



UCD GEARY INSTITUTE DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

The Irish non-voter: Evidence from the Irish National Election Study and Living in Ireland surveys

McKenzie, Kenneth¹ and Delaney, Liam.²

¹School of Psychology,
University of Dublin,
Trinity College,
Dublin 2.
Email: mckenzik@tcd.ie
Phone: 00-353-1-6083255.

² Geary Institute
University College Dublin
Dublin 4
Email: liam.delaney@ucd.ie
Phone: 00-353-1-7164631

The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the Geary Institute. All errors and omissions remain those of the author. The authors wish to extend their gratitude to Michael Marsh for providing full access to the INES dataset and to seminar participants in Trinity College Dublin, Dublin City University and the annual conferences of the British Psychological Society, Social Psychology Section; and the Political Studies Association of Ireland for useful comments.

Abstract

This paper analyses the determinants of voting abstention and voting intention utilising data from the Irish National Election Study (INES) and the Living in Ireland survey. We find a marked age effect (younger people less likely to vote) that is similar in magnitude across both cross-sectional results obtained from the INES and panel results obtained from the Living in Ireland survey. Additionally, we find an inverse relationship between education and likelihood of abstention that is similar in magnitude across the panel and cross-section. We find a number of social capital variables to be negatively related to abstention. We also model the determinants of abstention including variables such as political interest; feelings of duty; confidence in the Dáil; and feelings of guilt surrounding non-voting. Inclusion of these variables renders many of the above social capital variables insignificant. However, the effect of age remains significant in all models.

1. Introduction

Voting abstention has accelerated since 1989 (O'Malley 2001), and a further decline at the 2002 general election raises questions about the representativeness of Irish electoral politics (cf. Democracy Commission in Ireland 2005). This paper is the first of a series of papers examining voting abstention in Ireland. The overall aim of the series is to contribute to the methodological underpinnings of abstention work examining the implications of new insights from these methodologies for Irish politics. This first paper attempts to examine evidence from existing available raw data. An important question for Irish political studies is the extent of differential turnout: which groups display higher levels of abstention? A second question is the motivation behind abstention: why is it the case that so many are choosing not to vote? This paper examines the individual determinants of voting abstention in Ireland using both the Irish National Election Study and the Living in Ireland survey, the Irish round of the European Community Household Panel Survey.

The aggregate data support the point that Ireland fits the pattern of falling turnouts for advanced democracies. Sinnott (1995: 84) covers all Irish general elections from 1922 to 1992. We see that the 1933 turnout figure of 81 per cent was the peak - in 1937, there was a five per cent drop and from then on, turnout never exceeded 77 per cent. The 1944 and 1948 elections had lower turnouts than for any contest from 1969 to 1989. The figures on abstention for the 12 elections from 1961-2002 are given in Table 1:

From the 1989 election, Ireland's turnout record compares unfavourably: its fall of 10 per cent from 1989-2002 is twice that of the European average (O'Malley op. cit., 215). Even allowing for inadequacies in the keeping of the electoral register (removing the deceased and emigrants, for example) there is still a loss. Both official turnout and estimated turnout decline.ⁱ This falling trend is particularly discrepant when we consider that the proportional electoral system used in Ireland, and the emergence of new parties, are both thought to stimulate turnout.ⁱⁱ However, we cannot tell *who* is less compelled to vote by reliance on aggregate data; for an answer to this question, we need to turn to theoretical models and empirical findings based on individual data.

Since the 1960s, the conventional wisdom has been that socioeconomic disadvantage is predictive of a greater likelihood of voluntary abstention (cf. Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995). However, there is confusion over whether or not the 'marginalised' description is a good fit for the Irish non-voter. On the one hand, we have Kavanagh's (2002) analysis of turnout rates in inner-city Dublin as an illustration of how lower socioeconomic circumstances are key in determining abstention. Conversely, Anduiza Perea's (2002) cross-national comparative study finds that one cannot differentiate between Irish non-voters and voters on the basis of socio-demographic status. The reason for divergence may well lie in the difficulty of juxtaposing a large-n comparative study with a localised piece of field research. However, turnout rates in poorer constituencies are suggestive that the disadvantaged do, in fact, vote less frequently than average.

Previous work on modelling non-voting at the individual level includes that by Lyons and Sinnott (2003: 144). They compared constituency-level data with the ASES comparative study and a two-wave IMS study immediately before and after the 1997 election, and as such, their work is the most comprehensive to date. They found that abstention in 1997 was a function of three factors: circumstantial absence, reduced resources (including reduced political knowledge and social capital), and a fall-off in proximity to party and civic duty (op. cit. 156).

The INES offers one of the first opportunities to rigorously profile the determinants of abstention at the individual level. Firstly, we can examine the effect of demographic and attitudinal factors on voting abstention in the 2002 election, utilising standard binary probability models. However, the data also allows us to examine the determinants of repeated instances of non-voting as it also asks a question about whether the respondent voted in the 1997 election. This should give a clearer picture of the underlying determinants of voting abstention, as voting abstention in one election may be due to a number of reasonably random circumstantial factors, whereas abstention from two elections is more likely to be voluntary and more strongly related to characteristics of the individual. There are two problems with this analysis. Firstly, the data are collected in 2002 and so information about turnout at the 1997 election is retrospective in nature and may be subject to recall bias. Secondly, we do not have information on the characteristics of respondents in 1997. Thus, while we are able to estimate the effects of fixed characteristics such as gender on repeated abstention, we cannot differentiate between the effects of changes in characteristics in generating abstention.ⁱⁱⁱ

The Living in Ireland panel allows us to benchmark the results of the INES. The dataset contains information on voting intention over the period 1994-2001. While there is marked attrition in the data, there is nevertheless sufficient observations to estimate an intention function for each year over the period. This is, of course, different from analysing accounts of actual voting behaviour as conducted by the INES and is weaker in that it merely assesses intention rather than actually ascertaining whether the person voted. Nevertheless, to the extent that voting intention is representative of an underlying propensity to vote, modelling the determinants of this variable will yield valuable information about how abstention motivations changed over the 1994-2001 period. Furthermore, it enables us to partly circumvent the problems involved in using a one-period cross-sectional study to estimate the determinants of abstention, as we have information on the same individuals over an eight year period. Thus, comparing the results from a panel model with the individual cross-sectional results will enable us to, at least partly, ascertain the extent to which cross-sectional relationships derived from the INES hold in a panel context.

2. Data/Scales Employed

The data are drawn from the Irish National Election Study conducted in the summer of 2002 in the months following the General Election in May. Respondents were asked the following question to determine whether they had voted or abstained: “As you know, many people did not vote in the recent general election. How about you? Did you vote in the General Election in May?” Respondents who declared that they had abstained were then asked: “What was the main reason why you did not vote?”

Please describe as fully as possible.” All respondents were also asked whether they had voted in the 1997 General Election. Furthermore, respondents were asked whether they had voted in the Nice Treaty and Abortion Referenda, which had taken place that year.

For those over the age of 23 (i.e. potentially eligible to vote in both 1997 and 2002), we can construct a four way variable describing their voting behaviour in the two general elections that takes the following values:

1 = Voted in Both

2 = Voted in 97 but not 02

3 = Voted in 02 but not 97

4 = Voted in Neither

Respondents were asked about a number of socio-demographic characteristics including, date of birth; gender; highest level of education; weekly household income; occupation; occupational sector; trade union membership; GAA membership; marital status, and religion.

The second data source is derived from the Living in Ireland survey, part of the European Community Household Panel Survey (ECHP) (see Watson 2004 for a detailed overview). The first wave of the ECHP was conducted in 1994, and the same individuals and households were followed each year. The survey ran for eight waves, until 2001. In 2000, the seventh wave, the Irish sample of individuals and households followed from Wave 1 was supplemented by the addition of 1,500 new households to the total.

This was done in order to increase the overall sample size, which had declined due to attrition since 1994.¹ The questionnaire contains a simple measure of voting intention, namely asking respondents “Would you vote in a general election”. The survey contains detailed measures of marital status, gender, associational membership, regional location, labour force status, household composition thus allowing us to estimate standard socio-economic voting intention functions.

3. Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

Of the sample, 81.2 per cent stated that they had voted in the 2002 General Election. This turnout is higher than the 63 per cent of voters who actually did vote, which implies either a degree of sample selection bias, or social desirability bias, both of which cannot be controlled for given the data to hand.^{iv} Table 2 displays the cross-tabulations of the decision not to vote with respect to age bracket; gender; household income category; education; region; and employment status.

As can be seen, voter turnout in 2002 was not highly variable across the bulk of the distributions. The main observed frequencies of non-voting were among those with no education (62 per cent not voting); those between the ages of 18 and 25 (39 per cent not voting); and students (40 per cent not voting). Table 3 reveals that non voters demonstrate less interest in politics; are more likely to believe that it does not make a difference who is in government; that their vote does not make a difference; to find politics complicated; to believe that the Irish government does not have an influence;

¹ The questionnaires were administered in a face-to-face interview by the ESRI's team of interviewers. On average, the household questionnaire took 12 minutes to complete, while the individual questionnaire took 30-35 minutes to complete. The average number of individual interviews per household in 1994 was 2.4. Further information about sampling and attrition is available in Watson (op. cit).

to believe that the parties are not different to each other; and are less likely to believe that going out to vote is a duty and to feel guilty about not voting.

Binary Logistic Models of Abstention in General Election 2002

Table 4 displays marginal effects from four binary logistic regressions of the determinants of voter turnout in the 2002 general election. Model 1 examines the effect of household income; gender; age category; and level of education. Model 2 estimates this model employing a bootstrapped standard error procedure, which as can be seen makes very little difference to the estimated results. The results point against an independent effect of household income or gender on turnout. However, there is a substantial effect of both age and level of education. Model 3 includes a number of social capital variables: GAA membership; trade union membership; and religious participation.

Both trade union membership and religious participation have a statistically significant and positive effect on turnout, indicating support for the group mobilisation hypothesis (cf. Franklin, 2004). However, GAA membership does not have an effect on turnout, pointing against a hypothesised relationship between the type of social capital generated by sport and wider political participation. Finally, we include a number of psychological and attitudinal items: lack of guilt about abstention; political interest; perception that voting does not make a difference; perception of being well-informed; and feelings of duty to vote. With the exception of feelings of being informed, all of these variables have a statistically significant and substantial effect on the probability of abstention. Those with higher feelings of duty; guilt; perception that vote makes a difference; and political interest are more likely to

vote. Furthermore, including these variables renders the education and social capital variables insignificant, indicating that the effects of social capital variables can be explained by the different levels of attitudes to voting among the sub-groups. However, it is unclear how one should interpret these results from a causal perspective.

Multinomial Logistic Models of Dynamic Abstention Behaviour between General Election 1997 and General Election 2002

The next equation (Table 5) examines the determinants of the choice between four different decisions: (i) *vote in both elections*, (ii) *vote in 97 but not 02*, (iii) *vote in 02 but not 97*, and (iv) *vote in neither*.

We utilise the same set of variables used in the binary model. The base category for our analysis is the group who voted in both 1997 and 2002; the coefficients displayed in Table 5 are relative risk ratios describing the effect of the independent variables on the relative risk of being in the target category as opposed to the base category. The results show clearly that age is negatively related to being in all three categories as opposed to the base category (voted in both). Thus older respondents are less likely to miss elections either persistently or occasionally. The variables that most distinguish persistent non-voters from persistent voters are duty; guilt; political interest; and the perception that voting makes no difference, in the expected direction. However, as can be seen, their effect on persistent non-voting is far greater than their effect on occasional non-voting. Another item of interest was to examine whether there was an asymmetry in the factors that caused respondents to drop out of the 2002 election having voted in 1997, and the factors that caused people to vote in 2002 having abstained in 1997. One factor that emerges is that those who had experienced a spell

of unemployment in the last five years were more likely to be in the category that had abstained in 1997 but voted in 2002, perhaps indicating that returning to the labour market has a positive effect on voting.

Determinants of Voting Intention: Living in Ireland Survey Results

Table 6 displays binary logistic regression models of the determinants of voting intention for each year from 1994 to 2001. Similar to the INES data, the results demonstrate a statistically significant and positive effect on turnout of education, and a positive but quadratic effect of age, both of which are of a similar order of magnitude across each of the years.

Furthermore, social capital variables such as membership of clubs, religious participation and frequency of contact with neighbours all have a positive effect on intention to vote. We do not have the same control variables such as the duty and guilt variables from the INES. However, the social capital variables do remain statistically significant once one controls for confidence in the Dáil, which in itself positively predicts turnout. Unlike the results obtained from INES, household income has a significant and positive effect on intention to vote. Table 7 displays a panel binary logistic regression and confirms the cross-sectional effects of the education, income, age and social capital variables.^v The effect of health on turnout is also strongly positive, something explored further in Denny and Doyle (2005).

4. Conclusion

This paper has provided a detailed statistical profile of individual voting participation in Ireland using two major datasets and three separate modelling frameworks. The most marked demographic effect to emerge from all three frameworks is the effect of age with people being more likely to vote as they age – but with a quadratic form whereby voters in the 65 plus age bracket become less likely to vote. The panel results support the picture that emerges from cross-sectional analysis and point to a joint effect of education, age and social capital variables in determining turnout.

Our results should be considered with a number of caveats in mind. Firstly, the deviation between actual and reported turnout is an enduring problem in NES research and future work accounting for this will be a valuable contribution to the field. Secondly, the extent to which variables such as political interest, duty and guilt are tautological in the context of regression models of voting rather than genuinely explanatory, needs to be explored in more depth. Thirdly, it is unclear whether coefficients on demographic variables represent demand-side as opposed to supply-side relations. It may be the case that such positive coefficients on abstention represent differential underlying propensity to engage (demand) or it may be that such groups have not been well targeted by actors within the political system (supply). It is arguably both, but such relationships are difficult to ascertain in cross-sectional surveys, where the political system must be held constant.

References

- Anduiza Perea, E. (2002). 'Individual Characteristics, Institutional Incentives and Electoral Abstention in Western Europe'. *European Journal of Political Research* 41, 643-673.
- Democracy Commission of Ireland 2005. Final Report. Accessed on 19/11/05 at <http://www.tascnet.ie/upload/Democratic%20Renewal%20final.pdf>
- Denny, K., and Doyle, O. (2005). "Take up thy bed and vote: Measuring the Relationship between Voting Behaviour and Indicators of Health". *UCD Geary Institute Working Paper* 2005/11.
- Franklin, M., (2004). *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies Since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kavanagh, A.P. (2002). *Unequal Participation – Unequal Influence: Voter Participation and Voter Education in Dublin's South West Inner City*. Dublin: South West Inner City Network.
- Lyons, P., and Sinnott, R. (2003). 'Voter Turnout in 2002 and beyond', in M. Gallagher, M. Marsh & P. Mitchell, (eds), *How Ireland Voted 2002* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.143-158.
- Norris, P., 1997. 'Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional, Majoritarian and Mixed Systems.' *International Political Science Review* 18, 297-312.
- O'Malley, E. (2001). 'Apathy or Error? Questioning the Irish Register of Electors'. *Irish Political Studies*, 16, 215-224.
- Sinnott, R. (1995). *Irish Voters Decide – Voting Behaviour in Elections and Referendums Since 1918*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., and Brady, H.E. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watson, D. (2004). "Living in Ireland Survey – Technical Overview". Accessed on 19/8/05 at <http://issda.ucd.ie/documentation/esri/lii-overview.pdf>

Table 1: Abstention figures in Irish general elections, 1961-2002. After Nealon's Guide to the 29th Dáil, and Murphy & Farrell, 2002: 219.

<i>Election year</i>	<i>Percentage abstention</i>
1961	29.4
1965	24.9
1969	23.1
1973	23.4
1977	23.7
1981	23.8
Feb. 1982	26.2
Nov. 1982	27.2
1987	26.7
1989	31.5
1992	31.6
1997	34.1
2002	37.3

Table 2: Cross-tabulations of Participation by Socio-economic Groups

	Yes (%)	No (%)
Education		
None (n = 29)	38	62
Completed primary (n = 620)	86	14
Junior/inter group or equivalent (n = 593)	80	20
Leaving cert or equivalent (n = 661)	80	20
Diploma or certificate (n = 435)	81	19
University degree or equivalent (n = 313)	81	19
Age		
18-25	61	39
26-34	77	23
35-50	87	13
51-65	91	9
65+	88	12
Employment Status		
At work full-time (30+ hrs) (n = 1246)	81	19
At work part-time (<30hrs) (n = 271)	85	15
Relative assisting/unpaid family worker (n = 15)	93	7
Unemployed and seeking work (n = 102)	74	26
Student (n = 195)	60	40
Retired (n = 239)	87	13
Engaged in home duties (n = 494)	87	13
Long term sick or disabled (n = 74)	82	18
Other (n = 13)	77	23
Employment Sector		
Civil service (n = 158)	87	13
Local authority health board or vec (n = 215)	82	18
Non-commercial semi-state body (n = 60)	80	20
Commercial semi-state body (n = 101)	85	15
Private sector (n = 1683)	81	19
GAA Membership		
GAA Member (n = 414)	84	16
Not GAA Member (n = 2221)	81	19
Income Category		
a: under _240 p/w (n = 414)	81	19
b: _241-_450 p/w (n = 746)	82	18
c: _œ451-_700 p/w (n = 583)	85	15
d: _701 or more p/w (n = 570)	77	23
Gender		
Male (n = 1134)	82	18
Female (n = 1207)	84	16
Total	81	19

Table 3: Level of Agreement with Statements about Politics

	Voted		Did not Vote		Total	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Disinterested in Politics (1 to 4)	2.33	0.82	2.80	0.91	2.42	0.86
Vote no difference who's in government (1 to 7)	2.51	1.63	3.47	1.95	2.69	1.73
Duty to go out & vote in gen election (1 to 7)	6.10	1.24	4.67	1.89	5.83	1.49
Vote not much diff-candids elected (1 to 7)	2.38	1.53	3.37	1.83	2.57	1.64
If did not vote- would not feel guilty (1 to 4)	2.04	0.93	2.95	1.02	2.21	1.01
Politics: complicated-cant understand (1 to 7)	4.37	1.89	4.60	1.80	4.42	1.87
ord person has no influence on politics (1 to 7)	3.82	1.92	4.22	1.84	3.90	1.91
I'm better informed than most (1 to 7)	3.52	1.58	3.09	1.55	3.44	1.58
Irl govt cant influence what happens (1 to 7)	3.05	1.63	3.56	1.67	3.14	1.65
Not matter which party in power (1 to 7)	4.04	1.88	4.63	1.74	4.15	1.87

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regressions of Voter Participation (Marginal Effects)

	1		2		3		4	
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	dy/dx	Std. Err.	dy/dx	Std. Err.	dy/dx	Std. Err.
Weekly Household Income								
<240	-	-	-	-				
241 - 450	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.03
451 - 700	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02
700+	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.03
Number of Residents <14	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.01
Age Category								
18-25	-	-	-	-				
26-34	0.09***	0.01	0.09***	0.02	0.08***	0.02	0.07***	0.01
35-50	0.15***	0.01	0.15***	0.02	0.14***	0.02	0.10***	0.02
51-65	0.18***	0.01	0.18***	0.01	0.16***	0.02	0.09***	0.02
65+	0.13***	0.02	0.13***	0.01	0.11***	0.02	0.05**	0.02
Level of Education								
Junior Cert or Less								
Leaving Certificate	0.04**	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.01	0.02
Diploma/Post Leaving	0.04***	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.05***	0.02	0.01	0.02
Degree	0.05***	0.02	0.05***	0.02	0.04**	0.02	-0.01	0.03
GAA Membership					0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Trade Union Membership					0.03**	0.02	0.02	0.02
Religious Participation					0.01***	0.00	0.00	0.00
Period of Unemployment					-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Contacted by Party Rep							-0.01	0.01
Lack of Guilt							-0.05***	0.01
Lack of Political Interest							-0.02***	0.01
Vote Makes No Difference							-0.01***	0.00
Feel Well Informed							0.00	0.01
Duty to Go Out to Vote							0.03***	0.00
Number of observations	2305		2305		1777		1669	
Replications	50				50		50	
Wald chi2(12)	96.39		96.54		86.46		270.4	
Prob > chi2	0		0		0.000		0.000	
Pseudo R2	0.0565		0.0565		0.07		0.20	
Log likelihood	-805.48		-805.48		-683.80		-547.39	

*Indicates statistically significant at the 10% level. ** Indicates statistically significant at the 5% level. *** Indicates statistically significant at 1% level.

Table 5: Multinomial Logistic Regressions of Voter Participation (Relative Risk Ratios): Base Category (Voted in Both Elections)

	Voted 2002 but Not 1997		Voted 1997 but not 2002		Voted in Neither	
	RRR	Std. Err.	RRR	Std. Err.	RRR	Std. Err.
Weekly Household Income						
<240	-	-	-	-	-	-
241 - 450	0.58	0.24	1.45	0.40	0.91	0.48
451 - 700	0.57	0.20	1.42	0.47	0.44	0.30
700+	0.80	0.34	1.49	0.57	0.76	0.51
Number of Residents <14	1.07	0.09	1.04	0.13	0.92	0.18
Gender	0.91	0.20	1.21	0.27	0.66	0.33
Age	0.86***	0.04	0.87***	0.04	0.68***	0.06
Age Squared	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Level of Education						
Junior Cert or Less						
Leaving Certificate	1.12	0.37	0.89	0.23	0.82	0.47
Diploma/Post Leaving	0.58	0.19	0.93	0.27	0.74	0.52
Degree	1.27	0.49	1.24	0.48	0.89	0.66
GAA Membership	0.80	0.20	0.77	0.21	0.94	0.67
Trade Union Membership	0.88	0.16	0.88	0.16	0.48	0.24
Religious Participation	0.96	0.06	0.89**	0.05	1.10	0.12
Period of Unemployment	1.74**	0.50	0.76	0.26	1.64	0.72
Contacted by Party Rep	1.23	0.20	1.24	0.17	1.30	0.36
Lack of Guilt	1.57***	0.20	1.74***	0.17	2.49***	0.61
Lack of Political Interest	1.20	0.15	0.88	0.12	3.61***	1.09
Vote Makes No Difference	1.02	0.08	1.02	0.07	1.23**	0.13
Feel Well Informed	0.98	0.07	0.95	0.06	1.29	0.19
Duty to Go Out to Vote	0.95	0.07	0.79***	0.05	0.69***	0.07
Constant						
Number of observations	1491					
Replications	50					
Wald chi2(12)	-					
Prob > chi2	0.000					
Pseudo R2	0.20					
Log likelihood	-842.55					

*Indicates statistically significant at the 10% level. ** Indicates statistically significant at the 5% level. *** Indicates statistically significant at 1% level.

Table 6: Cross-Sectional Determinants of Stated Willingness to Vote: Living in Ireland Household Panel Survey: Marginal Effects Probit Model

	1994		1995		1996		1997	
	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.
Member of a Club	0.05***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
How often talk to Neighbours	0.02***	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
Lack of Confidence in the Dail	-0.09***	0.01	-0.07***	0.01	-0.06***	0.00	-0.06***	0.00
Religious Participation	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
Health Problems	-0.04*	0.03	-0.10***	0.03	-0.14***	0.03	-0.13***	0.03
Log Household Income	0.04***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.00	0.01
Log Age	0.22***	0.01	0.17***	0.01	0.15***	0.01	0.13***	0.01
Education								
No Qualifications								
Junior Certificate	0.02	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
Leaving Certificate	0.08***	0.01	0.07***	0.01	0.06***	0.01	0.05***	0.01
Third Level	0.11***	0.01	0.09***	0.01	0.08***	0.01	0.07***	0.01
Employment Status								
Full-Time (Reference)								
Apprentice	-0.18	0.09	0.00	0.05	-0.09*	0.06	-0.09**	0.06
Temporary Scheme	-0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.02
Self-Employed	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02
Farmer	0.06***	0.02	0.03*	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Relative Assist	-0.05	0.07	-0.02	0.08	-0.04	0.09	-	-
Farm Relative Assist	-0.06	0.05	-0.07	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.02	0.05
Training	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.09	0.08	-	-
Seek First Job	-0.05	0.03	-0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.04
Unemployed	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.05**	0.02	-0.05***	0.02
Unemployed Ill	-0.11	0.10	0.05	0.05	-0.22**	0.14	-0.14	0.10
Ill/Disabled	-0.03	0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.09***	0.04	-0.03	0.03
Retired	-0.05***	0.02	-0.04*	0.02	-0.09***	0.03	-0.07***	0.03
Home Duties	-0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.05***	0.01	-0.02	0.01
In Education	-0.16***	0.02	-0.08***	0.02	-0.17***	0.03	-0.12***	0.02
Female	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.01
Observed Probability	0.82		0.86		0.87		0.89	
Predicted Probability	0.86	(at x-bar)	0.90	(at x-bar)	0.92	(at x-bar)	0.93	(at x-bar)
Number of Observations	8585		7199		6218		5663	
LR Chi-Squared	1272		899		969		769	
Pr>0	0.000		0.000		0.000		0.00	
Pseudo R-Squared	0.16		0.15		0.20		0.20	

**Table 6 (continued): Cross-Sectional Determinants of Stated Willingness to Vote:
Living in Ireland Household Panel Survey: Marginal Effects Probit Model**

	1998		1999		2000		2001	
	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.
Member of a Club	0.02***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
How often talk to Neighbours	0.01**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.02**	0.00	0.02**	0.00
Lack of Confidence in the Dail	-0.06***	0.00	-0.06***	0.01	-0.07***	0.00	-0.06***	0.00
Religious Participation	0.01***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
Health Problems	-0.11***	0.04	-0.05***	0.03	-0.08***	0.03	-0.09***	0.03
Log Household Income	0.01***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
Log Age	0.14***	0.01	0.17***	0.01	0.19***	0.01	0.16***	0.01
Education								
No Qualifications								
Junior Certificate	0.02*	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.04*	0.01	0.02*	0.01
Leaving Certificate	0.04***	0.01	0.05***	0.01	0.09***	0.01	0.07***	0.01
Third Level	0.06***	0.01	0.07***	0.01	0.10***	0.01	0.07***	0.01
Employment Status								
Full-Time (Reference)								
Apprentice	-0.12	0.06	-0.13	0.07	-0.15	0.06	-0.04	0.05
Temporary Scheme	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.03
Self-Employed	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Farmer	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.02
Relative Assist	-0.05	0.11	-0.01	0.09	-0.03	0.07	0.03	0.06
Farm Relative Assist	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.07	-0.09	0.11	0.01	0.07
Training	0.01	0.04	-0.07	0.10	-0.01	0.06	-0.06	0.07
Seek First Job	-0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	-0.06	0.06	-0.14	0.10
Unemployed	-0.03*	0.02	-0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Unemployed Ill	-0.06	0.08	-0.27	0.14	0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.06
Ill/Disabled	0.00	0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Retired	-0.05**	0.02	-0.05**	0.03	-0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.02
Home Duties	-0.03**	0.01	-0.04***	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.01
In Education	-0.15***	0.03	-0.11***	0.03	-0.10***	0.02	-0.10***	0.02
Female	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01
Observed Probability	0.89		0.87		0.85		0.87	
Predicted Probability		(at x-bar)		(at x-bar)		(at x-bar)		(at x-bar)
Number of Observations	5223		4435		6446		5634	
LR Chi-Squared	946		797		1195		991	
Pr>0	0.000		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Pseudo R-Squared	0.26		0.24		0.21		0.24	

Table 7: GEE Panel Logit Regression of Intention to Vote (1 = Yes): Living in Ireland Household Panel Survey: Marginal Effects Probit Model

	Exchangeable Correlation		Ar (1) Model	
	dF/dx	Std. Err.	dF/dx	Std. Err.
Member of a Club	0.03***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
How often talk to Neighbours	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
Lack of Confidence in the Dail	-0.06***	0.00	-0.06***	0.00
Religious Participation	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
Health Problems	-0.07***	0.01	-0.06***	0.01
Log Household Income	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
Log Age	0.18***	0.01	0.16***	0.01
Education				
No Qualifications				
Junior Certificate	0.03***	0.00	0.03***	0.00
Leaving Certificate	0.07***	0.00	0.06***	0.00
Third Level	0.08***	0.00	0.08***	0.00
Employment Status				
Full-Time (Reference)				
Apprentice	-0.05***	0.02	-0.07***	0.02
Temporary Scheme	0.01***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
Self-Employed	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Farmer	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
Relative Assist	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.03
Farm Relative Assist	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.03
Training	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Seek First Job	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.02
Unemployed	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Unemployed Ill	-0.05	0.03	-0.05	0.03
Ill/Disabled	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01
Retired	-0.04***	0.01	-0.03***	0.01
Home Duties	-0.02***	0.00	-0.02***	0.01
In Education	-0.09***	0.01	-0.09***	0.01
Female	-0.00	0.04	-0.00	0.01
Number of Observations	49355		36394	
Number of Groups	14236		8314	
LR Chi-Squared	3764		2747	
Pr>0	0.000		0.000	

*Indicates statistically significant at the 10% level. ** Indicates statistically significant at the 5% level. *** Indicates statistically significant at 1% level.

ⁱ Based on electoral register anomalies as above which mean that 107 per cent of the eligible population was on the register (O'Malley, op. cit.)

ⁱⁱ Norris, 1997: 9.

ⁱⁱⁱ This has been examined in ongoing work by Kevin Denny and Orla Doyle at the UCD Geary Institute.

^{iv} This is a common problem in National Election studies, and is discussed in detail by Lyons & Sinnott (2003).

^v The second model is estimated using an AR(1) model to allow for potential auto-correlation in the voting participation equation.