government policy, about political stands of parties, and about ideologies and ideas.

Political cynicism: strong distrust in the reliability and / or competence of political actors. The opposite is political trust.

Electoral volatility: the percentage of seats that changed party between two successive elections, measured on the aggregate level.

Voter volatility: the share of citizens not choosing the same party in two successive elections, measured on the individual level. A **changing voter** is someone who does not vote for the same party in two successive elections. **Ideological voter volatility** includes the ideological scope of the change; changing between two related parties is regarded as a "smaller change" than changing between non-related parties and we call the scope of change ideological voter volatility.

Voter uncertainty: the share of citizens not making a party choice long before the elections or hesitating which party to vote for, measured on the individual level. A **hesitating voter** is someone who hesitates which party to vote for and who does not make a party choice until shortly before the elections. **Ideological voter uncertainty** includes the ideological scope of hesitation; hesitating between two related parties can then be regarded as a "smaller hesitation" than doubting between non-related parties.

Appendix B: Chapter 1, Survey Characteristics

Table B1 shows that our respondent data in Study 1 and 2 mirror census data by and large in terms of age, gender, and education.

Table B1: Respondent Characteristics Compared with Census Data

	Dataset Study 1	**Dataset Study 2**	**Census**
	%	%	%
Gender			
• male	47.4	50.7	49.1
• female	52.6	49.3	50.9
Age			
• 18-34	24.2	23.4	26.5
• 35-44	17.8	22.7	20.3
• 45-54	20.9	16.5	18.8
• 55-64	17.6	17.0	16.3
• 65+	19.5	20.4	18.0
Education			
• lower	34.5	34.4	27.1
• middle	40.6	44.3	41.6
• higher	24.9	21.3	31.4

Note. Study 1 includes 436 respondents. Study 2 includes 426 respondents. Census data concern the year 2009 and were obtained from "Gouden Standaard", which is the reference instrument of the Dutch Market Research Association (MOA), these reference data are collected by the Dutch National Statistics Institute (CBS). Not all columns add up to 100 percent because of rounding to decimal places.

Appendix C: Chapter 1, Exact Wording of the Questions

Table C1: Questions in the Dataset of Study 1

Question	Answering categories
Q1. To what extent do you trust government?	1. very little trust
	2. little trust
	3. much trust
	4. very much trust
	5. don't know
If Q1=1 or Q1=2: Q2a. Could you explain why you have (very) little trust in government? (First 8 categories are in random order)	1. are dishonest and not integer
	2. they are incompetent and not able to do their job
	3. they do not know what is important for the people
	4. they only care about their own interests
	5. they do not do what they promise
	6. they do not care about people like me
	7. they are not decisive in taking care of problems
	8. they are only interested in the money they earn
	9. I do not have a reason, it is mainly an impression
	10. other reasons
	11. I do not have a reason
If Q1=3 or Q1=4: Q2b. Could you explain why you say you have (very) much trust in government? (First 7 categories are in random order)	1. they are honest and integer
	2. they are competent and able to do their job
	3. they know what is important for the people
	4. they try to do what is best for the country
	5. they do what they promise
	6. they stand up for people like me
	7. they are decisive in taking care of problems
	8. I do not have a reason, it is mainly an impression
	9. other reasons
	10. I do not have a reason

Table C2: Questions in the Dataset of Study 2

Question	**Answering categories**
Q1. To what extent do you trust government?	1. very little trust 2. little trust 3. much trust 4. very much trust 5. don't know
If Q1=1 or Q1=2: Q2a. Could you explain why you have (very) little trust in government?	Open-ended question
If Q1=3 or Q1=4: Q2b. Could you explain why you say you have (very) much trust in government?	Open-ended question

Appendix D: Chapter 1, Coding Scheme

Table D1: Coding Scheme for Positive Attitudes

Category	Based on literature	Based on pretest
Reliability - honesty:		
1. honest, trustworthy, sincere, not manipulative	x	
2. not corrupt	x	
3. politics open, no backroom politics	x	x
4. not too much quarrel, blaming each other		x
Reliability - promises		
5. do what they promise	x	
Reliability - motives:		
6. good intentions, do what is best for the country, do try to do the best, ethical	x	
7. represent the general interest, interest of the different groups in society	x	
8. do not represent their own interest	x	
8a. subcategory: not too concerned with public opinion, getting re-elected, own career	x	
8b. subcategory: money is not their primary motivation, in office for own pocketbook	x	x
9. do not represent special interests, the elite or a few big interests	x	
10. no favoritism	x	
Reliability - responsiveness:		
11. listen to the public, responsive, voice heard	x	x
12. reference to people like themselves, the ordinary citizen, the common man	x	
Competence - general:		
13. are competent, capable, skilful or smart, government performs or is good	x	x
14. things look good for the country, everything will work out all right		x
Competence - taking charge:		
15. decisiveness, effective, vigor, do what is necessary	x	
16. efficient, using tax money efficiently	x	
Competence - awareness:		
17. are aware of problems, know what is going on, what is important	x	
18. precise when dealing with problems, careful in general	x	x
19. give sufficient information for citizens to form an opinion	x	
Other categories:		
20. focused on the long term		x
21. are stable		x
22. respondent agrees with policy, ideology or vision, specific political parties		x
23. democratically chosen, decision-making democratic, citizens should trust		x
24. one cannot satisfy everybody, one cannot do everything perfectly		x
25. politics is important, respondent politically interested		x
26. negative motivation (it could have been worse, no alternative)		x
27. other		
No answer or no interpretation possible:		
28. no answer		
29. no interpretation possible		

Note. All categories are coded as dichotomous variables (yes or no). Categories 4, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 were added after the pretest. In categories 3, 8b, 11, 13 and 18 extra aspects were added after the pretest.

Table D2: Coding Scheme for Negative Attitudes

Category	Based on literature	Based on pretest
Reliability - honesty:		
1. dishonest, not trustworthy, crooked, twisters, manipulative	x	
2. corrupt	x	
3. politics to closed and secret, backroom politics	x	x
4. too much quarrel, blaming each other		x
Reliability - promises		
5. do not do what they promise, promise more than they can deliver	x	
Reliability - motives:		
6. bad intentions, do not do what is best for the country, do not do try to do the best, not ethical	x	
7. do not represent the general interest, not the interest of the different groups in society	x	
8. represent their own interest	x	
8a. subcategory: too concerned with public opinion, getting re-elected, own career	x	
8b. subcategory: money is primary motivation, in office for own pocketbook	x	x
9. represent special interests, the elite or a few big interests	x	
10. favoritism	x	
Reliability - responsiveness:		
11. do not listen to public, unresponsive, interested in votes not opinions, voice unheard	x	x
12. reference to people like themselves, the ordinary citizen, the common man	x	
Competence - general:		
13. are not competent, capable, skilful or smart, government performs or is bad	x	x
14. things look bad for the country, it is going worse		x
Competence - taking charge		
15. no decisiveness, not effective, no vigor, put things off, do not do what is necessary	x	
16. not efficient, wasting tax monies	x	
Competence - awareness:		
17. are not aware of problems, do not know what is going on, what is important	x	
18. superficial when dealing with problems, superficial in general	x	x
19. do not give sufficient information for citizens to form an opinion	x	
Other categories:		
20. focused on the short term, instead of the long term		x
21. are not stable		x
22. respondent disagrees with policy, ideology or vision, specific political parties		x
23. not democratically chosen, decision-making is undemocratic		x
24. -		x
25. politics is unimportant, respondent not politically interested		x
26. positive motivation (one can always do better)		x
27. other		
No answer or no interpretation possible:		
28. no answer		
29. no interpretation possible		

Note. All categories are coded as dichotomous variables (yes or no). Categories 4, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 were added after the pretest. In categories 3, 8b, 11, 13 and 18 extra aspects were added after the pretest.

Appendix E: Chapter 2, Strategic and Substantive News

Table E1 shows the percentages of substantive and strategic news in the different news outlets. The lowest share of substantive news was found for Hart van Nederland (37 percent), while the highest share was found for Een Vandaag (83 percent). The lowest share of strategic news was found for Trouw (40 percent), while the highest share was found for Nova/Nederland Kiest (70 percent).

Table E1: Substantive and Strategic News in the Different News Outlets

	Substantive news	Strategic news
	%	%
News programs:		
• NOS Journaal (public service)	71	58
• RTL Nieuws (commercial)	79	65
• Hart van Nederland (commercial)	37	57
Current affairs programs:		
• Een Vandaag (public service)	83	49
• Nova / Nederland Kiest (public service)	77	70
Regular newspapers:		
• Algemeen Dagblad (tabloid)	55	41
• NRC Handelsblad (quality)	75	42
• De Telegraaf (tabloid)	58	42
• Trouw (quality)	72	39
• de Volkskrant (quality)	69	45
Free newspapers:		
• Metro	51	60
• Sp!ts	78	58

Appendix F: Chapter 2, Survey Characteristics

From a panel of approximately 145,000 Dutch citizens, a representative sample (1,115 persons) of the population of persons 18 years and older was selected, and invited to participate in a questionnaire. Of these persons, 870 respondents completed the questionnaire at t1 (September), and 703 respondents completed the questionnaire at t2 (November). This yields an overall response rate of 63 percent. Table F1 shows that our respondent data mirror census data by and large in terms of age, gender, and education.

Table F1: Respondent Characteristics Compared With Census Data

	Dataset, *n* = 703	Census
	%	%
Gender		
• male	49.1	49.0
• female	50.9	51.0
Age		
• 18-34	20.6	27.3
• 35-44	21.6	20.6
• 45-54	20.8	18.3
• 55-64	17.2	15.6
• 65+	19.8	18.3
Education		
• lower	31.9	32.0
• middle	39.3	40.1
• higher	28.8	28.0

Note. Census data is from 2006. Reference data were obtained from Gouden Standaard, which is the reference instrument of the Dutch Market Research Association (MOA); this reference data were collected by the Dutch National Statistics Institute (CBS). Not all columns add up to 100 percent because of rounding off to decimal places.

Appendix G: Chapter 2, Political Cynicism Scale

For the political cynicism scale, respondents were asked the following question, as shown in Table G1 (exact wording).

Table G1: Questions political cynicism scale

Could you please indicate for each statement whether you agree or do not agree? Do you …

	… fully agree	… agree	… dis-agree	… fully disagree	don't know / no answer
Politicians consciously promise more than they can deliver	232	382	50	1	38
Ministers and junior-ministers are primarily self-interested	70	218	314	25	76
To become Member of Parliament, friends are more important than abilities	91	295	192	22	103
Political parties are only interested in my vote, not in my opinion	153	329	170	8	43
Politicians do not understand what matters to society	87	282	264	9	61
Politicians are capable of solving important problems	52	293	279	8	71
Most politicians are competent people who know what they are doing	29	201	368	21	84

Note. n = 801. Cell entries are the frequencies for t2 (November).

For each statement, there were four possible answers: completely agree, agree, disagree and completely disagree. For the analysis, these categories were re-coded; higher values mean a more cynical response and the category "Don't know / no answer" was coded "missing" For every statement a respondent is given a score of between 1 and 4 (from non-cynical to very cynical) and we combined the scores for the seven items in one scale.

Political cynicism scale t1: *mean* = 2.806, *sd* = .503, *Cronbach's alpha* = .867. The inter-item correlations are between .354 and .578. Factor analysis shows that all items load on a single factor, with factor loadings between .675 and .806.

Political cynicism scale t2: *mean* = 2.761, *sd* = .510, *Cronbach's alpha* = .871. The inter-item correlations are between .404 and .599. Factor analysis shows that all items load on a single factor, with factor loadings between .698 and .792.

Appendix H: Chapter 3, Overview of All Effects in the SEM

Table H1: Measurement Model for Political Cynicism

	unstandardized factor loading	standardized factor loading	significance
pol. cyn. statement 1	1.000	0.631	
pol. cyn. statement 2	1.487	0.722	0.000***
pol. cyn. statement 3	1.338	0.693	0.000***
pol. cyn. statement 4	1.399	0.732	0.000***
pol. cyn. statement 5	1.459	0.754	0.000***
pol. cyn. statement 6	0.942	0.573	0.000***
pol. cyn. statement 7	1.032	0.636	0.000***

Table H2: Measurement Model for Political Interest

	unstandardized factor loading	standardized factor loading	significance
pol. int. statement 2	1.000	0.568	
pol. int. statement 1	1.139	0.733	0.000***

Table H3: Causal Relationships between Independent, Intermediary and Dependent Variables

dependent variable	independent variable	unstandardized effect	standardized effect	significance
ideological voter uncertainty	age	-0.002	-0.122	0.002
ideological voter uncertainty	scale political cynicism	0.103	0.179	0.000
ideological voter uncertainty	scale political interest	-0.142	-0.371	0.000
ideological voter uncertainty	education	0.004	0.026	0.521
ideological voter uncertainty	gender	0.013	0.029	0.413
ideological voter uncertainty	knowledge	0.007	0.006	0.888
ideological voter uncertainty	left right position	-0.005	-0.047	0.185
turnout intention	scale political cynicism	-0.075	-0.101	0.006
turnout intention	ideological voter uncertainty	-0.354	-0.271	0.000
turnout intention	gender	0.047	0.083	0.008
turnout intention	education	0.001	0.008	0.835
turnout intention	age	0.001	0.084	0.013
turnout intention	knowledge	-0.078	-0.046	0.203
turnout intention	scale political interest	0.236	0.471	0.000
turnout intention	left right position	0.004	0.028	0.371
ideological voter volatility	turnout intention	-0.25	-0.253	0.000
ideological voter volatility	scale political cynicism	0.072	0.098	0.012
actual turnout	education	-0.006	-0.034	0.258
actual turnout	scale political interest	0.009	0.019	0.724
actual turnout	age	-0.001	-0.038	0.177
actual turnout	scale political cynicism	0.058	0.079	0.010
actual turnout	gender	0.024	0.044	0.102
actual turnout	turnout intention	0.632	0.645	0.000
actual turnout	ideological voter uncertainty	-0.179	-0.139	0.000
ideological voter volatility	ideological voter uncertainty	0.344	0.266	0.000
ideological voter volatility	education	-0.001	-0.007	0.853
ideological voter volatility	age	-0.002	-0.105	0.003
ideological voter volatility	scale political interest	-0.001	-0.001	0.987
ideological voter volatility	gender	0.001	0.001	0.972
actual turnout	knowledge	0.066	0.04	0.182
ideological voter volatility	knowledge	-0.025	-0.015	0.693
actual turnout	left right position	-0.002	-0.017	0.518
ideological voter volatility	left right position	-0.002	-0.018	0.590

Table H3 shows the effects of independent variables on intermediary variables and dependent variables, as well as the effects of intermediary variables on dependent variables.

Table H4: Relationships between Independent Variables

independent variable 1	independent variable 2	unstandardized effect	standardized effect	significance
scale political interest	scale political cynicism	-0.046	-0.216	0.000
age	scale political interest	1.577	0.177	0.000
education	scale political cynicism	-0.121	-0.204	0.000
education	scale political interest	0.289	0.326	0.000
gender	scale political cynicism	-0.003	-0.014	0.733
age	scale political cynicism	-0.074	-0.012	0.760
gender	scale political interest	-0.034	-0.121	0.011
knowledge	scale political cynicism	-0.008	-0.13	0.002
knowledge	scale political interest	0.037	0.392	0.000
education	knowledge	0.047	0.176	0.000
age	knowledge	0.443	0.166	0.000
gender	knowledge	-0.002	-0.028	0.456
knowledge	left right position	-0.021	-0.055	0.137
gender	left right position	0.024	0.021	0.571
education	left right position	0.051	0.014	0.699
age	left right position	3.381	0.095	0.011
left right position	scale political cynicism	-0.038	-0.045	0.268
left right position	scale political interest	-0.099	-0.078	0.097
gender	education	-0.092	-0.117	0.002
age	gender	-0.707	-0.089	0.016
age	education	-4.361	-0.174	0.000

The direction of the relationships between independent variables in Table H4 is not defined. Although these relationships are interesting, it is beyond the scope of this study.

Appendix I: Chapter 4, News Paper Items About Education Policies

D66 = Liberal Democrats, CDA = Christian Democrats, GroenLinks = Green Party,
PvdA = Social Democrats, SP = Socialists, VVD = Liberal Party

Substantive version education policies

Education in Amsterdam important for all political parties

AMSTERDAM – The performance of educational institutions in Amsterdam is comparable to the national average. Nevertheless, there are some persistent problems in the school in Amsterdam. The improvement of education is therefore an important issue for the Election of the city council.

Each kind of school has its own problems. The quality of black primary schools is for example too low and many students in secondary schools have serious language deficiencies. Also, students too often play truant and the number of students that leave school without a certificate is too high. Furthermore, the waiting lists for education for children with special needs are long. The political parties in Amsterdam have different ideas to solve these problems. GroenLinks thinks that learning to live together in society and learning social skills are equally important as writing and calculating adequately. This party therefore aims to invest more in the "broad school", in which education, community work and sporting are combined. PvdA reserves money in their election program to control more for non-attendance. In this way, the party tries to prevent students from playing truant or leaving school without a certificate.

VVD stresses the importance of safety in schools: many schools are confronted with vandalism and physical violence among students. VVD therefore wants to pay more attention to the safety plan each school is supposed to have. D66 does not solely want to focus on problematical case, but also pleads for a special talent program for excellent students. Some parties focus on specific schools. CDA for example aims to reserve money for Christian schools in new housing estates, because students from these neighborhoods have to travel too far. SP wants to give more money to schools in the poor areas of the city. All in all, each party has clear policy preferences for increasing traffic safety. At the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Strategic version education policies

Political parties squabble about education in Amsterdam

AMSTERDAM – The performance of educational institutions in Amsterdam is comparable to the national average. Nevertheless, there are some persistent problems in the school in Amsterdam. The improvement of education is therefore an important issue for the Election of the city council.

The political parties use the education policies to create a distinct profile for themselves: in this way they aim to attract parents with young children. The governing parties PvdA and GroenLinks emphasize the differences between them to attract voters, while their viewpoints hardly differ. GroenLinks uses education policies to underline its social image. PvdA performs badly in the polls and loose almost half of their seats. The party therefore asked their own Alderman to acquire publicity for the successes in the last four years.

VVD characterizes the governing parties as patronizing and calls the ideas of the governing parties "communistic".

In this way, VVD tries to hold on to rightist voters in the city, without mentioning reasonable alternative policies. D66 performs well in the polls and does everything to maintain this position: the party therefore does not want to compel the voter to anything. Some parties appeal to specific groups, CDA aims to emphasize its image of a party for families and SP focuses on the poorer voters with its education policies. In this way these parties try to emphasize the contrast between themselves and the largest party in the city: PvdA.

We asked Piet de Jong, an expert on local politics, his opinion about this issue. He summarized the situation in this way: "Despite the successes, much more would have been possible in the last four years. A lot of things have not been done because parties in the city council thwart each other all the time. Now the elections will be soon they try to make a decisive impression after all and try to win seats in this way. They only care for a good election result." At the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Substantive & strategic version education policies

Education in Amsterdam important in election contest

AMSTERDAM – The performance of educational institutions in Amsterdam is comparable to the national average. Nevertheless, there are some persistent problems in the school in Amsterdam. The improvement of education is therefore an important issue for the Election of the city council.

Each kind of school has its own problems. The quality of black primary schools is for example too low and many students in secondary schools have serious language deficiencies. Also, students too often play truant and the number of students that leave school without a certificate is too high. Furthermore, the waiting lists for education for children with special needs are long. The political parties in Amsterdam have different ideas to solve these problems.

The political parties use the education policies to create a distinct profile for themselves: in this way they aim to attract parents with young children. The governing parties PvdA and GroenLinks emphasize the differences between them. GroenLinks therefore stresses how many policy plans it has, the party for example want more money for the "broad school". PvdA performs badly in the polls and therefore asked their own Alderman to acquire publicity for the successes in the last four years. With more control for non-attendance, the party tries to prevent students from playing truant.

VVD characterizes the governing parties as patronizing and stresses the importance of safety in schools: many schools are confronted with vandalism and physical violence among students. D66 performs well in the polls and does everything to maintain this position. The party therefore does not want to compel the voter to anything; but D66 pleads for a special talent program for excellent students. CDA aims to emphasize its image of a party for families and therefore reserve money for Christian schools in new housing estates. SP focuses on the poorer voters and therefore wants to give more money to schools in the poor areas of the city. At the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Appendix J: Chapter 4, News Paper Items About Cycling Policies

D66 = Liberal Democrats, CDA = Christian Democrats, GroenLinks = Green Party,
PvdA = Social Democrats, SP = Socialists, VVD = Liberal Party

Substantive version cycling policies

Cyclists' traffic safety important for all political parties

AMSTERDAM – Amsterdam has almost a hundred dangerous cross roads, also called black spots. Many traffic incidents occur in the city and cyclists are especially vulnerable. Each party's electoral program mentions traffic safety; it is an important issue for the Election of the city council.

In the past years, a lot of money was invested in traffic safety. Some regulations are far-reaching, like the construction of separate cycle tracks in busy streets, but sometimes smaller solutions are possible. Despite these policies, still many traffic incidents occur. The political parties in Amsterdam have different ideas to solve this problem.

GroenLinks stresses the importance of the bike as an environmentally friendly transportation and therefore proposed a lot of policies. A new idea is to ban mopeds from cycle tracks. PvdA suggests in its election program to decrease the speed limit in the city to 30 kilometers an hour. This will decrease the difference in speed between cars and cyclists and will therefore decrease the risk of collisions.

VVD opposes a decrease of the speed limit, but suggests introducing mirrors that cover the blind spot at each dangerous cross road. Blind spot mirrors make sure that truck drivers can see cyclists next to their vehicle and therefore help preventing incidents. D66 wants to stimulate visitors to park their car on the large parking spaces outside the city center and continue their trip with public transportation. Some parties aim to increase traffic safety in specific places. CDA for example points at the areas around schools and SP points at the poor areas of the city. All in all, each party has clear policy preferences for increasing traffic safety. At the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Strategic version cycling policies

Political parties squabble about cyclists' traffic safety

AMSTERDAM – Amsterdam has almost a hundred dangerous cross roads, also called black spots. Many traffic incidents occur in the city and cyclists are especially vulnerable. Each party's electoral program mentions traffic safety; it is an important issue for the Election of the city council.

The political parties use the cycling policies to create a distinct profile for themselves: in this way they aim to attract young voters. The governing parties PvdA and GroenLinks emphasize the differences between them to attract voters, while their viewpoints hardly differ. GroenLinks uses traffic safety policies to stress its environmentally friendly image. PvdA performs badly in the polls and loose almost half of their seats. The party therefore asked their own Alderman to acquire publicity for the successes in the last four years.

VVD characterizes the governing parties as patronizing and calls the ideas of the governing parties "anti-car policies". In this way, VVD tries to hold on to car owners in the city, without mentioning reasonable alternative

policies. D66 performs well in the polls and tries everything to maintain this position: the party therefore does not want to compel the voter to anything. Some parties appeal to specific groups, CDA aims to emphasize its image of a party for families and SP focuses on the poorer voters. In this way these parties try to emphasize the contrast between themselves and the largest party in the city: PvdA.

We asked Piet de Jong, an expert on local politics, his opinion about this issue. He summarized the situation in this way: "A lot of things have not been done because parties in the city council thwart each other all the time. Now the elections will be soon they try to make a decisive impression after all and try to win seats in this way. They only care for a good election result." t the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Substantive & strategic version cycling policies

Cyclists' traffic safety important in election contest

AMSTERDAM – Amsterdam has almost a hundred dangerous cross roads, also called black spots. Many traffic incidents occur in the city and cyclists are especially vulnerable. Each party's electoral program mentions traffic safety; it is an important issue for the Election of the city council.

In the past years, a lot of money was invested in traffic safety. Some regulations are far-reaching, like the construction of separate cycle tracks in busy streets, but sometimes smaller solutions are possible. Despite these policies, still many traffic incidents occur. The political parties in Amsterdam have different ideas to solve this problem.

The political parties use the cycling policies to create a distinct profile for themselves: in this way they aim to attract young voters. The governing parties PvdA and GroenLinks emphasize the differences between them. GroenLinks therefore stresses how many policy plans it has, among which the idea to ban mopeds from cycle tracks. PvdA performs badly in the polls and therefore asked their own Alderman to acquire publicity for the successes in the last four years. Also, the party considers decreasing the speed limit in the city to 30 kilometers an hour.

VVD characterizes the governing parties as patronizing. VVD opposes a decrease of the speed limit, but suggests introducing mirrors that cover the blind spot at each dangerous cross road. D66 performs well in the polls and tries everything to maintain this position. The party therefore does not want to compel the voter to anything; D66 only wants to stimulate visitors to park their car on the large parking spaces outside the city center. CDA aims to emphasize its image of a party for families and therefore points at the areas around schools. SP focuses on the poorer voters and therefore want to pay extra attention to traffic safety in the poor areas of the city. At the third of March, the voter can express its preferences.

Appendix K: Chapter 4, Political Cynicism Items

Table K1: Distribution of Answers on the Seven Political Cynicism Items

	fully disagree	2	3	4	5	6	fully agree
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Statements about reliability:							
*politicians consciously promise more than they can deliver	2	6	9	20	32	21	11
*the mayor and aldermen are primarily self-interested and	10	30	25	19	9	4	2
*friends more important than abilities to become city-councilor	6	19	19	25	16	12	3
*political parties are only interested in my vote, not in my opinion	4	13	20	22	22	10	9
Statements about competence:							
*politicians do not understand what matters to for the city	8	28	24	21	10	5	4
*politicians are capable of solving important problems	4	13	23	27	22	8	2
*most politicians competent people who know what they do	4	10	18	27	27	11	2

Note. Data entries are percentages. n = 459.