Campaigning on an upper level? Giebler/Wüst 2010

Kai Arzheimer

Übersicht

Einleitung/Fragestellung

Ergebnisse

Fazit

Was und warum?

- ▶ Rolle von Kandidaten generell vernachlässigt
- ▶ Received wisdom:
  - ▶ EP-Kampagnen 2nd order und
  - ▶ Von Parteien dominiert (weil nationale Kampagnen)
- ▶ Stimmt das?

Was und warum?

- ▶ Rolle von Kandidaten generell vernachlässigt
- ▶ Received wisdom:
    - ▶ EP-Kampagnen 2nd order und
    - ▶ Von Parteien dominiert (weil nationale Kampagnen)
- ▶ Stimmt das?
- ▶ Wie führen Kandidaten in 27 EU-Staaten ihren persönlichen Wahlkampf (wenn überhaupt)

JG|U
JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Theoretische Annahmen/Design

- ▶ Basiert auf nationalen Kandidatenstudien
- ▶ Besonderes Interesse an Internet – warum?

Theoretische Annahmen/Design

- ▶ Basiert auf nationalen Kandidatenstudien
- ▶ Besonderes Interesse an Internet – warum?
- ▶ Drei abhängige Variablen
    1. Dauer des Wahlkampfes
    2. Intensität
        - ▶ Zeit
        - ▶ Geld
    3. Grad der „(Post)modernität" (campaign tools)

Theoretische Annahmen/Design

- ► Basiert auf nationalen Kandidatenstudien
- ► Besonderes Interesse an Internet – warum?
- ► Drei abhängige Variablen
    1. Dauer des Wahlkampfes
    2. Intensität
        - ► Zeit
        - ► Geld
    3. Grad der „(Post)modernität" (campaign tools)

Campaign tools?

Table 2
Classification of Campaign Tools.

Campaign Tools	classic	post-modern
Door-knocking, canvassing	X	
Brief talks with people on streets, at markets, etc.	X	
Personal flyers/brochures	X	
Campaign posters	X	
Press activities (press interviews, press releases)	X	
Writing letters to voters	X	
Addresses or public debates at convened meetings	X	
Visits of firms, associations and clubs, or other meetings like fund raising events	X	
Webpage		X
Podcasts (audio or video files on the internet)		X
Weblog/blog (public diary or journal on the Internet)		X
Networking on the internet (Myspace, Facebook, Linkedin etc.)		X
Contacting voters by e-mail		X
Online chat with voters		X

Source: Giebler/Wüst 2010: 58

JG|U
JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Design/EP 2009

- ▶ Drei Analyseebenen
  1. Makro (Länder)
  2. Meso (Parteien innerhalb von Ländern)
  3. Mikro (Kandidaten innerhalb von Parteien innerhalb von Ländern)
- ▶ 27 Länder, regionale oder nationale Listen (STV); Unterschiede u. a.
  - ▶ Position im nationalen Wahlkalender
  - ▶ Preference voting
  - ▶ Alte vs. neue Demokratien
  - ▶ Zugang zum Internet
  - ▶ Erfolgaussichten der Kandidaten . . .

JG|U
JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Vermutungen

- ▶ Dauer: (fast) determiniert durch rechtliche Vorgaben

–66   57

Table 1
Independent variables and their expected effects on the dependent variables.

Level	Independent Variable	Dependent Variables		Campaign Tools	
		Intensity			
		time	spending	classic	post-modern
MICRO	Hopeless candidate	–	–	–	
	Incumbent MEP	þ	þ	þ	þ
	Elite nomination	–	þ		
	Personal share of spending	not used	–	not used	not used
	Age		þ		–
	Gender				þ
	Education				þ
	Classic campaigning	not used	not used	not used	þ
MESO	Party in Government	–	þ	þ	
	Predicted seat share	–	þ	þ	
	Left-right	–	þ		þ
	Polarization	þ	þ		
	EU position				
MACRO	Preferential Voting	þ	þ	þ	þ
	Distance to midterm	–	–		
	Internet density	not used	not used	–	þ
	GDP per capita in PPS	not used	þ	not used	not used

Source: Giebler/Wüst 2010: 57

JG|U

JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Daten

- ► EECS 2009
- ► 1346 Kandidaten befragt (20.6 pct)
- ► „Keine systematischen Ausfälle", MI (items auf Personenebene)

Intensity: time & spending

- ▶ Zeit: Stunden pro Woche während letztem Monat vor Wahl
- ▶ Geld: Quadratwurzel der Ausgaben für persönlichen Wahlkampf

Intensity: time & spending

Table 3
Regression models for campaign intensity (time and spending) of the EP candidates 2009.

level 1: 1336 candidates level 2: 216 parties level 3: 27 countries	a) time		b) spending	
	b	t	b	t
Intercept	54.25***	7.36	145.44***	4.99
Candidates				
Gender (male)	.75	.53	16.37*	2.48
Age (c)	−.27***	−4.93	.11	.45
Education (high)	−.76	−.41	6.83	.79
Incumbent	13.59***	4.49	43.77**	2.95
Elite nomination	−2.87	−1.28	−7.93	−1.07
Hopeless	−22.19***	−11.36	−65.91***	−7.11
Personal share of spending			−.44***	−4.64
Parties				
Predicted seat share	33.60***	4.58	48.91	1.34
l-r position (c)	1.43***	3.55	4.75*	2.48
Polarization	.81	1.11	2.55	.78
EU position (c)	−.28	−.73	−1.82	−1.73
In government	−.24	−.11	19.70*	1.97
Countries				
GDP (c)			−.62*	2.49
Preference voting	5.39	.94	−7.20	−.34
Midterm distance	−.12	−1.47	.03	−.09
Random effect (model)	variance comp.	R^2 (level-specific)	variance comp.	R^2 (level-specific)
u_{00} (level 3)	171.98	.34	2034.74	.43
r_0 (level 2)	15.69	.83	98.97	.89
e (level 1)	529.18	.14	8918.91	.11
Total R^2		.26		.24
Random effect (null model)	variance comp.		variance comp.	
u_{00} (level 3)	259.62		3569.94	
r_0 (level 2)	92.76		909.35	
e (level 1)	614.46		9974.02	

***$p < .001$; **$p < .01$; *$p < .05$.
(c) variable has been included grand centered.

Source: Giebler/Wüst 2010: 61

Campaign tools

- „Classic" und „post-modern" campaign tools
- Indexbildung
- Komplementär eingesetzt

Campaign tools

Regression models for classic and post-modern campaigning of the EP candidates 2009.

level 1: 1336 candidates level 2: 216 parties level 3: 27 countries	a) classic		b) post-modern	
	b	t	b	t
Intercept	7.95***	18.35	1.20**	3.03
Candidates				
Gender (male)	−.09	−.66	.23*	2.44
Age (c)	−.01	−1.06	−.03***	−8.43
Education (high)	−.10	−.58	.15	1.18
Incumbent	.56	1.73	.65**	2.94
Elite nomination	−.39*	−2.49	−.28**	−2.63
Hopeless	−.99***	−4.99	.62**	−4.65
Classic campaigning			.26***	12.54
Parties				
Predicted seat share	2.44**	3.32	−.94	−1.89
l-r position (c)	.04	1.02	.08**	3.05
Polarization	.11	1.51	.00	.06
EU position (c)	.03	.89	.10***	4.18
In government	.07	.32	−.43**	−3.14
Countries				
Internet density (c)	−.02**	−2.78	.01	1.05
Preference voting	−.09	−.37	.85**	3.40
Midterm distance	−.01*	−2.18	−.00	−.24
Random effect (model)	variance comp.	R^2 (level-specific)	variance comp.	R^2 (level-specific)
u_{00} (level 3)	.14	.64	.26	.34
r_0 (level 2)	.26	.60	.05	.74
e (level 1)	4.32	.03	1.89	.25
Total R^2		.14		.29
Random effect (null model)	variance comp.		variance comp.	
u_{00} (level 3)	.39		.39	
r_0 (level 2)	.64		.21	
e (level 1)	4.46		2.51	

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05.
(c) variable has been included grand centered.

Source: Giebler/Wüst 2010: 62

Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse

Table 5
Summary of the Results.

Level	Independent Variable	Dependent Variables			
		Intensity		Campaign Tools	
		time	spending	classic	post-modern
MICRO	Hopeless candidate	- (Á)	- (Á)	- (Á)	–
	Incumbent MEP	þ (þ)	þ (þ)	þ (þ)	þ (þ)
	Elite nomination	- (Á)	– (þ)	–	–
	Personal share of spending	not used	- (Á)	not used	not used
	Age	–	- (þ)		- (Á)
	Gender				þ (þ)
	Education		þ (þ)		þ (þ)
	Classic campaigning	not used	not used	not used	þ (þ)
MESO	Party in Government	- (Á)	þ (þ)	þ (þ)	–
	Predicted seats	þ (Á)	þ (þ)	þ (þ)	
	Left-right	þ (Á)	þ (þ)		þ (þ)
	Polarization	þ (þ)	þ (þ)		
	EU position				þ
MACRO	Preferential Voting	þ (þ)	- (þ)	- (þ)	þ (þ)
	Distance to midterm	- (Á)	- (Á)		
	Internet density	not used	not used	– (Á)	þ (þ)
	GDP per capita in PPS	not used	þ (þ)	not used	not used

Source: Giebler/Wüst 2010: 63

JG|U
JOHANNES GUTENBERG
UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Fazit

- ▶ Internet und de-alignment bieten neue Möglichkeiten für *Kandidaten*
- ▶ Aktivitäten von Kandidaten können im Mehr-Ebenen-Zugriff erklärt werden
- ▶ Kandidaten rational