The Mother of All Effects?

Stability and Change in Greens Political Party Identification in Australia

Bruce Tranter

University of Tasmania

and

Jonathan Smith

Monash University

Abstract

Some of the first young Australians able to inherit Greens party identity are examined, as the Australian Greens only formed as a national party in 1992. Analysis of youth cohort data from the state of Queensland spanning 5 years (n=2,160; aged 17 to 22), shows that parental political affiliation (especially maternal affiliation) strongly influences Greens party identification as it does for the major parties. However, Greens are less likely than major party identifiers to exhibit stable party allegiances over time. Defections between Greens and Labor identifiers are also far more likely than between these parties and conservative parties (Liberals or Nationals). The comparatively recent formation of the Australian Greens accounts for the relative instability of Greens identity over time. Nevertheless, inter-generational transmission of Greens identity should translate into a relatively stable electoral base for the Greens, helping ensure they remain an influential presence in Australian federal politics.

Keywords

Party identification

Green parties

Green voting

Australia

Introduction

Identification with the Greens party among young Australians is of particular interest for several reasons. While environmental social movements have been influential in Australia for decades (Hutton and Connors 1999), and the Australian Democrats' Norm Sanders 'was the first "green" politician, elected to the Tasmanian parliament in 1980' (Turnbull and Vromens 2006, 456), the Australian Greens did not form a national political party until 1992.[1] As partisan loyalties develop in childhood and early adolescence (Jennings and Niemi 1974), and given the small scale and fragmented nature of green parties across Australia prior to 1992, until very recently, only a small proportion of adult Greens identifiers could have acquired their partisan allegiances from their parents. Therefore, many Australian adults who claim to be Greens identifiers, are not 'conventional' partisans in a sense consistent with theories of political party identification, because identification with a particular party tends to be inherited from parent to child (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011).

Political party identification is a key factor in understanding voting behaviour and public opinion on a variety of social and political issues. Party identification refers to an individual attachment to, or 'psychological identification' with a political party (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011). As Miller and Shanks (1996: 120) put it party identification is 'a feeling of personal identity with…a political party' that 'need not reflect a formal membership in or active connection with a party organisation'. While identification strongly influences voting, it does not imply always voting for the party one identifies with (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011). Party identification has been described as 'the most enduring of political attitudes, responsible for shaping a wide variety of values and perceptions' (Miller and Shanks 1996, 117). For Lewis-Beck et al. (2011, 138) 'parties, like sports teams, evoke strong loyalty and affection in the

[1] According to Turnbull and Vromens (2006, 457) '[A]ctivists were suspicious of formal party organisations becoming elite-driven and working against their ethic of participatory democracy' (Turnbull and Vromens 2006, 456-7).

general public, but also animosity, rejection or indifference'. Party ID helps people navigate the complexity of politics and 'interpret what they cannot experience directly' (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011, 166).

Political scientists have long argued that political leaders influence public attitudes and behaviour and provide 'cues' for partisans to follow (Campbell *et al.* 1960; Bartels, 2000; Green, et al. 2002). By filtering complex political issues, party identification provides a 'simplifying function' where cues from political leaders 'guide the political thought and action of the party identifier' (Miller 1976, 23). For Gilens and Murakawa (2002, 21), partisans are more likely to follow the cues of political leaders than engage in 'substantive assessment of competing evidence and arguments'. Those who claim party identification to be a 'psychological attachment' (e.g. Campbell et al. 1960; Miller and Shanks 1996; Green and Yoon 2002; Green et al. 2002) are sometimes referred to as 'traditionalists' (Bartels et al., 2011). 'Revisionists' on the other hand (e.g. Fiorina 1981; Achen 1992), argue that 'party identification is malleable, and should be viewed as a running tally of retrospective evaluations' (Bartels et al. 2011, 211).

Some scholars argue that the influence of partisanship upon voting and public attitudes is declining. Dalton and others (e.g. Dalton and Wattenburg, 2002; Crewe and Denver 1985; Dalton *et al.* 1984) claim that a process of partisan de-alignment is occurring in Western nations. In cross-national research, Dalton and Wattenberg (2002) found evidence of this 'erosion of partisanship' both in the form of fewer citizens identifying with political parties over time, and declining overall strength of party attachment.

Nevertheless, partisanship remains a powerful predictor of voting in many countries (Bartels et al. 2002; Miller and Shanks 1996; Bean, 1997; 1996). Many 'traditionalists' and 'revisionists' alike, suggest partisan affiliations are transferred inter-generationally, with the

partisan affiliations of parents passed on to their children (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011; Achen 1992; Niemi and Jennings 1991). Nevertheless, inheriting party ID is a tendency, not a direct hand-me-down from parents to children. 'Traditionalists' claim that once formed during adolescence, identification with a particular party remains relatively stable. As Green et al. (2002, 4) argue: '[W]hen people feel a sense of belonging to a given social group, they absorb the doctrinal positions that the group advocates' and 'once they take root in early adulthood, they often persist.' Alternatively, 'revisionists' maintain party identification is sensitive to 'short term forces' including how partisans view political leaders or the state of the economy (Bartels et al. 2011, 211). If the latter case holds, partisanship should be less stable than traditionalist accounts suggest, depending upon the influence of short-term factors such as partisan aligned political issues.

We examine members of the first cohort of Australian Greens partisans. Our youth cohort survey data from the state of Queensland, collected when respondents were aged 17, 20 and 22, includes the first Australians old enough to have inherited Green party affiliations from their parents. Our data are therefore unique, as we measure respondent Greens and their parents' party ID in a large cohort survey collected using probability sampling (Tranter 2013).

Inheritance of Parental Party ID

Based on previous research, we test several hypotheses regarding party ID formation between adolescence and early adulthood. We first check the extent that young people inherit party ID from their parents. As Lewis-Beck et al. (2011, 141) put it, 'the adoption of partisan attachments requires parental nurturing.' If the claims of traditionalist party ID researchers hold, we expect to find strong evidence that parental partisan allegiances are taken on by their children (H1). In national election surveys, respondents are sometimes asked about the party

allegiances of their parents. However, such questions necessarily rely upon recall, which is potentially problematic. More reliable measures ask respondents about their parents' identifications 'when they are at a young age' (Lewis-Beck et al. 2011, 140). We first surveyed respondents regarding parental party when respondents were around 17 years of age, and expect our parental identification measures to have relatively high validity. These estimates collected when partisan attachments were forming, we argue, provide baseline measures of party identification that are more accurate estimates of parental party identification than recall measures.

Additionally, mothers and fathers have differential influence on the development of their children's party identification. Jennings and Niemi (1974, 176) found that children tend to follow their same-sex parent when it comes to party identification. We therefore examine the partisan influence of mothers and fathers separately. This is potentially very important in contemporary Australia, where approximately 84 per cent of single parent households are single mother families (ABS 2012).

The degree to which political party ID is inherited may also differ along party lines. In Australian politics, the main political divide at federal and state levels is between the centre-left Australian Labor Party, and the centre-right Liberal/National Coalition partners. The major parties have a relatively long history. The Labor Party formed in 1901 and the Liberal Party in 1945, with its antecedents stretching back to 1917[2], while the junior coalition partner of the Liberals, the National Party of Australia, formed in 1920. The Greens sit to the left of Labor, although many Greens supporters originally defected from the left of the Labor Party or other leftwing minor parties (Jackson 2016). Greens preferences have also tended to flow to Labor at federal elections, most notably in the 'Green' election of 1990 where Greens and

[2] The Liberal Party replaced the United Australia Party founded in 1931, which in turn succeeded the Nationalist Party of Australia formed in 1917.

Australian Democrat preferences, underpinned by the environmental movement more broadly, helped the Hawke Labor government secure its third term (Lohrey 2002).

The Greens are a relatively young party (Miragliotta 2006; 2012; 2013; Turnbull and Vromens 2006), and the parents of our Greens identifying Queenslanders could not have themselves been Greens identifiers when they were young, as the Greens did not exist as a party until 1992. Party identification forms during adolescence, so Greens respondents' parents would in most cases have originally been Labor identifiers. Parents who originally identified with the Labor party and later defected to the Greens may therefore retain some affinity with Labor (or the party they originally identified with). We therefore expect that inter-generational transference of party identification will be stronger among major party identifiers than Australian Greens identifiers (H2).

H1: Political party identification is inherited inter-generationally by children from their parents.

H2: The influence of parental party ID upon respondent party ID is stronger among major party identifiers than among Greens identifiers.

Inheritance, Partisan Stability & Voting Behaviour

As well as guiding how young people first align themselves politically, parental party ID may also stabilise their affiliations during the early stages of political socialisation. The distinctiveness and stability of partisan identities reflects historical linkages between parties and the ideological fault lines separating them. Many left-Labor supporters migrated to Greens when the latter party formed 25 years ago, and this association has likely continued. In his recent study of contemporary Australian Greens membership and party activists, Jackson (2016, 130) found that '19 per cent of activists were former members of the ALP, and very few (1 per cent) were from the Liberal or National parties.' Jackson (2016, 131; also

see Gauja and Jackson 2016) also suggests that the large number of former ALP members who joined the Greens, 'might lend some credence to the thesis that Greens effectively captured the remnants of the New Left movements both within and external to the major social democrat party (in this case the ALP).'

The links that persist between Labor and Greens identifiers today potentially undermines the stability of support for either party. That is to say, some crossover in party identification may exist between parties that have an affinity on certain political issues. In Australia, this is apparent in the fluidity between the left of the Labor Party and Australian Greens. At times such affinities are expressed in voting behaviour, including the propensity for vote splitting between Labor in the House of Representative and Greens in the Senate (Tranter 2007). As Bowler and Denemark (1993) argued, 'Australian ticket splitters are a tactically aware, politically interested subset who…utilise especially Senate minor party votes to put the brake on major party hegemony'. Given the origins of Greens support, a relatively fluid form of Labor/Greens identity may exist, potentially influenced by left-leaning Labor parents. This fluidity (i.e. a tendency to move between Labor and Greens identification, and/or the sense that these parties are closer to each other, than, for example, Liberals or Nationals are to Greens) is likely passed on to children.

We expect to find the stability of Labor and Greens ID to be weaker than it is for Coalition identifiers because of this hypothesised fluidity of Labor/Greens identity, particularly among those situated on the left of the Labor party (H3). While the transmission of party allegiance from parent to child may have more ambiguous outcomes in such cases, we argue that the inheritance of party ID is itself a distinct process. In other words, we expect the influence of parental party ID to persist even after accounting for other key influences on young people's political socialisation, such as sex, geographic location or parental education. In terms of electoral behaviour, this hypothesised permeable nature of Greens ID is likely to manifest in

the form of greater strategic voting amongst Greens identifiers compared to major party identifiers (H4) (Tranter 2007). Finally, one's own party affiliation is typically the strongest predictor of voting. We therefore expect to find that parents' influence on their children's voting can be explained by the level of influence they have on their children's party ID (i.e. inheritance) and other aspects of political socialisation (e.g. parental education) (H5).

H3: Coalition party ID is more stable than Labor or Greens party ID

H4: Greens identifiers will be more open to strategic voting than Labor or Coalition identifiers.

H5: The influence of parental party ID on respondent voting preferences is moderated by parental education and respondent party ID.

Data and Method

The 'Our Lives' Project

Data are from the Social Futures and Life Pathways project (also known as '*Our Lives'* project), a longitudinal study of young people from Queensland (QLD), Australia. The *Our Lives* project investigates stability and change in young people's aspirations, orientations and behaviors across a range of life domains, including the political sphere. Unlike surveys more exclusively focused on politics, the broad focus of the *Our Lives* study may help reduce self-selection bias amongst those with high political interest. In 2006, researchers sought to survey all Year 8 students (i.e. the first year of secondary school, aged 13 years) from all QLD secondary schools. After excluding 71 schools where access was not granted by school authorities, the survey achieved a school-level response rate of 55% (n=213 schools) and a within-school response rate of 34% (n=7,031 students). Follow-up survey waves were conducted with this cohort every 2 to 3 years: in 2008 (age 15), 2010 (age 17), 2013 (age 20) and 2015 (age 22). While the baseline survey consisted of a hardcopy self-completed questionnaire administered in classrooms, in subsequent survey waves participants completed

questionnaires via a mixture of online self-completion and Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). The top half of Table 1 shows the number of cohort members participating in each wave and response rates over time. The wave-on-wave retention rate for the cohort was 52 per cent in Wave 2 (n=3,649), 88 per cent in Wave 3 (n=3,209), 69 per cent in Wave 4 (n=2,208), and 98 per cent in Wave 5 (n=2,158).

Analytic sample and representativeness

We analyse data primarily from Waves 3, 4 or 5 of the Our Lives study, as these waves contained a politics survey module. In Wave 3, this module was only completed by respondents who undertook an extended version of the survey (n=2,392, 75 per cent of all W3 respondents), whereas it was completed by all respondents in subsequent waves. In cohort studies, it is not uncommon for cohort members to 'miss' a survey wave, or for analytic variables of interest not to be measured in all waves. Accordingly, we maximise our utilisation of the available data by allowing our analytic sample to vary depending on the requirements of each analytic stage. In the lower half of Table 1, we show the waves respondents needed to complete to be included in each analytic stage/table. The main criteria (applicable for most stages) was that participants completed Wave 4, containing one-off measures of Party ID inheritance, and 2013 Federal Election voting preferences. However, the available sample was smaller when 2 of the 3 survey waves needed to be completed (e.g. Tables 4 & 6), and larger when any of the 3 survey waves could be completed (e.g. Table 5).

[Table 1 about here]

The rates of response and attrition for the *Our Lives* cohort compare favorably with other Australian youth cohort studies (Rothman, 2009), as well as with those few political studies examining a similar cohort and time period (e.g. Hooghe et al., 2011). As is often the case in such studies, female respondents and those attending - typically wealthier - private

Independent schools were likelier to participate in earlier survey waves where attrition was highest. However, there was little change in the characteristics of the main analytic sample across the three later waves examined, suggesting attrition bias was lower for this group. Although we control for a range of background factors typically associated with non-response bias (Winship and Radbill, 1994), we nonetheless exercise caution regarding the generalisability of our findings. Table 2 contains descriptive statistics on the main analytic sample for all independent variables included in the analysis.

[Table 2 about here]

The data analysed are from the state of Queensland. The Greens vote in the House of Representatives at the last three federal elections (2010, 2013 and 2016), was slightly lower for Queensland than the national average (Appendix Table 1), although for 2010 and 2016 Queensland voting was almost identical to that in Australia's most populous state, New South Wales.[3] Election survey data indicate that Queenslanders also scored to the right of the national average on the ideological spectrum for the last three federal elections (Appendix Table 2). Our analyses of young Queenslanders are therefore likely to produce conservative estimates of the proportion of Greens party identifiers among young Australians more broadly.

Key variables

Our main dependent variable, party indentification, was measured in 2010, 2013, and 2015 using the following item from the Australian Election Study (AES): *Thinking about Australian political parties, would you consider yourself a supporter of the Labor party, Liberal party, National party or some other party?* (responses: Labor, Liberal, National,

[3] In the state of Queensland, Premier Anna Bligh's Labor government ruled from 13/09/2007 to 26/03/2012, followed by Campbell Newman's Liberal National Party from 26/03/2012 to 14/02/2015, and most recently Labor Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk, who has held government since 14/02/2015.

Greens, other party, no party). To simplify the categories for our multinomial regression analyses, we combined Liberal or National ID as "Coalition" ID, and dropped observations where respondents identified with other minority parties.

We also include several measures of political socialisation and behavior adapted from the AES. Father's and mother's party ID was measured retrospectively at Wave 4 (2013) by asking: "*Did your father have any particular preference for one of the political parties when you were young, say about 14 years old? And how about your mother?"* Respondents were able to choose from the party options outlined above as well as a "Don't know" option. The latter option was selected by a high proportion of the sample and likely encompasses several possible scenarios. Some respondents may have known their parent's party ID when they were aged 15 (in 2008), but were no longer able to recall this five years on (in 2013).

Other respondents may never have known their parent's party ID, for instance, because their parent(s) were weak party supporters who did not communicate their political preferences, or simply because they were unaligned politically. By including this "Unknown" category we differentiate these potential scenarios from respondents' parents who demonstrated significant party support. Political interest was measured in Wave 4 by asking "*Generally speaking, how much interest do you usually have in what's going on in politics?"* (0= "None"; 1 = "Not much"; 2 = "Some"; 3 = "A great deal"), while in Wave 4 we also asked respondents how they planned to vote in the 2013 Australian Federal Election: "*In the 2013 federal election, which party will you vote for first in the House of Representatives? And in the Senate?* (1= "Labor"; 2 = "Coalition"; 3 = "Greens"; 4= "Other Party"; 5 = "Unsure/Informal").

We controlled for key background influences on political socialisation including sex, geographic region, schooling sector, parental education, and parental union status. Earlier

research has found pro-environmental attitudes - a strong driver of Greens identification - to be more prevalent among young women, urban youth, and those attending non-Catholic independent schools rather than Catholic or State schools (Tranter and Skrbis, 2014). Parental education shapes young people's political socialisation during adolescence, as highly educated parents tend to be more civically and politically engaged, and influence their children to become engaged (Cicognani et al., 2012). Our parental education measure is based on the highest education level of either parent at Wave 3 (or Waves 1 or 2 in cases when unknown or missing). Parental influences on party ID formation also depend on the regularity of respondent contact with parents, which may differ according to family living arrangements. We differentiate between those who living with both parents at Wave 3 from respondents in other living arrangements.

Analytic Approach

We test our hypotheses in five stages. First, in Table 3 we test whether young people identify with the party supported by their parents (H1), especially major parties (Coalition or Labor) over the Greens (H2). We use multinomial logit models to estimate the influence of mother's and father's party ID on respondents' earliest measured party ID (at age 17 or 20). Second, in Table 4 we use a similar approach to examine respondent party ID stability between age 17 (Wave 3/2010) and 22 (Wave 5/2015). We expect conservative Coalition party identifiers to be less likely to change their affiliations over time than more progressive Labor or Greens identifiers (H3), andpresent predicted probabilities for party ID derived from these models.

Next, in Table 5 we test whether parental influences on party ID persist after controlling for broader factors shaping young people's political socialisation. We ran several logistic regression models with random effects (RE) to estimate the odds of respondents identifying with each party (vs. No party identification) across three time points (age 17, 20 and 22). Our

RE approach pools party ID observations across this period - drawing on a large pool of respondents who completed a survey at any of the three time points - whilst accounting for observations nested in the same individuals (Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal, 2008). This enables us to differentiate between changes within particular individuals over time (explainable by dynamic, time-varying factors), and variation between individuals (explainable by stable, time-invariant factors). Since most of the variables of interest are time-invariant (e.g. sex; parental ID), or relatively stable over the period in question (e.g. parental education, geographic region), partitioning the variance allows for more robust estimation of the effects of these factors than a cross-sectional approach.

Fourthly, in Table 6 we explore whether Greens identifiers are more open to voting strategically for Labor or the Greens based on which candidate is likelier to win a seat (H4). Greens identifiers may be less likely to vote with their party in the House of Representatives, with its preferential instant runoff voting, than in the Senate, where a single transferable vote proportional representation system favors the Greens as a 'balance of power' party (Bennett and Lundie 2007). We test H4 (using a similar approach as H1-H3) to examine the association between respondents' earliest measured party ID and their voting intentions in the 2013 Australian Federal Election.

Finally, in Table 7 we examine whether parental party ID predicts respondent voting intention independently of respondent party ID and parental education (H5). Multinomial logit models estimate a) the effects of parental party ID on 2013 Senate voting intention controlling for all analytic variables except respondent party ID and parental education, and b) how the latter variables mediate parental ID effects.

Results

Compared to national adult samples from the Australian Election Study survey, the Our Lives survey shows much lower levels of identification with the major parties, with non-affiliation much higher (Figure 1).[4] Two of the Our Lives surveys were collected in federal election years (2010 and 2013). In 2010, only 14 per cent of Australians did not identify with any political party at the national level,[5] while 41 per cent of the Our Lives sample did not identify with any political party. This finding is also relatively stable over time, although the 2013 sample results differ somewhat from 2010 and 2015. We suspect that the variation in 2013 is due to electoral contextual factors, as in 2013 (but not in 2010), the Our Lives survey data collection overlapped the 2013 election campaign.

[Figure 1 about here]

The campaign may have influenced respondents in a way that increased identification with the major parties rather than the Greens or non-identifiers. In 2015, a non-election year, party ID estimates were again similar to 2010 levels (2010 13.2%;2015 12.7%), with Greens support much higher than national estimates in both years (i.e. national level Greens party ID 6.1% in 2010; 6.2% in 2013).[6] Alternatively, major party identification is far lower than

[4] Question wording, Our Lives: "Thinking about Australian political parties, would you consider yourself a supporter of the Labor party, Liberal party, National party or some other party?" AES: "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Labor, National or what?"

[5] Minor party responses are omitted from these results.

[6] Australian Election Study results for Greens part ID are as follows 1996: 1%, 1998: 2%, 2001: 3%, 2004: 5%, 2007: 6%; 2010 6%, 2013: 6%, and 2016: 9% (Cameron and McAllister 2016: 28).

national estimates, but non-affiliation is far higher in the younger sample (AES 2010 Coalition 40.6%; Labor 39.2%; no party 13.1%; 2013 Coalition 43.5%; Labor 37.2% no party 14.1%). Our Lives Coalition party identification is also stronger than Labor Party ID, congruous with estimates from the Australian Election Study.

A consistent Australian finding in relation to concerns over environmental issues (Pakulski et al. 1998), environmental group membership (Tranter 1996; 2010) and support for Greens leaders (Tranter 2011), is that women tend to be more environmentally supportive than men. This trend is paralleled in political partisanship among young Australians. In each of the three Our Lives surveys, women are likelier than men to identify with the Australian Greens, while men tend to be supportive of the Coalition. Gender does not seem to be associated with Labor or nonidentification.

The fact that Queensland is a geographically large state that has developed strong National Party (formerly Country Party) constituency outside of the major population centres, may account for the strong urban/rural divide detected in the party identification findings. Coalition identification is expectedly stronger in rural areas, and Labor correspondingly weaker. A similar, but more pronounced pattern is apparent for Greens identification, with Greens identification far stronger in urban than rural areas, based on these data. This pattern persists in all survey waves.

[Table 3 about here]

Table 3 presents predicted probabilities based on the association between parental party ID and respondent ID. These results provide strong support for our first hypothesis. Respondents whose parents identified with one of the major parties were most likely to report being supporters of the same party. Moreover, where parental ID was unknown, respondents were most likely not to identify with any political party. These trends are consistent with H1,

suggesting that political partisanship tends to be inherited.

However, there is less support for our second hypothesis. The relative strength of the inheritance trend is indicated by having the same ID as one's parent. For instance, the parent to child association is strongest among Coalition identifiers. Having a Coalition mother is associated with a 52 percent chance of respondents being Coalition supporters, whilst there is a 43 percent chance of Coalition support amongst those with Coalition fathers.

Inheritance was more complex on the progressive side of the political spectrum. Greens ID is, in fact, more likely to be shared by parent and child than Labor ID. This runs contrary to our expectation of a weaker transmission of party ID for the more recently formed Greens party. Rather, our estimates indicate that maternal influence on party ID was equally strong for the Greens and the Coalition. Labor support was less likely to be passed on inter-generationally, with many children of Labor parents favoring the Greens, or not identifying with any party.

Further, partisanship (or lack thereof) is more strongly influenced by mother's ID than by father's ID in most instances. In models where these measures were included separately (not shown), mother's ID accounts for a larger proportion of the variation (15%) than father's ID (13%), whilst the two measures combined explain 17% or one-sixth of the total variation.

[Table 4 about here]

Table 4 displays predicted probabilities of respondent party ID at age 22 (2015) conditional on their earlier ID at age 17 (2010). Comparing party ID in this non-election year may help illustrate changes arising from fundamental or ideological (rather than pragmatic or campaign-related) considerations on the part of respondents. The results support our third hypothesis. Coalition identifiers had the highest chance (63%) of a similar response five years on, followed by unaligned respondents (60%), then Labor supporters (55%), whilst

Greens supporters (47%) were least stable identifiers across this period. Thus, Greens supporters were the likeliest to inherit parental party ID, but also the least likely to retain their party ID into their early twenties.

We more rigorously assessed the effects of parental party ID on respondent ID by accounting for potentially confounding influences involved in young people's political socialisation. Table 5 presents RE logistic regression models that examine influences on party ID (relative to ages 17 to 22). The odds ratios for each party ID indicate the overall change in likelihood of identifying with that party (relative to no party), associated with a unit change in the predictor variable. For example, female partisans were on average 3.4 times likelier ($p<0.001$) than males to identify with the Greens at any point in this period, and around 1.5 times likelier ($p<0.05$) to identify with Labor, whereas there was no significant gender difference between Coalition identifiers and non-identifiers, accounting for other covariates.

The time measure, serving as a proxy for age, indicates how a respondent's initial party ID changed in later waves after accounting for other covariates. On average, the odds of identifying with Labor rather than no party was higher at both later time points, an increase most pronounced at age 20 (coinciding with the 2013 election). Although the odds of Coalition support also briefly increased (by 40 percent) at age 20 in 2013, there was an overall decline of 30 percent in the likelihood of Coalition partisanship across the whole period. By contrast, Greens partisanship appeared to decline at age 20, before recovering some ground by age 22. In 2013, the chances of supporting the Greens over no party were 50% lower than in 2010, whereas there was no significant difference between the odds of Greens partisanship in 2010 and 2015. Against the reference category of non-identifiers, these changes suggest that Greens are more likely to 'de-align' in election years, whereas the reverse was true for Labor and the Coalition, where identification strengthened. These fluctuations highlight the importance of observing party ID across multiple time points. By

controlling for such changes and associated period (i.e. election) effects, we attempt to increase the reliability of the estimates for other key influences upon political socialization during this period.

[Table 5 about here]

Living in a rural location rather than a major city is associated with a higher chance of identifying with the Coalition, and lower odds of Labor and Greens identification. Compared to respondents who attended a State school, private school students from the (typically wealthier) independent school sector were much likelier to support the Coalition, even controlling for parental education. Having university-educated parents is generally associated with higher Greens support and lower support for the major parties. Identification with the Greens was also significantly lower among those from vocationally-educated backgrounds compared to those with at least one university-educated parent. Understandably, political interest displayed a strong positive association with partisanship across the board, though was most notable for the Greens. With each one level change in political interest (ranging 0-3), the odds of identification with the Greens rose 3.4 times, compared with 2.9 for the Coalition and 2.5 for Labor.

Consistent with hypothesis 5, parental ID predicted respondents' emerging political affiliations independently of other influences described above. Parental ID influences were generally larger and more significant on the maternal side, especially for the inheritance of Greens ID. In the latter case, the size of this association (odds ratio of 60) is likely overinflated by the low number of respondents with Greens mothers (n=76 or 4 percent of the sample). Nonetheless, a conservative estimate at the lower end of the 95% confidence interval suggests children of Greens mothers are 19 times more likely than those whose maternal party ID is unknown, to identify with the Greens.

Further illustrating the scope of maternal influence, one's mother did not need to support the Greens in order to increase the chances of their child identifying as Green; it was sufficient that respondents knew their mother's party ID. Those with Labor mothers, or even Coalition mothers, were likelier to identify with the Greens than respondents whose mothers' affiliations were unknown. Although children of Coalition mothers were most likely to support the Coalition, there was a relatively higher chance that the children of Labor mothers would support the Greens over Labor controlling for all other factors. Father's ID was strongly associated with respondent ID, and although the magnitude of father's 'inheritance' effects were smaller than for mother's, they were more consistent along partisan lines.

[Table 6 about here]

Table 6 explores how respondent party ID predicted intended vote at the 2013 Australian Federal Election. As per hypothesis 5, we found that Greens supporters intended to vote strategically for Labor or the Greens based on where their vote would have the greatest impact on candidates winning a seat (i.e. House of Representatives or Senate). Compared with Labor or Coalition identifiers, fewer Greens identifiers intended to vote for their party's candidates in either House. One in four Greens supporters intended to vote Labor in the House of Representatives, and one in five to vote Labor in the Senate. This difference between the Houses - with the House vote eliciting greater vote switching amongst Greens identifiers - is consistent with a pragmatic assessment of politics in a two-party system.

The findings thus far suggest that young adults' political affiliations remain highly influenced by those of their parents, even accounting for various shaping mechanisms, the electoral cycle, and general volatility of this period in their lives. Yet we have observed a degree of

fluidity, both in terms of how Greens partisanship is inherited (e.g. from both Labor and Greens mothers) and in how it informs electoral behavior (e.g. through the strategic voting of Greens identifiers).

Partisanship is also a concept that subsumes other socio-economic characteristics that shape young people's electoral behavior. As Lewis-Beck et al. (2011, 7-8) note, 'political perceptions and evaluations…are reflected in the social and economic characteristics of the voter. They are the result of social and political experiences that define social location and cultural values.' A key example here is educational advantage and disadvantage. It is possible that much of the influence of parents upon young people's voting practices might be explained in terms of parents cultivating (directly or indirectly) their children's partisanship and interest in politics more generally. Therefore, we expect the effects of parental partisanship on young people's voting preferences to be mediated by educational and political socialisation mechanisms.

To examine this final proposition, Table 7 examines the relationship between parental party ID and respondents' intended Senate vote. Columns 1, 3 and 5 include parental party ID and previous control variables except for parental education, political interest, and respondent party ID. The results show that parental party ID has similar, though less pronounced influences upon respondent voting intentions than it does their party ID formation. For instance, maternal affiliation with any party (but especially the Greens) predicted higher odds of intending to vote Green, in a similar way that it predicted the likelihood of being a Greens identifier. Father's party ID, though still important, was a weaker predictor for voting intentions than it was for party ID more generally.

[Table 7 about here]

After accounting for parental education, respondent party ID, and political interest in columns 2, 4 and 6, our final hypothesis (H5) is not entirely supported. These factors explained some of the associations for parental party ID, but in most instances parental effects remain significant. That is, the influence of parental party ID on respondent voting intentions is not solely explained as a function of parents' transmission of broader educational traits to their children, or of parents cultivating their children's early political interest and partisan alignment. While these mechanisms appear to have shaped voting intentions in ways consistent with theoretical expectations, the findings suggest that, beyond such influences, parents (particularly mothers) still exert a relatively persistent, stabilising influence on their children's electoral behavior as the latter approach political maturity.

Discussion

We examined the stability of, and background influences upon Australian Greens party identification through quantitative analysis of a large cohort of young Australians from the state of Queensland. This study is unique, first, because it includes young Greens identifiers, who are among the first Australians who could have actually inherited their parents' party ID, given the relatively recent formation of the Australian Greens as a national party in 1992. Second, our longitudinal sample enables us to examine how party ID emerges among a large number of young Australians. Such an approach is valuable, as Australian and international political surveys usually only provide point-in-time snapshots of party ID for population cross-sections that contain relatively small proportions of young people.

There is some evidence in our findings to support the 'traditionalist' view that party ID is a 'psychological attachment' (e.g. Campbell et al. 1960; Miller and Shanks 1996; Green and Yoon 2002; Green et al. 2002). Greens party ID among young Australians appears to be relatively stable over time, however, it also fluctuates according to contextual factors. The

federal election campaign of 2013 overlapped with the data collection period for our survey. The relative proportions of Greens party identifiers and non-identifiers declined in this intermediate survey wave, but identification with the major parties increased. Yet, in the most recent wave of data, levels of party identification returned to be almost identical with first wave results. Our findings support Miragliotta's (2013) assertion that '[T]he Greens is a political vehicle that is still developing and consolidating its structures and identity in a party system dominated by more established and better resourced competitors.'

These apparent contextual factors support the claims of 'revisionist' party identification theorists (e.g. Fiorina 1981; Achen 1992), who argue that 'party identification is malleable' and subject to 'short term forces' (Bartels et al. 2011, 211). In addition, the very large proportion of young people who do not identify with any political party, tends to support the de-alignment thesis (Dalton and Wattenberg 2000; Crewe and Denver 1985; Dalton et al. 1984). However, further tracking of this cohort is necessary to establish whether high levels of non-identification persist.

Nevertheless, we find support for Hypothesis 3, as Greens party ID is less stable than major party identification, particularly compared to identification with the Liberal/National coalition. Young people identifying with conservative parties have by far the most stable allegiances. Greens, alternatively, are the least stable. We suspect, and to an extent are able to demonstrate, that the relative instability of Greens is partly due to the 'fluid' party identification boundaries between Labor and Greens. This is (at least partly) historical in nature, as Greens party members contain many defectors from the Labor party, and other left-leaning minor parties (Jackson 2016; Gauja and Jasckon 2016). Greens identification is largely inherited from partisan parents (supporting Hypothesis 1), but our second hypothesis, that this process of inheritance is stronger among major party identifiers than among Greens, is not supported. The parent/child party ID association is of almost identical magnitude for

Coalition and Greens identifiers, but is much weaker for Labor identifiers.

The tendency for vote splitting between the federal House of Representative and the Senate (Tranter 2007; Bowler and Denemark 1993) is an important factor here. We find partial support for Hypothesis 4, that Greens identifiers vote strategically and suspect fluid voting behaviour is underpinned by a 'fluid' form of party identification, where (mainly) left-leaning Labor partisans vote strategically for the Greens (in the Senate), while some Greens identifiers vote Greens in the Senate but Labor in the House. Partisan fluidity between these (at least on the margins) ideologically aligned parties is also passed on inter-generationally. Left-leaning young Australians learn that the Greens and Labor are much closer ideologically, than the Greens are to the socially conservative Liberals or Nationals. Left-leaning party identifiers also understand they can vote strategically for the centre-left Labor party and the left-leaning Greens at federal elections. This maximises the chances of a moderately left party (Labor) controlling the House of Representatives, and a left leaning, 'postmaterial' Greens party (Tranter and Western 2009; Western and Tranter 2001) holding the balance of power in the Senate.

Importantly, while party identification is inherited from both fathers and mothers, mothers play a far important role in the formation of Greens political identity. The strength of the association between Green mothers and Green respondents is very strong, with the influence of mothers' identification on voting remaining even after respondent party identification is controlled. Yet the influence of mothers on respondent identification goes beyond same party inheritance. Mothers who identify with Labor or Coalition parties, were more likely than non-aligned mothers, or mothers whose affiliations were unknown, to have Green identifying children. This highlights again, the importance of childhood socialisation in partisan formation. While Jennings and Niemi (1974) suggest people are influenced more by their

same-sex parent in the United States, it seems that Greens party identification in Australia is influenced more strongly by mothers than by fathers.

Finally, the panel data show that Greens are the most likely of all party identifiers to become non-partisans over time. This finding is likely to have been influenced by the relatively recent formation of the Greens as a national party, and the recognition that as a minor party, the Greens have substantially less political clout, and are unlikely to wield substantial political power unless they can form a coalition government. There are historical precedents for Labor/Greens cooperation, particularly in Tasmania and in the Australian Capital Territory (Crowley, 2008), and at the federal level with the Gillard Labor government agreement with the Greens (Rootes, 2011). However, often Australian major parties go to great lengths to convince voters they will reject power sharing arrangements with the Greens, the coalition in particular targeting Labor/Greens cooperation in scare campaigns aimed at damaging the Labor vote. Regardless of potential power sharing agreements, the continuing presence of the Australian Greens as an influential minor party on the national level (add recent references here), and the relatively stable Greens identity found among young Australians, is likely to contribute to inter-generational transmission of Greens partisanship, and consequently, help to ensure at least the medium term survival of the Greens as a political player on the national stage.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistic (2012) 'Labour Force, Australia: Labour Force Status and Other Characteristics of Families, Jun 2012' (accessed 17/11/2017) http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/6224.0.55.001~Jun%202012~Chapter~one%20Parent%20Families

Bartels, B., Box-Steffensmeier, J., Smidt, C. and Smith, R. 2011 "The Dynamic Properties of Individual-Level Party Identification in the United States." *Electoral Studies* 30 (1): 210–22.

Bartels, L. 2000. Partisanship and voting behaviour 1952-1996. *American Journal of Political Science* 44(1): 35-50

Bean, C, 1997, 'Parties and Elections' in Galligan, B, McAllister, I, Ravenhill, J, eds *New Developments in Australian Politics,* South Melbourne: Macmillan, pp 102-24

Bean, C, 1996, 'Partisanship and Electoral Behaviour in Comparative Perspective' in Sims, M. (ed.) *The Paradox of Parties,* Sydney: Allen and Unwin, pp 135-55

Bennett, S. and Lundie, R. (2007) 'Australian Electoral Systems' *Parliamentary Library Research Paper No. 5*, https://www.aph.gov.au/binaries/library/pubs/rp/2007-08/08rp05.pdf

Cameron, S. and McAllister, I. (2016) *Trends in Australian Political Opinion: Results from the Australian Election Study 1987– 2016* Canberra: Australian National University.

Campbell, A, Converse, P, Miller, W, Stokes, D, 1960, *The American Voter* New York: Wiley and Sons.

Cicognani, E., Zani, B. Fournier, B., Gavray, C. and Born, M. 2012 "Gender differences in youths' political engagement and participation: The role of parents and of adolescences' social and civic participation." *Journal of Adolescence* 35 (3): 561-576.

Crewe, I. and Denver, D. (eds.) (1985) *Electoral Change in Western Democracies: Patterns and Sources of Electoral Volatility* London: Croom Helm.

Crowley, K. 2008. 'So close, and yet so far? The Tasmanian Greens and the 2006 state election' *Environmental Politics* 17(3): 481-484.

Dalton, R., S. Flanagan and P. Beck (eds.) (1984) *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dalton, R. and Wattenberg, M. (2002) *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies* Oxford Scholarship Online DOI: 10.1093/0199253099.001.0001

Gauja, A. and Jackson, S. (2016) 'Australian Greens party members and supporters: their profiles and activities' *Environmental Politics* 25(2): 359-379.

Gilens, M, Murakawa, N, 2002, 'Elite Cues and Political Decision Making' in Delli-Carpini, M, Huddy, L, Shapiro, R, eds *Political Decision-Making, Deliberation and Participation,* Oxford: JAI

Green, D. Palquist, B. and Schickler, E. 2002, *Partisan Hearts and Minds*. (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Hay, P. and Haward, G. (1988) 'Comparative Green Politics: Beyond the European Context?' *Political Studies* 36: 433 – 48.

Hooghe, M., Havermans, N., Quintelier, E. and Dassonneville, R. 2011 *Belgian Political Panel Survey (BPPS)*, *2006-2011. Technical report.* Leuven: K. U. Leuven.

Hutton, D. and Connors, L. (1999) *A History of the Australian Environment Movement,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, S. (2016) *The Australian Greens: From Activism to Australia's third party*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Jennings, M. and Niemi, R. (1974) *The Political Character of Adolescence*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Lewis-Beck, M., Jacoby, W., Norpoth, H., Weisberg, H. (2011) *The American Voter Revisited,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Lohrey, A. (2002) 'Ground-swell: The Rise of the Australian Greens' *Quarterly Essay* 8.

Miller, W. 1976. The cross-national use of party identification as a stimulus to political inquiry in: Budge, I., Crewe, I. and Farlie, D. (eds.) *Party identification and beyond*, (Wiley and Sons, London) pp. 21–31.

Miller, W. and Shanks, M. 1996, *The New American Voter,* Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Miragliotta, N. (2013) 'The Australian Greens: carving out space in a two-party system' *Environmental Politics* 22(5): 706-727.

Miragliotta, N. (2012) 'From local to national: Explaining the formation of the Australian Green Party' *Party Politics* 18(3): 409-425.

Miragliotta, N. (2006) 'One party, two traditions: Radicalism and pragmatism in the Australian Greens' *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 41(4): 585–596.

Niemi, R. and Jennings, M. (1991) 'Issues of Inheritance in the Formation of Party Identification' *American Journal of Political Science* 35(4): 970-88.

Rabe-Hesketh, S. and Skrondal, A. (2008) *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling using Stata*, 2nd edition, College Station, Texas: Stata Press.

Rootes, C. (2011) 'Denied, deferred, triumphant? Climate change, carbon trading and the Greens in the Australian federal election of 21 August 2010' *Environmental Politics* 20(3): 410-417.

Rothman, S. (2009) 'Estimating Attrition Bias in the Year 9 Cohorts of the Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth.' Technical report no. 48. LSAY Technical Reports. Australian Council of Educational Research (ACER).

Tranter, B. (2014) 'Social and Political Influences on Environmentalism in Australia' *Journal of Sociology* 50(3): 331-348.

Tranter, B. (2013) 'Sampling' in Walter, M. (ed.) *Social Research Methods,* (3rd edition) Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Tranter, B. (2011) 'Gendered Voting at the 2010 Federal Election' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 36(4): 719-29.

Tranter, B and Western, M. (2009) 'The Influence of Green Parties on Postmaterialist Values' *British Journal of Sociology* 60(1): 145-167.

Tranter, B. (2007) 'Political Knowledge and its Partisan Consequences' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 73-88.

Turnbull, N. and Vromen, A. (2006) 'The Australian Greens: Party Organisation and Political Processes' *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 25(3): 455-470.

Western, M. and B. Tranter (2001) 'Postmaterialist and Economic Voting in Australia, 1990-1998' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 439-458.

Winship, C., and L. Radbill. 1994. "Sampling Weights and Regression Analysis." *Sociological Methods & Research* 23 (2): 230–257.

Table 1: Cohort attrition and inclusion in analytic sample

	Survey wave*				
	W1: 2006	**W2: 2008**	**W3: 2010**	**W4: 2013**	**W5: 2015**
Cohort responding (n)	7,031	3,649	3,209	2,208	2,158
Wave-on-wave retention (%)	100%	52%	88%	69%	98%
Original sample (%)	100%	52%	46%	31%	31%

Completion status	**Analytic sample^**	**Table 3**	**Table 4**	**Table 5**	**Table 6**	**Table 7**
At least W4 (main criteria)	2,160	X				X
W3 & W4	1,534				X	
W4 & W5	1,453		X			
W3 or W4 or W5	3,117			X		

* Shaded columns indicate waves from which analytic sample is drawn

^ Totals after excluding any missing on key analytic variables

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for independent variables (main analytic sample)

	n	%		n	%
Male	807	37.4	*Parental union*		
Female	1,353	62.6	Couple	1,832	84.8
			Single/Other	328	15.2
Urban	1,530	70.8			
Rural	630	29.2	*Pol. Interest (0-3)^*	2,160	2.6 (0.9)
School type			*Mother's ID^*		
State	945	43.8	Unknown	1,043	48.3
Independent	822	38.1	Coalition	554	25.6
Catholic	393	18.2	Labor	488	22.6
			Greens	76	3.5
Parental edu.					
University	1,095	22.9	*Father's ID^*		
Year 12 or less	494	24.7	Unknown	1,082	50.1
Vocational	533	50.7	Coalition	628	29.1
Unknown/Missing	38	1.8	Labor	415	19.2
			Greens	35	1.6
Total respondents	2,160	100.0	Total respondents	2,160	100.0

^ Measure included in W4 only (all other measures from W3)

Table 3: Predicted Probabilities of Earliest Measured Party ID

	Earliest Measured Respondent Party ID			
	Coalition	Labor	Greens	No Party
Mother's ID				
Coalition	**0.516**	0.095	0.084	0.305
Labor	0.138	**0.352**	0.210	0.299
Greens	0.109	0.107	**0.517**	0.267
Unknown	0.218	0.192	0.098	**0.491**
Father's ID				
Coalition	**0.431**	0.123	0.124	0.322
Labor	0.177	**0.355**	0.123	0.345
Greens	0.000	0.211	**0.402**	0.387
Unknown	0.226	0.187	0.136	**0.452**
N (respondents)	2,160			

Table 4: Predicted Probabilities of W5 Party ID (Conditional on W3 Party ID)

	W5 Party ID			
	Labor	Coalition	Greens	No Party
W3 Party ID				
Labor	**0.547**	0.079	0.120	0.255
Coalition	0.076	**0.631**	0.052	0.241
Greens	0.170	0.060	**0.465**	0.305
No Party	0.188	0.138	0.078	**0.596**
N (respondents)	1,453			

Table 5: Logit Regression w/ Random Effects for Influences on Party ID (Ages 17-22)^

	Labor (vs. No Party)		**Coalition (vs. No Party)**		**Greens (vs No Party)**	
	OR	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*
Age 17 (Ref.)						
Age 20	2.6***	1.9, 3.5	1.4*	1.0, 1.9	0.5**	0.3, 0.8
Age 22	1.6**	1.2, 2.2	0.7*	0.5, 1.0	0.7	0.5, 1.1
Female	1.5*	1.1, 2.0	1.2	0.9, 1.8	3.4***	2.1, 5.7
Rural	0.7*	0.5, 1.0	1.7**	1.2, 2.6	0.4***	0.2, 0.7
School type						
State (Ref.)						
Independent	0.8	0.5, 1.1	3.7***	2.4, 5.7	1.1	0.7, 2.0
Catholic	0.6*	0.4, 1.0	1.4	0.8, 2.3	1.0	0.5, 1.9
Parental edu.						
Uni (Ref.)						
Year 12 or less	1.9**	1.3, 2.7	2.2***	1.4, 3.6	0.9	0.5, 1.6
Vocational	1.1	0.8, 1.6	0.9	0.6, 1.4	0.4**	0.2, 0.8
Pol. Interest (0-3)	2.5***	2.1, 3.0	2.9***	2.4, 3.6	3.4***	2.5, 4.5
Mother's ID						
Unknown (Ref.)						
Coalition	0.8	0.4, 1.4	11.5***	6.1, 21.8	2.6*	1.1, 5.9
Labor	4.7***	2.8, 7.8	0.6	0.3, 1.3	8.5***	3.9, 18.6
Greens	1.7	0.7, 4.5	0.6	0.2, 2.6	59.8***	19.3, 185.6
Father's ID						
Unknown (Ref.)						
Coalition	0.7	0.4, 1.3	5.7***	3.1, 10.5	0.6	0.3, 1.2
Labor	4.5***	2.6, 7.6	1.1	0.5, 2.3	1.3	0.6, 2.8
Greens	1.0	0.3, 4.1	0.7	0.1, 6.3	6.3*	1.4, 28.3
N (observations)	3,190		3,457		2,593	
N (respondents)#	1,602		1,681		1,405	
Pseudo R^2	0.23		0.35		0.22	

^ Non-significant variables (response mode, parental union status) omitted from output

Totals reflect no. of respondents in specified outcome & base category (No Party) for each regression; overall 6,485 obs. from 3,117 respondents were included

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 6: Predicted Marginal Probabilities of W4 Vote Intention (House of Reps)

	W4 Vote Intention (House of Reps)				
	Labor	Coalition	Greens	Other Parties	Unsure/Informal
W3 Party ID					
Labor	**0.52**	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.27
Coalition	0.09	**0.68**	0.02	0.02	0.18
Greens	**0.25**	0.09	**0.38**	0.02	0.26
No Party	0.23	0.19	0.06	0.05	0.48
	W4 Vote Intention (Senate)				
W3 Party ID					
Labor	**0.48**	0.09	0.08	0.03	0.31
Coalition	0.07	**0.65**	0.03	0.04	0.22
Greens	**0.18**	0.08	**0.43**	0.04	0.28
No Party	0.20	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.52
N (respondents)	1,534				

Table 7: Multinomial Logit Estimates of Parental ID Effects on 2013 Senate Voting Preference (Ref. = Unsure/Informal/Refused) ^

	Labor (1)		Labor (2)		Coalition (3)		Coalition (4)		Greens (5)		Greens (6)	
	OR	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*	*OR*	*95% CI*
Mother's ID												
Unknown (Ref.)												
Coalition	1.1	0.6, 1.9	1.3	0.7, 2.4	4.3***	2.8, 6.6	2.9***	1.8, 4.6	2.3*	1.2, 4.4	2.4*	1.2, 4.9
Labor	2.8***	1.9, 4.3	2.1**	1.4, 3.3	0.7	0.4, 1.2	0.7	0.4, 1.2	3.5***	2.0, 6.0	2.1*	1.3, 4.1
Greens	1.4	0.6, 3.1	1.3	0.6, 3.1	0.7	0.3, 2.0	0.6	0.2, 1.7	12.3***	6.0, 25.3	4.4***	2.3, 11.5
Father's ID												
Unknown (Ref.)												
Coalition	0.9	0.6, 1.5	0.8	0.6, 1.6	3.0***	1.9, 4.5	2.1**	1.3, 3.3	0.8	0.4, 1.4	0.7	0.4, 1.3
Labor	2.9***	1.9, 4.4	2.1**	1.3, 3.3	1.3	0.8, 2.4	1.4	0.7, 2.5	2.0*	1.1, 3.4	1.7	0.9, 3.7
Greens	3.1	0.9, 10.1	2.9	0.8, 10.1	2.2	0.5, 10.2	4.3	0.9, 20.5	4.5*	1.4, 14.3	2.2	0.6, 7.8
Parental education												
Uni. (Ref.)												
Year 12 or less			0.9	0.7, 1.3			0.9	0.6, 1.3			0.6	0.4, 1.0
Vocational			1.2	0.9, 1.6			1.0	0.7, 1.4			0.6*	0.4, 0.9
Earliest Measured Party ID												
None (Ref.)												
Labor			3.4***	3.5, 4.6			0.9	0.5, 1.4			1.6	0.9, 2.8
Coalition			0.6*	0.3, 1.7			4.7***	3.4, 6.5			0.5	0.3, 1.1
Greens			1.1	0.7, 1.7			0.8	0.5, 1.4			8.3***	5.2, 13.3
Pol. Interest (0-3)			1.7***	3.5, 2.0			1.4***	1.2, 1.6			2.2***	1.8, 2.7
N (respondents)	2,151											
Pseudo. R2	0.16		0.26		0.16		0.26		0.16		0.26	

^ All models include controls for response mode, sex, region, school type, and parental union status

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Appendix Table 1: Vote in House of Representatives (per cent)

2010									
	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	ACT	NT	National
ALP	37.28	42.81	33.58	31.18	40.74	43.95	45.02	37.91	*37.99*
COALITION ^	44.6	39.64	47.42	50.6	40.21	33.6	34.81	40.83	*43.62*
GRN	10.24	12.66	10.92	13.13	11.98	16.82	19.2	12.97	*11.76*
OTHERS	7.9	4.89	8.07	5.08	7.07	5.63	0.97	8.29	*6.63*
2013									
	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	ACT	NT	*National*
ALP	34.52	34.81	29.77	28.76	35.73	34.81	42.93	37.43	*33.38*
COALITION ^	47.34	42.69	45.66	51.21	44.89	40.26	34.62	41.7	*45.55*
GRN	7.95	10.8	6.22	9.74	8.28	8.32	13.4	7.89	*8.65*
OTHERS	10.2	11.72	18.35	10.29	11.11	16.62	9.04	12.98	*12.42*
2016									
	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	ACT	NT	*National*
ALP	36.93	35.58	30.91	32.45	31.55	37.9	44.27	40.39	*34.73*
COALITION ^	42.32	41.76	43.19	48.7	35.09	35.44	34.56	33.25	*42.08*
GRN	8.95	13.13	8.83	12.06	6.21	10.22	15.09	9.09	*10.23*
OTHERS	11.74	9.54	17.07	6.8	27.15	16.44	6.08	17.27	*12.97*

Notes: ^ Includes Liberal Party of Australia; Liberal National Party (QLD); National Party of Australia; Country Liberal Party (NT)

Source: Australian Electoral Commission.

Appendix Table 2: Left to Right Scale (0 to 10) Political Orientation by State (Means)

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	All
2010	5.02	4.98	5.21	4.54	5.26	5.07	5.29	4.81	5.03
2013	4.95	4.87	5.45	5.45	4.89	4.77	4.40	4.15	5.03
2016	4.61	5.06	5.56	5.33	5.19	4.06	4.82	4.43	4.99

Sources: Australian Election Studies (2010 – 2016).