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Determinants of support and participation in a major sport event referendum
We investigate the determinants of referenda support and participation intention in the context of a major sport event.

- Political cynicism, civic duty, and event status impacted voters’ referendum support.
- Civic duty, satisfaction with democracy, and event status impacted voting intentions.
- This study benefits those considering referenda in major sport event contexts.
Abstract

In recent years, referenda have been used to inform decisions to bid on major sport events. Recognising referenda as a means to engage a community in a major sport event, the purpose of this study was to investigate the determinants of referenda support and participation intention. A sample of 603 New Zealanders completed a questionnaire a) the intention to participate in such a referendum. Based on exploratory factor analysis assessing b) their support for a referendum on their city bidding to host the Commonwealth Games, and multinomial logistic regression, the key findings are that political cynicism, civic duty, event status and involvement affected voters’ referendum support, while political cynicism, civic duty, political interest, event status and involvement impacted their voting intentions. The results have implications for prospective host cities, sport managers, policymakers, and ordinary citizens.
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1 Introduction

Reflecting the contentious issue of whether host communities benefit from major sport events (Kim & Petrick, 2005), referenda are increasingly used to inform bid decisions. For example, the city of Sion (Switzerland) withdrew their bid for the 2026 Winter Olympics after 54% of residents voted against the bid in a referendum (Morgan, 2018). In the 2022 Winter Olympic bidding process, four potential host cities held referenda: Krakow, Poland; Oslo, Norway; St. Moritz, Switzerland; and Munich, Germany. In Krakow, St. Moritz, and Munich, citizens indicated their lack of support for the bid through the referenda, and the bids were removed as a result. Toward a similar end, while citizens living in Oslo voted to support the bid, politicians later overturned the vote and withdrew their bid (Zaccaradi, 2014).

Despite the belief that major sport event success is associated with host community support for the event (Kim, Jun, Walker, & Drane, 2015; Yong & Ap, 2008), local residents are usually excluded from decisions, including whether to bid (Coates & Wicker, 2015). Bidding decisions are often made by a small group of politicians, lack transparency and reflect global trends rather than local community wishes (Gursoy, Nunkoo, & Milito, 2017).

Decision making related to major sport event bids is best understood in the context of the wider political climate and citizen engagement. Representative democracy is changing, insofar as citizens are increasingly demanding a greater role in decision making (Colombo, 2018; Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). That role may take the form of a referendum, a process that enhances collective citizen decision-making and reduces political power. Referenda may be initiated by citizens or the government and be either binding or non-binding (i.e., indicative only). The extent to which citizens support and ultimately participate in referenda is important for various community and government stakeholders. Referenda support refers to a belief that the implementation of a voting process used to express citizens’ opinions is appropriate (Anderson & Goodyear-Grant, 2010; Rose & Borz, 2013) and is closely associated with populism (Anderson & Goodyear-Grant, 2010).
Populism is defined as the premise “that ordinary citizens should come together to act politically in order to transcend artificial decisions created by greed, corruption, and elite dominance” (Anderson & Goodyear-Grant, 2010, p. 228). Referendum participation refers to the act of casting a vote in the referendum.

Previous research on sport-related referenda has primarily focused on the use of public funds to build sport stadia in North America (Brown & Paul, 1999; Coates & Humphreys, 2006; Lenskyj, 2004). Data is often collected in conjunction with the referendum itself rather than capturing related sentiments/attitudes explicitly (Coates & Wicker, 2015).

No academic research has yet investigated support for referenda use in the decision to host a major sport event, nor has research explored residents’ intention to participate in such a major sport event referendum. Furthermore, doing so hypothetically before a referendum allows for residents to provide an unbiased view before any external groups - including the media and local growth coalitions - exert influence.

The two outcome variables in this research are Referendum Support (i.e., the degree to which one supports the use of a referenda in the process of a community deciding whether to bid for a major event) and Participation Intention (i.e., the likelihood that one would participate in such a referendum). Although sometimes correlated (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015), it is important to isolate the unique determinants of each. One may support the use of a referendum in this context, but that may not intend to participate in it. A specific understanding of the correlates of voting behaviour (Aldrich, 1993), as reflected in the research design, has wide-reaching benefits to event organisers. Political Interest, Habitual Voting, Political Ideology, Political Efficacy, Civic Duty, Political Cynicism, Satisfaction with Democracy, Event Status and Psychological Involvement are included in this research as potential determinants of referendum support and participation intention. Therefore, there are two research questions that guide this study: a) What are the determinants of referenda
support the context of a major sport event? b) What are the determinants of referenda participation intention in the context of a major sport event? The context of this research is a potential future Commonwealth Games bid in New Zealand.

This study provides at least three important theoretical and practical contributions that are most relevant in the context of western, democratic societies. First, it contributes to a better understanding of local resident support for the use of referenda in the decision to bid for major sport events. Second, it fosters a better understanding of intention to participate in referenda on bidding for major sport events. Third, drawing on work in political science, this research tests predictors of referenda support and participation intention, the utility of which have not been examined within a major sport event context.

2 Background

The overall purpose of this research is to investigate the determinants of referenda support and participation intentions in the context of a major sport event. Prior to doing so, it is imperative to consider related sport context literature. Likewise, an overview of each of the determinants is provided, including several that are well established in related literature and others that are novel and being explored in this context for the first time.

2.1 Sport-related referenda

It is important to differentiate between stadia and events as referenda contexts. Wicker and Coates (2018) have argued that major event decisions are larger in scope than stadia decisions but are shorter term in nature, as a new stadium is a fixture in the community for decades. A small number of studies have explored referenda to inform the decision to fund the construction of stadia for professional sport teams and universities (Horn, Cantor, & Fort, 2015; Kellison, Sam, Hong, Swart, & Mondello, 2018; Mondello & Kellison, 2016). The vast majority of this research has been undertaken within the United States. Research on stadia referenda has focused on factors that influence voter decisions. Studies have shown that voters may rely on information from
stakeholders when considering stadia construction decisions (Fort, 1997; Lupia, 1994). These stakeholders include politicians, the local media, stadium proponent groups, the local business community and professional sport team owners (Brown & Paul, 1999; Friedman & Mason, 2004, 2005; Sage, 1993).

In the majority of sport-related referenda studies, data were collected post-referendum, with a focus on exploring resistance towards an Olympic bid (Coates & Wicker, 2015, Konecke, Schubert, & Pruess, 2016; Siepell et al., 2016). Most studies have also relied upon secondary data or content-analysed media coverage (Coates & Wicker, 2015; Konecke et al., 2016; Siepell et al., 2016). One exception is Wicker and Coates’ (2018) research on Hamburg’s referendum to bid for the 2024 Summer Olympics, which was the first to use primary data collected pre-referendum. Their research indicated that local residents’ decision to vote favourably was influenced more by the expected costs of hosting the Games rather than the expected benefits. Furthermore, no research has yet explored perceptions of community members about the nature of sport referenda and specifically whether it should be binding or not (i.e., the government must act on the result). Previous research has indicated that whether a referendum is binding or not can influence participation in it (Silagadze & Gherghina, 2018).

**2.2 Determinants of referenda support and participation intention**

One way to develop the sport management discipline is to test and apply theories derived from other related bodies of empirical research (Chalip, 2016). Determinants of referenda support and participation intentions are established lines of inquiry in political science and are unquestionably relevant to sport event referenda. While it is clear from previous research some citizens are more supportive of referenda than others (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015), this line of inquiry has yet to be explored in a sport context. Therefore, the theoretical frame of this study is shaped by related research in political science, but also considers relevant constructs from our understanding of sport events. Hypotheses are proposed that each of the key determinants
identified are related to support, and intention to participate, in major sport event referenda. All aside from political interest are depicted in Figures 1 and 2.

2.2.1 Political interest

An individual’s level of political interest has a strong influence on referendum support and participation (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). Referenda are embraced by those who are already politically interested and involved (Donovan & Karp, 2006). Those who are interested in one form of election are generally also interested in another (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). In addition, people with higher political interest are more likely to vote regardless of the issues on the ballot (Biggers, 2014). Political interest is a product of socialisation (Bowler & Donovan, 2013). Those who are socialised to have an interest in politics are more likely to see politics and voting in a more positive light, and thus are more likely to vote (Dostie-Goulet, 2009). In another study of referenda support in the European Union, it was found that those who were socialised to be interested in politics and to identify with a particular political party were more likely to favour referenda use (Rose & Borz, 2013).

Hypothesis 1a: Higher levels of political interest contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

Hypothesis 1b: Higher levels of political interest contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.

2.2.2 Habitual voting

Habitual voters are more likely to vote no matter the issue (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). Measures of habitual voting behaviour identifies not only those who are regular participants in elections and referenda, but also those that regularly abstain from voting. Both long-term voting behaviour and long-term abstention are powerful habits (Linke & Petrusek, 2016). Voting behaviour is learned and develops gradually (Bhatti, Hansen, & Wass, 2016; Linek & Petrusek, 2016; Plutzer, 2002). The process begins at a ‘starting level,’ which is the probability that citizens
will vote in the first election they are eligible for, and is ultimately characterised by ‘inertia,’ which is the propensity for citizens to settle into habits of voting or non-voting (Plutzer, 2002). Generational differences in habitual voting are often evident (Linek & Petrusek, 2016). For example, younger generations are less likely to participate in elections or referenda because their voting habits are less ingrained (Linek & Petrusek, 2016). Most research on habitual voting has focused on elections rather than referenda.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Higher levels of habitual voting contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Higher levels of habitual voting contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.

### 2.2.3 Political ideology

An individual’s political ideology is an important predictor of both referenda support and participation intentions (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). Political ideology is defined as a shared model of beliefs groups of individuals possess that provide both an interpretation of the society and a prescription of how that society should be structured (Denzau & North, 2000). Many political ideologies exist on a continuum featuring different views on the role of the government, the role of citizens, and how decisions should be made. Many studies have investigated the impact of political ideology on referenda support and participation intentions, but there is, as yet, no consensus. Donovan and Karp’s (2006) research compared referenda support across New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. The research identified that people with left-leaning political ideologies are more likely than centrists to support the use of referenda in New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden, whereas in Switzerland those with right-leaning political ideologies are more likely to support referenda use. In comparison, Smith, Tolbert and Keller’s (2010) research into referenda support in the United States found that those with central political views are more likely to support the use of referenda. They suggest
that this result is due to centrists being a large group of peripheral voters that are ‘long-term structural losers’—those who are not attached to either of the two major political parties, and therefore are less likely to be satisfied with representative government. Thus, although political ideology may be an important predictor for referendum support and participation intentions, the differing results suggest that this predictor of referenda support is contextually based.

**Hypothesis 3a:** One’s support for the use of referenda in the context of a major sport event will differ based on political ideology.

**Hypothesis 3b:** One’s intention to participate in a major sport event referendum will differ based on political ideology.

### 2.2.4 Political efficacy

Referenda support and participation intentions are also associated with political efficacy. Political efficacy was first defined by Campbell, Gurin and Miller (1954) as “the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, and impact upon the political process” (p. 187). Feelings of powerlessness and meaningless have been found to decrease support and engagement in political practices (Valentino, Beckmann, & Buhr, 2001). Karp’s (2012) study of political efficacy across 30 countries with a variety of party systems and both established and new democracies, identified the positive influence of political efficacy on political participation and the belief that one’s vote makes a difference. In addition, Bowler and Donovan (2013) found that in the context of the 2011 British electoral system referendum, those that have a high sense of political efficacy are more likely to perceive referenda in a positive light and are more likely to participate in referenda. No research has yet explored the role of political efficacy in the decision to support or participate in a sport event-related referendum.

**Hypothesis 4a:** Higher levels of political efficacy contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.
Hypothesis 4b: Higher levels of political efficacy contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.

2.2.5 Satisfaction with democracy

Numerous studies have indicated that citizens who display higher levels of satisfaction with democracy are more likely to participate in political voting (Donovan & Karp, 2006; Ezrow & Xezonakis, 2014). The foundation of this relationship is that citizens who are more satisfied with democracy tend to be more politically engaged, and thus they are more likely to turn out to vote (Franklin, 2002). However, in other studies, there is evidence that dissatisfaction with democracy generates demand for change, which stimulates a higher level of voter turnout (Ezrow & Xezonakis, 2014). Similarly, people who are disconnected and frustrated with traditional party politics are more likely to support and participate in referenda (Dalton, Burklin, & Drummond, 2001). Despite the conflicting evidence as to the impact of satisfaction with democracy as an antecedent for referenda support and participation, it is evident that satisfaction with democracy must still be considered when measuring sport-related referenda support and participation intentions.

Hypothesis 5a: Higher levels of satisfaction with democracy contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

Hypothesis 5b: Higher levels of satisfaction with democracy contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.

2.2.6 Civic duty

Civic duty is “the belief that a citizen has a moral obligation to vote” (Blais & Galais, 2016, p. 61). From this perspective, dutiful citizens believe that participating in elections and referenda is the right thing to do and abstaining is wrong. Civic duty captures motivation rather than habitual behaviour (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015).
The concept of civic duty has its origins in cognitive mobilisation theory (Bowler & Donovan, 2013; Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). The theory of cognitive mobilization suggests that those with greater cognitive resources (e.g., education and knowledge), have a higher level of political interest and are more likely to participate in democratic practices (Donovan & Karp, 2006). Because citizens’ political skills and knowledge are increasing, citizens are now demanding more voice and are less willing to leave decisions to the political elite (Inglehart, 1990). People with greater interest and knowledge in politics and possess greater cognitive skills are more likely to support and participate in referenda because it is an opportunity for political expression (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). Schuck and de Vreese’s (2015) research on referenda support found civic duty was not only an important predictor of voter participation intentions but also an important factor for explaining referenda support.

**Hypothesis 6a:** Higher levels of civic duty contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

**Hypothesis 6b:** Higher levels of civic duty contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.

### 2.2.7 Political cynicism

Political cynicism is a concept that has emerged from the satisfaction with democracy literature (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015; Southwell, 2008). Political cynicism is characterised not only by dissatisfaction and aversion to politics but also a lack of political efficacy (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015; Southwell, 2008). Higher levels of political cynicism can alienate people from politics, decrease political learning and engagement, and subsequently result in a decreased likelihood of voter participation (Valentino, Beckmann, & Buhr, 2001). However, several studies indicate that political cynicism can actually stimulate voting participation (de Vreese & Sementko, 2002; Southwell, 2008). In these circumstances, people that are frustrated and cynical about traditional party-based politics embrace a referendum as
an unfiltered opportunity to voice on important issues. Southwell’s (2008) research on voter
behaviour in American elections found that political cynicism can have both a positive and
negative relationship with voter turnout. When political cynicism interacts with political
efficacy, one will be more likely to vote. However, when political cynicism exists without
political efficacy, voter turnout will be low (Southwell, 2008). Therefore, it seems important
in future to measure these constructs both individually, and explore if they interact.

Despite varying results on its influence, there is strong support for political cynicism
as a significant predictor of participation intentions. Whilst political cynicism has been
widely researched in regard to participation intentions in referenda, it is less established as a
key predictor for referenda support. Through a comparison of referendum support across 21
countries in the European Union, Schuck and de Vreese (2015) analysed both civic duty and
political cynicism alongside other predictors of referendum support. Whilst both civic duty
and political cynicism significantly predict referenda support, political cynicism was the
better predictor (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015).

Although there is agreement about the importance of political cynicism, there is little
agreement on the conceptualisation and measurement of the construct. Because of the lack of
standardised measures and interpretations, quantifying political cynicism is problematic (de
Vreese & Semetko, 2002; Hetherington, 2001). Despite the varied efforts to operationalize
political cynicism, the absence of trust is at the core of political cynicism (de Vreese &
Semetko, 2002; Schuck, Boomgaarden, & de Vreese, 2013).

Hypothesis 7a: Higher levels of political cynicism contribute to higher levels of support
for a major sport event referendum.

Hypothesis 7b: Higher levels of political cynicism contribute to greater intentions to
participate in a major sport event referendum.

2.2.7 Contextual factors
In the context of major sport event referenda, there are likely to be other determinants of referenda support and participation intentions. Involvement and event status are two additional factors meriting consideration.

Rothschild (1984) defined psychological involvement as a state of interest, motivation or arousal between an individual and an activity or product. Involvement is multi-dimensional, and extends beyond individual motives and participation, to the relevance or meaning of an activity within the context of an individual’s overall outlook on life (Ridinger, Funk, Jordan, & Kaplanidou, 2012). This concept is frequently represented by three different measurements of involvement: centrality, hedonic value, and symbolic value (Beaton, Funk, Ridinger, & Jordan, 2011; Inoue & Havard, 2014; Ridinger et al., 2012).

In research exploring the impact of events on local residents, the involvement construct has been used to most accurately capture underlying psychology of support for an event (Fredline, 2004; Inoue & Havard, 2014). The premise is that those who are involved in sport are more likely to perceive the hosting of an event, and its associated impacts, favorably. Fredline’s (2004) research assessed local resident perceptions of a major sport event hosted in two Australian cities: Melbourne, which hosts the Australian Formula One Grand Prix, and the Gold Coast, which hosts the Indy 300. Although there is a range of positive and negative perceived impacts associated with hosting the event in both communities, the findings show that those residents who are involved or identify with motorsport are more likely to disregard or tolerate the negative impacts because of the offsetting benefit they derive through being entertained (Fredline, 2004).

**Hypothesis 7a:** Higher levels of psychological involvement in sport contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

**Hypothesis 7b:** Higher levels of psychological involvement in sport contribute to greater intentions to participate in a major sport event referendum.
In addition, perceptions of an event’s status may also affect perceived event impacts. Mao, Zhang, Connaughton, Holland and Spengler (2013) discussed event impact in terms of ‘value of association,’ in that those who have high regard for a particular event are more likely to respond favourably to that which is associated to the event. Speed and Thompson (2000) argue that event status perception differs from a personal liking of an event, because individuals can still respond favourably to an event they believe is of high status due to the perceived benefits they may receive from it, even if they do not personally like the event. The effects of event status have been typically used within sport sponsorship research, measuring associations with brands with the perceptions of event status (Mao et al., 2013; Speed & Thompson, 2000). However, event status may also influence the local residents’ perceptions of the impacts associated with hosting a sport event. In the current research context, for example, it is possible those who view the Commonwealth Games as a significant and high-status event may perceive the benefits and costs associated with hosting the event differently than if the event was of lower status.

**Hypothesis 9a:** Higher levels of event status perceptions contribute to higher levels of support for a major sport event referendum.

**Hypothesis 9b:** Higher levels of event status perceptions contribute to greater intentions of participating in a major sport event referendum.

This research tests a novel set of predictors of referenda support and participation intentions derived from political science that have not yet been examined within a major sport event context. These constructs are tested within the context of a potential Commonwealth Games bid from New Zealand.

### 3 Method

### 3.1 Context
The Commonwealth Games is a quadrennial, international multi-sport event involving athletes from the Commonwealth of Nations. At the 2018 event, nearly 4500 athletes representing 71 nations competed in 19 sports. New Zealand has not hosted a Commonwealth Games since 1990. A bid in the near future is probable, in connection with one of New Zealand’s largest cities (Strang, 2018). Auckland (1990) and Christchurch (1974) have hosted the event previously and feature in this research.

New Zealanders have an inherent affinity for the consultation process (Hayward, 2014). New Zealand has a long history of local referenda to inform high-level political decision making. For example, in the 1990s, referenda were implemented in conjunction with the adoption of electoral reforms as well as implementing a process for citizen-initiated referendums in 1993 (Donovan & Karp, 2006). More recently, in 2016, a referendum was held by the New Zealand Government to determine whether New Zealanders wanted a new national flag (Osborne, Lees-Marshment, & van der Linden, 2016). New Zealanders’ support for referenda has been examined in a number of studies (Donovan & Karp, 2006; Karp & Aimer, 2002). The decision to bid for a major event has never been the subject of a referendum in New Zealand. Although community support for referenda in New Zealand is seemingly high, the transferability of this support to a major sport event remains unexplored.

The Commonwealth Games are a high profile and well-regarded event in New Zealand. Respondents were asked on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) whether they believed the Commonwealth Games was a significant sport event, and whether it was important to where they live. The majority of respondents indicated that the event was a significant ($M = 5.83, SD = 1.36$) and important ($M = 5.30, SD = 1.54$) sport event.

### 3.2 Participants
A sample of 603 New Zealanders completed a questionnaire with items querying determinants of support for a Commonwealth Games referendum and their intention to participate. Data were collected using a questionnaire distributed by a market research company. The firm used an existing database and a quota sampling scheme running until a sample of 300 reporting residence in each of Christchurch and Auckland has been generated. Respondents were excluded if they were less than 18 years old because this age represents the current voting age in New Zealand and subsequently, the eligibility to vote in an event bidding referendum.

The sample comprised both Auckland residents ($n = 302$) and Christchurch residents ($n = 301$). The sample reflected New Zealand population parameters in terms of age, gender and education. The largest age group in the sample were those 25 to 34 years old, and this group represented 19.6% of overall respondents. The gender of the sample was fairly evenly split, with 49.1% of respondents male ($n = 296$), and 50.9% female ($n = 307$). Respondents with a university education were the largest group, representing 43.9% of the sample.

### 3.3 Instrumentation

Two focal dependent variables were included in this research. They represent a distinct attitude and a behavioural intention, which combine to provide a rigorous overview of this phenomenon in the research context. The two items were derived from a similar research context (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). First, respondents were asked on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly against, 7=strongly in favour) to what extent they were in favour of holding a referendum to decide whether their city should bid for the Commonwealth Games. Respondents were also asked whether they believed this referendum should be binding or non-binding. Next, respondents were asked on a 7-point Likert scale (1=very unlikely, 7=very likely) how likely they were to participate in such a referendum.
Sixteen items were used to measure the psychological constructs related to politics (i.e., political cynicism, civic duty, political interest, habitual voting, political ideology, political efficacy, satisfaction with democracy) (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). Five items were used to measure context-related constructs, including involvement (Inoue & Havard, 2014) and event status (Speed & Thompson, 2000) (see Table 1). It is common for involvement in sport to be measured in condensed form using one item for each dimension (encompassing centralist, hedonistic, and symbolic value) (e.g. Inoue & Havard, 2014; Inoue, Havard, & Irwin, 2016; Ridinger, Fink, Jordan, & Kaplandidou, 2016). All of these items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The underlying structure of the instrument was analysed using exploratory factor analysis. Multinomial logistic regression was used to analyse the two regression models. Political ideology’s relationship to the two outcome variables was measured through ANOVA analyses.

4. Results

Overall, New Zealanders ($M = 4.46$, $SD = 1.90$) were supportive a referendum (Auckland, $M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.91$, Christchurch, $M = 4.46$, $SD = 1.90$) to inform a Commonwealth Games bid decision. Overall, the majority of respondents ($M = 5.55$, $SD = 1.72$) were likely to participate in such a referendum (Auckland, $M = 5.45$, $SD = 1.78$, Christchurch, $M = 5.65$, $SD = 1.65$). The majority of respondents believed a Commonwealth Games referendum should be binding (57.7%), as opposed to non-binding (42.3%). A greater number of Christchurch residents (61.8%) believed a referendum should be binding, compared to Auckland residents (53.6%).

Next, the underlying structure of items measuring four of the multivariate constructs (i.e., civic duty, political cynicism, political efficacy, and involvement) were assessed using EFA with an oblique, direct oblimin rotation. The structure of the four constructs was largely
supported with the exception of EFF3, which did not load with the other efficacy items (see Table 2). Unlike EFF1 and EFF2, EFF3 was not reverse coded, perhaps contributing to that psychometric issue. Having assessed the wording of the two remaining items, it was determined that the nature of political efficacy was adequately captured by EFF1 and EFF2 ($\alpha = .76$).

Remaining items were subsequently used to create composite variables. The overall sample reported higher levels of civic duty ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.33$, $\alpha = .88$) than political cynicism ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 1.18$, $\alpha = .82$). The sample reported moderate levels of sport involvement ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 1.69$, $\alpha = .93$) and that the Commonwealth Games had significant status ($M = 5.83$, $SD = 1.36$, $\alpha = .74$).

The dependent variables were conceptualized as ordinal (Jamieson, 2004; Wu & Leung, 2017). One of the foundational assumptions underlying ordinal logistic regression is that of proportional odds. The assumption for proportional odds was rejected for both models; therefore, a multinomial logistic regression was carried out (Hosmer, Lemeshow, & Sturdivant, 2013). Multinomial logistic regression requires the dependent variable to be treated as nominal/categorical. Treating the dependent variables as nominal means that no value is attributed to each point on what was implementated as a likert scale (Wu & Leung, 2017). The highest level for each outcome (i.e., strongly in favour and very likely to participate) provided the reference category from which other levels are compared.

### 4.1 Referendum support

The multinomial regression model assessing referendum support included four significant independent variables (political cynicism, civic duty, event status and involvement), $\chi^2(42) = 106.28$, $p < .01$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .12$ (see Table 3). As support for a Commonwealth Games referendum decreases, so too does political cynicism ($p < .01$). A decrease in support for a referendum also emerges as sense of civic duty decreases ($p = .03$),
but the result is not as pronounced as it was for political cynicism. The two contextual
variables were also significant for the referendum outcome. As support for the referendum
decreases, so too does perception of the status of the event \( (p = .03) \). Likewise, support for
the referendum decreases as involvement in sport decreases \( (p < .01) \), although this is not
manifested at the highest level of referendum opposition. There was no relationship between
political ideology and referendum support, \( F(3, 525) = .49, p = .69 \).

4.2 Participation intention

The regression model assessing participation intention had five significant variables
(political cynicism, civic duty, political interest, event status, and involvement), \( \chi^2 (42) =
145.71, p < .01 \), Nagelkerke \( R^2 = .23 \) (see Table 4). As one’s likelihood to participate in a
Commonwealth Games referendum decreases, so too does level of political cynicism \( (p =
.02) \) although it is noteworthy that this is a relatively moderate effect and does not extend to
being very unlikely to participate. The relationship between political interest and intention to
participate in the referendum is significant and should be interpreted similarly. The
interpretation of the relationship between civic duty and intention to participate in a
referendum is more straightforward. As intention to participate decreases, so too does a one’s
sense of civic duty. Each of the two sport context variables had significant relationships with
intention to participate in the referendum, in a direction consistent with what was
hypothesised (i.e., higher levels of event status perceptions and involvement are related to
stronger intention to participate). As was the case for referendum support, no significant
differences emerged across groups in relation to political ideology on referendum
participation \( F(3, 525) = 1.19, p = .31 \).

4.3 Type of referendum

[Insert Table 3 about here]
Results of an independent t-test indicate that referendum support is greater for those who favour a binding referendum ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.80$) over a non-binding referendum ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.85$), $t(601) = 7.31$, $p < .01$. Similarly, those more likely to participate in a referendum favour a binding referendum ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.50$) as opposed to a non-binding referendum ($M = 5.06$, $SD = 1.87$), $t(601) = 5.96$, $p < .01$.

Supporters of a binding referendum reported a higher sense of civic duty ($M = 5.96$, $SD = 1.23$) compared to those who supported a non-binding referendum ($M = 5.65$, $SD = 1.37$), $t(601) = 2.83$, $p = .01$. Those who supported a binding referendum did not differ in their level of political cynicism ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.19$) compared to those who supported a non-binding referendum ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 1.16$), $t(601) = 1.71$, $p = .09$.

5 Discussion

Referenda are increasingly being used as a means to determine local resident support for hosting major sport events. Therefore, knowing the level of local resident support and the factors which impact this support is important to a variety of event stakeholders. In the context of a possible Commonwealth Games in either Christchurch or Auckland, data were collected related to referendum support, participation intentions, and preference for a binding or non-binding referendum. The regression model explaining a resident’s participation intentions was stronger than the model predicting a resident’s support for a referendum taking place.

Relationships between five of the independent variables and at least one of the outcome variables were significant. Ten of the eighteen hypotheses were not supported. Specifically, no evidence emerged linking habitual voting, political efficacy, satisfaction with democracy or political ideology with either referendum support or participation. That these predictors are not significant in the context of this major event referendum scenario does not
suggest they are not important at all. It is not unusual for some variables that have an otherwise solid theoretical basis to end up statistically insignificant in terms of referendums (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). As evidence emerged in this study that political interest, political cynicism, civic duty, event status, and involvement were significant, they are discussed in more detail next.

5.1 Political interest

Evidence emerged supporting the notion that political interest is positively related to intention to participate in a major sport event referendum but not to a person’s support for such a referendum. This finding is in line with the assumption that citizens who are more politically interested tend to be more politically engaged, and thus, they are more likely to turn out to vote (Donovan & Karp, 2006). Political interest tends to be robust no matter what is on the ballot (Biggers, 2014), and this seems to have carried through to the major event referendum context. Although one might expect referendum support from those who are dissatisfied by the political process (i.e., politically cynical), in this study, we found those who are politically interested and have a strong sense of civic duty are more likely to turn up and participate in a major sport event referendum.

5.2 Political cynicism

The results of previous research are equivocal as to whether political cynicism positively or negatively impacts referenda support and participation intention. Some research has shown that feelings of powerlessness and meaningless alienate people from politics, and as a consequence, decrease their likelihood to support or participate in political practices (Valentino et al., 2001). Conversely, several studies have indicated that rather than leading to disengagement in politics, for an efficacious individual, political cynicism can have a mobilizing effect (de Vreese & Semenko, 2002; Southwell, 2008). Our study provides evidence that political cynicism positively impacts both referendum support and participation.
intention, although it is noteworthy that these relationships did not exist at the extremes (i.e., strong opposition to a referendum or being very unlikely to participate). This suggests that a major sport event referenda may provide an opportunity for ‘critical citizens’ to curtail the influence of politicians (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015; Southwell, 2008), but not to any great extent. Stated differently, those dissatisfied with politics in New Zealand may view a Commonwealth Games referendum as an opportunity to politically express themselves.

5.3 Civic duty

The finding here that referendum support and participation intention are stronger among residents with high levels of civic duty is consistent with previous research (Schuck & de Vreese, 2015). The stability of this predictor in conjunction with political processes is noteworthy and held firm in this context. That civic duty has emerged as significantly related to both referendum support and participation is evidence of its importance. Further, it can be argued as per cognitive mobilisation theory that the cognitive resources linked to a sense of civic duty may be particularly relevant in regards to a major sport event. This finding suggests that those who have a sense of civic duty could potentially be purposefully mobilised to participate in a major sport event referendum.

5.4 Event status

Perceptions of event status were included in the current research because of previous evidence suggesting its importance (Fredline, 2004; Inoue & Havard, 2014). Indeed, the findings support inclusion of this construct in attempting to understand support for and intention to participate in a major sport event referendum. Respondents who believe the Commonwealth Games are a significant event reported greater support for a referendum on whether to bid to host the event, and are more likely to participate in this referendum. Referenda are only utilised for issues of significance, and therefore, for one to support the use of a referendum and see value in participating in that referendum, they must first perceived
the issue to be of significant importance. Thus, the perception that an event is significant
relates to this notion of importance. The cost and potential impact on residents associated
with New Zealand hosting the Commonwealth Games would be substantial, and therefore,
respondents that view this event as high-status are more likely to view the use and
participation of a referendum in a positive light.

5.5 Involvement

For both referendum support and participation intention, a significant relationship
emerged with the involvement construct. As an indicator capturing one’s connection to sport,
it was expected that it would be related to one’s support for a sport-related referendum and
one’s intention to participate in that referendum. It would stand to reason that one who is
highly connected to sport would be more favourable to their community hosting a major
event but no evidence yet exists about whether those who are more involved would be more
supportive of it or report greater intention to participate. This study generated evidence that
those who are more highly involved with sport report more support for and intention to
participate in a major sport event referendum. The results here extend Fredline’s (2004)
conclusion that those who are highly involved tend to disregard or tolerate negative event
impacts. It may be possible to mobilise those who are highly involved in sport to participate
in a referendum that could help bring an event to a community.

5.6 Binding, non-binding results

In previous research, the type of referendum has not been examined in relation to
support or participation in referenda. Findings here indicate that New Zealanders have strong
support for a Commonwealth Games referendum and are likely to participate in that
referendum if it is binding. Therefore, those who believe that the results of the referendum
must be acted upon, rather than simply provide politicians and key decision makers with only
an indication, are more likely to support and participate in a major sport event referendum.
This finding aligns with the notion of political efficacy whereby one believes in the legitimacy of political processes. Those who believe their vote will make a difference (i.e., political efficacy) through a binding referendum are more likely to support the use of a referendum to make a bid decision and whether they will participate. If their vote is not going to count, why vote at all?

6 Limitations and future research

It is important to acknowledge several limitations of this study. Importantly, several antecedents were measured using single items, which some argue to lack rigor or robustness. This of course needs to be balanced with brevity in a questionnaire, which was prioritised. However, the single item antecedents here have often been used this way in previous research (e.g. Donovan & Karp, 2006; Schuck & de Vreese, 2015; Smith, Tolbert, & Keller, 2010).

Although respondents were of legal voting age, it is unclear whether they could be reliably expected to vote in an election or referendum, nor is it known if respondents were enrolled to vote. Of course, given the fact more than three-fourths of respondents reported they would be likely to vote if a referendum was held, it might also be the case that the sample was mostly homogenous and trending toward likely voters. In future research, one approach to address this issue is to include individuals who are not enrolled to vote (but are eligible to enrol) in the survey sample. These individuals have chosen not to exercise their democratic rights and could further our understanding of the factors that contribute to certain attitudes toward civic duty and political cynicism. Another response to this issue is to direct inquiry toward those individuals who are enrolled to vote but do not participate in elections. Soliciting feedback via focus groups, for example, could provide new insights that enhance what we know about public perception of both the form and outcome of a Commonwealth Games bid.

Similarly, this study utilized a measure of voting intentions rather than actual voter behaviour. In the absence of real voter data, the predictive validity of the voting intentions
measures was not assessed in this study. Previous attempts to identify voter likelihood have been plagued by a lack of predictive validity (Traugott & Tucker, 1984). However, more recent research has shown that two items—vote intent and previous vote behaviour—has shown both generalizability and validity over four elections and three decades (Murray, Riley, & Scime, 2009). While the central purpose of this study was not to identify likely voters, this strategy may be employed in future research to forecast a referendum outcome with greater confidence.

The extent to which context—that is, the unique facets of Auckland, Christchurch, and the Commonwealth Games—influenced the tested relationships in this study has not been determined. Therefore, this line of research should be extended to investigate hypothetical sport referendums in cities elsewhere and in the context of other major sporting events. An alternate context may well produce a more robust model explaining more variance in referendum support and participation intentions than was found here.

Based on these limitations, we offer several other directions for future research. First, because the focus of this study was on New Zealanders’ support for and intention to participate in a major event referendum, other unexplored factors may explain the likelihood of a referendum passing. These factors could include the timing of the vote in a general election cycle, the number of other issues appearing on the ballot, and the public cost of the proposed project (Mondello & Anderson, 2004). Particularly for individuals or groups aiming to affect the outcome of a referendum vote, more research is necessary to get a full view of the factors that contribute to a voter’s support of or opposition to an event bid.

A second area of study might focus not on citizens’ attitudes toward the use of referenda, but rather those of policymakers. Given the apparently increasing utilization of the referendum in stadium- and event-related cases, it is largely assumed that it is a popular tool among decision-makers. However, as previous research has shown, elected officials may be
disincentivized to promote public deliberation on an issue such as the construction of sporting
infrastructure for a club or event (Kellison, Newman, & Bunds, 2017; Scherer & Sam, 2008).
Therefore, researchers should consider the effect, if any, the popularity of the referendum
among ordinary citizens affects policymakers’ willingness to employ it.

Another important angle for future research as it relates to major event decision
making and referenda has to do with whether the event would take place in a single or
multiple host cities. Multi-sport events like the Olympics and Commonwealth Games have
historically been hosted by a single city, whereas sport-specific events like the Cricket World
Cup are more likely to be hosted across multiple cities within a single country. This contrast
has been explored in previous research (Bakhsh, Potwarka, Nunkoo, & Sunnassee, 2017),
although that study took the traditional form of focusing on event support as the outcome
variable of interest. It is important to explore if key decision-makers’ perception of
community engagement in major event bids differs based on the number of host cities.

7 Conclusion

Growing public scepticism toward mega sporting events like the Olympic and
Paralympic Games and FIFA Men’s and Women’s World Cup has led to changes to the way
in which some governing bodies organize their bidding processes. For example, in 2019, the
International Olympic Committee announced it would consider allowing joint bids, in which
the Games could be held in multiple cities, regions, or countries (Zaccardi, 2019). The results
of this study indicate that reforms may also occur more locally in the cities and regions
expressing interest in hosting an event like the Commonwealth Games. In the absence of a
referendum, it is unclear whether the public at large would support or oppose a proposal to
host a major sporting event. Practically, a lack of support could present problems down the
road, including a lack of ticket sales or widespread public protests. Beyond these economic
consequences, policy decisions that are suspected (or prove) to be incongruent with the public
may ultimately prompt serious questions about the efficacy of the democratic system itself.
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### Table 1

**Referendum Support and Participation Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Cynicism</td>
<td>CYN1: Almost all politicians will sell out their ideals or break their promises if it will increase their power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYN2: Most politicians are in politics for what they can get out of it personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYN3: Most politicians are truthful with the voters*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYN4: Most politicians are dedicated and we should be grateful to them for the work they do*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>CD1: It’s every citizen’s duty to vote in an election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD2: I would be seriously neglecting my duty as a citizen if I didn’t vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD3: I feel a sense of satisfaction when I vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CD4: I would feel very guilty if I didn’t vote in an election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>PI: How interested are you in political issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Voting</td>
<td>HV: Of all elections in which you were eligible to vote, how many times have you actually voted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>(select from among 7 NZ political parties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>EFF1: People like me don’t have any say about what the government does*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFF2: I don’t think the government cares much what people like me think*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFF3: Having referenda make the government pay attention to what people think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Democracy</td>
<td>SD1: Regardless of who is in government, on the whole, I am satisfied with the way democracy works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD2: I am satisfied with the way democracy works in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>INV1: I really enjoy following sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INV2: Sport has a central role in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INV3: Being a sport fan says a lot about who I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Status</td>
<td>ES1: The Commonwealth Games is a significant sport event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES2: The Commonwealth Games will be important to where I live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*reverse coded
Table 2

*Factor Loadings for Political Cynicism, Civic Duty, Political Efficacy and Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CYN4</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN3</td>
<td>-0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN2</td>
<td>-0.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN1</td>
<td>-0.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF3</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

Multinomial Logistic Regression Measuring Referendum Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Cynicism</th>
<th>strongly against</th>
<th>moderately against</th>
<th>slightly against</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly in favour</th>
<th>moderately in favour</th>
<th>strongly in favour</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-.637*</td>
<td>.523*</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>-.319*</td>
<td>.691*</td>
<td>.667*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Civic Duty           |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| -.399*               | .728*           | -.554*             | .578*            | -.375*  | .754*              | -.409*               | .679*              | .275    | -.309* | .756* | 1.000 | 1.000 | .030 |

| Political Interest   |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| .037                 | 1.039           | .087               | 1.090            | -.031   | .975               | -.069               | .934              | -.095   | .909   | .042  | 1.044 | 1.000 | 1.000 | .777 |

| Habitual Voting      |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| .288                 | 1.317           | .293               | 1.338            | .129    | 1.113              | .055                | 1.053             | .120    | 1.127             | .122  | 1.123 | 1.000 | 1.000 | .183 |

| Political Efficacy   |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| -.139                | .828            | -.132              | .868             | -.132   | .822               | -.032               | .953              | .049    | 1.043             | -.036 | .945  | 1.000 | 1.000 | .858 |

| Satisfaction with Democracy |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| .325                 | 1.385           | .034               | 1.035            | .371    | 1.450              | .100                | 1.105             | .023    | 1.024             | .134  | 1.144 | 1.000 | 1.000 | .058 |

| Event Status         |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| -.462*               | .654*           | -.278              | .759             | -.335*  | .751*              | -.162               | .857              | -.237*  | .787*              | -.142 | .879  | 1.000 | 1.000 | .031 |

| Involvement          |                |                    |                  |         |                    |                      |                    |         |
| -.171                | .879            | -.510*             | .610*            | -.370*  | .714*              | -.299*              | .753*             | -.150   | .866              | -.242* | .800* | 1.000 | 1.000 | <.001 |

* Statistically significant at <.05 level
### Multinomial Logistic Regression Measuring Referendum Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very unlikely</th>
<th>moderately unlikely</th>
<th>slightly unlikely</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly likely</th>
<th>moderately likely</th>
<th>very likely</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Cynicism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>-.451</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>-.912*</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>-.294*</td>
<td>.820*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.479*</td>
<td>.575*</td>
<td>-.495*</td>
<td>.582*</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>-.314*</td>
<td>.703*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>-.607*</td>
<td>.558*</td>
<td>-.229*</td>
<td>.796*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-.617*</td>
<td>.529*</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>-.276*</td>
<td>.744*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>-.364*</td>
<td>.692*</td>
<td>-.224*</td>
<td>.788*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Status</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>-.364*</td>
<td>.692*</td>
<td>-.224*</td>
<td>.788*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at <.05 level
Support for Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Habitual Voting</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Habitual Voting</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Democracy</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Democracy</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a</td>
<td>Political Cynicism</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b</td>
<td>Political Cynicism</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a</td>
<td>Event Status</td>
<td>Referendum Support</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b</td>
<td>Event Status</td>
<td>Referendum Participation</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>