

The internet, participation and democratic support: an analysis of panel data

Jill Sheppard
Australian Centre for Applied Social Research Methods
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200

Abstract

The internet creates new opportunities for online political participation without citizens incurring the high transaction costs of many offline activities. However, the lower costs associated with online participation may also equate to lower benefits. This study examines whether the benefits of offline participation on diffuse democratic support extend to e-participation. It is hypothesised that offline participation will have positive effects on political efficacy, political trust and satisfaction with democracy, while online participation will have positive, but weaker, effects on those measures. It is also hypothesised that both modes of participation are also factors of democratic support, such that the relationship is non-recursive. This will add to theories of online reinforcement of previous beliefs and behaviours. To address these questions, panel data from US and New Zealand election studies are used.

This paper is prepared for presentation at the panel 81.52 'Online and Offline Political Participation and Their Consequences for Democracy', 2015 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, 3-6 September 2015.

Introduction

Political participation is widely viewed as a symptom of democratic health or malaise (for example Norris 2011). While it is certainly the case that rates of participation – across a range of activities – can provide insight into the state of a democratic system, it is also the case that participation can have positive effects on individuals' attitudes towards democracy (Finkel 1987; 1985). Such a relationship may resemble other non-recursive relationships within democratic systems,¹ but rates of participation can also reflect those citizens who are moved to participate by feelings of dissatisfaction or frustration with democracy (Norris 2011; Barnes, Farah, and Heunks 1979b; Dalton, Van Sickle, and Weldon 2010). In this scenario, the act of participation has net benefits on democratic health; by affording dissatisfied citizens the capacity to participate – a central criterion of most democratic benchmarks – a system can increase those citizens' satisfaction.

Further to the hypothesised positive effects of participation on democratic attitudes is the advent of online forms of political activity, potentially opening up opportunities to participate to previously inactive citizens (Krueger 2002; Cantijoch and Gibson 2011; Anduiza, Cantijoch, and Gallego 2009). By lowering the costs of political participation, the internet may increase the number of citizens who participate and consequently report more favourable attitudes towards their democratic system. Alternatively, with lower costs of participation, the subsequent benefits may be diminished. By comparing offline and online forms of activity, this study extends findings from Kenski and Stroud (2006) which show small positive associations between internet use and democratic attitudes (namely internal political efficacy). Two hypotheses are tested: first, that offline forms of political activity will have positive effects on citizens' attitudes towards democracy, and second, that online forms of the same activities will have smaller but still positive effects on attitudes.

The study proceeds by first discussing existing research on the bi-directional (and multi-faceted) relationship between political participation and democratic attitudes. It then explores the phenomenon of online political participation, looking at who participates online, the relative costs and benefits of e-participation and the different profiles of offline and online activists. Third, data and methodology are outlined, followed by analysis of participation and attitudes among citizens of Australia, Britain, Canada and New Zealand – the major Westminster democracies. Finally, the

¹ Such as the 'knowledge gap' effects of media consumption, wherein those who benefit from positive effects are those who need them the least.

paper discusses the findings with emphasis on the implications for democratic support among citizens of the advanced democracies in this study.

Reciprocal effects of political activity and democratic attitudes

The task of unravelling the causal relationships between democratic attitudes, offline political activity and online political activity is intensely problematic. First, it is practical to delineate the scope of what is being discussed. For the purposes of this study, democratic attitudes refer to individuals' reported satisfaction with democracy and external political efficacy (i.e. the extent to which they can influence political outcomes). Political activity here refers to a range of behaviours, including traditional measures of participation but extending to political news seeking. The relationships under examination comprise the effects of democratic attitudes on individuals' propensity for political activity, and the effects of political activity on democratic attitudes. While the majority of research on these relationships has measured political activity as one of more offline behaviours, increasingly researchers are exploring the effects of online participation on democratic attitudes, and vice versa.

The differential effects of democratic attitudes on political activity are widely established: low political trust and democratic satisfaction are associated with protest activity, while diffuse support for democratic regimes is associated with more conventional, non-confrontational political activities (Barnes, Farah, and Heunks 1979b; Hooghe and Marien 2013). The effects of personal dissatisfaction, or relative deprivation, are more contested; Barnes et al. (1979a) find little evidence that discontent with personal circumstances translates into political action, while more recently Dalton et al. (2010) observe that opportunity is more important than relative deprivation to the process of becoming active. In other words, it matters little how 'hardly done by' an individual may feel; what matters more is that they have little faith in their political system and find it relatively easy to express their distrust, for instance by attending an organised protest. As many studies have noted (for example Verba and Nie 1972; Barnes et al. 1979a; Verba et al. 1995), politics is a marginal activity for most citizens, who require substantial motivation to incur the costs of participating.

On the other side of the attitude-participation equation, at least from a social choice perspective, are the benefits of participating. Citizens who participate in civic and political life are shown to accrue positive feelings of (internal and external) political efficacy, political trust and satisfaction with their democratic system (Fennema and Tillie 2001; Finkel 1987; Kaase 1999; Kenski and Stroud 2006). Specifically,

participation in voluntary networks can generate diffuse social and political trust (Fennema and Tillie 1999, 2001); involvement in contentious political activity, such as protest, can even have negative effects on system support (Finkel 1985). The diversity of findings has implications for social capital theory, which argues that participation in the kinds of voluntary organisations and social networks central to political activity leads to increased social and political trust, and more diffuse support for democratic political systems (for example Putnam 2001; Sivesind et al. 2013). Evidence of negative effects of some types of 'aggressive' political participation suggests that, at least in terms of accruing social capital, not all social networks are equal.

In sum, measures of political support positively predict traditional political participation and negatively predict contentious political participation, such as protest activity. In the other direction, traditional political participation can generate positive attitudes towards a democratic political system, whereas contentious political participation appears to erode political trust. Further, a combination of panel and cross-sectional studies suggest that the relationships between democratic attitudes and participation are reciprocal (Finkel 1987; Finkel 1987; Kenski and Stroud 2006; Kaase 1999). It is assumed, then, that the respective negative and positive effects of participation on attitudes increase existing divides in trust, efficacy and democratic satisfaction between activists and non-activists. For instance, a citizen with low political trust and low democratic satisfaction may be mobilised to protest as a result of holding those views. However, the act of protest – particularly if it becomes confrontational or violent – is expected to decrease any existing trust or satisfaction, leading to even deeper mistrust and dissatisfaction. Unless the protestor retains adequate levels of external political efficacy, they are decreasingly likely to engage with political life.

The literature on democratic attitudes and political activity therefore indicates the existence of spiraling, non-recursive effects with both positive and negative implications for democratic systems. As with other non-recursive relationships within political science, it is hypothesised that activity increases the gulf between the engaged and disengaged, or in this case, those supportive and those unsupportive of democratic systems. The potential implications for democracy are substantial. Democratic regimes achieve legitimacy through the diffuse support of their citizens (Easton 1975); if that support is increasingly concentrated within certain groups or types of citizens, the overall legitimacy of the regime may decrease. Further, the evidence to date suggests that participation in certain political activities do not generate measures of diffuse support. For participants in these activities, their lack of diffuse support may become entrenched.

Data and methodology

Among existing social survey data, there are only a small number of avenues in which to test for a causal relationship between online activity and democratic attitudes. Attitudes are presumed endogenous to participation, and cross-sectional data not well suited to isolating the direction of any observable effects. Among the panel datasets available to secondary researchers, few contain suitable measures of comparable online and offline activity (enabling the researcher to control for confounding offline activity). Two sets of panel data are analysed in this study: the New Zealand Election Study (NZES) 2002-2005-2008 panel and the American National Election Study (ANES) 2008-2009 online panel (Cohort 1 respondents only).

Both panels comprise three time points, but with vastly different intervals. The NZES panel was surveyed at three-year intervals following the 2002, 2005 and 2008 general elections. The ANES panel was surveyed each month between January 2008 and August 2009, in a total of 21 waves. Only ten waves included ANES questions, with three – Waves 1 (January 2008), 9 (November 2008), and 19 (May 2009) – used in this study. For the purposes of the paper, they will be referred to as T1, T2 and T3.

There is a tradeoff between sample size and panel maintenance, as respondents break off from the panel over time. This is more evident in the NZES than the ANES panels, likely due to the combination of longer intervals between surveys, mode of administration (mail-back compared with online) and the incentives offered to ANES respondents (see DeBell, Krosnick, and Lupia 2010). At the completion of their three relevant waves, the NZES panel includes 215 respondents, and the ANES panel 1271 respondents. Among this cohort, 380 respondents did not previously have the requisite internet access to complete the study, and were provided with access to facilitate their participation (while also acting as an incentive to participate). The NZES is weighted by a validated weight provided by the investigators, and the ANES is weighted with a cumulative weight to Wave 19. Both panels ask respondents how many days a week they read a newspaper, watch television news, listen to radio news, and look for news online. Those measures of online c.f. offline news seeking are used to compare online and offline activity in this study.

Democratic attitudes are measured by several measures: trust in parliament and satisfaction with democracy in the NZES panel, and whether government officials care and whether citizens can have an affect on government in the ANES panel. Variable scoring and distributions are available in Appendix 1. To begin building that profile, descriptive statistics are used to present the distributions of those activities within the

respective samples at each time point and longitudinally. Ordinary least squares regression, using a mixed linear effects model to control for heterogeneity across time points, explores the effects of online activity on subsequent attitudes. To test for reciprocity in the relationship between online activity and attitudes, alternate models explore the effects of attitudes on subsequent activity: the relationship that is more commonly assumed among behavioural researchers. Partial effects of activity on attitudes, and vice versa, are also presented for each time point to identify variation across waves. All analyses are conducted using R.

Online activity: the usual suspects?

Hypothesising that e-participation can generate democratic support among new types of citizens assumes that there are differences between who is active online and offline. Specifically, it assumes that some citizens are politically active online, who have not and might never have been active offline. Existing evidence on the capacity of the internet to mobilise previously inactive citizens into participating is mixed: research has variously found that the internet replicates offline patterns of participation, in terms of activities and participants; that the internet provides a medium for existing offline participants to extend their participatory repertoire; and elsewhere that the internet can and does mobilise citizens who would not participate otherwise (Anduiza, Cantijoch, and Gallego 2009). This section examines which of these scenarios best describes the internet's effects on citizens' political activity.

Taking an initial look at mean participation in the range of online and offline activities under examination, there are consistent and immediately noticeable trends (Table 1). Between 2002 and 2008, internet use increased among New Zealand respondents, as might be expected. However, the mean number of days that respondents report using the internet to read or watch news almost doubled, from one to 1.8. Concurrently, the use of all other media to consume news decreased, with the exception of television, which remained stable. In the ANES sample, similar trends are evident despite the much shorter time period. The mean days that respondents report reading or watching news online increased from 3.2 to 3.4 days across 11 months. Use of more traditional media remained stable across the first two waves (i.e. Waves 1 and 9 of the ANES panel), before falling across all three categories in Wave 19, conducted in May 2009.

Table 1: mean online and offline activity among panel respondents over time

	<i>Wave 1</i>	<i>Wave 2</i>	<i>Wave 3</i>
<i>New Zealand panel</i>	<i>Sept 2002</i>	<i>Nov 2005</i>	<i>Dec 2008</i>
Read news on internet (days/week)	-	1.06 (1.99)	1.83 (2.52)
Read newspaper	-	4.62 (2.28)	4.51 (2.31)
Watch TV news	-	5.80 (1.68)	5.78 (1.75)
Listen to radio news	-	2.87 (2.85)	2.35 (2.84)
<i>American panel</i>	<i>Jan 2008</i>	<i>Sept 2008</i>	<i>July 2009</i>
Read news on internet (days/week)	3.16 (2.72)	3.31 (2.67)	3.36 (2.66)
Read newspaper	3.43 (2.84)	3.41 (2.82)	3.17 (2.81)
Watch TV news	4.87 (2.29)	4.88 (2.25)	4.73 (2.38)
Listen to radio news	3.33 (2.60)	3.30 (2.56)	3.10 (2.55)

Cells display mean responses, with standard deviations in parentheses.

Question wordings are available in Appendix 1. Media use questions not asked in NZES Wave 1.

Multivariate analysis of the factors predicting online political activity – reading or watching news on the internet – in the NZES indicates that as online behaviours are becoming more diffuse, people participating online are increasingly heterogeneous. The first model in Table 2 presents data from the 2005 wave of the NZES, and shows that educational attainment, household income, political interest and newspaper readership all have strong, positive effects on online news consumption. The strength of these relationships, both in terms of effect size and small standard errors, is notable given the relatively small sample size in the NZES sample. By the 2008 wave, these effects have diminished. Curiously, the only factor within the model to display any statistically significant effect on online news consumption is radio news consumption. This may be an artefact of the similarly electronic and portable nature of both media (although no such effect is evident in 2005).

Table 2: predictors of online news seeking in the NZES panel

	<i>Wave 2: 2005</i>		<i>Wave 3: 2008</i>	
	B	SE	B	SE
Age	-.03**	.01	-.03	.02
Gender (male)	.26	.29	.15	.17
Education	.22**	.08	.12	.11
Household income	.14*	.06	.15	.09
Political interest	.53**	.20	.38	.27
Read newspapers	.19**	.07	.07	.09
Watch TV news	.07	.09	-.04	.12
Listen radio news	.06	.05	.18*	.08
Constant	-2.65*		.21	
Adj r ²	.21		.09	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: NZES 2005 and 2008 waves. N=167/162. **p<.01 *p<.05

While the ANES data show that similar factors explain online news seeking in the United States as New Zealand (particularly Wave 3 of the NZES, which was conducted in the same year as the ANES Waves 1 and 2), they also reveal the temporal effects of the 2008 presidential election. In Table 3, the regression coefficients vary only marginally between Waves 1 and Waves 2, both conducted in the months leading up to the November 2008 election. As in the NZES, education, income and political interest have positive effects; the greater degree of confidence in the ANES data is likely attributable to the larger sample size.

However, conducted eight months after the 2008 election, Wave 3 shows a vastly different distribution of only news consumers. The effect of political interest – which likely accounted for at least some interest in the election campaign specifically – becomes negative (though small), while the effects of other media consumption increase. The Wave 3 results are probably also affected by panel attrition between Waves 2 and 3: although 1271 respondents remained in the panel, the listwise exclusion of missing values reduces the Wave 3 analysis here to 490 respondents. Within that caveat, the resulting picture is that post-election, online news consumers are more likely general, cross-platform news consumers, rather than specific political information seekers.

Table 3: predictors of online news consumption in the ANES panel

	Wave 1		Wave 2		Wave 3	
	B	B	B	SE	B	SE
Age	-.03**	.01	-.03**	.01	.01**	.00
Gender (male)	.35*	.14	.38**	.15	-.06	.07
Education	.27**	.07	.22**	.07	.08*	.04
Household income	.07**	.02	.06**	.02	.00	.01
Political interest	.29**	.07	.43**	.07	-.08*	.04
Read newspapers	.03	.03	.01	.03	.18**	.04
Watch TV news	.11**	.03	.07*	.03	.33**	.06
Listen radio news	.11**	.03	.16**	.03	.31**	.05
Constant	1.42**		1.30**		.29	
Adj r ²	.09		.11		.48	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: ANES Waves 1, 9 and 19. N=1351/1344/490. **p<.01 *p<.05

Modelling the relationship between online activity and democratic attitudes

Having established that there are meaningful differences between online and offline activity within the two panels (particularly with an attention-focusing event such as an election imminent), the next question to be answered is whether they have differential effects on respondents' attitudes. To that end, ordinary least squares regression analysis is used to model the time-lagged effects of online and offline news seeking on four separate dependent variables: satisfaction with democracy and trust in parliament among NZES respondents, and how much government cares what people think and how much people can affect government among ANES respondents. Only two waves are analysed in each panel, due to data limitations. In the NZES, media use questions were not asked until the 2005 wave, so the 2002 wave has been excluded for this analysis. In the ANES panel, respondents were asked the two measures of political efficacy in Wave 19, two waves after the final time they were asked about media use. With the time order of any news seeking effects on attitudes disrupted, analysis of that relationship is restricted to the first two waves of measures.

In the NZES model, respondents' use of each news medium from the 2005 wave (T2) is modelled as a baseline measure predicting attitudes from the 2008 wave (T3). The time-lagged use of each medium, scored as each respondent's answer from the 2005 wave subtracted from their 2008 answer, controls for the cross-sectional effects of news consumption at T3. Table 4 shows that, among NZES panel respondents, neither

Table 4: predictors of democratic attitudes in New Zealand, 2008 (T3)

	Satisfaction with democracy		Trust in parliament	
	B	SE	B	SE
TV – T2	-.04	.06	.19	.10
Newspapers – T2	.04	.05	.03	.09
Radio – T2	.00	.04	-.01	.06
Internet – T2	.00	.04	.15	.08
<i>Time-lagged effects</i>				
Television – T3-T2	-.19**	.07	.08	.12
Newspapers – T3-T2	-.05	.05	.12	.09
Radio – T3-T2	.01	.04	-.03	.07
Internet – T3-T2	.01	.05	.10	.08
<i>Controls</i>				
Age – T3	-.01	.01	.01	.01
Gender (male) – T3	-.12	.07	.15	.012
Education – T3	-.06	.05	.00	.09
Household income – T3	.00	.04	.06	.07
Political interest – T3	.25*	.13	-.58**	.22
Constant	2.77**		3.65**	
Adj r ²	.09		.12	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: NZES 2005 and 2008 waves. N=167/162. **p<.01 *p<.05

satisfaction with democracy nor trust in parliament is well predicted by the multivariate model (Table 4). Political interest has a strong positive effect on satisfaction, and surprisingly a stronger negative effect on trust. This partial effect may be picking up on some discontent following the 2008 election, at which the three-term Labour Party government was removed from power. Of greater relevance to this study, however, are the null effects of online news consumption. Seeking news on the internet has no observable effect on New Zealanders' satisfaction with democracy or trust in parliament across T2 and T3. However, the lagged effect of television news consumption has a negative effect on satisfaction: the less TV news respondents watched between the 2005 and 2008, the more satisfied they appear to have become.

Replicating the analysis on the ANES data reveals similar findings. In table 5, news consumption from Wave 1 (T1) of the panel is used to predict democratic attitudes from Wave 9 (T2), controlling for the lagged effects of change in consumption habits between waves. Again, the model does not fit the data particularly. However,

Table 4: predictors of democratic attitudes in the United States, 2008 (T2)

	Can affect government		Government cares	
	B	SE	B	SE
TV – T1	.01	.01	.01	.01
Newspapers – T1	.02	.01	.02*	.01
Radio – T1	.03*	.01	.02*	.01
Internet – T1	.02	.01	.00	.01
<i>Time-lagged effects</i>				
Television – T2-T1	.02	.02	.01	.02
Newspapers – T2-T1	.00	.02	.00	.02
Radio – T2-T1	.01	.01	.02	.01
Internet – T2-T1	.02	.01	.00	.01
<i>Controls</i>				
Age – T2	.00	.00	.00	.00
Gender (male) – T2	-.26**	.06	.27**	.05
Education – T2	.08**	.03	.12**	.03
Household income – T2	.01	.01	.00	.01
Political interest – T2	.16**	.03	.09**	.03
Constant	4.62		4.75	
Adj r ²	.06		.06	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: ANES Waves 1 and 9. N=1269/1366.
 **p<.01 *p<.05

some statistically significant effects of news consumption on attitudes are evident. Listening to radio news at T1 has a small positive effect on both agreement that people can have an effect on government and that government cares what people think. Newspaper readership has a small positive effect on the latter. Both are most strongly explained by respondents' gender (in opposite directions), educational attainment and political interest. Online news consumption has no observable effect on either dependent variable, despite the robust sample sizes. From these two analyses, it is reasonable to cast doubt on the hypothesis that online activity affects democratic attitudes. Of course, from these results offline activity does not appear to have any effect either.

Turning to the hypothesis that democratic attitudes may affect individuals' propensity for online *vis a vis* offline activity, Table 5 presents results of OLS regression analysis predicting online news consumption among NZES respondents. The results

Table 5: predictors of online activity in New Zealand, 2008 (T3)

	B	SE
Democratic satisfaction –T2	.22	.18
Trust in parliament – T2	-.01	.01
<i>Time-lagged effects</i>		
Democratic satisfaction – T3-T2	.10	.18
Trust in parliament – T3-T2	.02	.01
<i>Controls</i>		
Age – T3	-.01	.01
Gender (male) – T3	.06	.16
Education – T3	.31**	.08
Household income – T3	.06	.08
Political interest – T3	.77**	.22
Constant	.65	
Adj r ²	.13	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: NZES 2005 and 2008 waves. N=138.

**p<.01 *p<.05

suggest that respondents' feelings of democratic satisfaction and trust in parliament at T2 have little effect on their online activity at T3. The regression coefficient for democratic satisfaction is positive and quite strong; with a larger sample, the standard error may decrease and the effect gain statistical power. However, even in that case there is little evidence here to suggest that the resulting relationship would be bi-directional. These results indicate that attitudes are likely to have stronger predictive power over subsequent activity than vice versa.

More encouragingly, analysis of ANES data – with its larger sample – indicates that attitudes can affect propensity for subsequent online activity. However, the direction of the regression coefficients in Table 6 suggests that it is a negative effect: respondents who believed that people can affect government at T1 were less likely to use the internet to look for news at T2. The effect holds across the cross-sectional measure and the time-lagged measure. However, further exploratory analysis (not displayed) indicates that both attitude measures from T1 have strong and significant negative effects on all three forms of offline media consumption measured at T2, even controlling for changes between T1 and T2. If anything, it may be that disaffected Americans are less likely to seek out political news over time, but if they do seek it out, they are more likely to look online than to traditional news media.

Table 6: predictors of online activity in the United States, 2008 (T2)

	B	SE
Can affect government –T1	-.12	.09
Government cares – T1	-.01	.01
<i>Time-lagged effects</i>		
Can affect government – T2-T1	-.15*	.09
Government cares – T2-T1	-.06	.11
<i>Controls</i>		
Age – T2	-.02**	.01
Gender (male) – T2	.31*	.15
Education – T2	.32**	.08
Household income – T2	.05**	.02
Political interest – T2	.45**	.07
Constant	2.07	
Adj r ²	.08	

Ordinary least squares regression analysis. Source: ANES waves 1 and 9. N=1275.

**p<.01 *p<.05

Conclusion

In examining whether online political activity can generate positive attitudes towards democracy in the same way as offline political activity, this study of respondents to panel surveys in New Zealand and the United States finds that the internet appears to have no meaningful effect on subsequent democratic attitudes. However, these data also indicate that offline activity, measured as traditional media news consumption, has similarly low to null effects on democratic attitudes, measured as external political efficacy, democratic satisfaction and trust in parliament. This hypothesis is resoundingly unsupported by these data. It was also hypothesised that attitudes would have reciprocal effects on individuals' propensity for online *vis a vis* offline activity. This study finds that democratic attitudes have negative effects on subsequent online activity. However, exploratory analysis of offline political activity as a dependent variable indicates that these negative effects are even stronger when modelled on offline news consumption.

These findings have potentially substantial implications for citizens' diffuse support for democratic systems. While total rates of diffuse regime support remain relatively high across the Westminster democracies (for example Norris 2011), the

effects of emerging online media, including social networking and interactive news outlets, may to be deepen the malaise among the already dissatisfied. As with other non-recursive relationships before it, including mass media's 'knowledge gap', the relationship between online political activity and democratic attitudes seems to widen increasing gaps. Among the vast majority of New Zealand and American respondents who report satisfaction with their democratic systems, this does not pose a substantive threat. The threats to democratic support look to be concentrated among the least satisfied and least convinced that they can make a difference.

Appendix 1

New Zealand Election Study 2002-2005-2008 panel component

Measure	Question wording	Scoring	Wave 1		Wave 2		Wave 3	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Democratic satisfaction	On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in NZ?	1-9	2.52	1.40	2.41	1.13	2.45	1.18
Trust in parliament	On this scale, please indicate how much trust and confidence you have in parliament	1-9	4.38	2.00	4.87	2.01	4.90	1.92
Internet news	In an average week, but not during an election campaign, how many days do you normally...	1-7	NA	NA	1.06	1.99	1.83	2.52
Newspaper	As above	1-7	NA	NA	4.62	2.28	4.65	2.31
Radio news	As above	1-7	NA	NA	2.87	2.85	2.35	2.84
TV news	As above	1-7	NA	NA	5.80	1.68	5.78	1.75

American National Election Study 2008-2009 online panel

Measure	Question wording	Scoring	Wave 1		Wave 11		Wave 17		Wave 19	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
People can affect govt	How much can people like you affect what the government does?	1-5	3.32	1.07	3.31	1.03	3.46	.95	NA	NA
Govt cares what people think	How much do government officials care what people like you think?	1-5	3.62	.93	3.56	.92	3.56	.94	NA	NA
Internet news	During a typical week, how many days do you...	1-7	3.16	2.72	3.31	2.67	NA	NA	3.31	2.67
Newspaper	As above	1-7	3.43	2.84	3.41	2.82	NA	NA	3.41	2.82
Radio news	As above	1-7	3.33	2.60	3.30	2.56	NA	NA	3.30	2.56
TV news	As above	1-7	4.87	2.29	4.88	2.25	NA	NA	4.88	2.25

References

- Anduiza, Eva, Marta Cantijoch, and Aina Gallego. 2009. "Political Participation and the Internet." *Information, Communication & Society* 12 (6): 860–78. doi:10.1080/13691180802282720.
- Barnes, Samuel Henry, Barbara Farah, and Felix Heunks. 1979a. "Personal Dissatisfaction." In *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*, edited by Samuel Henry Barnes and Max Kaase. Sage Publications.
- . 1979b. "Political Dissatisfaction." In *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*, edited by Samuel Henry Barnes and Max Kaase. Sage Publications.
- Cantijoch, Marta, and Rachel Gibson. 2011. "Conceptualising and Measuring E-Participation." In . Centre for the Study of Democracy, University of California Irvine. <http://www.democracy.uci.edu/files/democracy/docs/conferences/2011/Cantijoch%20and%20Gibson%20UCI%20final.pdf>.
- Dalton, Russell, Alix Van Sickle, and Steven Weldon. 2010. "The Individual–institutional Nexus of Protest Behaviour." *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (01): 51–73. doi:10.1017/S000712340999038X.
- DeBell, Matthew, Jon A. Krosnick, and Arthur Lupia. 2010. "Methodology Report and User's Guide for the 2008 –2009 ANES Panel Study." American National Election Studies. Palo Alto CA and Ann Arbor MI: Stanford University and University of Michigan. http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2008_2009panel/anes2008_2009panel_MethodologyRpt.pdf.
- Easton, David. 1975. "A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support." *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (04): 435–57. doi:10.1017/S0007123400008309.
- Fennema, Meindert, and Jean Tillie. 1999. "Political Participation and Political Trust in Amsterdam: Civic Communities and Ethnic Networks." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 25 (4): 703–26. doi:10.1080/1369183X.1999.9976711.
- Fennema, M., and J. N. Tillie. 2001. "Civic Community, Political Participation and Political Trust of Ethnic Groups." *Connections* 24 (1): 26–41.
- Finkel, Steven E. 1985. "Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* 29 (4): 891–913. doi:10.2307/2111186.
- . 1987. "The Effects of Participation on Political Efficacy and Political Support: Evidence from a West German Panel." *The Journal of Politics* 49 (2): 441–64. doi:10.2307/2131308.
- Hooghe, Marc, and Sofie Marien. 2013. "A Comparative Analysis of the Relation Between Political Trust and Forms of Political Participation in Europe." *European Societies* 15 (1): 131–52. doi:10.1080/14616696.2012.692807.
- Kaase, Max. 1999. "Interpersonal Trust, Political Trust and Non-institutionalised Political Participation in Western Europe." *West European Politics* 22 (3): 1–21. doi:10.1080/01402389908425313.
- Kenski, Kate, and Natalie Jomini Stroud. 2006. "Connections between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 50 (2): 173–92. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_1.
- Krueger, Brian S. 2002. "Assessing the Potential of Internet Political Participation in the United States." *American Politics Research* 30 (5): 476–98.
- Norris, Pippa. 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011. *Democratic Deficit: "Critical Citizens" Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, Robert. 2001. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Sivesind, Karl Henrik, Tereza Pospíšilová, and Pavol Frič. 2013. "Does Volunteering Cause Trust?" *European Societies* 15 (1): 106–30. doi:10.1080/14616696.2012.750732.

- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.