UC Irvine
CSD Working Papers

Title
Styles of Political Representation: What do Voters Expect?

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0sd3x8n0

Authors
Bengtsson, Åsa
Wass, Hanna

Publication Date
2009-06-02

While the institutional arrangements for representative democracy have been largely stable since the end of eighteenth century, there has been a constant argument on the content of representation (Manin et al. 1999, 3).[1] Three questions seem to dominate the debate: whom do legislators represent, how do they represent and how representative or responsive are they as regards to voters' opinions and policy expectations (see Weβels 2007, 838).[2] Of these questions, the first is related to the focus of representation, the second to the style of representation and third to congruence between voters and representatives. At present, all of these questions can be regarded particularly relevant.

Firstly, the locus of political action has shifted from nation-state to more complex political terrain, which challenges the custom to form constituency on territorial basis (Urbinati & Warren 2008, 388-8). Secondly, the classic mandate-independence controversy, i.e. whether representatives should follow the instructions given by their constituencies or act independently in the best interests of the represented (Pitkin 1967), is perhaps more relevant now than ever. On the one hand, the increased educational level together with growing access to political information has improved the cognitive skills of the electorate (Dalton 2000, 29, referring to his earlier study of 1984) thus suggesting that voters could be more willing and able to instruct their representatives.[3] On the other hand, the complexity of political agenda has accelerated over the past few decades which in turn might be pushing towards more independent style of representation (for similar argument, see Andeweg 2003). Finally, the declining trends in turnout and trust in political parties partly demonstrates the problems in congruence between voters and legislators.

In this study we examine the style of representation from voters' point of view based on the Finnish election study 2007 (FSD2138, N=1,422) which includes several statements concerning voters' preferences for the style and focus of representation.[4] We first analyse support for various representational styles most often discussed in the literature, i.e. resemblance, delegation and trustee model, and then account for it through the social and political background of the respondents.

Although it is easy to agree with Stimson (2007, 851) who finds normative debate on the content of representation rather fruitless and unable to reach any consensus, it appears as if one important aspect has been largely neglected in the debate, i.e. the citizen perspective. While people's views and preferences are presented by elected representatives, it is clear that the basis for representative democracy lies in popular sovereignty. In addition, the idea that representation is a relationship is widely acknowledged in the literature on representation (Urninati & Warren 2008, 389). In this respect, both counterparts of the representational relationship should be able to agree on the nature of this relationship in order for it to be legitimate.

Whilst the question of the ideal relationship between representatives and voters have attracted extensive theoretical interest, empirical investigations in the field have been far less common, and most importantly, elite-driven. Research has mainly concentrated on either MP's own views on their representative roles (e.g. Converse & Pierce 1979; Esaiasson 2000;

Gross 1978; Gunlicks 1969; Oksanen 1972; Studlar & McAllister 1996; Wahlke et al. 1962) or opinion congruence between representatives and the electorate (e.g. Erikson 1978; Herrera et al. 1992; Holmberg 1989; Miller & Stokes 1963; Uslander & Weber 1983; Weisberg 1978).

Voters' preferences on the matter, namely how they expect their representatives to act on their behalf, seems to be overlooked by political scientists. The existing literature is scarce, rather dated, and biased towards the representation process in the U.S. (Davidson 1970; McMurray & Parsons 1965; Patterson et al. 1975). There are, however, a few recent exceptions. In a study from 2002, Mendez-Lago and Martínez compares attitudes towards different representational perspectives of Spanish voters and MPs. Two studies by Carman from 2006 and 2007 are concentrated on voters' preferences towards the roles of representation in Great Britain and the U.S, respectively. While the latter study is based on data collected in the 1970s, it takes advantage of modern multivariate techniques in order to test sophisticated hypotheses on individual and contextual levels.

Given that representation should be reciprocal, the scarcity of electorate-based research can be considered as problematic as well as surprising. A few possible reasons for this deficit have been offered. Firstly, public opinion has been considered to be homogeneously in favour of a mandate type of relationship (see Carman 2007, 1, referring to Manin et al. 1999) thus making research on the preferences of voters redundant. Despite the fact that the sparse research in the field has indicated different directions concerning the type of representative relationship voters prefer, it seems fair to conclude that the presumption about homogeneity does not hold (Carman 2006; 2007; McMurray & Parsons 1965; Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002). The second and perhaps more plausible explanation for the lack of interest is the view that the process of representation is a too demanding topic for voters to form opinions about. As capturing the concept of representation is difficult even for scholars in political science, it might seem exacting to expect the general public to have an opinion about this multifaceted phenomenon. However, as Carman points out, we do not need to expect citizens to have highly developed, constrained and sophisticated attitudes over the representational relationship (2007, 2, see also Zaller and Feldman 1992). As a point of departure, it is sufficient to know that 1) citizens do have preferences on the matter, and 2) these preferences vary across individuals (Carman 2007, 2).

Finally, Carman (2006, 104) points out that the examination of voters' preferences on the representational roles of MPs may feel like an abstract academic exercise, untouched by the reality of a political process characterised by strong political parties (for defence, see ibid.). In fact, if parties are considered as more important than individual politicians (see Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002, 69) or if the constituency's demands are overhauled by the party whip in decision making among MPs (Carman 2006, 106), there is not much point in studying citizens' preferences. On the other hand, we agree with Mendez-Lago and Martínez (2002) and Carman (2007, 104) who both argue that the gap between public expectations on representation and its actual outcome could be related to distance and discontent towards MPs and political parties in particular as well as declining trust in governmental institutions in general. Moreover, the mismatch between voters' views and reality may have implications on turnout if voters feel that their vote only has an effect on electoral results but not on political decision making as such. We thus argue that information on voters' views is beneficial for representatives themselves in order to better meet their constituencies' expectations. According to Castiglione and Warren (2006, 11), representation should be understood as political process. One aspect of this process is the acknowledgment that even though there are rules and norms that define representational roles, these roles are

also constituted by the self-understanding of the representative and the expectations of the represented.

In summary, to understand the functioning of political representation we need more information on the style of action the voters prefer their MPs to use and the way these perceptions are connected to various individual characteristics and institutional settings. Given the scarcity of previous research in the field, there is also need to develop tools for empirical investigation of these perceptions. Based on the Finnish election study 2007 (FSD2138, N=1,422), we seek to increase knowledge in this field by bringing together normative theories of representation and voters' preferences on political representation in the Finnish open-list PR-system, with mandatory preferential voting (see e.g. Marsh 1985, 365: Reynolds et al. 2005, 84). Finland is a particularly interesting case as open-list voting provides a closer link between voter and representative. As Weβels (2007, 837) points out, electoral laws that enhance personal voting authorise personal representation and make candidates directly accountable to voters. In fact, in the elections of 2003, 48 per cent of Finnish voters stated that the candidate was more important than the party (Bengtsson & Grönlund 2005, 233).

The paper is structured as follows. In the subsequent chapter, we briefly discuss three normative models of representation, i.e. the resemblance, delegate and trustee models (Pitkin 1967), which constituted the basis for question formulation in the Finnish election study. We then present the context of the study in more details. In the empirical part, we will begin by presenting our research design before turning to the analyses, where we first examine voters' views on representation and then account for the differences in preferences by socio-demographic status and political attitudes. We finish with concluding remarks and a discussion on the implications of our findings for the study of electorate-based research on representation.

Normative models of political representation

Referring to Pitkin's conceptual analysis (1967), Judge (1999, 1-2) remarks that the term representation is generally used in a sense of making something present. In continuing to follow Pitkin's thought, he also points out that political representation should be examined as a system of government in which the people are held present through their representatives in making political decisions. Consequently, citizens are simultaneously included and excluded in political decision-making process and it depends on one's concept of democracy whether emphasis is put on the side of inclusion or exclusion. The emphasis also has implications for the preferred style of representation (see Thomassen 1994, 238). If representative democracy is regarded a mere substitute of direct democracy, the ideal representative body would be identical with the interests of the people (ibid., referring to Dahl 1982, 13). On the other hand, according to liberal theory of democracy, there is a division of labour between representatives and voters thus suggesting more room for independency for the former (ibid.).

Hanna Pitkin, the author of seminal study on political representation, '*The concept of representation*' from 1967, divided the style of representation into three different groups based on the constraints imposed between the voters and the representatives, i.e. how close a relationship they have with each other. At the opposite sides of the continuum, there is representation in the meaning of 'to stand for' on one hand and 'taking care of' on the other. A representative that 'stands for' something or someone acts as representative by of what he/she represents rather than doing something (Pitkin 1967, 61). A representative that takes care of voters is in turn acting based on his/her own common sense and according to what he/she

thinks is in the best interest of voters without further public consultation. It is thus a passive form of representation in which emphasis lies on the correspondence between the representatives and those who are represented. The third alternative, representation in the meaning of 'acting for', can be described as something between the two previously mentioned ideal types. This is a representative that both listens to voters and, when necessary, acts according to his/her own preferences.

As mentioned in the introduction, an overall view of the literature on representative styles provides us with three basic models of how the relationship between voters and their political representatives: the resemblance, the delegate and the trustee models. While two of these models, the resemblance and the trustee model, can be translated straight into Pitkin's terminology as 'standing for' (descriptive representation) and 'taking care of' (substantive representation), respectively, the delegate model is more difficult to locate. Manin (2002, 111) remarks that although both the descriptive and the delegate model share the same aim, i.e. to act as a miniature of the people, they differ from each other as regards the means. Whereas in the delegate model the correspondence between the representational body and constituency is driven by legislation, descriptive theory assumes that representatives act spontaneously and in accordance with people's preferences, as they are a reflection of it, share the same conditions with it, and are close to it. The following is a more detailed description of the three models.

The resemblance model gives priority to the social make-up of the political representatives.[5] The elected parliament should share the same characteristics as the people in general and be comparable to a representative sample of the public, in which different groups are equally represented and every one has the same chance of being selected. In this respect, one obvious question is what characteristics of electorate need to be represented to insure a fair sample (Grofman 1982, 98). Consequently, descriptive representation has been much discussed in the context of historically underrepresented groups based on gender and ethnicity (see e.g. Dovi 2002). The logic behind the resemblance model is that values and opinions are assumed to follow socio-demographic traits (Heidar 1986, 281). If all groups are represented, all opinions are heard.[6]

The second ideal type of political representation is the delegate model, which also goes under the name of the mandate model of representation or the imperative mandate. According the delegate conception of representation, the representative ought to reflect intentionally his constituents' preferences (McCrone & Kuklinski 1979). The delegate model thus emphasises a close relation between the representative and the voters, the constituency, the party, interest groups or specific groups of voters – depending on the kind of delegate that is being referred to. Consequently, the delegate style of representation can be classified as a model of linkage, i.e. an instrument for representatives to act according to demands of the constituencies (Thomassen 1994, 239). On the other hand, one could ask how strictly mandated representation, apart from the method, actually differs from direct democracy if representatives simply reflect constituencies' views (Budge 1996, 47).

The third and last ideal model, the trustee, paints a picture of an actor that makes his or her political judgments independently, based on what he/she thinks is best for the voters. This model is largely supported in the literature and by historical evidence. The well cited speech by Edmund Burke to the electors of Bristol in 1774 has had substantial impact on the normative formation of the trustee model. In his speech, Burk concentrated on the notion of the focus of representation in defending national interest as the proper focus, more valuable than local and necessarily hostile interests (see e.g. Judge 1999, 53: Thomassen 1994, 238). As

Eulau et al. (1959, 744) notes, Burke however links the different focuses with particular representational styles when he states that a legislator interested in what is best for the nation as a whole cannot be bound by instructions but must follow his own judgement. Later on several nations have included this principle in their constitutions, stating that political representatives are not bound by other than their own conscious and effective legislation (Weβels 2007, 840). This was done in order to avoid representatives being controlled by others who would oblige them to act in a certain manner. The development of a practice of party discipline in many of the same countries can, however, raise some questions about their compliance with this principle.

Context of the Study

As Weβels (2007, 839) points out, elite-centred research in the field has convincingly proven that the institutional settings shape different attitudes towards representational roles. Firstly, even as imperative mandate is virtually illegal in all representative democracies, many of these countries are in practice characterized by strong party discipline and unity, thus leaving little room for independent actions by representatives. Secondly, representational style is also linked to electoral system. Electoral laws that enhance personal voting make candidates directly accountable to voters (ibid., 837, 841).

The majority of the existing studies concerning voters' views on representation are performed in the US and Britain, i.e. countries which use plurality electoral systems with single member districts.[7] In this respect, our study contributes by providing results from rather different contextual setting. From the institutional perspective, Finland constitutes an interesting case with an electoral system that combines the use of a proportional formula as well as multimember districts with a strong degree of candidate-centeredness. The electoral system used in Finland is an open-list PR-system (see e.g. Marsh 1985, 365). Whereas in many PR systems in Western Europe voters are entitled to indicate also their favoured candidate within their favourite party list, it is compulsory to vote for a candidate in Finland (Reynolds et al. 2005, 84). The number of seats won by each party is based on the number of total votes gained by its candidates. The selection of candidates representing each party is in turn based on the number of their personal votes (ibid.).

The Finnish electoral system is thus a mixture of characteristics strongly advanced by majoritarian systems, i.e. the specific focus on candidates, with a feature typical of proportional representation, i.e. the focus on parties. Due to the individual focus of the electoral system, the perceptions of the deputies' role are far less party centred in Finland when compared to other Scandinavian countries (Esaiasson 2000, 61-2). While party unity concerning parliamentary voting is generally very high in the Nordic countries, Finland also deviates slightly from this pattern with a less pronounced discipline (Jensen 2000, 217-20). From a historical perspective, we can find relatively pronounced differences between the socialists and the conservatives concerning the preferred representative styles. Socialists have traditionally emphasised a more collective responsibility and party discipline while conservatives have worked in favour of the trustee-like independent actor. Moreover, Finnish MPs differ on their views of the importance of party representation. Only a minority of the Finnish MPs consider party representation a very important task as compared to over 70 percent in Sweden and Norway and a majority in Denmark and Iceland. These deviations are accounted for the candidate-centred electoral system of Finland (Esaiasson 2000).

In sum, we suggest that Finland provides an intriguing context for studying representational roles as the link between individual voters and representatives can be expected to be closer than in electoral systems based on closed party list. Moreover, the somewhat weaker party unity compared to other Scandinavian countries may provide at least some room for the trustee-style of representation.

Empirical Design

The aim of this study is to bring together normative theory on styles of representation and voters' preferences for the roles of their representatives. We firstly map voters' preferences towards different normative models of representation and secondly account for the differences in preferences by connecting these views with the social and political background of respondents. The study is based on the Finnish election study in 2007 (FSD2138) carried out after the parliamentary election in March 2007. Data was collected in two stages. The first part of data was collected via face-to-face interviews with a total of 1,422 respondents based on multistage stratified sampling. The second part was collected via self-administrated questionnaire, answered by 1,033 of those being interviewed in the fist stage. The survey includes an oversample of Swedish speaking respondents which is controlled for by using appropriate weights. The Finnish election study of 2007 is one of the few publicly available surveys that include information on how voters expect their MPs to act in accordance with their constituent's preferences.

As regards the empirical analyses, two additional remarks are necessary. Firstly, while the statements on representative roles included in the Finnish election study of 2007 were formulated on the basis of the theoretical models, it is an open question whether the respondents' perceptions of the roles of representation are structured in accordance with theoretical expectations. As tools for empirical analysis the effectiveness of the theoretical models might thus be limited. Secondly, due to the relative scarcity of previous studies of voters' views on the roles of representation, the selection of independent variables is a challenging task. While substantially utilising the studies by Carman (2006; 2007) and Mendez-Lago and Martínez (2002), we have also proceeded in an explorative manner.

In the following empirical chapters, we begin by looking at the distribution of view on each statement among the Finnish electorate and at the same time outlining the basis for the dependent variables of the study. In the second phase, we make an explorative factor analysis in order to find out whether the statements form distinct dimensions in line with the theoretical models. Finally, we conduct a multivariate analysis in order to examine the impact of independent variables on the representative models found in the electorate. This will be done by a block-wise inclusion of three sets of independent variables: socio-demographics, political sophistication, and political integration.

Voters' Views on Representational Styles

In the 2007 Finnish national election study, the respondents were asked to make a stand on five different statements regarding the styles or roles adopted by political representatives.[8] All statements were asked individually in conjunction with each other rather than as mutually

exclusive alternatives. Table 1 presents the distribution of responses ordered according to the share of the respondents that strongly agree with each of the statements. The results give us a clear view of the style that enjoys the strongest support among the Finnish public. Taken as a whole, over 90 per cent of voters support the first statement that declares that representatives should act according to 'their own common sense'. The third statement about 'independent voting behaviour by representatives' enjoys relatively strong support among voters as well (73%). Both of the statements describe an independent style of representation in line with the trustee model, suggesting it to be the most popular style of representation among the Finnish electorate. These findings are in line with the results found in the U.S. context by Patterson et al. in 1975 and more recently in Spain by Mendez-Lago and Martínez (2002). Other studies on the American public have in turn shown a stronger tendency in favour of the delegate style of representation (Davidson 1970). Nevertheless, it should be noted that strict comparability between the few studies in the field is not possible given the use of different survey methodology, i.e. open ended versus fixed alternatives, and differences concerning phrasing and as well as the alternatives offered to respondents. In addition, in most studies the style and focus of representation are combined together prohibiting us from studying the two dimensions of representation separately.

Not far behind in popularity after the independent actor, we find a statement that can be described as close to the opposite of the ideal model of representation, i.e. the delegate model. This statement concerns the demand for political representatives to keep themselves informed about voters' opinions and promote these views in politics. It is supported by almost 90 percent, even though the distribution of answers between the categories of 'strongly' and 'partly agrees' indicates a slightly more ambiguous attitude when compared to the previous statement.

Table 1 Views on styles of representation among voters (%).

	Strongly agree	Partly agree	Partly disagree	Strongly disagree	Don´t know	Total %	(n)
MPs should act in the best interest of the public with the use of their own common sense	53.4	40.1	4.0	0.7	1.8	**100**	**(1022)**
MPs should regularly find out voters' opinions and act according to them[a]	43.7	46.1	6.2	1.3	2.7	**100**	**(1021)**
MPs should vote according to their own opinion independently of their group	33.8	39.3	18.6	4.0	4.3	**100**	**(1023)**
The gender distribution in parliament should correspond to that of the general public	10.6	35.6	26.9	15.3	11.7	**100**	**(1012)**
The age distribution in parliament should correspond to that of the general public	7.8	35.7	31.0	15.1	10.4	**100**	**(1015)**

Notes: [a] The statement consists of two parts that can be agreed or disagreed by respondents, i.e. that representatives should find voters' views and that they should act according to them. Since these two goals do not necessarily coincide for all respondents, interpretation of the statement is difficult and its validity is rather problematic.

Among the statements that enjoy less widespread public support, we find the ones connected to the resemblance style of representation. Less than 50 percent of the voters responded positively towards the statements that parliament should correspond to the public concerning gender and age. Furthermore, only 11 percent strongly agree with the statement that women and men should constitute equal portions of the political representatives. These values, frequently presented as generally accepted in the public debate, seem not to be prioritised to the extent that is often taken for granted. It should, however, be mentioned that the share of respondents that find it difficult to respond to the statements about gender and age distribution in the parliament is larger than for other statements.

Of the two most popular statements, which can be interpreted as opposite views on representation, both seem to be supported by a large majority of the public. Further examination of the distribution of responses (not presented here) reveals that 30 per cent of all respondents strongly agree with both of the statements. That is to say, many of the voters who strongly support the idea of political representatives behaving as independent actors are also much in favor of a style in which representatives follow fairly closely the opinions of voters.

The distribution of responses brings two aspects to our attention: the complexity of the phenomenon of representation and the weakness of the applied indicators. The general observation made by Zaller and Feldman (1992, 420) that individuals possess multiple and often conflicting opinions toward important issues can contribute with some clarification to the at first sight illogical response pattern. It is likely that people do not possess well thought through and distinct opinions about the style that they prefer their political representatives to apply. It is also plausible that the style preferred varies depending on the occasion and issue at stake. The last point is stressed by Pitkin (1967, 214) in a remark about the difficulties involved with studying representation empirically: the preferred style of representation depends on the occasion and thus varies with the issue domain.

Obviously, the ambiguity found in the responses would have been less pronounced if the respondents had been asked to choose between mutually exclusive alternatives instead of offering them a buffet which includes all options available on menu of representation. The alternative strategy might on the other hand involve a weakness of different kind. Carman (2006, 112) points out that if respondents do not perceive the response options provided as logical or discrete choices, we end up with a distribution that is contrived. With the current strategy we are, however, confronted with overlapping or 'multiple' attitudes which is probably related to the complexity of the phenomenon as well as the survey strategy employed. Nevertheless, before reaching consensus about the best strategy to asking questions about representation, we will simply have to do with the data available.

Dimensions of Representation

The normative models of representation – the trustee, the delegate and the resemblance model – can all be traced in the statements analysed above, since each of the statements were formulated to illustrate some aspect of various theoretical models of representation. From a theoretical point of view, the statements about what kind of people representatives should constitute or how they should act can thus be divided in groups to grasp different normative models. However, in the minds of the respondents' they might be interconnected differently than would be expected on the basis of literature. In fact, this seems to the case with regard to

the extent the voters agree with the different statements concerning the trustee and delegate style of representation. In order to form a clearer picture of the empirical relationship between the different statements we use principal component analysis presented in table 2.

Table 2 Principal component analysis of the representation items (pattern matrix with oblimin rotation).

	Resemblance model	Trustee model	Delegate model
The gender distribution in parliament should correspond to that of the general public	**0.893**	0.005	-0.018
The age distribution in parliament should correspond to that of the general public	**0.880**	-0.007	-0.035
MPs should regularly find out voters' opinions and act according to them	0.019	0.003	**0.993**
MPs should vote according to their own opinion independently from their group	0.073	**0.850**	-0.072
MPs should act in the best interest of the public with the use of their own common sense	-0.073	**0.826**	0.080
Eigenvalues	1.837	1.305	0.857
Variance (%)	36.74	26.09	17.14

Notes: Entries are factor loadings from a principal component analysis with oblimin rotation of five representation items on a scale from 0-1. Don't knows are coded as 0.5. Variables constituting each dimension are bolded.

Keeping mind the overlapping attitudes held by voters towards some of the statements presented in table 1, the results found in the principal component analysis are rather encouraging. Although voters to certain extent have overlapping or 'multiple' attitudes towards the issue, the principal component analysis shows that there are patterns that resemble the theoretical expectations. According to the results in table 2, two different dimensions that logically follow theoretical expectations, i.e. the resemblance and the trustee models, are singled out. Both of the dimensions are consisted of two different statements. In addition, there is an independent dimension comprised of the statement '*MPs should regularly find out voters' opinions and act according to them*' illustrating the delegate style of representation.[9]

In order to be able to analyse the correlates of different preferences of representation, the measures need to be as accurate as possible. Concerning the resemblance model, the procedure is fairly straightforward. The two statements about descriptive representation constitute the dimension with the highest *Eigenvalues*, as well as factor-loadings. As these two statements have a high degree of statistically significant internal consistency (Spearman's correlation 0.60) and clearly constitutes a distinct dimension that can be considered as independent from the other statements, they are combined in a sum variable representing the resemblance model were a high index-value indicates a strong priority of the social make-up of the political representatives.

The best strategy to single out the two dimensions representing the trustee and delegate models appears as less obvious. The principal component analysis indicates that one

solution is to form two independent variables: one index including two statements for the trustee dimension, and one constituted by the single delegate statement. However, since attitudes towards the statements that reflect different theoretical models are overlapping to such a large extent, this strategy leaves us with an impending possibility of ending up with artefact results. Thus, we chose to apply an alternative strategy which makes it possible to single out which of the two models comes closest to respondents' preferences. Rather than using one index or measure for each of the ideal types, we use a single measure that combines the most distinct statements for each model. By subtracting the statement that best corresponds the delegate style, i.e. '*MPs should regularly find out voters' opinions and act according to them*' from the statement that illustrates the trustee style i.e. '*MPs should act in the best interest of the public with the use of their own common sense*' we get a measure that singles out those holding a distinct preference from those whose attitudes are conflated.[10] High values indicate a distinct preference for the trustee model, and low values a distinct preference for the delegate model. Respondents that express a similar preference for both statements are found in the middle of the scale.

The Impact of Social and Political Characteristics on Views on Representation Styles

As shown in the previous chapter, citizens' support for different statements about representation styles varies substantially. Our next task is therefore to examine how these views are associated to the respondents' social and political characteristics. In spite of its scarcity, the previous literature in the field has introduced several hypotheses concerning the systematic variation in voters' preferences. As Carman (2007, 8) points out, in most cases data limitations prevent the testing of all the possible hypotheses. Our selection of the variables included in the analyses is based on the findings by Carman (2006; 2007) and to a lesser extent by Mendez-Lago and Martínez (2002). Moreover, older studies (McMurray & Parsons; Patterson et al. 1975) have also been utilised. Nevertheless, we will proceed in a slightly different manner compared to previous research. Instead of focusing on separate independent variables, we work with models of an overall character in order to form a more complete picture of the interplay between representative preferences and social and political background. In the following, we will briefly present the three models used in the analyses, i.e. socio-demographics, political sophistication, and political integration. The operationalisation of each model is described in more details in the appendix.

The socio-demographic model includes what in studies of political behaviour is commonly referred to as 'the usual suspects', i.e. age, gender, education, social class, and ethnic background, which in this case refers to the minority status.[11] The socio-demographic model included appears to be a natural point of departure for most studies of political attitudes and behaviour. The idea that certain demographic characteristics interplay with the individual's views of representation was already presented in the seminal studies by McMurray and Parsons (1965) and by Patterson et al. (1975). Education in particular has been considered to have a potential effect on views on representational styles. The understanding of the complex world of politics is assumed to rise in accordance with educational level thus working in favour of a trustee-like preference of representation (Carman 2007). In addition, social class has been presented as a possible factor having an influence in the same direction as education (Carman 2006, 110). Although this might be because members of the higher classes may possibly be

more confident that their interests are looked after since MPs in a trustee style of representation are often from the same social strata.

Previous studies do not present any explicit hypothesis on the effects of gender and age. The results by Carman (2006, 2007), however, indicate that women as well as younger age groups are more inclined to prefer a close relation with their political representatives than men and the older members of the population. As far as age is concerned, the results are not very surprising. Numerous studies have shown that the younger cohorts recently entered in the electorate tend to have a different relationship to politics than their predecessors (Dalton 2007; Inglehart 2007; Norris 2002). These inter-cohort differences in attitudes, which among other things involve weaker attachment to political parties, lower confidence in political authorities and demonstrate an increased interest in individualised political action, all point towards a preference for the delegate style of representation. We will, however, include nonlinear age-effects as well. This is done in order to account for the possibility that preferences on representation are strictly connected to underrepresentation and thus shared by both the youngest and the oldest members of the population.[12] Women's preference for a tighter bond between the representatives and public might in turn be accounted for women's underrepresentation in most political arenas (Norris & Inglehart 2003). In addition, we may well also expect gender and age to have a connection to preferences for a resemblance style of representation.

Yet another hypothesis related to socio-demographic characteristics concerns the minority-majority aspect that has been found to influence attitudes towards representation roles in Spain (Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002) and the U.S. (Carman 2007). The effect of minority status appears however to display contextual variation concerning institutional features. In Spain, where PR electoral system with multimember districts are in use, voters from distinct minority district appears more prone to prefer a direct and delegate style of representation (Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2000). In the U.S. FPTP-context in turn, African-Americans have much larger propensity to prefer trustee model over delegate as, being a minority, their policy preferences might be better heard if the representatives act independently of majority (Carman 2007).[13] In the Finnish case, the Swedish-speaking minority of close to six percent of the population constitutes an interesting opportunity to test the previous findings. Minority status is included in the analyses by controlling for the mother tongue of respondents.

The second model designed to grasp the level of political sophistication of voters. Political sophistication appears as a logical second step in the examination of potential background factors affecting attitudes towards different styles of representation since it touches upon the importance of politics for the individual. As discussed by Luskin (1987), sophistication is a highly demanding concept to both define and measure. Our model includes two variables: the level of political knowledge and political interest, the impact of which has not been previously tested in studies on representation. To some extent, the political knowledge measure can actually be claimed to constitute a more accurate and thorough indicator of what is often aimed at in studies of political behaviour when controlling for educational attainment. Consequently, we hypothesise that the impact of political knowledge is largely similar to that of education: the higher the level of knowledge, the more insights the person will have into the complexity of the political world as well as a higher inclination towards the independent style of representation. It is, however, harder to speculate about the effect of political interest.

The third model reflects the individual's integration into the political system. It includes variables that measure respondents' satisfaction with democracy as well as political preferences and activity. On an overall level, the hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

voters that are well integrated in the political system have more confidence that their interests are looked after, and thus feel that there is no need for a closer relationship or a larger degree of resemblance between the representatives and the electorate. Citizens who feel left out or unsatisfied with the way the system works are probably more prone to favour the delegate model of representation or representation in terms of descriptive similarities. Carman (2006; 2007) use similar arguments in controlling for voters sense of efficacy, in his case the system oriented external efficacy or confidence in government authorities' and institutions' responsiveness towards citizens demands (referring Niemi et al. 1991), and party support.

In addition to the aforementioned variables, we include respondents' self-placement on the left-right continuum in the model of political integration. As mentioned in the previous chapter, conservatives have traditionally favoured independent style of representation, whereas those in left have emphasised closer link between representatives and constituencies. It has also been shown that left-oriented voters in Finland vote more often for a candidate with approximately the same age and gender (Bengtsson & Grönlund 2005, 243).

In the following analysis, the two dependent variables described in the previous chapter will be used: one sum variables including two statements for the resemblance model and one subtracted variable that gauge which of the representational styles that comes closest to respondents' preference, the trustee or delegate style. The examination on the impact of background variables is based on OLS regression. All the models are presented including block-wise inclusion of the three aforementioned blocks of independent variables. The final models in tables 3, 4 and 5 include those variables with statistically significant effects in the previous three models.[14]

Before turning to the results, a slight reflection over our assumptions is in order. As shown in table 1, and discussed thoroughly in the previous chapter, there is a considerable variation in voters' views concerning representational roles. In addition, voters seem to prefer all of the different styles without reflecting over the often-contradictory strategies they contain, which is of course a natural, but negative consequence of the survey technique applied. Since most responses are found at one end of the response-scale concerning both the trustee and delegate statements, and hence ending up in the middle of the scale on the subtracted variable used in the following analyses, we cannot expect very strong effects for the single variables included in our models, nor particularly high values of explained variance.

Table 3 shows the impact of social and political background on the views of the resemblance style of representation. Rather strikingly, political factors seem to have virtually no effect. While most of the variables included in the socio-demographic block affect attitudes towards descriptive representation, none of the variable related to the individual's political sophistication or integration turns out significant. Party identification comes close, but only reaches the less strict criteria for statistical significance. In other words, the priority given to descriptive representation is not connected to political aspects. This is a particularly interesting finding as according the previous studies, voting based on social resemblance is more popular among leftwing voters (Bengtsson & Grönlund 2005, 243). Perhaps not very surprisingly, it appears that the groups underrepresented in the political arena favour a resemblance style of representation.

Table 3 The effects of social and political background on support for the resemblance style of representation (OLS). Non-standardised regression coefficients (*b*) with standard error in parenthesis.

	Socio-demographics	Political sophistication	Political integration	Final model
Gender (man)	-0.13***	-0.12***	-0.12***	-0.13***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Age/100	0.09~	0.12**	0.14*	0.13*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Education	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.12**	-0.11**
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Class	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.11*	-0.08*
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Language (Swedish)	0.05	0.05	0.05	
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	
Political knowledge		-0.04	-0.02	
		(0.04)	(0.05)	
Political interest		-0.03	-0.01	
		(0.04)	(0.05)	
Satisfaction with democracy			-0.05	
			(0.05)	
External efficacy			0.06	
			(0.06)	
Internal efficacy			-0.03	
			(0.04)	
Party identification			-0.08(*)	-0.07(*)
			(0.04)	(0.04)
Ideological self-placement (right)			0.05	
			(0.04)	
Voted			0.01	
			(0.03)	
Constant	0.57***	0.60***	0.60***	0.61***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.06)	0.04
R2	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09
adj. R2	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08
F-value (sign.)	17.24 ***	11.66 ***	6.37***	16.94 ***
N	1020	967	840	909

Notes: ***$p< 0.001$ **$p< 0.01$ *$p< 0.05$ (*)$p< 0.1$. Entries are non-standardised regression coefficients. All variables are measured on a scale between 0-1. For more information about the variables see appendix. Multicollinearity diagnostic statistics show that there is no cause for concern. VIF values for each of the variables included in the different models are below 2.5.

Women and the older age group, as well as those with lower levels of education and those belonging to a lower subjective class have a higher propensity to prefer descriptive representation. Further controls suggest that the effect of age is linear.[15] The popularity of the

resemblance model is thus not strictly connected to factual representation, as the elderly are as underrepresented in the Finnish parliament as younger age groups (Statistics Finland 2007).

Table 4 The effects of social and political background on support for the trustee/delegate style (subtracted measure) of representation (OLS). Non-standardised regression coefficients (*b*) with standard error in parenthesis.

	Socio-demographics	Political sophistication	Political integration	Final model
Gender (man)	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***	0.03***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Age/100	0.07**	0.07*	0.06*	0.06*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Education	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Class	-0.03	0.02	-0.00	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Language (Swedish)	0.03	-0.03	-0.03	
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Political knowledge		-0.01	-0.03	
		(0.02)	(0.03)	
Political interest		0.01	0.02	
		(0.02)	(0.02)	
Satisfaction with democracy			0.01	
			(0.03)	
External efficacy			-0.01	
			(0.03)	
Internal efficacy			-0.00	
			(0.02)	
Party identification			-0.03	
			(0.02)	
Ideological self-placement (right)			0.06**	0.06**
			(0.02)	(0.02)
Voted			0.02	
			(0.02)	
Constant	0.47***	0.47***	0.46***	0.45***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	0.02
R2	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03
adj. R2	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
F-value (sign.)	5.07 ***	3.83 ***	2.68***	9.50 ***
N	1015	962	835	959

Notes: ***p< 0.001 **p< 0.01 *p< 0.05 (*)p< 0.1. Entries are non-standardised regression coefficients. In the dependent variable the question that corresponds the delegate model is subtracted from the question illustrating trustee model. High values indicate a distinct support for a trustee style of representation and low values distinct support for a delegate style of representation. All variables are measured on a scale between 0-1. For more information about the variables see appendix. Multicollinearity diagnostic statistics show that there is no cause for concern. VIF values for each of the variables included in the different models are below 2.5.

In table 4 we turn to voters' preferences concerning the trustee and delegate styles of representation, gauged by the subtracted measure that that singles out respondents with a distinct preference for one of the two styles from those with a more blurred attitude. Again the socio-demographic model contributes with most of the statistically significant effects while the importance of the political variables is scant. Taken as a whole, three factors can be used to distinguish between those preferring an independent or a delegate type of political representative. Women prove to have stronger preference for a closer relationship with their political representatives as is the case with descriptive representation. The same applies to younger people. Also the non-linear effect was tested, but it was non-significant (not shown here). Both of these effects are in line with the results found by Carman (2006; 2007).

The third variable that is important in accounting for trustee and delegate styles of representation is political orientation. As expected, those found on the left side of the ideological scale are more inclined to prefer a close relation between voters and representatives. Assumingly, this tendency reflects the mass-party tradition. Based on the literature, we hypothesised to find preferences in favour of the independent political actor among citizens who are 'better-off' in politics, i.e. those who have higher levels of political sophistication and integration. The results presented in table 4 clearly suggests that this not the case.

Conclusions

Located in the core of modern political systems, the concept of representation has been widely discussed. While there are vast theoretical contributions, empirical studies in the field have been less common and most importantly, elite-driven with only few exceptions (Carman 2006; 2007; Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002). In this study we analysed voters' views on representational roles in the Finnish open-list PR-system with mandatory preferential voting, which is characterised by a strong degree of candidate centeredness. We first presented support for five statements, which illustrate various aspects of representation roles. In the second phase two main representation dimensions – the resemblance and trustee-delegate dimensions – were formed, and connected to social and political background of the respondents.

The results are in many respects in line with previous studies. We found strong support for Carman's (2007, 2) claim that citizens do have opinions on representational roles and that those views vary owing to background variables. Public views are, however, not as clear-cut as could be assumed based on the theoretical literature. It is a rather puzzling observation that the statements illustrating delegate style of representation on the one hand and trustee style on the other, seem to be almost equally popular. That result however at partially reflects the abstract character of the statements as well as the formulation of the research questions. If presented as mutually exclusive alternatives or contextualised with some particular decision-making situation or issue, it might have been easier for respondents to make clearer distinctions.[16] What is more evident is that the resemblance model has least support among Finnish voters. A parliament that mirrors the population according to gender and age is not seemingly a prioritisation shared by a large number of voters. This is in fact a very interesting finding given that in the Finnish parliamentary elections of 2003, 63 per cent of voters voted for a candidate of the same gender and 42 per cent for a candidate of approximately the same age (Bengtsson & Grönlund 2005, 241). In 2007, the corresponding figure for same-gender voting was also 63 per cent (Holli & Wass 2009).

Interesting patterns are revealed when accounting for the support for each of the models of representation. The most distinct finding is the dominance of the socio-demographic background variables and the lack of importance of political sophistication. As expected, support for representation in terms of descriptive resemblance is strongly connected to socio-demographic background. It is the underrepresented groups that prefer more social resemblance such as women, people with lower educational attainment and a lower subjective class position. On the other hand, also older cohorts are more in favour of a parliament that resembles the public in terms of gender and age. Moreover, voters with a low sense of party identification give higher priority to the social makeup of the parliament. Perhaps more surprisingly, the distinction between the delegate and the trustee model also turns out to be dependent on socio-demographics factors in terms of age and gender. Younger cohorts as well as women are more inclined to prefer a delegate style of representation. As regards to political factors, voters who place themselves on the right on the left-right continuum are more in favour of trustee style of representation.

The Finnish context with a nearly six per cent minority of Swedish-speaking Finns also provides a good opportunity to test the effect of a minority status (cf. Carman 2007; Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002). One could have expected to find a similar result as in the Spanish PR-context (Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002), i.e. a propensity of Swedish-speaking Finns to prefer the delegate model. Quite surprisingly, minority status did not have an impact on support for representative roles. It might be the case that the representation of Swedish-speaking Finns by their own Swedish People's Party, which has been represented in almost every post-war government (see e.g. Nousiainen 1998, 244-245), is so well secured that their views do not differ from the rest of the population in this respect.

The Finnish context becomes particularly evident when looking at opinions towards the statement '*MPs should vote according to their own opinion independently of their group'* to which 73 per cent of respondents agreed with. As voters cast their votes directly to candidates, parties and especially a party whip might appear almost an obstacle to ideal representation. In this respect, the candidate centred electoral system could be one factor related to the low levels of turnout in Finland: as voters invest substantial value on candidates, they become easily disappointed when the actual decision making is to a large extent seen to be dominated by the parties. The role of the parties brings us to the question that has been left untouched in this study, namely the *focus* of representation, for which we need more information together with the representational styles. The role and the importance of the parties need to be clarified from the voter's perspective in a variety of contextual arrangements in order to make a full account for voters' preferences in a representational relationship.

As pointed out earlier, voters' views on representation, i.e. how they prefer to be represented and how they feel that the political system is working in this respect, are of significant relevance for our understanding of the changing and seemingly withering relationship between voters and parties. Moreover, in order to better meet voters' needs, MPs should be aware of the kind of representational style voters prefer. While our results seem to be supportive for various styles, we also found some systematic variation in these attitudes. Different voters seem to have different expectations. In this respect, it is an interesting question whether the same background variables are also related to MPs views on their own representational roles. Consequently, we need more information on MPs' attitudes and systematic comparisons between the views of MPs and the views of voters (cf. Mendez-Lago & Martínez 2002).

Before undertaking any further inquiries, we need to agree on valid measurements of representational preferences. Strong theoretical groundwork in the field of political representation probably facilitate this process. Strengths and weaknesses of different strategies will need to be further scrutinised and common procedures developed in order to guarantee comparability of future studies. After reaching consensus concerning measurements, voters' preferences on political representation can constitute a new, important dimension in future studies of political behaviour.

References

Andeweg, Rudy B. (2003) Beyond representativeness? Trends in political representation. *European Review* 11 (2): 147-61.

Bengtsson, Åsa and Kimmo Grönlund. (2005) Ehdokasvalinta. In: Heikki Paloheimo (ed) *Vaalit ja demokratia Suomessa*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Birch, Anthony H. (1993) *Concepts and theories of modern democracy*. London: Routledge.

Brown, Mark B. (2006) Survey article: citizen panels and the concept of representation. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 14 (2): 203-25.

Budge, Ian. (1996) *The new challenge of direct democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Carman, Christopher J. (2006) Public preferences for parliamentary representation in the UK: an overlooked link? *Political Studies* 54 (1): 103-122.

Carman, Christopher J. (2007) Assessing preferences for political representation in the US. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinions and Parties* 17 (1): 1-19.

Castiglione, Dario and Mark E. Warren. (2006) *Rethinking democratic representation: eight theoretical issues*. Paper prepared for delivery to 'Rethinking democratic representation'. Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of British Columbia. May 18-19, 2008.

Converse, Philip E. and Roy Pierce. (1979) Representative roles and legislative behavior in France. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 4 (4): 525-62.

Dalton, Russell J. (2000) The decline of party identifications. In Russell J. Dalton and Martin P. Wattenberg (eds) *Parties without partisans: political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, Russell J. (2007) *The good citizen: how a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Davidson, Roger H. (1970) Public prescriptions for the job of congressman. *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 14 (4): 648-66.

Dovi, Suzanne. (2002) Prefarable descriptive representatives: will just any woman, black, or latino do? *American Political Science Review* 96 (4): 729-743.

Erikson, Robert S. (1978) Constituency opinion and congressional behavior. A reexamination of the Miller-Stokes representation data. *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (3): 511-35.

Esaiasson, Peter. (2000) How members of parliament define their task. In: Peter Esaiasson and Knut Heidar (eds) *Beyond Westminster and congress: the Nordic experience*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Eulau, Heinz, John C. Wahlke, William Buchanan, and Leroy C. Ferguson. (1959) The role of the representative. Some empirical observations on the theory of Edmund Burke. *American Political Science Review* 53 (3): 742-56.

Grofman, Bernard. (1982) Should representatives be typical to their constituents? In Bernard Grofman, Arend Lijphart, Robert B. McKay, and Howard A. Scarrow (eds) *Representation and redistricting issues*. Lexington: LexingtonBooks.

Gross, Donald A. (1978) Representative styles and legislative behavior. *Western Political Quarterly* 31 (3): 359-71.

Gunlicks, Arthur B. (1969) Representative role perceptions among local councilors in Western Germany. *Journal of Politics*. 31 (2): 443-64.

Heidar, Knut. (1986) Party organizational elites in Norwegian politics. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 9 (3): 279-90.

Herrera, Cheryl Lyn, Richard Herrera, and Eric R.A.N. Smith. (1992) Public opinion and congressional representation. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 56 (2): 185-205.

Holli, Anne Maria and Hanna Wass. (2009) *Gender-based voting in the parliamentary elections of 2007 in Finland*. Unpublished manuscript.

Holmberg, Sören. (1989) Political representation in Sweden. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 12 (1): 1-36.

Inglehart, Ronald. (2007) Postmaterialist values. In: Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of political behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jensen, Torben K. (2000) Party cohesion. In: Peter Esaiasson and Knut Heidar (eds) *Beyond Westminster and Congress: the Nordic experience*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Judge, David. (1999) *Representation: theory and practice in Britain*. London: Routledge.

Luskin, Robert. (1987) Measuring political sophistication. *American Journal of Political Science* 31 (4): 856-99.

Manin, Bernard. (2002) *The principles of democratic government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan Stokes. (1999) *Introduction*. In Adam Przeworski, Susan Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds) *Democracy, accountability and representation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marsh, Michael. (1985) The voters decide. Preferential voting in European list systems. *European Journal of Political Research* 13 (4): 365-378.

McCrone, Donald J. and James H. Kuklinski. (1979) The delegate theory of representation. *American Journal of Political Science* 23(2): 278-300.

McMurray, Carl D. and Malcolm B. Parsons. (1965) Public attitudes toward the representational roles of legislators and judges. *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 9 (2): 167-85.

Mendez-Lago, Mónica and Antonia Martínez. (2002) Political representation in Spain: an empirical analysis of the perception of citizens and MPs. *Journal of Legislative Studies* 8 (1): 63-90.

Miller, E. Warren and Donald E. Stokes. (1963) Constituency influence in congress. *American Political Science Review* 57 (1): 45-56.

Narud, Hanne Marthe and Henry Valen. (2007) *Demokrati og ansvar. Politisk representasjon i et flerpartisystem.* Oslo: Damm.

Norris, Pippa. (2002) *Democratic Phoenix: reinventing political activism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. (2003) *Rising tide: gender equality and cultural change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nousiainen, Jaakko. (1998) *Suomen poliittinen järjestelmä.* Juva: WSOY.

Oksanen, Matti. (1972) *Kansanedustajan rooli. Tutkimus kansanedustajien suhtautumisesta edustajantoimeensa vuoden 1969 valtiopäivillä.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Patterson, Samuel C., Ronald D. Hedlund, and G. Robert Boynton. (1975) *Representatives and represented.* New York: Wiley.

Pitkin, Hanna F. (1967) *The concept of representation.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reynolds, Andrew, Ben Reilly, and Andrew Ellis. (2005) *Electoral system design: the new international IDEA handbook.* Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

Statistics Finland. (2007) *Eduskuntavaalit 2007, ehdokkaiden ja valittujen taustat.* http://www.stat.fi/til/evaa/2007/evaa_2007_2007-03-19_kat_001.html.

Stimson, James. (2007) Perspectives on representation: asking the right question and getting the right answers. In: Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (eds) *The Oxford handbook of political behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Studlar, Donley T. and Ian McAllister. (1996) Constituency activity and representational roles among Australian legislators. *Journal of Politics* 58 (1): 69-90.

Thomassen, Jacques. (1994) Empirical research into political representation: failing democracy or failing models? In: M. Kent Jennings and Thomas E. Mann (eds) *Elections at home and abroad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Urbinati, Nadia and Mark E. Warren. (2008) The concept of representation in contemporary democratic theory. Annual Review of Political Science 11: 387-412.

Uslander, Eric M. and Ronald E. Weber. (1983) Policy congruence and American state elites. Descriptive representation versus electoral accountability. *Journal of Politics* 45 (1): 183-96.

Wahlke, John, Heinz Eulau, William Buchanan, and LeRoy C. Ferguson. (1962) *The legislative system.* New York: Wiley.

Weisberg, Herbert F. (1978) Evaluating theories of congressional roll-call voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 22(3): 554-77.

Weβels, Bernhard. (2007) Political representation and democracy. In: Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (eds) *The Oxford handbook of political behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. (1992) A simple theory of survey response: answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (3): 579-616.

Appendix

All variables are coded on a scale from 0 to 1.

Dependent variables

Resemblance model

A sum-variable with ten values (0-1) based on two statements with five values each (strongly agree, partly agree, don't know, partly disagree, strongly disagree): '*The age distribution of the parliament should correspond to the public*' and '*The gender distribution of the parliament should correspond to the public*'. Spearman's correlation 0.60.

Trustee/delegate model

Subtraction of two statements with five values each (strongly agree, partly agree, don't know, partly disagree, strongly disagree). '*MPs should regularly find out voters' opinions and act according to them*'. subtracted from '*MPs should act in the best interest of the public with the use of their own common sense*'. High values indicate a distinct preference for the trustee model, low values a distinct preference for the delegate model. Intermediate values represent a blurred preference.

Independent variables

Socio-demographics

Gender: 1 =man, 0=woman.
Age: age in years divided by 100.
Education: 1=lower and higher academic degree, 0.8=polytechnic degree, 0.6=unfinished polytechnic or academic degree, 0.4=lowest level tertiary education, 0.2=upper secondary level education, 0= lower secondary level education.
Class: subjective class identification (1=upper class, 0.75=upper middle class, 0.5=middle class or no class 0.25=lower middle class, 0=working class).
Language: mother tongue of the respondent (1=Swedish, 0=Finnish/other).

Political sophistication

Political knowledge: five questions about political matters which were combined in an index counting the number of correct answers, divided by five. The questions are as follows: '*Who (of the following) was the Finnish Minister of foreign affairs during 2006?*', '*What party (of the following) is the second largest party in the new parliament measured in terms of mandates?*', '*What country (of the following) is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council?*', '*Who are entitled to vote in Finnish parliamentary elections?*' (four alternatives were offered), and '*What is meant by a parliamentary form of government?*' (four alternatives were offered).
Political interest: 1=very interested, 0.66=quite interested, 0.33=not very interested, 0=not interested at all.

Political integration

Satisfaction with democracy: a statement '*Democracy is better than any other form of government*' (four point scale where zero indicates a negative response and one a positive response).

External efficacy: an index consisting of four different categorical variables with four different values each. The questions used in the index are as follows: '*MPs are becoming out of touch with ordinary people*', '*Politicians don't care about what ordinary people think*', '*Parties are only interested in people's votes, not their opinions*', and '*It doesn't matter who is in power, politics won't change any way*'. Cronbach's alpha = 0.75.

Internal efficacy: a statement '*Sometime it feels like politics is so complicated that I don't understand what is going on*' 1=strongly agree, 0.66=partly agree, 0.33=partly disagree, 0=strongly disagree.

Party identification: a question '*How stable is your party choice?*' 1=very stable, 0.66=fairly stable, 0.33=not very stable, 0=not at all stable.

Ideological self-placement: respondent's self-placement on the left-right dimension ranging from 0 to 1 (higher values indicate more rightist orientation).

Voting: voting in the Finnish parliamentary elections of 2007 (0=did not vote, 1=voted)

Notes

[1] We wish to warmly thank the three anonymous reviewers and the JEPOP editors for their insightful comments and suggestions that have been very helpful for revising the article.

[2] Besides the questions of who should be represented and how representatives should behave, Birch (1993, 69-70) mentions also the dispute about the method of selecting the representatives, which will probably also remain as controversy in some countries given that the mechanism by which votes are converted to seats has direct effect on the success of political parties.

[3] An example is the local Swedish political party Demoex that has started an experiment to combine representational and direct democracy by offering its' supporters a chance to debate and vote on certain issues on local government' agenda the day before local government's meeting. In the meeting, its representatives will vote for the option preferred by the majority of its supporters (see http://demoex.net/en).

[4] It should be emphasised that this study concentrates solely on the *style* in which voters wish their representatives to act. In their early contribution to empirical research on the topic, Eulau et al. (1959, 744-46) recognised that the question of representation can be divided into two analytically distinct dimensions, i.e. the *focus* of representation and the *style* of representation. Whereas the focus of representation addresses the question of whose interests the representative is pursuing, the style of representation in turn refers to the question of how representatives reach their decisions. In the classical debate, the focus of representation has mainly been a question of the interests of the constituency on the one hand, and the interests of the nation as a whole on the other (Narud & Valen 2007). In time, the debate has broadened considerable to involve other interests such as political parties or different types of interest groups. Eulau et al. (1959, 745) emphasised that from an analytical point of view, the style of representation is neutral concerning the different interests that a political representative might pursue and, accordingly, the two dimensions of representation should be treated separately. Consequently, even though our data contains questions related to the *focus* of representation, the topic is reserved of another investigation.

[5] It can be debated whether representation in terms of resemblance should be classified as a style or a focus of representation, as it appears to contain elements of both aspects. We, however, view representation in terms of socio-demographic likeness as a style, since the emphasis is on the way voters' interests are represented and not on the question of whose interest should be represented as such.

[6] According to Brown (2006, 218-219) there are, however, several reasons why we should not identify descriptive representation with interest representation. Firstly, people belong to various different social groups and it is not possible to now in advance how their rank those identities in their self-conception and behaviour. Secondly, individuals who identify to a certain social group may lack some group-defining characteristics and vice versa. In addition, people are capable representing other interest than those of their own social group, and groups are not necessarily coherent internally. Uslaner and Weber (1983) have also shown that the large differences in opinion congruence between constituencies and three elite groups remained even after weighting the socioeconomic composition of the latter in order to better correspond the former. Also Pitkin dismisses representation in terms of resemblance of the public as an unrealistic and incomplete view of representation (see Holmberg 1989, 1).

[7] The only study of voters' views of representation in a proportional electoral system with multimember districts that we are aware of is by Mendez-Lago and Martínez (2002) based on Spanish data.

[8] Besides the statements used in study, the data include three additional statements concerning the role of representatives: '*Representatives should have higher education than citizens'*, '*Representatives should first and foremost be experts in their fields'* and '*The opinions of parliament should first and foremost correspond with that of the general public in central questions'* The proportions agreeing with these statements were 39.9, 74.4 and 78.2 percent, respectively. We however decided to exclude all three from analyses for several reasons. Concerning the first two statements the decisions was based on the fact that they, regardless of having some similarities with trustee-style of representation, do not fully reflect the theoretical models of representation roles. Further, an explorative principal component analyses showed that together they form an independent 'expert' dimension. The third statement was excluded due to its problematic formulation. The statement refers to an aggregated opinion held by the parliament, which do not correspond with the idea of roles adapted by individual MPs. Empirically the statement loads quite strongly with the delegate as well as the resemblance dimension.

[9] This becomes evident when the criteria for *Eigenvalues* is set below 1.

[10] We warmly thank an anonymous reference for this suggestion.

[11] Minority status is a measure of whether the respondent belongs to the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland. Income is not included due to a relatively large amount of missing cases.

[12] We thank an anonymous referee for this suggestion.

[13] Carman (2007) found however that the preference for trustee model is conditioned on the race of the representative: a black constituency with black representative is more prone to prefer the delegate style of representation.

[14] The models of representation roles are presented in accordance to the extent of personal initiative and knowledge demanded from the political representative. The resemblance model, which only expects that the MP should have certain personal characteristics such as being a male or female or belonging to a certain age group, is considered least demanding. The model that requires the second least from MPs is the delegate style of representation in which MPs should follow the opinions of voters. To act as a trustee according to his or her own considerations is valued most demanding.

[15] Nonlinear effect of age, i.e. age squared, was analysed as well in order to test the underrepresentation hypotheses (not shown here). The effect turned out to be significant but with b-coefficient and standard error very similar to the linear age variable, suggesting a very weak u-curve effect. Moreover, when both linear age and non-linear effects of age were included in the same model, both were non-significant.

[16] 34 per cent of British voters chose the response category 'depends on the issue' when offered among other categories, i.e. 'follow his/her conscience' (11%), 'follow his/her constituency' (53%) and 'don't know' (2%) (Carman 2006, 111).