Candidate Campaigning in Low Information Elections:

Evidence from Local Election Candidates in the UK

Colin Rallings, Michael Thrasher, Galina Borisyuk & Mary Shears

Elections Centre, School of Management, University of Plymouth, UK

Constituency campaigning at recent UK general elections generally shows that modern parties are adept at targeting winnable seats and furthermore that the expenditure of resources has a positive effect on vote share(Ashcroft, 2010; Denver & Hands, 1993; Denver & Hands, 2004; Denver et al., 2003; Denver & Hands, 1997; Fisher, Denver & Hands, 2006a; Fisher, Denver & Hands, 2006b; Johnston, 2003; Kavanagh, 1995; Pattie & Johnston, 2003a; Pattie & Johnston, 2009; Pattie & Johnston, 2003b; Pattie & Johnston, 2004; Whiteley & Seyd, 2003). Dependent upon the party and the candidate this effort may be directed towards retaining a seat or capturing a new one but the general point can be made – constituency specific effort expended relates to risk and reward. To a large extent this research is facilitated by an information-rich environment; general election campaigns receive national media coverage, voters receive a broad range of campaign material, local campaigning is undertaken by a range of party activists, candidates are required to submit details of legitimate election expenses and the list of marginal/safe constituencies is commonly agreed. Moreover, these factors can become inter-related – the national media focus attention upon the "key" seats, driving further efforts by the competing candidates and their local parties that are observed by the targeted voters who then act accordingly. In short, there is enough raw material in these types of election for the story to be re-assembled after the event allowing opportunities for empirical analyses that enrich our understanding about the nature and effect of modern campaigning.

The story is rather different in information-poor elections such as those that take place for seats on local authorities. Low information applies to more or less everyone concerned in these contests, from the local party activists, the candidates that stand for election and of course the voters. Local media may sometimes mitigate these effects by publishing or broadcasting material about the election – candidates, issues and seats that could potentially change hands – but the spread and consumption of local media is in decline and even consumers that remain are largely disinterested in the electoral process outside of the parliamentary context (Temple, 2005). That leaves local parties and candidates to provide the necessary information for framing each election contest (Copus, 2004). Even here resources may be limited. The previous detailed result (apart from knowing who won) in each electoral district may be unknown (particularly when complex electoral cycles and/or boundary changes are involved); a different set of parties and/or candidates may be contesting now than

contested before. Moreover, low information elections [we can include supra-national European parliament elections here (Heath et al., 1999; Hix & Marsh, 2007; Kousser, 2004; Marsh, 1998; Weber, 2007)] are at the mercy of the effects of the national electoral cycle with some candidates unexpectedly winning simply because their party is in the ascendant nationally and others losing because of the reverse effect. A shifting local electoral context coupled with a more or less volatile electorate makes for an especially uncertain environment for candidates – how can we define, if at all, whether a seat is "safe" or not.

This makes for an uncertain campaign environment for candidates, some of whom are incumbents seeking re-election, others returning once more into the electoral fray and another, more exclusive, group for whom this is a first adventure in the world of campaigning (at least as a candidate). Are these experiences indeed relevant to a campaign strategy, assuming that there is a strategy in the first place?

This paper tests whether and how far the level of campaign investment by individual candidates standing for election to local councils in the UK relates to the prospect of winning. Annually, since 2006 local candidates for political office have been randomly selected from nomination lists and asked to complete postal questionnaires immediately after the election. Responses from more than 8,000 election candidates are available for analysis (Rallings et al., 2007; Rallings et al., 2009; Rallings et al., 2010a; Rallings, Thrasher & Shears, 2008). As well as facilitating a detailed composite picture of the nature and attitudes of candidates that contest these elections (Rallings et al., 2010b) some questions relate specifically to the election experience, including the number of hours per week spent campaigning, whether the candidate resides inside or outside the boundaries of the electoral district they are contesting, whether they were reactive or proactive in the selection process, and the competitive nature of that process. Many candidates, about a quarter it appears, stand because they are asked, are the only volunteers and are 'paper' candidates. By contrast, others are incumbents or perceive themselves as strong challengers. With time spent campaigning as the variable of interest the paper considers candidate behaviour using a range of variables, including candidates' social, residential and partisan characteristics, the local authority electoral cycle, and differences between incumbents seeking re-election and other candidates. The individual-level survey

data are also matched to the aggregate electoral district data, allowing the analysis to consider the impact of electoral context, both before and after the election itself, upon a candidate's investment in the campaigning.

The opening section provides more detail about the survey methodology and leads into a brief overview of the types of people that stand for election. There then follows an examination of the relationships between the time in hours each candidate spends campaigning and a range of variables that include the electoral context (year and type of local authority), partisan context (a candidate's party affiliation, if any), incumbency, residency, and the effects on time devoted to campaigning from being a paper candidate. A fourth section builds on this bivariate analysis and describes a multivariate approach that has campaign time as the dependent variable. In the conclusions we draw some lessons about the nature of future research on local campaigning.

The Local Election Candidates Surveys

Local councillors in the UK have been fairly regularly surveyed but the same cannot be said in respect of local election candidates. Because we felt that surveying councillors provided only a partial view, surveying the victors and not the vanquished, we have compiled annual surveys of all those that stand for an election. The survey process began in 2006 and the full complement of the different types of principal local authorities in England and Wales (London boroughs, metropolitan boroughs, shire districts, shire counties and a range of recently established unitary councils) have now been surveyed[1]. In 2009 local council elections were re-scheduled from the normal date in May to coincide with elections for the European parliament held in June.

Candidates are randomly selected from nomination lists published by each local authority. Sampling procedures vary according to the number of candidates that are

---

[1] Local authorities in Scotland are excluded because the Scottish Parliament commissioned its own survey of local election candidates. See MacAllister, I. 2003. "National Survey of Local Government Candidates." Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research. These authorities now employ the Single Transferable Vote rather than simple plurality voting to select councillors.

contesting in a given year. In 2009, when the number of contests and therefore of candidates was relatively small, the random selection interval lay between one in two and one in three. By contrast, in 2007, when 28,379 candidates contested, the sampling interval was closer to one in ten. In 2010 we over-sampled among candidates contesting London borough council seats but this is controlled for in our detailed analysis. The normal target for each survey is to collect the names and addresses of approximately 3,000 candidates and to obtain at least 1,000 usable responses assuming a final response rate of about a third (Table 1). Those randomly selected from published lists were sent a postal questionnaire to the address on their nomination forms. Questionnaires were posted on the day of the election and timed to arrive while the election experience was still fresh. As well as providing demographic information about each candidate (age, sex, ethnic background, occupational and employment status, and educational qualifications) the surveys addressed questions about party membership, political and electoral experience, the process of recruitment to candidate status and crucially for this paper the level and nature of election campaigning[2]. This analysis uses pooled data from four postal surveys conducted among local election candidates between 2007 and 2010, amounting to a total of 4,646 individual respondents.

Table 1 here

The pooled data are weighted according to the type of authority and the response rate from each local authority. The survey data in respect of candidate partisanship and sex are compared with the aggregate election data and we are confident that there is no response bias in respect of either partisanship or sex.

---

[2] Because the 2006 survey did not ask candidates about election campaigning these data are excluded from this analysis. However those authorities having elections that year were subsequently surveyed in 2010 and campaign data are therefore available for this cohort.

Who are the candidates?

Table 2 describes the profile of candidates in respect of some social and other characteristics. Men campaign longer than do women but this difference is most likely related to the fact that men comprise about 70% of councillors and incumbents campaign more intensively than challengers. Candidates aged between 45-54 years spend least time campaigning but those in the next decade spend the most time chasing votes. The relatively small group of candidates aged below 35 years are enthusiastic it seems in contesting their seats. One of the enduring problems of local government in Britain is the accusation that it is 'male, pale and stale' – women, Black, Asian and other minority ethnic and younger people are all under-represented social groups on local council benches. The surveys of local election candidates continue to show that non-white people are notably absent from the electoral process but these data show that when they do stand there is a considerable time investment in campaigning.

Table 2 here

Local election candidates are also unrepresentative of the general population in respect of relatively high levels of educational attainment, occupational status and patterns of employment. More than half the candidates, for example, have university degrees but those with a first degree only are campaigning less than those with no formal qualification but here age is the most likely factor behind this difference. Those from high-status occupations dominate local hustings with very few people from partly- or un-skilled occupations become involved. It does appear, however, that skilled manual workers are campaigning almost as long as workers in managerial or technical occupations. Clear patterns are evident in terms of candidates' employment status and campaigning time. It is understandable, perhaps, that retired people campaign most but the self-employed also appear to make a relatively large investment in time. By contrast, workers in full-time paid employment campaign least of all. Given that serving on local councils is not a paid occupation it is neither

surprising to discover the large proportion of retired among the candidates and the relatively small number of full and part-time employed people.

On the campaign trail

A small fraction of respondents either admitted to having done no campaigning at all or omitted to answer these particular questions. Those candidates spending zero hours on the campaign trail were more likely to be describing themselves as 'paper candidates' – agreeing with their local party that their name could be added to the ballot paper but adamant this was the extent of their involvement. At the other end of the spectrum were some respondents who may have misunderstood the question or were clearly anxious to make a point that for them the opportunity/chore of being a candidate was a 24/7 process. Whilst being sympathetic to this view we have, nevertheless, omitted all respondents that claimed to be spending more than 80 hours per week campaigning time. Table 3 describes the hours spent campaigning each week by candidates contesting local elections.

Table 3 here

Generally, candidates spend an average of 16 hours per week campaigning with a median value of 12 hours. There are some notable differences according to the election year, however. Candidates contesting those local elections that coincided with either the European (2009) and UK Parliamentary (2010) elections reported more time spent campaigning than did those contesting in 2007 and 2008. This might suggest that synchronous elections result in more campaign time but the explanation may be more complex than this. Most of the 2009 contests were for seats on the English shire counties where electoral districts (county divisions) cover larger geographic areas and have larger electorates than do those in the shire districts (which are sub-units of the counties) for example; campaign time may be a function of both geography and electorate. Moreover, county councils have greater administrative

responsibilities and bigger spending powers than do the smaller districts and this may account for some of the difference in campaign time.

The local electoral process is rather complex but councils divide into two basic types in respect of the fraction of seats determined at any given election. Some authorities, for example, the London boroughs, hold elections for the whole council every four years. Others, including the metropolitan boroughs (the larger urban areas outside London, e.g. Birmingham, Manchester and Newcastle) hold elections each year for a fraction, normally a third, of council seats. One conjecture might be that a whole council election would generate greater interest among voters (the opportunity to change who runs the local administration) and this would prompt candidates to invest more time campaigning. Certainly, the level of electoral participation increases for a whole council rather than a partial council election (Hoffmann-Martinot, Rallings & Thrasher, 1996; Rallings & Thrasher, 1990) but it is not entirely clearly that it impacts upon campaign time. While London candidates spend more time campaigning than do their counterparts standing for metropolitan borough councils the pattern in the districts is reversed. Candidates contesting whole council districts in 2007 averaged 13.5 hours but on districts elected by thirds saw candidates average 15 hours. The most likely explanation for differences between London and metropolitan candidates is election timing. Candidates contesting metropolitan borough seats that responded to our surveys in 2007 and 2008 reported average campaign times of 14.7 and 12.8 hours respectively. By contrast, candidates also contesting metropolitan boroughs seats but standing in 2010, the general election year, spent 19.1 hours on the campaign trail. We conclude from this that a synchronous general/local election has a major impact on campaigning.

A candidate's party allegiance appears to impact on campaigning time. Conservative candidates campaigned for longer periods than did their Labour and Liberal Democrat opponents. The greater involvement among Conservatives may be a function of that party's position in the country generally; during this period it was regarded as the party most likely to replace Labour as the party of national government and it was enjoying notable success at local government elections. However, the rather small gap between Labour and Liberal Democrats is perhaps puzzling. The Liberal Democrats, the third-placed party at parliamentary elections, are known to campaign

fiercely at their local equivalents since victories there provided much needed publicity and a boost to their party membership. Some part of the explanation for this smaller than expected gap may be uncovered when political incumbency is controlled for (see below, Table 4). Local elections also feature a growing proportion of candidates that contest on behalf of one of the many smaller parties. Most of these candidates have very little chance of winning seats under first past the post rules and it is unsurprising that the mean value is lower, 12.4 hours spent campaigning, than for main party candidates. However, there are significant differences within this minor party category which largely comprises the three parties, Greens, British National Party (BNP: a right-wing, anti immigration party) and the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP: an anti-European Union party). While the mean values for BNP and UKIP candidates are almost identical (14.3 and 14.6 hours respectively) they differ markedly from Green candidates who spent just 9.2 hours on average campaigning. It is unsurprising that candidates that contested as Independents rather than adopt a party description campaigned for relatively lengthy periods. In elections that are increasingly party political those candidates that stand as Independents and rely upon personal votes may work harder to gain an electoral profile and to compete with organised parties.

Because local council office is regarded as a part-time activity it is not salaried and attracts only relatively moderate financial allowances. There is, therefore, a regular turnover amongst sitting councillors with many dropping out voluntarily after a single elected term. We expect, therefore, that any incumbents that continue to fight another election have done so because they are seeking re-election. *Ceteris paribus*, returning incumbents would be expected to campaign more than the average challenger. As Table 4 shows this is indeed the case. Generally, incumbents spent an average of 20 hours a week campaigning compared with non-incumbents who expended only 14 hours. Distinguishing amongst candidates from the three main parties shows a consistent pattern with councillors seeking re-election all investing more campaign time than their party colleagues seeking office. For Independents, however, the picture is reversed with challengers spending 18 hours a week but incumbents spending less time, just 15.5 hours. Sitting Independents may feel more secure in their chances of being re-elected while those contenders for office may be having to

campaign harder to establish a personal vote of some kind and also to do battle against rival party organisations.

Table 4 here

It is not compulsory that a candidate is resident in the ward that they contest for an election; roughly half live outside the ward although we do not know the distance from there to their place of residence! There is a very small difference in average campaigning hours although it is in the expected direction (Table 5). Candidates that are ward residents campaign for 16.14 hours but outside residents spend slightly less time, 15.89 hours. Controlling for a candidate's party, however, reveals some interesting differences. Liberal Democrat incumbents are campaigning two hours more than the party's challengers – evidence that the party's pursuit of "pavement politics" has some observable manifestation. The gap between incumbents and non-incumbents amongst the Conservative party candidates is somewhat smaller. But for Labour this relationship is reversed with outsiders devoting more time to their campaigns. There is, as yet, no explanation for this finding although we did find that in London a relatively large proportion of Labour candidates lived outside the ward that they contested so this may be contributing towards this finding.

Table 5 here

It also appears that campaigning is not necessarily a solitary experience; some candidates will assist other party members contesting other wards although it is unclear from our data whether such people are 'altruists' (giving time to assist others), responding to the norm of reciprocity (campaigning for others after or in anticipation of outside assistance) or some other explanation. Whatever the circumstances are it affects campaigning hours generally. Those that campaign in other wards will contribute 16.61 hours on average but those that restrict their activity to their own ward are working for a smaller time, 15.13 hours. This relationship holds across parties but not for Independents. The gap in hours for Conservative campaigners is rather smaller than that for its two main rivals, Labour and Liberal Democrats, but in general these candidates are spending most time. Those Labour candidates

campaigning in other wards as well as their own are giving almost 17 hours to the campaign compared to 13 hours for own-ward campaigners.

Table 6 here

Some of the most surprising findings emerge after controlling for whether or not respondents admitted that their selection as a candidate came after they were prepared to act as a paper candidate. National parties are reluctant to concede large areas by not fielding any candidate at all since this undermines claims that they can appeal to all kinds of voter. There is pressure, therefore, on local parties to find candidates even for wards where there is virtually zero chance of success. The annual surveys regularly find that around one in four candidates admits to being simply a name on the ballot paper. A priori, therefore, we expect that paper candidates, of all party political persuasions, will campaign for the least time. Table 7 shows paper candidates campaigning for a mean of 10.19 hours and others for 16.70 hours. This relationship is common for all parties and especially so for Independents. What is, perhaps, surprising is that paper candidates – people agreeing to see their names on the ballot paper but not expecting/wanting to be election – are so active during the campaign.

Table 7 here

Of course, it is possible that paper candidates are devoting an average of 10 hours a week helping their fellow candidates contest their election and have abandoned their own ward contest entirely. This appears not to be the whole explanation however. Table 8 divides paper/other candidates into those that campaign only in their own wards and those that also campaign in other wards. Amongst the non-paper candidates it is evident once again that campaigners that help others are devoting the most time. Perhaps the most surprising finding is that paper candidates that are campaigning in their own and not others' wards are still prepared to invest over seven hours a week on the campaign. These are candidates, it should be recalled, that have no prospect of winning, have agreed when selected that the extent of their electoral ambition is to be a name on the ballot paper and provide some voters with some opportunity to express their partisan support. Their investment in campaigning,

therefore, is a further contribution towards the party cause, delivering campaign leaflets whilst knowing that there is no prospect of victory.

Table 8 here

Modelling campaign time

Both the analysis of candidate survey data and knowledge of local election aggregate data together suggest a number of factors that may influence the amount of time spent campaigning. These factors include:

- Ward majority (continuous variable that is percentage point difference in the electoral district between first and second placed parties for the election contested by each respondent to the candidate survey)
- Probability of winning (a scale running from 0 to 10 which is the candidate's own estimate of their chance of winning a seat at the recent election)
- Certain winner (this is a binary variable that allows us to capture the nonlinear character of influence; those who are absolutely sure that they will win do not bother to campaign too hard)
- Incumbent
- Paper candidate (did the candidate indicate that one of the criteria for their selection was their willingness to be a paper candidate in name only)
- Conservative
- Independent
- Greens
- Retired
- Full-time employed
- 2010 (binary) to reflect coincidence of local and general elections
- County elections
- Campaigned in other wards

Although these factors demonstrate differing degrees of association with the amount of time spent campaigning, to take account of these issues simultaneously and evaluate their relative effects on candidates' attitudes, we conducted a multivariate analysis. The dependent variable represents time spent campaigning (hours per week).

Because the dependent variable is measured at the interval level scale, a linear regression model is an obvious choice [3]. The variable 'time spent campaigning', however, has a severely biased distribution and when applying OLS technique to the raw data the distribution of regression residuals indicates a profound departure from normality (assessed visually by plotting the residuals against the fitted values). Clearly, violation of the normality assumption can lead to invalid conclusions about the significance of the estimates. To rectify this problem, the logarithmic transformation of the dependent variable is used and the desired normality of the residuals was thereby achieved.

Table 9 here

The model estimates for the threshold and location parameters are described in Table 9. Results of the multivariate analysis[4] are consistent with the findings from our preliminary analysis. The regression coefficient for the dummy variable '*General election*' is positive and statistically significant and indicates [as the column headed Exp(B) explains] that a parliamentary election (compared to a simple local election) would be expected to find local election candidates spending an additional 52% more time campaigning. The effect of the dichotomous variable *'County election'* is positive meaning that candidates contesting county elections spent more time campaigning – 60% more time than did candidates contesting other types of local council seats. Compared with the time spent contesting a highly competitive seat campaigning time in safe seats is lower as is also the case of seats where the

---

[3]   Two binary logistic regression models were also constructed. The first model has the dependent variable that identifies respondents with time spent campaigning in terms of whether they are above/below the mean. The second variant of the binary dependent uses cases above/below the median. Both logistic regression models reveal the same statistically significant factors as are identified in the linear regression. The OLS model only is reported here.

[4]   2,988 cases were included in the analysis. The overall model is significant at the 0.01 level according to the F statistic ($F_{13,2974} = 61.5$, $p < 0.01$). The adjusted R-square is 0.21. No multicollinearity is present in the data.

candidate feels their personal election victory is guaranteed. The positive coefficient for *'Incumbent'* (vs. non-incumbent) means that councillors seeking re-election care more about campaigning or have more resources for campaigning than do non-incumbents (with all other circumstances equal of course); such a candidate would devote 24% more time to campaigning. The direction of the effect of the dummy variables Conservative, Greens, and Independent on the dependent variable is in the expected direction: positive for Conservative and Independent (who would spend 12% and 39% more time respectively) and negative for Greens (campaigning only for 59% of the time spent by other candidates). The dummy predictor *'Retired'* fails to demonstrate a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable but those in full-time employment are unable/unwilling it appears to campaign for as much time as others.

Following the OLS model we might wish to provide broad profiles of two rather different types of candidate in terms of estimated time spent campaigning (having first undertaken a back transformation of our dependent variable to actual hours). Beginning with the most reluctant campaigner (ignoring those that do no campaigning at all) we would expect to find this person contesting a ward where the winner's majority was above 80 percentage points, where the non-incumbent candidate estimated their own chance of winning as zero, (hardly surprising since they had been selected after agreeing to be a paper candidate only). This candidate is most likely to be contesting the election on behalf of the Greens and is in full-time employment. The local election does not coincide with a general election year and our candidate is not contesting a county council seat. The candidate is not particularly engaged with the electoral process and consequently is not bothering to campaign for fellow party members in other wards who might a stand better chance of winning votes. The model estimates that our reluctant candidate would only campaign for 1.9 hours for each week of the campaign.

By contrast, a rather more active candidate might be someone contesting the most marginal seat (split-wards electing different parties as winners with exactly the same number of votes), where the incumbent candidate is not absolutely sure of victory but rather is placed at "9" on that scale. This person is certainly not a paper candidate but is likely to be standing as an Independent and is not in full-time employment. The

local election is not coincident with the general election (where all the candidates are campaigning harder) but it is a contest for a county council seat. Our hard-working candidate is also helping with the campaign in other wards beyond his or her own. A candidate fitting this precise description is expected from the model estimates to spend a significant amount of time on the campaign trail – 32 hours per week.

Conclusions

The research shows that candidates are instrumental in their campaign behaviour but only to a degree. The competitive nature of the seat and each candidate's perception of the possibility of winning are related to the amount of time that is dedicated to the campaign. Of course, once sitting councillors have made the initial decision to carry on for a further four-year term, then it appears logical that they should mobilise the resources and invest the time in securing re-election. Of greater interest, perhaps, is the behaviour of remaining candidates, a large majority of whom face little or no prospect of being elected. Despite this, such candidates are apparently willing to invest a sizeable amount of time for the duration of the three week campaign. Moreover, around eight in ten enjoy this experience and more than that fraction would do it all again (and many do). These people are already at the high end of public participation by virtue of being current members of political parties and have taken a further step up that ladder by agreeing to become candidates.

For the moment, however, we can only speculate about how each candidate perceives the value of the investment in campaign time. What is missing from the analysis is first, what impact, if any, campaign time has upon vote and second, what the candidates themselves believe they are achieving with this time. One possibility for examining the first question would be to consider the relationship between campaign investment and vote share (or change in vote). Do candidates that invest a relatively large amount of time in contacting electors receive any additional reward in votes over and above that received by party colleagues that make a much lower investment? The second question is better addressed in future surveys. Candidates are currently asked about the number of hours spent campaigning but they are not asked about the

14

impact – on votes, on raising public awareness of their party and its message, on party recruitment etc – those activities might have.

References

Ashcroft, M. (2010) *Minority verdict: The Conservative Party, the voters and the 2010 general election.* London: Biteback.

Copus, C. (2004) *Party politics and local government.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Denver, D. & Hands, G. (1993) 'Measuring the intensity and effectiveness of constituency campaigning in the 1992 general election'. in Denver, D., Norris, P., Broughton, D. and Rallings, C. (eds.) *British Elections & Parties Yearbook 1993.* Hemel Hempsted: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Denver, D. & Hands, G. (2004) 'Labour's targeted constituency campaigning: nationally directed or locally produced?', *Electoral Studies*, 23 (4), pp. 709-726.

Denver, D., Hands, G., Fisher, J. & MacAllister, I. (2003) 'Constituency campaigning in Britain 1992-2001 - Centralization and modernization', *Party Politics*, 9 (5), pp. 541-559.

Denver, D. T. & Hands, G. (1997) *Modern constituency electioneering : local campaigning in the 1992 general election.* London: Frank Cass.

Fisher, J., Denver, D. & Hands, G. (2006a) 'Party membership and campaign activity in Britain', *Party Politics*, 12 (4), pp. 505-519.

Fisher, J., Denver, D. & Hands, G. (2006b) 'The relative electoral impact of central party co-ordination and size of party membership at constituency level', *Electoral Studies*, 25 (4), pp. 664-676.

Heath, A., McLean, I., Taylor, B. & Curtice, J. (1999) 'Between first and second order: a comparison of voting behaviour in European and local elections in Britain', *European Journal of Political Research*, 35 pp. 389-414.

Hix, S. & Marsh, M. (2007) 'Punishment or protest? Understanding European Parliament elections', *Journal of politics*, 69 (2), pp. 495-510.

Hoffmann-Martinot, V., Rallings, C. & Thrasher, M. (1996) 'Comparing local electoral turnout in Great Britain and France: More similarities than differences?', *European Journal of Political Research*, 30 (2), pp. 241-257.

Johnston, R. a. P., C. (2003) 'Do Canvassing and Campaigning Work? Evidence from the 2001 General Election in England'. in Rallings, C., Scully, R., Tonge, J. and Webb, P. (eds.) *British Elections & Parties Review.* London: Frank Cass Publishers.

Kavanagh, D. (1995) *Election campaigning : the new marketing of politics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Kousser, T. (2004) 'Retrospective voting and strategic behavior in European Parliament elections', *Electoral Studies*, 23 (1), pp. 1-21.

Marsh, M. (1998) 'Testing the second-order election model after four European elections', *British Journal of Political Science*, 28 pp. 591-607.

Pattie, C. & Johnston, R. (2003a) 'Local battles in a national landslide: constituency campaigning at the 2001 British General Election', *Poilitical Geography*, 22 pp. 381-414.

Pattie, C. & Johnston, R. (2009) 'STILL TALKING, BUT IS ANYONE LISTENING? The Changing Face of Constituency Campaigning in Britain, 1997-2005', *Party Politics*, 15 (4), pp. 411-434.

Pattie, C. J. & Johnston, R. J. (2003b) 'Hanging on the telephone? Doorstep and telephone canvassing at the British general election of 1997', *British Journal of Political Science*, 33 pp. 303-322.

Pattie, C. J. & Johnston, R. J. (2004) 'Party knowledge and candidate knowledge: constituency campaigning and voting and the 1997 British General Election', *Electoral Studies*, 23 (4), pp. 795-819.

Rallings, C. & Thrasher, M. (1990) 'Turnout in English local elections - an aggregate analysis with electoral and contextual data', *Electoral Studies*, 9 pp. 79-90.

Rallings, C., Thrasher, M., Borisyuk, G. & Shears, M. (2007) *The 2007 Survey of Local Election Candidates.* London: Improvement and Development Agency. 16 pp. Available.

Rallings, C., Thrasher, M., Borisyuk, G. & Shears, M. (2009) *The 2009 Survey of Local Election Candidates.* London: Improvement and Development Agency. Available.

Rallings, C., Thrasher, M., Borisyuk, G. & Shears, M. (2010a) *The 2010 Survey of Local Election Candidates.* London: Improvement & Development Agency. Available.

Rallings, C., Thrasher, M., Borisyuk, G. & Shears, M. (2010b) 'Parties, recruitment and modernisation: Evidence from local election candidates', *Local Government Studies*, 36 (3), pp. 361-379.

Rallings, C., Thrasher, M. & Shears, M. (2008) *The 2008 Survey of Local Election Candidates.* London: Improvement and Development Agency. 20 pp. Available.

Temple, M. (2005) 'Carry on campaigning: The case for 'dumbing down' in the fight against local electoral apathy', *Local Government Studies*, 31 (4), pp. 415-431.

Weber, T. (2007) 'Campaign effects and second-order cycles - A top-down approach to European Parliament elections', *European Union Politics*, 8 (4), pp. 509-536.

Whiteley, P. & Seyd, P. (2003) 'Party election campaigning in Britain - The Labour Party', *Party Politics*, 9 (5), pp. 637-652.

Table 1: The Local Election Candidate Surveys

Year	Sampling criterion	Questionnaires issued	returned	Response %
2007	1 in 10	2,848	1,255	44.1
2008	1 in 4	3,142	1,105	35.2
2009	1 in 2.5	3,534	1,105	31.3
2010	1 in 4*	5,676	1,966	34.7

* A one in two sample was conducted among candidates contesting seats for London borough councils.

Table 2: Social characteristics of candidates and campaigning time (hours per week)

		Mean	Std Dev	Weighted N=
Sex	Men	16.43	13.81	2957
	Women	15.12	13.39	1319
	Total	*16.03*	*13.70*	*4276*
Age (years)	<35	15.63	14.49	480
	35-44	15.12	13.73	558
	45-54	14.99	12.80	850
	55-64	16.91	13.71	1420
	65+	16.20	13.73	843
	Total	*15.98*	*13.65*	*4151*
Ethnic origin	White	15.88	13.66	3992
	Non-white	18.45	14.01	193
	Total	*16.00*	*13.69*	*4185*
Education	No qualification	17.61	12.86	345
	GCSE	16.33	12.99	636
	A level	16.12	13.41	916
	First degree	15.28	13.62	1408
	Higher degree	16.10	14.69	920
	Total	*15.99*	*13.67*	*4226*
Occupational status	Professional	15.87	13.93	2144
	Managerial/technical	16.48	13.48	1117
	Skilled non-manual	15.41	15.00	339
	Skilled manual	16.31	12.34	290
	Partly skilled	15.32	11.95	160
	Unskilled	15.04	11.40	99
	Total	*15.99*	*13.67*	*4149*
Employment	Full-time	14.19	12.72	1290
	Part-time	14.95	12.99	455
	Self employed	16.48	13.30	683
	Retired	17.28	14.37	1332
	Other	17.92	14.93	458
	Total	*16.02*	*13.70*	*4219*

Table 3 Hours per week spent election campaigning

	Count	Unweighted Count	Min	Max	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Election year							
2007	849	858	1.0	60	11.8	10.0	9.82
2008	751	753	1.0	70	12.5	10.0	9.73
2009	978	969	1.0	80	19.1	15.0	14.73
2010	1751	1755	0.5	80	17.9	14.0	15.26
Total	*4329*	*4335*	*0.5*	*80*	*16.0*	*12.0*	*13.70*
Authority type							
London boroughs (w)	760	981	0.5	80	17.7	12.0	16.08
Metropolitan boroughs (t)	701	507	0.5	80	16.2	12.0	13.45
Districts/Unitaries (w)	1016	1032	1.0	80	13.5	10.0	10.62
Districts/Unitaries (t)	1054	1024	1.0	78	15.0	10.0	13.05
Counties (w)	797	791	1.0	80	18.9	15.0	14.98
Total	*4329*	*4335*	*0.5*	*80*	*16.0*	*12.0*	*13.70*
Candidate party							
Conservative	1279	1332	1.0	80	17.8	15.0	13.72
Labour	1155	1141	1.0	80	15.8	12.0	13.00
Liberal Democrat	957	967	1.0	80	16.2	11.0	14.61
Minor party	713	677	0.5	80	12.4	9.0	12.42
Independent	223	218	1.0	80	17.5	12.0	14.69
Total	*4329*	*4335*	*0.5*	*80*	*16.0*	*12.0*	*13.70*

Table 4: Hours per week campaigning by incumbency

	Incumbent		Non-incumbent		Total	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Conservative	20.34	14.07	16.06	13.19	17.84	13.72
Labour	20.28	13.74	13.91	12.21	15.79	13.00
Liberal Democrat	19.68	15.25	14.71	14.05	16.25	14.61
Minor party	22.33	15.48	11.57	11.80	12.35	12.42
Independent	15.52	13.19	18.08	15.07	17.53	14.69
Total	*20.07*	*14.31*	*14.34*	*13.08*	*16.02*	*13.70*

Table 5: Place of residence and campaigning

	Resident in ward		Resident outside ward		Total	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Conservative	17.99	13.58	17.65	13.88	17.83	13.72
Labour	14.99	12.40	16.66	13.56	15.81	13.00
Liberal Democrat	17.24	15.36	15.12	13.62	16.25	14.61
Minor party	12.67	12.57	11.93	12.21	12.36	12.42
Independent	17.74	14.74	16.74	14.65	17.53	14.69
Total	*16.14*	*13.76*	*15.89*	*13.62*	*16.02*	*13.70*

Table 6: The location of campaigning activity

	Campaign in other wards		No outside campaigning		Total	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Conservative	18.10	14.20	17.50	12.95	17.86	13.72
Labour	16.95	13.62	12.90	10.91	15.77	13.02
Liberal Democrat	16.80	15.20	15.19	13.34	16.28	14.64
Minor party	12.50	12.81	12.21	12.01	12.36	12.42
Independent	15.73	16.55	17.80	14.48	17.55	14.73
Total	*16.61*	*14.21*	*15.13*	*12.84*	*16.03*	*13.71*

Table 7: Type of candidate and average campaign hours per week

	Paper candidates		Other candidates		Total	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Conservative	12.77	11.72	17.54	13.12	16.75	13.02
Labour	11.42	11.87	15.92	12.55	14.29	12.49
Liberal Democrat	10.37	10.57	16.97	14.03	14.27	13.13
Minor party	7.19	8.22	14.76	11.98	10.84	10.88
Independent	8.00	3.38	21.72	16.95	21.19	16.83
Total	*10.19*	*10.76*	*16.70*	*13.15*	*14.50*	*12.77*

Table 8: Type of candidate and campaigning activity

		Mean	Std Dev	Count
Paper candidate	Campaign in other wards	11.04	11.43	774
	Campaign own wards	7.62	8.13	267
	Total	10.16	10.78	1041
Other candidates	Campaign in other wards	17.48	13.60	1167
	Campaign own wards	15.72	12.51	880
	Total	16.72	13.16	2046
Total	Campaign in other wards	14.91	13.16	1941
	Campaign own wards	13.83	12.13	1147
	Total	*14.51*	*12.79*	*3087*

Table 9: The investment in campaign time

	B	Std Err	Beta	t	Sig	Exp(B)
(Constant)	2.068	0.059		35.3	0.000	
General election	0.419	0.039	0.209	10.81	0.000	1.520
County council	0.469	0.043	0.198	10.93	0.000	1.598
Ward majority	-0.003	0.001	-0.047	-2.76	0.006	0.997
Probability of winning (scale 0-10)	0.028	0.007	0.101	3.91	0.000	1.028
Certain winners	-0.157	0.067	-0.046	-2.34	0.019	0.855
Incumbent	0.219	0.042	0.103	5.25	0.000	1.245
Paper candidate	-0.535	0.045	-0.268	-12	0.000	0.586
Outside campaigner	0.125	0.033	0.064	3.72	0.000	1.133
Independent	0.328	0.139	0.039	2.36	0.018	1.388
Conservative	0.116	0.036	0.056	3.19	0.001	1.123
Green	-0.492	0.056	-0.151	-8.73	0.000	0.611
Full-time employ	-0.119	0.038	-0.058	-3.16	0.002	0.888
Retired	0.045	0.037	0.022	1.21	0.226	1.046

Dependent Variable: LN(time)