

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS (CSES) - MODULE 3 (2006-2011)

CODEBOOK: VARIABLES DESCRIPTION

FULL RELEASE - DECEMBER 15, 2015 VERSION

CSES Secretariat  
www.cses.org

HOW TO CITE THE STUDY:

The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (www.cses.org). CSES MODULE 3  
FULL RELEASE [dataset]. December 15, 2015 version.  
doi : 10.7804/cses.module3.2015-12-15

These materials are based on work supported by the American National  
Science Foundation (www.nsf.gov) under grant numbers SES-0451598 ,  
SES-0817701, and SES-1154687, the GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social  
Sciences, the University of Michigan, in-kind support of participating  
election studies, the many organizations that sponsor planning meetings and  
conferences, and the many organizations that fund election studies by  
CSES collaborators.

Any opinions, findings and conclusions, or recommendations expressed  
in these materials are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily  
reflect the views of the funding organizations.

IMPORTANT NOTE REGARDING FULL RELEASES:

This dataset and all accompanying documentation is the "Full Release"  
of CSES Module 3 (2006-2011).

Users of the Final Release may wish to monitor the errata for  
CSES Module 3 on the CSES website, to check for known errors which may  
impact their analyses. To view errata for CSES Module 3, go to the Data  
Center on the CSES website, navigate to the CSES Module 3 download page,  
and click on the Errata link in the gray box to the right of the page.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

))) CSES MODULE 3 VARIABLE LIST

))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: IDENTIFICATION, WEIGHT, AND STUDY  
ADMINISTRATION VARIABLES

))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: DEMOGRAPHIC, VOTE CHOICE, AND  
ELECTION VARIABLES

))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: SURVEY VARIABLES

))) CSES MODULE 3 DISTRICT-LEVEL VARIABLES

))) CSES MODULE 3 MACRO-LEVEL VARIABLES

))) CSES MODULE 3 VARIABLE LIST

))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: IDENTIFICATION, WEIGHT, AND STUDY  
ADMINISTRATION VARIABLES

```

C1001      >>> DATASET
C1002      >>> DATASET VERSION
C1002_DOI  >>> DIGITAL OBJECT IDENTIFIER
C1003      >>> ID VARIABLE - ELECTION STUDY (NUMERIC POLITY)
C1004      >>> ID VARIABLE - ELECTION STUDY (ALPHABETIC POLITY)
C1005      >>> ID VARIABLE - RESPONDENT
C1006      >>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY CSES CODE
C1006_UN   >>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY UN CODE
C1006_NAM  >>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY NAME
C1007      >>> ID COMPONENT - SAMPLE COMPONENT
C1008      >>> ID COMPONENT - ELECTION YEAR
C1009      >>> ID COMPONENT - RESPONDENT WITHIN ELECTION STUDY
C1010_1    >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: SAMPLE
C1010_2    >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC
C1010_3    >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: POLITICAL
C1011_1    >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF SAMPLE WEIGHT
C1011_2    >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF DEMOGRAPHIC WEIGHT
C1011_3    >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF POLITICAL WEIGHT
C1012_1    >>> POLITY WEIGHT: SAMPLE
C1012_2    >>> POLITY WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC
C1012_3    >>> POLITY WEIGHT: POLITICAL
C1013      >>> FACTOR: SAMPLE SIZE ADJUSTMENT
C1014_1    >>> DATASET WEIGHT: SAMPLE
C1014_2    >>> DATASET WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC
C1014_3    >>> DATASET WEIGHT: POLITICAL
C1015      >>> ELECTION TYPE
C1016      >>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - MONTH
C1017      >>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - DAY
C1018      >>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - YEAR
C1019      >>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - MONTH
C1020      >>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - DAY
C1021      >>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - YEAR
C1022      >>> STUDY TIMING
C1023      >>> MODE OF INTERVIEW
C1024      >>> INTERVIEWER WITHIN ELECTION STUDY
C1025      >>> INTERVIEWER SEX
C1026      >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - MONTH
C1027      >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - DAY
C1028      >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - YEAR

```

))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: DEMOGRAPHIC, VOTE CHOICE,  
AND ELECTION VARIABLES

```

C2001      >>> D1. AGE
C2002      >>> D2. GENDER OF RESPONDENT
C2003      >>> D3. EDUCATION
C2004      >>> D4. MARITAL OR CIVIL UNION STATUS
C2005      >>> D5. UNION MEMBERSHIP
C2006      >>> D6. UNION MEMBERSHIP OF OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD
C2007      >>> D7. BUSINESS OR EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP
C2008      >>> D8. FARMERS' ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP
C2009      >>> D9. PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP
C2010      >>> D10. CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
C2011      >>> D11. MAIN OCCUPATION
C2012      >>> D12. SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS
C2013      >>> D13. EMPLOYMENT TYPE - PUBLIC OR PRIVATE
C2014      >>> D14. INDUSTRIAL SECTOR
C2015      >>> D15. SPOUSE: CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
C2016      >>> D16. SPOUSE: OCCUPATION
C2017      >>> D17. SPOUSE: SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS
C2018      >>> D18. SPOUSE: EMPLOYMENT TYPE - PUBLIC OR PRIVATE
C2019      >>> D19. SPOUSE: INDUSTRIAL SECTOR
C2020      >>> D20. HOUSEHOLD INCOME
C2021      >>> D21. NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD
C2022      >>> D22. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD UNDER AGE 18
C2023      >>> D23. RELIGIOUS SERVICES ATTENDANCE
C2024      >>> D24. RELIGIOSITY
C2025      >>> D25. RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION
C2026      >>> D26. LANGUAGE USUALLY SPOKEN AT HOME
C2027      >>> D27. REGION OF RESIDENCE

```

```

C2028      >>> D28. RACE
C2029      >>> D29. ETHNICITY
C2030      >>> D30. RURAL OR URBAN RESIDENCE
C2031      >>> D31. PRIMARY ELECTORAL DISTRICT
C2032      >>> D32. DAYS INTERVIEW CONDUCTED POST ELECTION

```

## ))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: SURVEY VARIABLES

```

C3001_1    >>> Q1a. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-EGOCENTRIC-FIRST MENTION
C3001_2    >>> Q1b. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-EGOCENTRIC-SECOND
              MENTION
C3002_1    >>> Q2a. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-SOCIOTROPIC-FIRST
              MENTION
C3002_2    >>> Q2b. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-SOCIOTROPIC-SECOND
              MENTION
C3003_1    >>> Q3a. PARTY/CANDIDATE COMPETENCE-FIRST SOCIOTROPIC
              PROBLEM
C3003_2    >>> Q3b. PARTY/CANDIDATE COMPETENCE-SECOND SOCIOTROPIC
              PROBLEM
C3004      >>> Q4. WHO IS IN POWER CAN MAKE DIFFERENCE
C3005      >>> Q5. WHO PEOPLE VOTE FOR MAKES A DIFFERENCE
C3006      >>> Q6. GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE: GENERAL
C3007_1    >>> Q7. IS THERE A PARTY THAT REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS
C3007_2    >>> Q7a. PARTY THAT REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS BEST
C3008_1    >>> Q8. IS THERE A LEADER WHO REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS
C3008_2    >>> Q8a. LEADER WHO REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS BEST
C3009_A    >>> Q9a. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY A
C3009_B    >>> Q9b. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY B
C3009_C    >>> Q9c. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY C
C3009_D    >>> Q9d. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY D
C3009_E    >>> Q9e. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY E
C3009_F    >>> Q9f. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY F
C3009_G    >>> Q9g. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G
C3009_H    >>> Q9h. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3009_I    >>> Q9i. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
C3010_A    >>> Q10a. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER A
C3010_B    >>> Q10b. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER B
C3010_C    >>> Q10c. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER C
C3010_D    >>> Q10d. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER D
C3010_E    >>> Q10e. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER E
C3010_F    >>> Q10f. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER F
C3010_G    >>> Q10g. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3010_H    >>> Q10h. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3010_I    >>> Q10i. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I
C3011_A    >>> Q11a. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY A
C3011_B    >>> Q11b. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY B
C3011_C    >>> Q11c. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY C
C3011_D    >>> Q11d. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY D
C3011_E    >>> Q11e. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY E
C3011_F    >>> Q11f. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY F
C3011_G    >>> Q11g. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G
C3011_H    >>> Q11h. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3011_I    >>> Q11i. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
C3012_A    >>> Q12a. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER A
C3012_B    >>> Q12b. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER B
C3012_C    >>> Q12c. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER C
C3012_D    >>> Q12d. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER D
C3012_E    >>> Q12e. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER E
C3012_F    >>> Q12f. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER F
C3012_G    >>> Q12g. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3012_H    >>> Q12h. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3012_I    >>> Q12i. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I
C3013      >>> Q13. LEFT-RIGHT - SELF
C3014_A    >>> Q14a. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY A
C3014_B    >>> Q14b. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY B
C3014_C    >>> Q14c. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY C
C3014_D    >>> Q14d. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY D
C3014_E    >>> Q14e. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY E
C3014_F    >>> Q14f. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY F
C3014_G    >>> Q14g. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G

```

```

=====
C3014_H      >>> Q14h. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3014_I      >>> Q14i. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
C3015_A      >>> Q15a. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER A
C3015_B      >>> Q15b. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER B
C3015_C      >>> Q15c. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER C
C3015_D      >>> Q15d. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER D
C3015_E      >>> Q15e. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER E
C3015_F      >>> Q15f. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER F
C3015_G      >>> Q15g. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3015_H      >>> Q15h. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3015_I      >>> Q15i. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I
C3016        >>> Q16.  OPTIONAL SCALE - SELF
C3017        >>> Q17.  DIFFERENCES OF CHOICE OPTIONS
C3018        >>> Q18.  CAMPAIGN INVOLVEMENT
C3019        >>> Q19.  SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRACY
C3020_1      >>> Q20.  ARE YOU CLOSE TO ANY POLITICAL PARTY
C3020_2      >>> Q20a. DO YOU FEEL CLOSER TO ONE PARTY
C3020_3      >>> Q20b. WHICH PARTY DO YOU FEEL CLOSEST TO
C3020_4      >>> Q20c. DEGREE OF CLOSENESS TO THIS PARTY
C3021_1      >>> Q21.  CURRENT ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A
                  BALLOT 1
C3021_2      >>> Q21.  CURRENT ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A
                  BALLOT 2
C3022_1      >>> Q21a. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED-FIRST
                  MENTION
C3022_2      >>> Q21a. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED-SECOND
                  MENTION
C3022_3      >>> Q21a. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED-THIRD
                  MENTION
C3022_4      >>> Q21a. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED-FOURTH
                  MENTION
C3023_PR_1   >>> Q21b. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 1
C3023_PR_2   >>> Q21b. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 2
C3023_LH_PL   >>> Q21c. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE
                  - PARTY LIST
C3023_LH_DC   >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE
                  - DISTRICT CANDIDATE
C3023_UH_PL   >>> Q21c. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE
                  - PARTY LIST
C3023_UH_DC_1 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE
                  - DISTRICT CANDIDATE 1
C3023_UH_DC_2 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE
                  - DISTRICT CANDIDATE 2
C3023_UH_DC_3 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE
                  - DISTRICT CANDIDATE 3
C3023_UH_DC_4 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE
                  - DISTRICT CANDIDATE 4
C3026        >>> Q21e. CURRENT ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE
                  PREFERENCE VOTE
C3027_PR     >>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, PRESIDENT
C3027_LH     >>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, LOWER HOUSE
C3027_UH     >>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, UPPER HOUSE
C3028_PR_1   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION,
                  PRESIDENT
C3028_PR_2   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND
                  MENTION, PRESIDENT
C3028_PR_3   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION,
                  PRESIDENT
C3028_PR_4   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH
                  MENTION, PRESIDENT
C3028_LH_1   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION,
                  LOWER HOUSE
C3028_LH_2   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND
                  MENTION, LOWER HOUSE
C3028_LH_3   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION,
                  LOWER HOUSE
C3028_LH_4   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH
                  MENTION, LOWER HOUSE
C3028_LH_5   >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-ADDITIONAL
                  MENTIONS, LOWER HOUSE
=====

```

```

=====
C3028_LH_6    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-ADDITIONAL
C3028_LH_7    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-ADDITIONAL
C3028_LH_8    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-ADDITIONAL
C3028_LH_9    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-ADDITIONAL
C3028_UH_1    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION,
C3028_UH_2    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND
C3028_UH_3    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION,
C3028_UH_4    >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH
C3029_PR      >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
C3029_LH      >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
C3029_UH      >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
C3030_PR_1    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST
C3030_PR_2    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND
C3030_PR_3    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD
C3030_PR_4    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH
C3030_LH_1    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST
C3030_LH_2    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND
C3030_LH_3    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD
C3030_LH_4    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH
C3030_LH_5    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIFTH
C3030_LH_6    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SIXTH
C3030_LH_7    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SEVENTH
C3030_LH_8    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-EIGHTH
C3030_LH_9    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-NINTH
C3030_UH_1    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST
C3030_UH_2    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND
C3030_UH_3    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD
C3030_UH_4    >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH
C3031         >>> Q23. PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT
C3032_PR_1    >>> Q23a. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 1
C3032_PR_2    >>> Q23a. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 2
C3032_LH_PL    >>> Q23b. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE -
C3032_LH_DC    >>> Q23c. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE -
C3032_UH_PL    >>> Q23b. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -
C3032_UH_DC    >>> Q23c. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -
C3035         >>> Q23d. PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE
C3036_1       >>> Q24a. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 1ST

```

```

C3036_2      >>> Q24b. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 2ND
C3036_3      >>> Q24c. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 3RD

```

## ))) CSES MODULE 3 DISTRICT-LEVEL VARIABLES

```

C4001      >>> NUMBER OF SEATS IN DISTRICT
C4002      >>> NUMBER OF CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT
C4003      >>> NUMBER OF PARTY LISTS IN DISTRICT
C4004_A    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY A
C4004_B    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY B
C4004_C    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY C
C4004_D    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY D
C4004_E    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY E
C4004_F    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY F
C4004_G    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY G
C4004_H    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY H
C4004_I    >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY I
C4005      >>> TURNOUT IN DISTRICT

```

## ))) CSES MODULE 3 MACRO-LEVEL VARIABLES

## I. DATA FROM THE MODULE 3 MACRO QUESTIONNAIRE

```

C5001_A    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5001_B    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5001_C    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5001_D    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5001_E    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5001_F    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5001_G    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5001_H    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5001_I    >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY I
C5002_A    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5002_B    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5002_C    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5002_D    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5002_E    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5002_F    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5002_G    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5002_H    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5002_I    >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY I
C5003_A    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5003_B    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5003_C    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5003_D    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5003_E    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5003_F    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5003_G    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5003_H    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5003_I    >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY I
C5004_A    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5004_B    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5004_C    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5004_D    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5004_E    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5004_F    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5004_G    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5004_H    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5004_I    >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY I
C5005_A    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY A
C5005_B    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY B
C5005_C    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY C
C5005_D    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY D
C5005_E    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY E
C5005_F    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY F
C5005_G    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY G
C5005_H    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY H
C5005_I    >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY I
C5006_1    >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT - VERSION 1
C5006_2    >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT - VERSION 2

```

```

=====
C5007    >>> PARTY OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE
C5008    >>> PARTY OF THE PRIME MINISTER BEFORE
C5009_A  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY A
C5009_B  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY B
C5009_C  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY C
C5009_D  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY D
C5009_E  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY E
C5009_F  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY F
C5009_G  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY G
C5009_H  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY H
C5009_I  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY I
C5010    >>> SIZE OF THE CABINET BEFORE
C5011    >>> PARTY OF THE PRESIDENT AFTER
C5012    >>> PARTY OF THE PRIME MINISTER AFTER
C5013_A  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY A
C5013_B  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY B
C5013_C  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY C
C5013_D  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY D
C5013_E  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY E
C5013_F  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY F
C5013_G  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY G
C5013_H  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY H
C5013_I  >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY I
C5014    >>> SIZE OF THE CABINET AFTER
C5015    >>> NUMBER OF PARTIES PARTICIPATING IN ELECTION
C5016_A  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY A
C5016_B  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY B
C5016_C  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY C
C5016_D  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY D
C5016_E  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY E
C5016_F  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY F
C5016_G  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY G
C5016_H  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY H
C5016_I  >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY I
C5017_A  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY A
C5017_B  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY B
C5017_C  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY C
C5017_D  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY D
C5017_E  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY E
C5017_F  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY F
C5017_G  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY G
C5017_H  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY H
C5017_I  >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY I
C5018    >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION
C5018_A  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY A
C5018_B  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY B
C5018_C  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY C
C5018_D  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY D
C5018_E  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY E
C5018_F  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY F
C5018_G  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY G
C5018_H  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY H
C5018_I  >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY I
C5019_1  >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 1ST
C5019_2  >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 2ND
C5019_3  >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 3RD
C5019_4  >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 4TH
C5019_5  >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 5TH
C5020    >>> FAIRNESS OF THE ELECTION
C5021    >>> FORMAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST NATIONAL LEVEL RESULTS
C5022    >>> ELECTION IRREGULARITIES
C5023_1  >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - MONTH
C5023_2  >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - DAY
C5023_3  >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - YEAR
C5024_1  >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - MONTH
C5024_2  >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - DAY
C5024_3  >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - YEAR
C5025    >>> ELECTION IRREGULARITIES
C5026    >>> ELECTION VIOLENCE
C5027    >>> GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF VIOLENCE

```

```

C5028 >>> POST-ELECTION VIOLENCE
C5029 >>> POST-ELECTION PROTEST
C5030 >>> ELECTORAL ALLIANCES PERMITTED IN ELECTION
C5031 >>> ELECTORAL ALLIANCES IN PRACTICE
C5032 >>> DID ANY ELECTORAL ALLIANCES FORM?
C5033 >>> REQUIREMENTS FOR JOINT PARTY LISTS
C5034 >>> THE POSSIBILITY OF APPARENTMENT
C5035 >>> TYPES OF APPARENTMENT AGREEMENTS
C5036 >>> MULTI-PARTY ENDORSEMENTS
C5037 >>> MULTI-PARTY ENDORSEMENTS ON BALLOT
C5038_1 >>> VOTES CAST - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5038_2 >>> VOTES CAST - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5038_3 >>> VOTES CAST - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5038_4 >>> VOTES CAST - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_1 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_2 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_3 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_4 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5040_1 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5040_2 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5040_3 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5040_4 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5041_1 >>> PARTY LISTS - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5041_2 >>> PARTY LISTS - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5041_3 >>> PARTY LISTS - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5041_4 >>> PARTY LISTS - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5042_1 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5042_2 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5042_3 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5042_4 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5043_1 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5043_2 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5043_3 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5043_4 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5044_1 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5044_2 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5044_3 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5044_4 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5045_1 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5045_2 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5045_3 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5045_4 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5046_1 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5046_2 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5046_3 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5046_4 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_1 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_2 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_3 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_4 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

```

## II. DATA FROM PUBLIC SOURCES

```

C5050_1 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T
C5050_2 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T-1
C5050_3 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T-2
C5051_1 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T
C5051_2 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T-1
C5051_3 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T-2
C5052 >>> AGE OF THE CURRENT REGIME
C5054 >>> REGIME: TYPE OF EXECUTIVE
C5055 >>> NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST LOWER HOUSE ELECTION
C5056 >>> NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
C5057 >>> PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS ELECTORAL FORMULA
C5058 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA IN ALL ELECTORAL TIERS
C5059 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL TIERS
C5060 >>> LINKED ELECTORAL TIERS
C5061 >>> DEPENDENT FORMULAE IN MIXED SYSTEMS
C5062 >>> SUBTYPES OF MIXED ELECTORAL SYSTEMS
C5063 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - LOWEST TIER - LOWER HOUSE

```



```

=====
C5064 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - LOWEST TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5065 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - LOWEST TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5066 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - SECOND TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5067 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - SECOND TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5068 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - SECOND TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5069 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - THIRD TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5070 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - THIRD TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5071 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - THIRD TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5072 >>> NUMBER OF SEATS ABOVE THE FIRST TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5073 >>> PERCENTAGE OF SEATS ABOVE THE FIRST TIER - LOWER HOUSE
C5074 >>> FUSED VOTE
C5075 >>> SIZE OF THE LOWER HOUSE
C5080_1 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5080_2 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5080_3 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
C5081_1 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5081_2 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5081_3 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
C5082_1 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5082_2 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5082_3 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
C5083_1 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T
C5083_2 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T-1
C5083_3 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T-2
C5084_1 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5084_2 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5084_3 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
C5085_1 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5085_2 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5085_3 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
C5090 >>> CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERAL STRUCTURE
C5091 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTED LEGISLATIVE CHAMBERS
C5092 >>> ELECTORAL RESULTS DATA AVAILABLE
C5093 >>> EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES
C5094 >>> CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES
C5095 >>> EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES
C5096 >>> CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES
=====

```

```

=====
))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: IDENTIFICATION, WEIGHT, AND STUDY
ADMINISTRATION VARIABLES
=====

```

```

-----
C1001 >>> DATASET
-----

```

Dataset.

.....

CSES-MODULE-3. CSES MODULE 3

NOTES: C1001

This variable reports the CSES module used in each election study. Generally, MODULE 3 was used, or will be used, for election studies conducted between the years 2006 and 2011, inclusive.

```

-----
C1002 >>> DATASET VERSION
-----

```

Dataset version.

VER2012-MAY-31. Version of dataset,  
released on May 31, 2012.

NOTES: C1002

The version number corresponds to the date of the dataset's  
release.

-----  
C1002\_D01 >>> DIGITAL OBJECT IDENTIFIER  
-----

Digital Object Identifier.

.....  
doi : 10. 7804/cses. modul e3. 2015-12-15.

NOTES: C1002\_D01

This variable indicates the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) which  
is registered for the dataset. CSES DOI registration is conducted  
by the DA|RA registration agency for economic and social science  
data. Each CSES dataset version (see variable C1002) has a  
unique, persistent DOI.

-----  
C1003 >>> ID VARIABLE - ELECTION STUDY (NUMERIC POLITY)  
-----

Election Study Identifier: Numeric Polity Code and Election Year

.....  
03602007. AUSTRALIA (2007)  
04002008. AUSTRIA (2008)  
11202008. BELARUS (2008)  
07602006. BRAZIL (2006)  
07602010. BRAZIL (2010)  
12402008. CANADA (2008)  
15202009. CHILE (2009)  
19102007. CROATIA (2007)  
20302006. CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)  
20302010. CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)  
20802007. DENMARK (2007)  
23302011. ESTONIA (2011)  
24602007. FINLAND (2007)  
24602011. FINLAND (2011)  
25002007. FRANCE (2007)  
27602005. GERMANY (2005)  
27602009. GERMANY (2009)  
30002009. GREECE (2009)  
34402008. HONG KONG (2008)  
35202007. ICELAND (2007)  
35202009. ICELAND (2009)  
37202007. IRELAND (2007)  
37602006. ISRAEL (2006)  
39202007. JAPAN (2007)  
42802010. LATVIA (2010)  
48402006. MEXICO (2006)  
48402009. MEXICO (2009)  
52802006. NETHERLANDS (2006)  
52802010. NETHERLANDS (2010)  
55402008. NEW ZEALAND (2008)  
57802005. NORWAY (2005)  
57802009. NORWAY (2009)  
60402011. PERU (2011)

60802010. PHILIPPINES (2010)  
 61602005. POLAND (2005)  
 61602007. POLAND (2007)  
 62002009. PORTUGAL (2009)  
 64202009. ROMANIA (2009)  
 70302010. SLOVAKIA (2010)  
 70502008. SLOVENIA (2008)  
 72402008. SPAIN (2008)  
 75202006. SWEDEN (2006)  
 71002009. SOUTH AFRICA (2009)  
 41002008. SOUTH KOREA (2008)  
 75602007. SWITZERLAND (2007)  
 15802008. TAIWAN (2008)  
 76402007. THAILAND (2007)  
 79202011. TURKEY (2011)  
 84002008. UNITED STATES (2008)  
 85802009. URUGUAY (2009)

## NOTES: C1003

This eight digit variable uniquely identifies an election study within the CSES.

The variable is constructed from two components, variable C1006 (CSES polity code) and C1008 (election year).

The first three digits are the numeric version of the country codes created by the United Nations Statistics Division ("countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002).

The fourth digit distinguishes between multiple studies conducted within a single country, for the same election.

The fifth through eighth digits correspond to the election year as specified in variable C1008.

-----  
 C1004 >>> ID VARIABLE - ELECTION STUDY (ALPHABETIC POLITY)  
 -----

Election Study Identifier: Alphabetic Polity Code and Election Year.

.....  
 AUS\_2007. AUSTRALIA (2007)  
 AUT\_2008. AUSTRIA (2008)  
 BLR\_2008. BELARUS (2008)  
 BRA\_2006. BRAZIL (2006)  
 BRA\_2010. BRAZIL (2010)  
 CAN\_2008. CANADA (2008)  
 CHE\_2007. SWITZERLAND (2007)  
 CHL\_2009. CHILE (2009)  
 CZE\_2006. CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)  
 CZE\_2010. CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)  
 DEU\_2005. GERMANY (2005)  
 DEU\_2009. GERMANY (2009)  
 DNK\_2007. DENMARK (2007)  
 ESP\_2008. SPAIN (2008)  
 EST\_2011. ESTONIA (2011)  
 FIN\_2007. FINLAND (2007)  
 FIN\_2011. FINLAND (2011)  
 FRA\_2007. FRANCE (2007)  
 GRC\_2009. GREECE (2009)  
 HKG\_2008. HONG KONG (2008)  
 HRV\_2007. CROATIA (2007)  
 ISL\_2007. ICELAND (2007)  
 ISL\_2009. ICELAND (2009)

```

IRL_2007. IRELAND (2007)
ISR_2006. ISRAEL (2006)
JPN_2007. JAPAN (2007)
KOR_2008. SOUTH KOREA (2008)
LVA_2010. LATVIA (2010)
MEX_2006. MEXICO (2006)
MEX_2009. MEXICO (2009)
NLD_2006. NETHERLANDS (2006)
NLD_2010. NETHERLANDS (2010)
NZL_2008. NEW ZEALAND (2008)
NOR_2005. NORWAY (2005)
NOR_2009. NORWAY (2009)
PER_2011. PERU (2011)
PHL_2010. PHILIPPINES (2010)
POL_2005. POLAND (2005)
POL_2007. POLAND (2007)
PRT_2009. PORTUGAL (2009)
ROU_2009. ROMANIA (2009)
SVK_2010. SLOVAKIA (2010)
SVN_2008. SLOVENIA (2008)
SWE_2006. SWEDEN (2006)
THA_2007. THAILAND (2007)
TUR_2011. TURKEY (2011)
TWN_2008. TAIWAN (2008)
URY_2009. URUGUAY (2009)
USA_2008. UNITED STATES (2008)
ZAF_2009. SOUTH AFRICA (2009)

```

## NOTES: C1004

This eight-character variable uniquely identifies an election study within the CSES.

The variable is constructed from two components, variable C1006 (CSES polity code) and C1008 (election year).

The first three characters are the alphabetic country codes 'alpha-3' created by the International Organization for Standardization in their ISO 3166 Standard and shared by the United Nations Statistics Division ("Countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002).

If appropriate, the fourth character distinguishes between multiple studies conducted within a single country, for the same election. This distinction was never needed in CSES Module 3, as there was no instance of two election studies being conducted after a single election in any country. So this character appears as an underscore (\_) for all elections in CSES Module 3.

The fifth through eighth characters correspond to the election year as specified in variable C1008.

-----  
C1005 >>> ID VARIABLE - RESPONDENT  
-----

Respondent Identifier.  
.....

This variable is eighteen characters in length.  
It is unique across the data file.

## NOTES: C1005

This eighteen-character variable uniquely identifies a respondent within the CSES data file.

The variable is constructed from three components, variable C1006 (CSES polity code), C1008 (election year), and C1009 (respondent within election study).

The first three characters are the numeric version of the country codes created by the United Nations Statistics Division ("countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002).

If appropriate, the fourth character distinguishes between multiple studies conducted within a single country, for the same election. All other election studies in CSES MODULE 3 are coded 0 here.

The fifth through eighth characters correspond to the election year as specified in variable C1008.

The last ten characters are the respondent identifier from C1009, which is unique within each election study.

-----  
C1006 >>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY CSES CODE  
-----

Polity Identifier CSES Code.

.....

0360.	AUSTRALIA
0400.	AUSTRIA
1120.	BELARUS
0760.	BRAZIL
1240.	CANADA
1520.	CHILE
1910.	CROATIA
2030.	CZECH REPUBLIC
2080.	DENMARK
2330.	ESTONIA
2460.	FINLAND
2500.	FRANCE
2760.	GERMANY
3000.	GREECE
3440.	HONG KONG
3520.	ICELAND
3720.	IRELAND
3760.	ISRAEL
3920.	JAPAN
4280.	Latvia
4840.	MEXICO
5280.	NETHERLANDS
5540.	NEW ZEALAND
5780.	NORWAY
6040.	PERU
6080.	PHILIPPINES
6160.	POLAND
6200.	PORTUGAL
6420.	ROMANIA
7030.	SLOVAKIA
7050.	SLOVENIA
7100.	SOUTH AFRICA
4100.	SOUTH KOREA
7240.	SPAIN
7520.	SWEDEN
7560.	SWITZERLAND
1580.	TAIWAN
7640.	THAILAND
7920.	TURKEY
8400.	UNITED STATES
8580.	URUGUAY

## NOTES: C1006

This four-character variable uniquely identifies a polity conducting an election study that is present in CSES MODULE 3.

The first three characters are the numeric version of the country codes created by the United Nations Statistics Division ("countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002).

The fourth character distinguishes between multiple studies conducted within a single country, for the same election.

-----  
C1006\_UN >>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY UN CODE  
-----Polity Identifier UN Country Code.  
.....

036. AUSTRALIA  
040. AUSTRIA  
112. BELARUS  
076. BRAZIL  
124. CANADA  
152. CHILE  
191. CROATIA  
203. CZECH REPUBLIC  
208. DENMARK  
233. ESTONIA  
246. FINLAND  
250. FRANCE  
276. GERMANY  
300. GREECE  
344. HONG KONG  
352. ICELAND  
372. IRELAND  
376. ISRAEL  
392. JAPAN  
428. Latvia  
484. MEXICO  
528. NETHERLANDS  
554. NEW ZEALAND  
578. NORWAY  
604. PERU  
608. PHILIPPINES  
616. POLAND  
620. PORTUGAL  
642. ROMANIA  
703. SLOVAKIA  
705. SLOVENIA  
710. SOUTH AFRICA  
410. SOUTH KOREA  
724. SPAIN  
752. SWEDEN  
756. SWITZERLAND  
158. TAIWAN  
764. THAILAND  
792. TURKEY  
840. UNITED STATES  
858. URUGUAY

## NOTES: C1006\_UN

This three-character variable uniquely identifies a polity conducting an election study that is present in CSES MODULE 3.

It consists of the numeric version of the country codes created by the United Nations Statistics Division ("Countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002).

-----  
C1006\_NAM>>> ID COMPONENT - POLITY NAME  
-----

Polity Identifier Country Name.

.....  
Australia  
Austria  
Belarus  
Brazil  
Canada  
Chile  
Croatia  
Czech Republic  
Denmark  
Estonia  
Finland  
France  
Germany  
Greece  
Hong Kong  
Iceland  
Ireland  
Israel  
Japan  
Latvia  
Mexico  
Netherlands  
New Zealand  
Norway  
Peru  
Philippines  
Poland  
Portugal  
Republic of Korea  
Romania  
Slovakia  
Slovenia  
South Africa  
Spain  
Sweden  
Switzerland  
Taiwan  
Thailand  
Turkey  
United States of America  
Uruguay

NOTES: C1006\_NAM

This variable uniquely identifies a polity conducting an election study that is present in CSES MODULE 3.

It consists of country names based on those used by the United Nations Statistics Division ("Countries or areas, codes and abbreviations", revised 13 February 2002). However, in some instances, country names deviate from those used by the United Nations.

-----  
C1007 >>> ID COMPONENT - SAMPLE COMPONENT  
-----

In some cases, analysts may wish to consider regions of countries or other sample components units of analysis, rather than the countries themselves. This variable identifies these sample components. Where these sample components do not exist this variable is coded 001.

001. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 002. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 003. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 004. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 005. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 006. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

999. MISSING

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C1007

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Pre-election survey, only
02.	Pre-and-post-election survey, only
03.	Pre-and-post-election-mail-back survey only
04.	Pre-and-post-election-panel survey, only
05.	Pre-and-post-election-mail-back-panel survey

Values 4 and 5 mean that respondents also participated already in earlier election studies.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C1007

C1007 reflects the language of interviewing (see also notes on C1009).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Finnish
02.	Swedish

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C1007

Germany used two different samples, dividing the German population along the former division of the country after the Second World War. The population of the two components equal the population of residence in C2027, where values 12 to 15 refer to East Germany.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	East Germany, including East Berlin
002.	West Germany, including West Berlin

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C1007

The German data over-sample the eastern part of Germany, the federal states of the former German Democratic Republic. However, the original German data do not allow to separate both parts of Berlin, which has been over-sampled for the eastern part, as well.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Eastern part (former German Democratic Republic)
002.	Western part of Germany (including Berlin)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C1007

New Zealanders of Maori descent can choose to be registered on a separate Maori roll, and cast their electorate votes within seven constituencies that overlie the general electorates. For its new sample the 2008 New Zealand Election Study sampled within four subsets of registered voters and over-sampled



subsets 1, 3, and 4 below, groups of particular interest to the researchers. For the CSES release, respondents from the three over-sampled subsets were re-sampled to bring their numbers into the appropriate proportions among registered voters, removing any need for sampling weights.

In this variable you find information of persons registration:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Those on Maori roll 27 and over
02.	Those on General roll 27 and over
03.	Those on Maori roll 18-26
04.	Those on General Roll 18-26

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C1007

In Sweden, some respondents did not receive the same questionnaire in terms of length. The following codes allow users to identify respondents by questionnaire type. 408 respondents did not get the CSES module.

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	FULL QUESTIONNAIRE
02.	SHORTENED QUESTIONNAIRE
03.	VERY SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE (NO CSES)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C1007

The CSES survey was applied in several stages and with different methodologies. For details see study description in codebook. Variable C1007 accounts to the type of sample from where each respondents was selected, as well as type of questionnaire employed in the follow-up stage (if applicable).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Respondents from national sample and no follow-up participation
02.	Respondents from cantonal over-sample and no follow-up participation
03.	Respondents from national sample and completed mail-back questionnaire follow-up.
04.	Respondents from cantonal over-sample sample and completed questionnaire mail-back follow-up.
05.	Respondents from national sample and completed online questionnaire follow-up.
06.	Respondents from cantonal over-sample sample and completed online questionnaire follow-up.

#### C1008 >>> ID COMPONENT - ELECTION YEAR

Election year.

2005-2011. ELECTION YEAR

NOTES: C1008

The official period covered in Module 3 is from 2006 to 2011. The questionnaire was finalized for data collection beginning in 2006, however we include three pilot studies from 2005, namely Germany (2005), Norway (2005) and Poland (2005).

#### C1009 >>> ID COMPONENT - RESPONDENT WITHIN ELECTION STUDY

## Respondent identifier.

.....

This variable is ten characters in length. It is unique for each survey respondent within an election.

## NOTES: C1009

While this variable uniquely identifies a respondent within an election study, it is not unique across the entire dataset.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C1009

The first digit of respondents' unique id variable reflects the language of the interviewing, as explained in the election study note on C1007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C1009

The unique respondent identifier provided with the Taiwan (2008) study was too long to be included in this variable. It was not possible to find an algorithm to convert it to a variable that fit within the same length as the CSES variable. Therefore, a respondent identifier for Taiwan (2008) was created that is unique to CSES, but unfortunately does not allow analysts to merge the CSES dataset back to the original Taiwan (2008) election study.

-----

C1010\_1 >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: SAMPLE  
 C1010\_2 >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC  
 C1010\_3 >>> ORIGINAL WEIGHT: POLITICAL

-----

## NOTES: C1010

These variables report the original weights provided with the respective deposited data files.

Sample weights include those intended to correct for unequal selection probabilities resulting from "booster" samples, procedures for selection within the household, non-response, as well as other features of the sample design.

Demographic weights adjust sample distributions of socio-demographic characteristics to more closely resemble the characteristics of the population.

Political weights reconcile discrepancies in the reported electoral behavior of the survey respondents from the official vote counts.

In cases where a collaborator provides a single weight that is a combination of one or more of the three weight categories (sample, demographic, and political), the weight is duplicated in the two or more appropriate variables. Thus, analysts using two or more of the weights simultaneously will need to account for this duplication.

Use of weights is at the discretion of the analyst based upon the considerations of her/his individual research question. We recommend that analysts familiarize themselves with the weights, their components, and their methods of creation before applying them.

Additionally, analysts will want to keep in mind that these weights are prepared to be election study weights, not country weights. To convert the weights to country weights requires an

adjustment for those countries for which one or more polities or election studies appear in the dataset.

Where a weight of a particular type is not available, these variables are coded 1.

Collaborators provided the original weights with a varying number of decimal places. In this CSES dataset, however, all of the original weights have been rounded to four decimal places at maximum (i.e. 1.1234) using STATA.

Table: Summary of Election Study Weights, by Type of Weight.

	Sample Weight	Demog Weight	Political Weight	No Weight Provided
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)				
AUSTRALIA (2007)				AUS_2007
AUSTRIA (2008)		AUT_2008		
BELARUS (2008)				BLR_2008
BRAZIL (2006)		BRA_2006		
BRAZIL (2010)				BRA_2010
CANADA (2008)	CAN_2008			
CHILE (2009)		CHL_2009		
CROATIA (2007)		HRV_2007	HRV_2007	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)				CZE_2006
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)				CZE_2010
DENMARK (2007)	DNK_2007			
ESTONIA (2011)		EST_2011		
FINLAND (2007)				FIN_2007
FINLAND (2011)			FIN_2011	
FRANCE (2007)	FRA_2007	FRA_2007	FRA_2007	
GERMANY (2005)	DEU_2005	DEU_2005		
GERMANY (2009)	DEU_2009	DEU_2009		
GREECE (2009)			GRC_2009	
HONG KONG (2008)		HKG_2008		
ICELAND (2007)		ISL_2007		
ICELAND (2009)		ISL_2009		
IRELAND (2007)		IRL_2007		
ISRAEL (2006)				ISR_2006
JAPAN (2007)	JPN_2007			
LATVIA (2010)		LVA_2010		
MEXICO (2006)	MEX_2006	MEX_2006		
MEXICO (2009)	MEX_2009	MEX_2009		
NETHERLANDS (2006)		NLD_2006	NLD_2006	
NETHERLANDS (2010)		NLD_2010	NLD_2010	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		NZL_2008	NZL_2008	
NORWAY (2005)				NOR_2005
NORWAY (2009)				NOR_2009
PERU (2011)	PER_2011	PER_2011	PER_2011	
PHILIPPINES (2010)	PHL_2010			
POLAND (2005)		POL_2005		
POLAND (2007)		POL_2007		
PORTUGAL (2009)		PRT_2009		
ROMANIA (2009)		ROU_2009		
SLOVAKIA (2010)		SVK_2010		
SLOVENIA (2008)				SVN_2008
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	ZAF_2009			
SOUTH KOREA (2008)				KOR_2008
SPAIN (2008)		ESP_2008		
SWEDEN (2006)				SWE_2006
SWITZERLAND (2007)	CHE_2007		CHE_2007	
TAIWAN (2008)		TWN_2008		
THAILAND (2007)				THA_2007
TURKEY (2011)		TUR_2011		
UNITED STATES (2008)	USA_2008			
URUGUAY (2009)			URY_2009	

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C1010\_2

Because of non-response the sample is not an exact representation in terms of equal distribution of known demographic characteristics of the Austrian population. A demographic sample weight is included that adjusts sample characteristics to known population estimates, which were taken from census data carried out by Statistics Austria.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C1010\_2

The election study has been weighed to correct for demographic characteristics of the population as reported in the official demographic census PNAD2003. Weights were calculated on basis of 1000 respondents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C1010\_1

In order to produce national estimates it is advisable to correct for both the unequal probabilities of selection at the household stage and the unequal probabilities of selection based on province of residence. The National Weight is the product of the household weight and the provincial weight and should be used when national estimates are required.

The aforementioned National Weight was provided by the Canada collaborators only for respondents who were participating for the first time in the 2008 study (C1007=1-3). The 1238 panel respondents carried forward from past studies (C1007=4-5) were assigned a weight of zero (0) for the variable by the Canadian collaborators. Thus, any time that the weight is used, the panel respondents will be dropped out of the analysis. To get around this, the CSES Secretariat assigned to the 1238 panel respondents a weight which is the mean of the weights used for the remainder of the (non-panel) respondents in the Canada (2008) study.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C1010\_2

The sample was designed with the proportions of the population in terms of sex and age as registered on the electoral district and occupation. The weight corrects sex and age for the national distributions of the registered voters.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C1010\_2

A weight has to be used to control for the demographic marginal (region, settlement, size, sex, age, etc.). The weight has been calculated on the base of the Croatian Census data of 2001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C1010\_3

A weight is necessary to control for the political marginal (region, settlement, size, sex, age, education) according to the election results. The weight has been calculated on the base of the Croatian Census data of 2001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C1010\_1

Researchers should note that the original Danish data contains of two subsamples, as explained in the codebook introduction. The employed sample weight (C1010\_1) depends on both subsamples. Consequently, the exclusion of the web-panel part of the Danish data might slightly bias this weight. See also description of the Danish sampling process in the introduction part of the current CSES codebook.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C1010\_2

A weight combining gender, ethnicity, region and rural-urban nature of settlement was calculated based on data from the Population Register. No subpopulation was purposefully oversampled.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C1010\_3

The Finnish data include a political weight, controlling for the electoral outcome of the parliament election in 2011 (C3023\_LH\_PL). Its effect on other variables in the CSES is only marginal.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C1010\_1

This weight controls for unequal probabilities of selection, especially due to random draw in households of unequal size, defined as the product of the probability of selection of the *i*-th observation in its PSU and the corresponding probability of selecting this observation in its household.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C1010\_2

The demographic weight is designed to match the population distribution on gender, age, education, occupation and household size.

All these variables have been considered in their French definition, which do not match international classifications. Existence of bias after weighting depends on these various definitions of categories.

The CSES Secretariat is aware that some of the minimum values of the weight are very low (0.0001) compared to the maximum values of the weight (23.0556) but this was determined to be intentional by the collaborator.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C1010\_3

The political weight controls for political skewness, computed to correct for a bias on the aggregate electoral results of legislative elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C1010\_1

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C1010\_1

Due to the German history, the eastern part of the country is over-sampled. To study Germany as a whole, C1010\_1 is needed to correct for this kind of the sample selection.

In addition, C1010\_1 also controls for skewness in relevant socio-demographic characteristics within each of the German federal state, as it is done by C1010\_2.

In contrast, researchers interested in comparing both parts of Germany separately, should not make use of C1010\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C1010\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C1010\_2

According to drop-outs, non-responds and incomplete interviews, C1010\_2 controls for potential skewness in relevant socio-demographic characteristics. The weight corrects for age-groups and sex within each region. To study Germany as whole, C1010\_1 has to be used exclusively to control for the over-sampling of East Germany as well as for potential skewness of socio-demographic characteristic. Consequently, a combination of both weights is not necessary.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C1010\_3

The weight is based on vote in current elections: Each voter of party  $i$  is weighted by  $W_i = VSi / PR_i$ , where  $VSi$  is the vote share of party  $i$  and  $PR_i$  is the proportion of respondents in the data file who have responded that they have voted for party  $i$ .

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C1010\_2

A sample weight is included to correct for skewness in the distribution by age, sex, and the region of residence, according to the sampling process. As a benchmark, the "Age and Sex profile of registered electors by Legislative Council Constituencies in 2010" has been used, available at the website of the Hong Kong Registration and Electoral Office. Note that there were 63 cases with missing values in the submitted weight variable. These cases are coded zero (0) in C1010\_2.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C1010\_2

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C1010\_2

The data set includes a weight variable (C1010\_2) for age, as proportionally fewer in the younger age groups replied to the survey compared to the distribution of age in the population according to information from Statistics Iceland.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C1010\_2

A cross-sectional weight variable (C1010\_2) was included to adjust sample totals to the population using the Gross minimum distance algorithm. These population totals are from the 2006 Census and the Quarterly National Household Survey in terms of household size (number of adults age 18 and over), age, sex, education, economic status, marital status and region.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C1010\_1

As the implementation of the CSES Module 3 points out, Japan used two different samples. Consequently a weight is necessary to make the sample representative of the population being studied and to compensate bias of potential skewness in relevant demographic factors. The weight included in the original data file was constructed by strata of six layers of age (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, and over 70) and gender, based on the frequencies of Population Census of Japan 2005.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C1010\_2

To make the survey data representative to the universe, the data weighting in this survey was performed with an aim to get the sample division as close as possible to the universe. Criteria that were used for the data weighting were: age, nationality, region, type of residence and gender.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C1010\_1

Sampling units were selected with unequal probabilities. Weights are estimated and used to correct for this unequal probabilities.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C1010\_2

Poststratification weights were estimated to correct for non-response and to match known demographic characteristics of the population gender and age.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C1010\_1

C1010\_1 corrects for unequal probability of selection of sampling units.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C1010\_2

C1010\_2 is post-stratification weight that adjusts for non-response and matches the sample to known demographic characteristics of the population (gender and age).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C1010\_2

The demographic weight includes the characteristics age, gender, marital status, urbanization, region, ethnicity. It is based on all respondents participating in wave I and II (the original weight variable wgt3).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C1010\_3

The political weight includes voting turnout as an additional population characteristic. It is based on all respondents participating in wave I and II (the original weight variable wgt4).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C1010\_2

The demographic weight includes the characteristics age, gender, marital status, urbanization, region, ethnicity. It is based on all respondents participating in wave I and II (the original weight variable wgt3).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C1010\_3

The political weight includes voting turnout as an additional population characteristic. It is based on all respondents participating in wave I and II (the original weight variable wgt4).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C1010\_2

The weights are designed to match known age and sex distributions in the electoral roll from which the sample was taken.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C1010\_3

(Additional details about the political weight were not present in the Design Report for New Zealand.)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C1010\_1 and C1010\_2

The sample was weighted according to the number of population in each region and urban-rural distribution.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C1010\_3

(Additional details about the political weight were not present in the Design Report for Peru.)

Note that according to compulsory voting in Peru, non-voters are coded "0" in C1010\_3 and are thus excluded from any analysis, employing the political weight.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C1010\_1

To yield representative figures at the national level, census-based population weights are applied to the survey data. The weight projection is computed by dividing the projected population in the area by the sample size of the same area. Appropriate projected factors were applied so that original population proportions were reflected in the data tables using this formula.

=====

Since the sample is equally allocated across the four major areas (National Capital Region or NCR, the rest of Luzon outside NCR, Visayas and Mindanao, weights are used to adjust to known area population distributions.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C1010\_2  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C1010\_2

Both Polish datasets include a demographic weight to make the sample comparable to the overall Polish population. Researchers should be aware of the fact that the construction rules as well as the data used for benchmarking are actually unknown.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C1010\_2

The data include a demographic weight to make the sample comparable to the overall Portuguese population aged 18 years or older. The weight is based on the distribution of the target population in terms of gender, age, and education, according to the Portuguese National Statistics Office Census 2001. In the source file, 13 cases had system missing values in the weight variable. The reason is that in these cases, at least one variable used to calculate the weight (gender, age and education) is a missing value. In CSES dataset, these cases are imputed the average weight score from the source file (.999881).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C1010\_2

Due to differential response rates across socio-demographic categories, weights are necessary. The weight was created based on gender, age, urban/rural, and education.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C1010\_2

The weights were created using gender, age, education, size of settlement, and region.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C1010\_1

People living in Northern Cape province, and coloured and Indian race group members were oversampled and then weighted downward. Other variables (e.g. household size) were also used to adjust for any discrepancies between the original and realized sample.

The CSES Secretariat is aware that some of the minimum values of the weight are very low (0.0033) compared to the maximum values of the weight (6.9694) but this was determined to be intentional by the collaborator.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C1010\_2

Weighting by sex (2) and age groups (4) = 8 cells.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C1010\_1

The sample weight is based on the size of the electorate of each canton and adjusts for over-sampling of certain cantons in the survey sample.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C1010\_3

This is a cumulative weight that corrects for sample biases in party choice and turnout while taking cantonal over-sampling into account.

The CSES Secretariat is aware that some of the minimum values of the weight are very low (0.0417) compared to the maximum values of the weight (8.3235) but this was determined to be



| intentional by the collaborator.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C1010\_2

Weights were implemented to control for demographic characteristics of age (5 groups), education (5 groups), and area (6 regions).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C1010\_2

There are deviations from the known population characteristics in terms of gender, age group and education level. So, an appropriate weight was calculated.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C1010\_1

Weights account for the sampling design and match population benchmark for selected variables. ANES data are based on complex sample designs and must be weighted to adjust for the sample design in order to generalize to the population. Weights for such analysis must adjust for unequal probability of household selection and for respondent selection within households. Additionally, the weights take into account nonresponse adjustment and post-stratification raking when needed to match known population benchmarks.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C1010\_3

(Additional details about the political weight were not present in the Design Report for Uruguay.)

-----  
C1011\_1 >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF SAMPLE WEIGHT  
C1011\_2 >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF DEMOGRAPHIC WEIGHT  
C1011\_3 >>> FACTOR: MEAN OF POLITICAL WEIGHT  
-----

NOTES: C1011

These variables report the mean weight of each type, within each polity (election study). The resulting factors are then used to create the derivative "Polity Weights" in variables C1012\_1 through C1012\_3.

To follow is the STATA code used to create variables C1011\_1, C1011\_2, and C1011\_3:

```
local elec AUS_2007 BLR_2008 BRA_2006 CHE_2007 DEU_2005 FIN_2007
HRV_2007 ISR_2005 JPN_2007 KOR_2008 NOR_2005 SWE_2006 THA_2007
TWN_2008
```

```
forvalues i=1/3 {
    foreach x of local elec {
        su C1010_`i' if C1004=="`x'"
        replace C1011_`i' = r(mean) if C1004=="`x'"
    }
}
```

The STATA code to create the derivative variables in the CSES dataset was run on the original, unrounded version of the original weight variables (C1010\_1-C1010\_3). Thereafter the derivative variables were rounded to four decimal places at maximum (i.e. 1.1234) using STATA.

It is due to this rounding that the mean values of derivative weight variables C1011\_1-C1011\_3 for individual election studies and for the full dataset are close to, but not necessarily exactly equal to, 1.0000.

```
-----
C1012_1 >>> POLITY WEIGHT: SAMPLE
C1012_2 >>> POLITY WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC
C1012_3 >>> POLITY WEIGHT: POLITICAL
-----
```

## NOTES: C1012

See also Variable and Election Study Notes for C1010-C1011.

These variables report standardized versions (with a mean 1 within the polity) of the original weights provided with the component election studies, described in C1010. They are the ratio of each weighting factor to the mean weight (C1011) of each type, calculated within each polity.

The derivative "Polity Weight" (C1012) has been created so that for each weight (sample, demographic, political), each respondent within the election study has a mean weight of "1". If you are running a frequency, for instance, this weight will work so that the N in your frequency table comes out to approximately the same as the number of interviews in the study. This derivative weight is created by dividing the individual weight for each respondent within an election study by the mean for that weight for all respondents in that election study.

To follow is the STATA code used to create variables C1012\_1, C1012\_2, and C1012\_3:

```
gen C1012_1 = C1010_1 / C1011_1
gen C1012_2 = C1010_2 / C1011_2
gen C1012_3 = C1010_3 / C1011_3
```

The STATA code to create the derivative variables in the CSES dataset was run on the original, unrounded version of the original weight variables (C1010\_1-C1010\_3). Thereafter the derivative variables were rounded to four decimal places at maximum (i.e. 1.1234) using STATA.

It is due to this rounding that the mean values of derivative weight variables C1012\_1-C1012\_3 for individual election studies and for the full dataset are close to, but not necessarily exactly equal to, 1.0000.

```
-----
C1013 >>> FACTOR: SAMPLE SIZE ADJUSTMENT
-----
```

## NOTES: C1013

This variable reports the ratio of the average sample size to each election study sample. Note that this factor is calculated on the basis of the samples appearing in the CSES data files (i.e. does not incorporate booster samples, panel respondents who did not participate in the CSES wave of multi-wave studies, etc.). Further, this factor treats elections, and not political systems, as the unit of analysis. Analysts wishing to compare across-countries, instead of across-election studies, should adjust this weight accordingly.

The resulting factor is then used to create the derivative "Dataset Weights" in variables C1014\_1 through C1014\_3.

To follow is the STATA code used to create variable C1013:

```
gen n=1
gen tot_obs = _N /*Number of observations*/
```

```
gen estudios = 14 /*Number of election studies*/
gen mean_res = tot_obs/estudios
```

```
gen n_cases = .
foreach x of local elec {
    su n if C1004=="`x'"
    replace n_cases = r(sum) if C1004=="`x'"
}
```

```
replace C1013 = mean_res / n_cases
drop n-Ncases
```

The STATA code to create the derivative variables in the CSES dataset was run on the original, unrounded version of the original weight variables (C1010\_1-C1010\_3). Thereafter the derivative variables were rounded to four decimal places at maximum (i.e. 1.1234) using STATA.

It is due to this rounding that the mean value of derivative weight variable C1013 for the full dataset is close to, but not necessarily exactly equal to, 1.0000.

```
-----
C1014_1 >>> DATASET WEIGHT: SAMPLE
C1014_2 >>> DATASET WEIGHT: DEMOGRAPHIC
C1014_3 >>> DATASET WEIGHT: POLITICAL
-----
```

NOTES: C1014

See also Variable and Election Study Notes for C1010-C1013.

These variables are intended for micro-level analyses involving the entire CSES sample. Using the sample size adjustment (C1013), the centered weights (C1012) are corrected such that each election study component contributes equally to the analysis, regardless of the original sample size. Users are advised to read the notes of the preceding variables carefully so as to ensure that their analyses will be weighted appropriately.

The derivative "Dataset Weight" (C1014) has been created so that each election study in the dataset will contribute equally to analyses of respondents, regardless of the number of interviews in each election study.

To follow is the SPSS code used to create variables C1014\_1, C1014\_2, and C1014\_3:

```
replace C1014_1 = C1012_1 * C1013
replace C1014_2 = C1012_2 * C1013
replace C1014_3 = C1012_3 * C1013
```

The STATA code to create the derivative variables in the CSES dataset was run on the original, unrounded version of the original weight variables (C1010\_1-C1010\_3). Thereafter the derivative variables were rounded to four decimal places at maximum (i.e. 1.1234) using STATA.

It is due to this rounding that the mean values of derivative weight variables C1014\_1-C1014\_3 for the full dataset are close to, but not necessarily exactly equal to, 1.0000.

```
-----
C1015 >>> ELECTION TYPE
-----
```

Type of election.

10. PARLIAMENTARY/LEGISLATIVE  
 12. PARLIAMENTARY/LEGISLATIVE AND PRESIDENTIAL  
 13. PARLIAMENTARY/LEGISLATIVE AND PRIME MINISTER  
 20. PRESIDENTIAL  
 30. HEAD OF GOVERNMENT

NOTES: C1015

The following table gives an overview of which type of elections are included for which country.

Table: Summary of the Election Type.

	President	Lower House	Upper House
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)			
AUSTRALIA (2007)	-	X	X
AUSTRIA (2008)	-	X	-
BELARUS (2008)	-	X	-
BRAZIL (2006)	X	X	-
BRAZIL (2010)	X	X	X
CANADA (2008)	-	X	-
CROATIA (2007)	-	X	-
CHILE (2009)	X	X	-
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	-	X	-
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	-	X	-
DENMARK (2007)	-	X	-
ESTONIA (2011)	-	X	-
FINLAND (2007)	-	X	-
FINLAND (2011)	-	X	-
FRANCE (2007)	-	X	-
GERMANY (2005)	-	X	-
GERMANY (2009)	-	X	-
GREECE (2009)	-	X	-
HONG KONG (2008)	-	X	-
ICELAND (2007)	-	X	-
ICELAND (2009)	-	X	-
IRELAND (2007)	-	X	-
ISRAEL (2006)	-	X	-
JAPAN (2007)	-	-	X
LATVIA (2010)	-	X	-
MEXICO (2006)	X	X	X
MEXICO (2009)	-	X	-
NETHERLANDS (2006)	-	X	-
NETHERLANDS (2010)	-	X	-
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	-	X	-
NORWAY (2005)	-	X	-
NORWAY (2011)	-	X	-
PERU (2011)	X	X	-
PHILIPPINES (2010)	X	-	-
POLAND (2005)	-	X	X
POLAND (2007)	-	X	X
PORTUGAL (2009)	-	X	-
ROMANIA (2009)	X	-	-
SLOVAKIA (2010)	-	X	-
SLOVENIA (2008)	-	X	-
SOUTH AFRICA	-	X	-
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	-	X	-
SPAIN (2008)	-	X	-
SWEDEN (2006)	-	X	-
SWITZERLAND (2007)	-	X	X
TAIWAN (2008)	X	-	-
THAILAND (2007)	-	X	-
TURKEY (2011)	-	X	-
UNITED STATES (2008)	X	X	(X)

=====

URUGUAY (2009)	X	X	X
----------------	---	---	---

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C1015

In 2006, the presidency, seats in the National Congress (Chamber of Deputies and Senate), the governorship of the 26 states and the Federal District, and the seats in the state and Federal District legislatures were all up for election. The primary focus of this election study are the election of the President and of the lower house (Chamber of Deputies) of the Brazilian Parliament.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C1015

In 2010, the presidency, seats in the National Congress (Chamber of Deputies and two thirds of the seats in the Senate), the governorship of the 26 states and the Federal District, and the seats in the state and Federal District legislatures were all up for election. The primary focus of this election study are the election of the President and of the lower house (Chamber of Deputies) of the Brazilian Parliament.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C1015

Note that although most of the questions refer to the parliamentary election, which had taken place on 13/12/2009, some concern the presidential election which was held at the same day (first round only). The second round of the presidential election took place after the interviews were finished (on 17.1.2010), and there are no questions concerning this second round of presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C1015

The July 29, 2007 elections were held to renew half of the House of Councilors, the Upper House of the Parliament.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C1015

Note that elections for the Senate, i.e. the Upper House, were held only in some states (see notes on C3023\_UH\_DC).

-----

C1016	>>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - MONTH
C1017	>>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - DAY
C1018	>>> DATE 1ST ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - YEAR

C1019	>>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - MONTH
C1020	>>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - DAY
C1021	>>> DATE 2ND ROUND ELECTION BEGAN - YEAR

-----

Date [first round/second round] election began.

.....

MONTH

01. JANUARY
02. FEBRUARY
03. MARCH
04. APRIL
05. MAY
06. JUNE
07. JULY
08. AUGUST
09. SEPTEMBER
10. OCTOBER
11. NOVEMBER
12. DECEMBER

99. MISSING

DAY

01-31. DAY OF MONTH

99. MISSING

YEAR

2005-2011. YEAR

9999. MISSING

NOTES: C1016-C1021

Variables C1016-C1018 represent the start date of the election. If the election involved a second round, variables C1019-1021 are used to represent the start date of the second round.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C1016-C1018

This date refers to the parliamentary election and the first round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C1019-C1021

This date refers to the second round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C1016-C1018

This date refers to the parliamentary election and the first round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C1019-C1021

This date refers to the second round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C1019-C1021

Note that the interviewing phase for the Chilean election study took place in between the two rounds of the presidential election. Apart from the date for the second round, the study thus only contains data which refers to the legislative and the first round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C1016-C1021

The election took place from 02.-03.06.2006.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C1016-C1021

The election took place from 28.-29.05.2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - Latvia (2010): C1016-C1018

The interview of one respondent was started on 2nd and ended on 4th of November 2010. The ending date is reported.

-----  
C1022 >>> STUDY TIMING  
-----

Timing of study relative to election.

- .....
1. POST-ELECTION STUDY
  2. PRE-ELECTION AND POST-ELECTION STUDY
  3. BETWEEN ROUNDS

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C1022

The CSES questionnaire was administered as the post-election portion of a two-wave panel study.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C1022

The US-American Election Study is a pre-/post-panel study. Socio-demographic variables included in the CSES (C2001 to C2031) were part of the pre-election survey, which took place between September 2nd and November 3rd, 2008.

-----  
C1023 >>> MODE OF INTERVIEW  
-----

Mode of interview.  
.....

1. FACE-TO-FACE
2. TELEPHONE
3. SELF-ADMINISTERED (MAIL-BACK; SELF-COMPLETED SUPPLEMENT)
4. COMBINATION OF TELEPHONE AND SELF-ADMINISTERED
5. COMBINATION OF FACE-TO-FACE AND SELF-ADMINISTERED
9. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C1023

Note that the bigger part of the sample was selected respondents who had taken part in the previous study (in 2002). This resulted in 1013 interviews and 139 replies to a shortened mail

version. This was supplemented by a new, three-stage sample. For more details see point (2) in the study description. Also see C1024. Note that some variables have a relatively high proportion of missing data partly due to some questions missing in the mail questionnaire. Also see C1024.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C1023

An additional mail/postal survey which included some of the CSES questions was sent to respondents who had participated in the telephone interview and declared that they were willing to fill out an additional questionnaire (which was the case in 3009 of 3164 cases). Of those respondents 2291 actually responded in the paper/online survey. Percent total panel attrition: 27.59%.

-----  
C1024 >>> INTERVIEWER WITHIN ELECTION STUDY  
-----

Interviewer identification variable, within election study.  
.....

00000-999995. INTERVIEWER IDENTIFIER

999999. MISSING

## NOTES: C1024

This variable uniquely identifies an interviewer within an election study. It is not unique across the entire dataset.

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), GERMANY (2005), HONG KONG (2008), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), ISRAEL (2006), SOUTH KOREA (2008), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NORWAY (2005), NEW ZEALAND (2008), SWEDEN (2006), THAILAND (2007).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C1024

In the case of Australia, the CSES Module 3 was implemented as a self administered questionnaire. Hence, information about interviewers is not applicable.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C1024

Interviewer IDs refer to the post election survey.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C1024

Note that interviewer-IDs are only available for those respondents, who were interviewed in person (face-to-face).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C1024

The major number of the respondents were interviewed face-to-face. 139 respondents answered a shortened mail questionnaire. Also see point (2) in the study description.

-----  
C1025 >>> INTERVIEWER GENDER  
-----

Gender of interviewer.

- .....
1. MALE
  2. FEMALE
  9. MISSING

## NOTES: C1025

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), HONG KONG (2008), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), JAPAN (2007), MEXICO (2006), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SWEDEN (2006), TAIWAN (2008), THAILAND (2007).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C1025

In the case of Australia, the CSES Module 3 was implemented as a self administered questionnaire. Hence information about interviewers is not applicable.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C1025

According to the collaborator, virtually all interviewers are women, marking on or two male interviewers would identify them. Hence, the variable was dropped.



```

-----
C1026    >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - MONTH
C1027    >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - DAY
C1028    >>> DATE QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED - YEAR
-----

```

Date questionnaire administered.

MONTH

01. JANUARY  
02. FEBRUARY  
03. MARCH  
04. APRIL  
05. MAY  
06. JUNE  
07. JULY  
08. AUGUST  
09. SEPTEMBER  
10. OCTOBER  
11. NOVEMBER  
12. DECEMBER

99. MISSING

DAY

01-31. DAY OF MONTH

99. MISSING

YEAR

2005-2011. YEAR

9999. MISSING

NOTES: C1026-C1028

Election study notes on C1026-C1028 reflect the period of interviewing, according to the corresponding Design Report, available at <http://www.cses.org>.

Researchers should note that in some cases the current dates of interviewing, coded in C1026-C1028, differs from the field period mentioned in the Design Reports. For more details, see Election Study Notes, below.

Data are not available for GERMANY (2005), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), THAILAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between November, 23, 2007 and March, 14, 2008.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between May, 5 and July, 2, 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between February, 2 and February, 24, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C1026-C1028

These variables report the date data collection began. The survey was administered between December, 17 and December, 27, 2006.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between November, 4 and November, 20, 2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C1026-C1028

C1026 through C1028 refer to post election interviews (PES). The post election survey was administered between October 15, 2008 and December 23, 2008.

The 806 missing cases in C1026 through C1028 refer to respondents that participated in the pre-election study, exclusively.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between December, 26th, 2009 and January, 7th, 2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between March, 10 and April, 03, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between June, 9 and June, 21, 2006.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between May, 31 and June, 18, 2010. Due to a mistake at the stage of interviewing, for 13 cases exact information about the day of the interview (C1027) is missing.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between November, 21, 2007 and June, 12, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between March, 7 and March, 25, 2011. According to C1026-C1028, interviews were held between March, 17, and April, 18, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C1026-C1028

The part of the survey for the Finnish speaking respondents was administered between March, 20 and April, 23, 2007. The Swedish speaking respondents were interviewed between April 1 - May 20, 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C1026-C1028

The part of the survey for the Finnish speaking respondents was administered between April, 18 and May, 28, 2011. The Swedish speaking respondents were interviewed between May, 05 and May 24, 2011. In fact, the last interview was held on May, 25, 2011.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between June, 18 and July, 07, 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between September, 21 and October, 5, 2005.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between September, 28 and November, 23, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between December, 10 and December, 18, 2009.

According to C1026-C1028, interviews were held between December, 10, and 19, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C1026-C1028

The post-election survey was administered between November, 03 and November, 30, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C1026-C1028

The study was administered between June, 2 and August, 22, 2007. Due to a data collection problem, the interview date for each respondent is indicated as of this starting date. In fact, the true dates could not be retrieved anymore.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between May, 7 and August, 31, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between May, 31 and November, 2, 2007.

Note that the exact date is missing for persons who completed a paper-and-pencil interview, also see C1024.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between July, 17 and 28, 2006.

According to C1026-C1028, interviews were held between July, 11 and 28, 2006.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between July, 31 and August, 13, 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between October, 16 and November, 7, 2010. Note that for one respondent the finishing date was different from the starting one. The finishing date was used.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between July 23 and August 2, 2006.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between July, 12 and July 23, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C1026-C1028

These variables report the date of interview after the election,

i.e. of the second-wave interview.

The survey was administered between November, 23, 2006 and January, 4, 2007.

According to C1026-C1028, interviews were held between November, 23, 2006 and January, 5, 2007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C1026-C1028

These variables report the month and year of interview after the election, i.e. of the second-wave interview.

The survey was administered between June, 10 and July, 22, 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C1026-C1028

These variables report the month and year of interview after the election, i.e., of the second-wave interview.

The survey was administered between June, 10 and July, 22, 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between November, 10, 2008 and February, 27, 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between September 13 and December 20, 2005. In addition, six interviews were held between December 23, 2005 and January 02, 2006.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between September, 15, 2009 and February, 04, 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between April, 30th and May, 3rd, 2011. The concrete date of the interview is not available (see notes on C2032).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between June, 25 and June, 28, 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C1026-C1028

Included interviews were collected between September, 27 and October, 08, 2005, according to C1026-C1028.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C1026-C1028

Included interviews were collected between November, 8 and December, 1, 2007, according to C1026-C1028.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between October, 2, 2009 and February, 8, 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between December, 07, 2009 and December, 20, 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between June, 18 and July, 20, 2010.

## =====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C1026-C1028

According to C1026-C1028, interviews were held between March, 24 and June, 4, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between October, 2 and November 4, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between April, 10 and 21, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between April, 11 and 21, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between September, 18 and October, 31, 2006.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between October, 22 and December, 31, 2007.  
These dates make reference to the telephone survey. Application dates of the self-completion questionnaires are not available. However, the last one registered was on December, 07 of 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C1026-C1028

Note that these variables report the date of first contact to respondents, between June and August 2008. The survey was administered between June and September 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between January, 9 and 31, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between July, 21 and August, 26, 2011.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C1026-C1028

According to the data, the post election survey was administered between November 5th and December 30th, 2008.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C1026-C1028

The survey was administered between August, 13 and 31, 2010.

=====  
))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: DEMOGRAPHIC, VOTE CHOICE, AND  
ELECTION VARIABLES  
=====

-----  
C2001 >>> AGE  
-----

D1. Age of respondent (in years).

.....  
010-150. AGE, IN YEARS

001. AGE RANGE 1 - SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES  
 002. AGE RANGE 2 - SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES  
 003. AGE RANGE 3 - SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES  
 004. AGE RANGE 4 - SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES  
 005. AGE RANGE 5 - SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES

997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

999. MISSING

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2001

Note that the sample was restricted to respondents aged 18 to 89, which consequently defines the range of C2001. For more details on the Greek sampling process, see the introductory part of the current codebook.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2001

Age is reported as a continuous variable, ranging from 18 to 80 years old. It was calculated from the respondent's year of birth according to information from the sample. Corresponding to information from the Icelandic Election Study, there are 13 persons in the sample who were born in 1989 and reported to be

not yet eligible to vote. It can be assumed that those respondents had either only just turned 18 or were not 18 years old yet. (Compare to Election Study Notes of C3021\_1).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2001

Age is reported as a continuous variable, ranging from 18 to 80 years old. It was calculated from the respondent's year of birth according to information from the sample. Corresponding to information from the Icelandic Election Study, there are 2 persons in the sample who were born in 1991 and reported to be

not (yet) eligible to vote. It can be assumed that those respondents had either only just turned 18 or were not 18 years old yet. (Compare to Election Study Notes of C3021\_1).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2001

13 cases had respondents with ages 18.5, 19.5, 20.5, 21.5 and 22.5. These 13 cases were rounded up to values without decimals.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2001

Note that respondents aged 76 years or older are captured in a single category.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
76.	Older than 75 years

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2001

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	AGE RANGE 1 - 20-29
02.	AGE RANGE 2 - 30-39
03.	AGE RANGE 3 - 40-49
04.	AGE RANGE 4 - 50-59
05.	AGE RANGE 5 - 60 and over

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2001

Detailed information on C2001 for respondents aged 90 years or older are not available.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	90 years or older

---

C2002 >>> GENDER OF RESPONDENT

---

D2. Gender of Respondent.

- .....
- 1. MALE
  - 2. FEMALE
  - 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 9. MISSING

---

C2003 >>> EDUCATION

---

D3. Education of respondent.

- .....
- 01. NONE
  - 02. INCOMPLETE PRIMARY
  - 03. PRIMARY COMPLETED
  - 04. INCOMPLETE SECONDARY
  - 05. SECONDARY COMPLETED
  - 06. POST-SECONDARY TRADE/VOCATIONAL SCHOOL
  - 07. UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE INCOMPLETE
  - 08. UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE COMPLETED
  - 09. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  - 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW
  - 99. MISSING

NOTES: C2003

The categories listed were constructed to indicate the following:

Incomplete primary: R left school before completing the level of education required (at the time R left school) for entry into secondary school.

Primary completed: R completed the level of education required (at the time respondent left school) for entry into secondary school, but has never attended secondary school.

Incomplete secondary: R attended secondary school, but has never achieved the minimum level of qualifications normally required (at the time R left school) for entry into university or other degree level higher education. Respondents currently studying for such qualifications should also be included in this category.

Secondary completed: R has at least the minimum qualifications normally required (at the time R left school) for entry into university or other degree level higher education but has never entered a university or other degree level course of higher

education.

Post-secondary trade/vocational school: R has attended a non-degree granting institution teaching a skilled trade, or providing sub-degree professional or technical.

University incomplete: R has attended university or entered other degree level of course of higher education but either left before successful completion of an undergraduate level degree, or has yet to complete a degree upon which currently embarked.

University degree completed: R has undergraduate level or higher degree.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2003

Four variables have been used to derive C2003: Age left school (G1); Number of years of tertiary education (G2); Highest qualification since leaving school (H3); and Occupation last week (H4).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01. *	None R answered "no formal schooling" to H1, and no further information available from H2 and H3 [NO FREQUENCIES]
02. *	Incomplete Primary: R completed school at age 10, and no further information available from H2 and H3 [NO FREQUENCIES]
03.	Primary Completed: R answered "went to primary school only" to H1, or R completed school between ages of 11-13, or if R answered "still at school" to H1 and reported 0 years of tertiary education or "no qualification since leaving school" to H3
04.	Incomplete Secondary: R completed school between ages of 14-16, and no further information about higher qualification or degree; or if missing answer to H1 but had completed one or more years of "tertiary" education
05.	Secondary Completed: R completed school at age 17 or above, and no further information about higher qualification or degree
06.	Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational School: R completed school at age 17 or above, had "Trade" or "Non-trade" qualifications, and had completed one or more years of "tertiary" education, or R had an "Associate Diploma" qualification, or R had an "Undergraduate Diploma" qualification
07.	University Incomplete R completed school at age 17 or above, was "full-time school or university student", had not previously completed a university or higher degree, and HAD completed one or more years of "tertiary" education, or R completed school at age 17 or above, had not completed a qualification, and had completed one or more years of "tertiary" education
08.	University Degree Completed R had a "Bachelor Degree" qualification, or R had a "Postgraduate Degree or Diploma"



## qual i f i c a t i o n

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2003

Note that the Austrian Election Study did not provide the answer categories "none", "incomplete primary" and "primary completed" but only a category "compulsory education incomplete" and "compulsory education completed". The Austrian education system matched the CSES categories only with great difficulty.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	[NOT IN USE IN AUSTRIAN DATA]
02.	[NOT IN USE IN AUSTRIAN DATA]
03.	[NOT IN USE IN AUSTRIAN DATA]
04.	1 Incomplete compulsory education
05.	2 Compulsory education;
	3 Post-secondary trade/vocational school;
	4 Secondary completed (academic secondary);
	5 Secondary completed (technical and vocational school)
06.	6 Post-secondary college
07.	[NOT IN USE IN AUSTRIAN DATA]
08.	7 University degree completed
09.	8 Other

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
03.	Primary complete
04.	Secondary incomplete
05.	Secondary complete
06.	Post-secondary trade/ vocational school
07.	University undergraduate degree incomplete
08.	University undergraduate degree complete

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01. *	[NOT IN USE IN BRAZIL DATA]
02.	Illiterate/Primary incomplete
03.	Primary completed
04.	Incomplete secondary (Gi nã; si o/Col égi o)
05.	Secondary completed (Col égi o)
06. *	[NOT IN USE IN BRAZIL DATA]
07.	University undergraduate degree incomplete
08.	University undergraduate degree completed or more

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2003

The submitted variable classifies respondents into 10 categories. The following shows the adjustment of the original codes to the CSES standard.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Illiterate/Never gone to school
02.	Basic 1 incomplete (up to 3rd grade)
	Basic 1 completed (4rd grade)
	Basic 2 incomplete (up to 7th grade)
03.	Basic 2 completed (8th grade)
04.	Secondary (high school incomplete (up to 2nd grade)
05.	Secondary-high school completed (3rd grade)
06.	[NOT IN USE IN BRAZIL DATA]
07.	Undergraduate incomplete or Technical incomplete
08.	Undergraduate completed
	Post-graduate or more

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No schooling
02.	Some elementary school
03.	Completed elementary school
04.	Some secondary / high school
05.	Completed secondary / high school
06.	Some technical, community college, CEGEP, College Classique
	Completed technical, community college, CEGEP, College Classique
07.	Some university Bachelor's degree
08.	Master's degree Professional degree or doctorate

Note that CEGEP (code 6) relates to vocational training (3 year programs) as well as to pre-university programs (2 year). The 2nd year of a pre-university program is equivalent to the first year of university.

College Classique (code 6) is only relevant for older respondents in Quebec, which is (more or less) equivalent to the CEGEP pre-university program.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	97. None, did not go to school (original: Ni ninguno, no estudio)
02.	02-08 1-7° Básico
03.	09 - Básico, segundo humanidades
04.	10-12 Enseñanza media, tercero-quinto humanidades
05.	13 Enseñanza media, sexto humanidades
06.	16 Técnico-profesional incompleto
	17 Técnico-profesional completo
07.	14 University incomplete
08.	15 University complete
09.	01 Analphabet

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C2003

In the case of the educational variable, Croatia used the original categories of CSES in their questionnaire.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2003

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2003

The Czech election study asked for more details. The answer categories were collapsed to match CSES in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	[NOT IN USE IN CZECH DATA]
02.	incomplete primary
03.	primary completed
04.	secondary vocational without leaving exam
	secondary without leaving exam
05.	secondary with leaving exam
	secondary general with leaving exam
06.	post-secondary trade/vocational school;
08.	Bc / MA. / PhD.
09.	"Other" refers to situations in which the education category was non standard. It may be for example some kind of artistic education, conservatories etc.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C2003

C2003 depends on the combination of two questions: a) "What is your school education?" ("Hvad er din skoleuddannelse?") and b) "What kind of education do you have beyond school?" ("Hvilken

uddannelse har du ud over skoleuddannelsen?").

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Primary school/basic school
05.	Secondary school/high school
06.	Vocational training
	Higher education, short
07.	Higher education, middle
08.	Higher education, long

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No formal education
03.	Primary education
04.	Lower secondary education, still at school
	Vocational school or course, still at school
05.	Upper secondary (general)
	/Short vocational training
06.	College level vocational education
07.	Some university studies (university or polytechnic)
08.	University of applied sciences (polytechnic)
	University degree

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2003

Certificates attained are noted in parentheses.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
02.	Without a diploma
03.	Primary certificate (Certificat d'etudes primaires)
04.	Vocational certificates (Certificat d'aptitude professionnel, Ancien Brevet BEPC)
05.	Complete upper secondary (Baccalauréat général, Baccalauréat technologique)
	d'enseignement professionnel)
07.	Complete Secondary plus two years post-secondary training
08.	Complete university degree
	"Grandes Ecoles/Ecoles d'Ingenieurs"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2003

Due to the compulsory school attendance, covering pupils aged

6 to 15, a category for 1 "no education" was not used in the

German questionnaire. Researchers interested in the German

compulsory school attendance should take note that Germany

is a federal state and that the regulations for education

are in the hand of the federal state governments.

Hence, the length of compulsory education may vary across

federal states.

Furthermore, code 4 "incomplete secondary" was not in use in

Germany. People who have not achieved the minimum level of

qualification normally required to enter university are instead

coded as 3 "primary completed".

Finally it has to be noted, that Germany distinguishes between

two different types of university, a general university as well

as an university of applied sciences and an university of

engineering.

The classification of these types of educational institutes to

the CSES codes are:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
02.	Incomplete primary
03.	Primary completed, includes primary schools,
	junior high schools and the so-called polytechnic
	schools of the former federal republic of Germany
05.	Secondary completed covers all persons who

- achieved the minimum level of education to enter any kind of university
06. Post-secondary trade / vocational school, includes all persons completed an university degree of applied sciences or an university of engineering.
07. University undergraduate degree incomplete, covers people going to a general university but have not finished it (yet).
08. University undergraduate degree completed including persons having achieved a minimum level of university education, e.g. bachelor, master or the German diploma.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2003

To classify respondent's level of education Germany used a modified scheme of the ISCED-1997. First, the CSES level 4 INCOMPLETE SECONDARY was replaced by the ISCED-code 2 for LOWER SECONDARY. In detail, this category includes people with a full implementation of basic skills, entering after some 6 years of primary education, or those who left school after the compulsory education, ending after 9 years since the beginning of primary education.

Second, the CSES category 5 SECONDARY COMPLETED was replaced by the ISCED category 3 HIGHER SECONDARY, covering respondents, who have at least the minimum qualifications normally required to enter into university, or any other degree level of higher education, but who have never entered a university or other degree level course of higher education.

Finally, according to the compulsory schooling in Germany, the use of CSES categories 2 INCOMPLETE PRIMARY and 3 COMPLETE PRIMARY is not applicable.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None
04.	Lower secondary isced code 2
05.	Higher secondary isced code 3
06.	Post-secondary trade / vocational school
08.	University undergraduate degree completed

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2003

Respondents' educational status was asked exactly in according to the categories included in the CSES codebook

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None (no formal education)
02.	Incomplete primary (primary incomplete)
03.	Primary completed (primary completed)
04.	Incomplete secondary (secondary incomplete)
05.	Secondary completed (secondary completed)
06.	Post-secondary trade/vocational school (matriculation incomplete, matriculated, vocational education / sub-degree incomplete, vocational education / sub-degree completed, pro-secondary diploma incomplete, pro-secondary diploma completed)
07.	University undergraduate degree incomplete (university degree or above incomplete)
08.	University undergraduate degree completed (university degree or above completed)
09.	Others (not specified)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2003

Note that in the Icelandic election Study respondents were asked

three questions regarding education:

- a) if he/she was attending school,
- b) at what degree/education respondent had finished and
- c) if respondent had started a school or studying for a degree but not finished (dropped out).

The response categories for each question were a list of 54 different degrees or level of education and possibility to write in an explanation about respondent's education. These variables were then used to calculate the education level as used by CSES. Due to a coding problem there may be single cases of persons on a vocational training who already hold a university degree, which is not reported.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2003

Note that the Irish election study data does not contain a category "primary incomplete".

##### CSES Code Election Study Category/Categories:

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 01. | 1 none   |
| 02. | [NOT IN USE IN IRISH DATA]                         |
| 03. | 2 completed primary                                |
| 04. | 3 junior/inter group or equiv.                     |
| 05. | 4 leaving cert or equiv                            |
| 06. | 5 diploma or certificate                           |
| 07. | [NOT IN USE IN IRISH DATA]                         |
| 08. | 6 university degree or equivalent degree completed |

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2003

##### CSES Code Election Study Code/Category

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 01. | None                                       |
| 02. | Incomplete primary                         |
| 03. | Primary completed                          |
| 04. | Incomplete secondary                       |
| 05. | Secondary completed                        |
| 06. | Post-secondary trade / vocational school   |
| 07. | University undergraduate degree incomplete |
| 08. | B. A.                                      |
|     | M. A.                                      |

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2003

The original wording for the education question in Japan was: "What is your highest level of education? (If you had quit school or are currently in school, please choose that school as your latest background)." In a second question respondents were separately asked if they completed the type of school mentioned before. The combination of both answers approximates the following CSES categories:

##### CSES Code Election Study Code/Category

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 02. | new junior high school, former elementary school, former higher, elementary school - not completed  |
| 03. | new junior high school, former elementary school, former higher, elementary school - completed  |
| 04. | new high school, former junior high school - not completed  |
| 05. | new high school, former junior high school - completed, as well as higher professional school (kousen), junior college, vocational school (senshuu gakko), trade school - not completed |
| 06. | higher professional school (kousen), junior college, vocational school (senshuu gakko), trade school - completed  |
| 07. | university - not completed  |
| 08. | university - completed  |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2003

Note that category 0 - no education was not given in the Latvian election study.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2003

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None
02.	Incomplete Primary (Elementary school)
	Complete Primary (Elementary school)
	Incomplete Secondary (Middle School)
	or technical education
03.	Complete Secondary (Middle School)
	or technical education
04.	Incomplete Preparatory (High School)
	or technical education
05.	Complete Preparatory (High School)
	or technical education
07.	Incomplete university degree
08.	Complete university degree or more

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2003

The submitted variable reports "Highest education (completed)" of respondent", classified into 5 categories. The following shows the adjustment of the original codes to the CSES standard.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Elementary
04.	(Lower) Vocational
05.	Secondary
06.	Middle level vocational, higher level secondary
08.	Higher level vocational, university
99.	Don't know / no answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2003

The submitted variable reports "Highest education (completed)" of respondent", classified into 5 categories. The following shows the adjustment of the original codes to the CSES standard.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Elementary
04.	(Lower) Vocational
05.	Secondary
06.	Middle level vocational, higher level secondary
08.	Higher level vocational, university
98.	Don't know / Not answered

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2003

"No education" and "Primary Only" were collapsed into one category in the 2008 Election Study, all respondents coded as 2, "Primary only or less".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2003

The construction of education was provided by Statistic Norway; five variables were used to derive C2003:  
 Bak27: What kind of general education have you completed?  
 (7 years of 7 years of primary school or less, 1 year of practical training, 2 years of practical training, 9 or 10 years of primary school, 1 year course of college without any formal education, lower secondary school, 2 years of college, without formal education, high school, no education).  
 Bak28: Have you completed another education where the studies

normally take more than 4 to 5 months full-time?

Bak29a: What is the duration of this education? Specify Year

Bak29b: What is the duration of this education? Specify Month

Bak30: Is any of this on the university or college level?

The final variable contains only three categories which correspond to the CSES categories as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Primary completed
05.	Secondary completed
08.	University undergraduate completed

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2003

Note that the Norwegian variable on education differentiates only between three categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Primary completed
05.	Secondary completed
08.	University undergraduate degree completed

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2003

The Peruvian question on respondents education bases on the the years of formal education.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No education (0 years)
02.	Incomplete primary (1 through 5 years)
03.	Primary completed (6 years)
04.	Incomplete secondary (7 through 10 years)
05.	Secondary completed (11 through 13 years)
06.	Post secondary trade / vocational school (14 years)
07.	University undergraduate degree incomplete (15 through 18 years)
08.	University undergraduate degree complete (more than 18 years)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2003

Respondent's education was asked in the CSES manner, including an additional category for post university degrees.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
09.	Post University

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2003

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No education
02.	Incomplete primary
03.	Primary
04.	Basic vocational school
05.	Secondary incomplete
05.	Secondary vocational
05.	Secondary school
06.	Post-secondary
07.	Higher incomplete (6 semesters or more)
08.	Three-year college or vocational studies
	Higher education

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C2003

The Portuguese questionnaire 2009 follows the implementation of CSES to ask for respondent's education, including some further information; however, a category for post-secondary trade /

vocational school was not included.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None
02.	Primary incomplete
03.	Primary school (4th grade)
04.	Incomplete secondary
05.	Full secondary (former 7th grade / current 12th grade)
07.	University undergraduate degree incomplete
08.	University undergraduate degree complete (bachelor / graduated)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Pre-school education (Kindergarten)
02.	Primary school incomplete
03.	Primary education (4 years) - Primary school
04.	Lower secondary education (6 years), including Lower secondary school - Gymnasium (4 years)
	High school lower cycle (2 years)
05.	Upper secondary education (2 years) - High school upper cycle
06.	Post-secondary education - Post high school education
07.	University education, including Bachelor (3-6 years) and Master (2 years)
08.	Post university education: Doctorate (3 years)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
02.	Incomplete primary
03.	Primary completed
04.	Incomplete secondary
05.	Secondary completed specific
	Secondary completed general
06.	Vocational 1
	Vocational 2
	Vocational 3
07.	Post-secondary
	University - Bachelor-Degree
08.	University - Master Degree
09.	University - PhD

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
09.	Post university

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2003

Questioning for the education level followed the schema provided for CSES Module 3.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2003

The question on education slightly differs from the CSES manner, providing nine different answer categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than primary, illiterate, doesn't know how to read
	Less than primary, literate, knows how to read
02.	Complete primary
03.	Former Elementary School, Compulsory Primary
04.	Vocational, Professional Education
05.	Former High School, Compulsory Secondary
06.	Pre-University Year, Present High School



07.	Undergraduate University (Bachelor's)
08.	Graduate University and Engineering (M.A., M.S., PhD.)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2003

This variable was constructed from the original dataset by the collaborator. The original eleven categories include the following:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	Primary School: 6 or 7-year primary/secondary school (old system) Comprehensive School: 8 or 9-year comprehensive school (current system)
04.	Vocational School: Various forms of vocational and apprentice education received in publicly organized school, 1-year trade college Secondary School: 2-year secondary school (old system), total: 9 years education Secondary/High School: 2-year secondary school (current system), total: 11 years education Upper Secondary/High School: 3 or 4-year secondary school (current system), total: 12 years education. No Degree studying at this level
05.	Upper Secondary/High School: As above. Completed degree.
06.	Post-Secondary/High School, not university (No degree studying at this level)
06.	Post-Secondary/High School, not university (completed degree)
07.	University: No degree studying at this level
08.	University: Completed degree/continued education
98.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2003

The Swiss survey only used five categories. They correspond to the CSES categories as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None
03.	Primary school
05.	Secondary school
06.	Basic vocational training Vocational training, apprenticeship Diploma school Trading school Secondary school vocational diploma High school, school preparing for the Baccalaurate Higher vocational education Higher vocational education with master Diploma Higher vocational college
08.	University

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Illiterate
02.	Literate but no formal schooling
03.	Some primary school Primary school graduate

04.	Some junior high school Junior high school graduate Some high school or vocational school Some technical college
05.	High school or vocational school graduate
06.	Technical college graduate
07.	Some university
08.	University graduate Post-graduate education

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	None
02.	Primary school not completed
03.	Finished primary school
04.	Secondary, high school not completed
05.	Finished secondary, high school
06.	Vocational training
07.	University level not completed
08.	University level

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2003

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No formal education
02.	Primary school dropout
03.	Primary school graduate
04.	Secondary school dropout
05.	Secondary school graduate
06.	High school dropout High school graduate
07.	College dropout
08.	College graduate

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2003

Respondent's education was constructed in the use of three different variables, asking for

1. The highest grade of school or years of college completed,
2. Achieving a high school diploma, and
3. The highest school degree respondent's has earned.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	0-8 grades - no HS diploma/equivalency
02.	9-12 grades - no HS diploma/equivalency
03.	0-12 grades - HS diploma/equivalency
04.	13+ grades, no degree
05.	Junior or community college level degrees (AA degrees)
06.	BA level degrees or 17+ grades with no advanced degree
07.	Advanced degree (including LLB)
08.	University undergraduate degree, completed

## C2004 &gt;&gt;&gt; MARITAL OR CIVIL UNION STATUS

D4. Respondent's marital or civil union status.

1. MARRIED OR LIVING TOGETHER AS MARRIED
2. WIDOWED
3. DIVORCED OR SEPARATED (MARRIED BUT SEPARATED/  
NOT LIVING WITH LEGAL SPOUSE)
4. SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED
5. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW  
 9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2004

This variable reports the respondent's current marital status. For instance, a person who is both divorced and living together as married would be coded 1.

Note that C2004 is a filter question for spouses' occupational variables (C2015 through C2019), which was not applied for all countries in the final release of the CSES. For more details see Elections Study Notes, below, as well as Election Study Notes on C2015 through C2019.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2004

Note some differences in the Austrian Election Study data:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Married or living together as married
02.	Widowed
03.	Divorced or separated
	Married but separated/not living with legal spouse
04.	Single, never married
05.	Long-term relationship

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2004

The Brazilian election study distinguished between more categories which were collapsed to the CSES standard as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Married
	Lives together
02.	Widowed
03.	Divorced
	Separated
04.	Bachelor

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2004

The original marital status variable had separate response categories for 'Married' ("Marié(e)"), 'Living together as married' ("Vit en concubinage") and PACSÉ, (Pacte Civil de solidarité) which is a contractual partnership between 2 people of legal age to organize their life in common.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2004

Note that one respondent reported not to be married in C2004, but presented occupational information for a spouse in C2015 through C2019. This may be due to some problem with interviewing.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2004

Note that in Ireland C2004 lays emphasis on the legal status of marriage, thereby under-representing in code 1 those who are not married, but are living together as married.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2004

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2004

As most of the demographic variables, the marital status variable has been added to the data-file by Statistics Netherlands on the basis of population records. Therefore, the variable is based on the legal definition of being married or in registered partnership. As a result, there is a number of respondents coded as not married in V422 but also as having "a partner that is a member of the household" according to V440 (the variable based on interview records).

In order to bring this variable closer to the CSES definition of C2004, respondents with a partner in household were coded as "1." in C2004 regardless of their code in the original marital status variable, unless they were coded "2. Single" or "7. Parent in single parent household" in variable "V423 Place of respondent in household". In the latter case the cases remained in their original marital status categories.

Note that this adjustment reduces the skip pattern inconsistency between C2004 and variables dealing with spouse's socioeconomic status (C2015), but does not eliminate it.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2004

Note that category 3, "divorced or separated" were two separate code categories in the Slovakian Election Study.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2004

Note that the Slovenian data include several respondents that mentioned neither to be married nor to live with a partner, but that present information on spouses' occupation. According to the Slovenian collaborators, this might have happened due to interviewer errors in the occupational variables (C2015 through C2019). These data remained unchanged.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2004

The question on marital status slightly differs from the CSES manner, providing six different answer categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	02. Married (Casado)
	03. Coupled (en pareja)
02.	06. Widowed (viudo)
03.	04. Separated (Separado)
	05. Divorced (divorciado)
04.	01. Single (soltero)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2004

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2004

In the Swiss survey, category "01. Married or Living Together as Married" does not include those "Living Together as Married". In contrast living together with a partner was asked in a single variable. The combination of both equates the given category "01. Married or Living Together as Married".

The combination yields some cases that mentioned widowed (eleven cases), divorced (90 cases) or single (244 cases), but are living together with a (new) partner. These 345 observations have been defined as "01. Married or Living Together as Married".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2004

The Taiwanese election study distinguished between more categories which were collapsed to the CSES standard as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

- |     |                                     |
|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 01. | Married or living as married        |
| 02. | Cohabitation without legal marrying |
| 03. | Widowed                             |
| 03. | Separated                           |
| 04. | Divorced                            |
| 04. | Single                              |

---

C2005 >>> UNION MEMBERSHIP

---

## D5. Union membership of respondent.

- .....
1. R IS MEMBER OF A UNION
  2. R IS NOT A MEMBER OF A UNION
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2005

Data are not available for CHILE (2009), SPAIN (2008).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2005

The original question related to union membership included responses for both professional associations and unions combined.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2005

In general the membership in a trade union and a business or employer association is unusual for a single person in Germany. However, there are several cases, e.g. pilots or public employees unions, which are close to associations of professions. Consequently, the German data include some observations, which mentioned a membership in both types of organizations.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2005-C2009

The Irish election study does not differentiate between different kinds of unions or associations for employees or self-employed respondents.  
Also note that persons currently not working (e.g. unemployed, or retired) were systematically asked to answer this question according to their former occupation.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2005

The Polish data of 2007 include three persons that are both a member of a union (C2005) and also in a business or employer association (C2007). However, even if this is unusual, it is possible in several circumstances.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2005

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

---

C2006 >>> UNION MEMBERSHIP OF OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD

---

D6. Someone in household other than respondent is a member of a union.

1. SOMEONE ELSE (OTHER THAN R) IS MEMBER OF A UNION
2. NO ONE ELSE (OTHER THAN R) IS A MEMBER OF A UNION
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C2006

See also notes for variable C2005.

Data are not available for CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2006

In contrast to the CSES implementation, Australia only covers the membership for spouses but not for other household members. The original wording of the Australian questionnaire had been: "Does your partner belong to a trade union?"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2006

The original question related to union membership included responses for both professional associations and unions combined, of the respondent's partner. This question does not ask whether someone else in the household other than the partner is a member of a union.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2006

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	997 Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2006

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

C2007 >>> BUSINESS OR EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

D7. R is a member of a business or employers' association.

1. R IS A MEMBER OF A BUSINESS OR EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION
2. R IS NOT A MEMBER OF A BUSINESS OR EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C2007

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), PERU (2011), SLOVAKIA (2010),

| SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2007

| This question was not asked in the Austrian Election Study due to compulsory memberships.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2007

| The Canadian election study used a slightly different wording in the context of respondent's business or employers' association membership: "Been active during the past five years: Business association, yes or no"

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2007

| Note that round 21% of respondents in a trade union also report membership in an employer's association. This could be partly due to the similarity of the words employer and employee in the Czech language. Some respondents may thus have misunderstood question C2007. However, this may only affect answers to C2007 and not C2005 since in C2005 the wording was "trade union membership".

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2007

| In general the membership in a trade union and a business or employer association is unusual for a single person in Germany. However, there are several cases, e.g. pilots or public employees unions, which are close to associations of professions. Consequently, the German data include some observations that mentioned a membership in both types of organizations.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2007

| This item and the subsequent questions about organizational membership were asked in the following manner: "Can you please tell me if you belong to any of the following associations? Business or employers association."

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	R is a member
02.	R is not a member

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2007

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
8.	997 Don't know / Not answered

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2007

| Note that 9 members of a Business or Employers' Association are also members of a Union (in C2005). Although single cases of response error are possible, being a member in both kinds of organizations may also be reasonable for specific situations (e.g. for managers in the public sector, school principals or private sector contractors such as truck drivers,

| who may want their own work interests as well as contracting issues addressed).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2007

| The Polish data of 2007 include three persons that are both a member of a union (C2005) and also in a business or employer association (C20077). However, even if this is unusual, it is possible in several circumstances.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2007

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2007

Note that there are 107 respondents who are members of a union as well as a business or employers' association. In Taiwan, it is quite common that people who own small businesses also have part-time jobs. They may well join both associations.

---

C2008 >>> FARMERS' ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

---

D8. R is a member of a farmers' association.

- .....
1. R IS A MEMBER OF A FARMERS' ASSOCIATION
  2. R IS NOT A MEMBER OF A FARMERS' ASSOCIATION
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

NOTES: C2008

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2011), FRANCE (2007), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007), (2008).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2008

This question was not asked in the Austrian Election Study due to compulsory memberships.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2008

The Canadian election study used a slightly different wording in the context of respondent's farmers' association membership: "Been active during the past five years: Farmer's association, yes or no"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2008

This item and the subsequent questions about organizational membership were asked in the following manner: "Can you please tell me if you belong to any of the following associations? Farmers or agricultural organization."

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	R is a member
02.	R is not a member

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2008

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

---

C2009 >>> PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

---



D9. R is a member of a professional association.

1. R IS A MEMBER OF A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
2. R IS NOT A MEMBER OF A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C2009

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), UNITED STATES (2008).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2009

This question was not asked in the Austrian Election Study due to compulsory memberships.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2009

The Canadian election study used a slightly different wording in the context of respondent's professional association membership: "Been active during the past five years: Professional association, yes or no"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2009

This item and the subsequent questions about organizational membership were asked in the following manner: "Can you please tell me if you belong to any of the following associations? Professional association."

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	R is a member
02.	R is not a member

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2009

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
8.	997 Don't know / Not answered

C2010 >>> CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

D10. Current employment status of respondent.

IN LABOR FORCE:

01. EMPLOYED - FULL-TIME (32+ HOURS WEEKLY)
02. EMPLOYED - PART-TIME (15-32 HOURS WEEKLY)
03. EMPLOYED - LESS THAN 15 HOURS
04. HELPING FAMILY MEMBER
05. UNEMPLOYED

NOT IN LABOR FORCE:

06. STUDENT, IN SCHOOL, IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING
07. RETIRED
08. HOUSEWIFE, HOME DUTIES

09. PERMANENTLY DISABLED  
 10. OTHERS, NOT IN LABOR FORCE  
 11. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 12. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C2010

Data are not available for BRAZIL (2006).

Respondents who are temporarily unemployed are coded UNEMPLOYED. Respondents on "workfare" or enrolled in a government job training program are coded EMPLOYED.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2010

The Australian questionnaire divided up the category of unemployment, asking if respondent is looking for a full or part time job:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories
01.	Working full-time for pay
02.	Working part-time for pay
05.	Unemployed-looking for full-time work
	Unemployed-looking for part-time work
06.	A full-time school or university student
07.	Retired from paid work
08.	Keeping house
10.	Others

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2010

Note some differences in the Austrian election Study data:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full time
02.	Employed - part time
03.	Employed - less than 15 hours
04.	[NOT IN USE IN AUSTRIAN DATA]
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, In school Apprentice
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, homemaker, home duties
09.	Permanently disabled
10.	Military/civilian service
11.	Parental leave or other leave of absence
12.	Professional/vocational retraining

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2010

For current employment status in Belarus, there are no frequencies in the choice option 4. "helping family member" although this option was offered to respondents.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2010

The Brazilian 2010 election study does not differentiate full-time and part-time employment. Variable from the original data file are recoded in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed Autonomous

=====

	Liberal professional (medecin, lawer, etc)
	Employer
04.	Helps someone in the family and receives remuneration
	Helps someone in the family with no remuneration
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student
	Apprentice with remuneration
	Apprentice with no remuneration
07.	Retired
	Retired for medical reasons
	Receives pension
08.	Housewife
10.	Is not working, Social Security decision

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2010

Note that the Canadian study provided slightly different answer categories, in comparison to the CSES.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Working for pay (full - or part-time)
05.	Unemployed / looking for work
06.	Student
	Student and working for pay
07.	Retired
	Retired and working for pay
08.	Caring for a family
	Caring for family and working for pay
09.	Disabled
10.	Other
11.	Self-employed (with / without employees)
12.	Work at two or more jobs

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2010

The question was asked with different answer categories  
Note that code 1 is used here for all persons working in spite of not knowing for how many hours.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2010

The Finish survey originally included more detailed information that could be subsumed into CSES categories.  
Note the following information on categories 7-10:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories
01.	Employed - full time (32 or more hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part time (15 to less than 32 hours weekly)
03.	Employed - less than 15 hours
04.	Helping family member
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired (because of age or other reasons)
08.	Housewife, homemaker, home duties (including persons on parental leave)
10.	(presently) in army or civil service

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2010

Variable from the original  
French data file are recoded in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student or internship
07.	Retired

08.	Housewife/house duties
09.	Permanently disabled
98.	Refused

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2010

The German classification of full- and part-time working differs slightly from the original CSES coding schema:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories
01.	Employed - full-time (35+ hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part-time (15-35 hours weekly)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2010

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
11.	Not applicable (never employed)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2010

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2010

The variable was calculated basing on replies to two questions: a) how many hours per week the respondent worked in the last month and b) if the respondent had not been working last month, which of the following applied to them: unemployed, student, retired, housewife or permanently disabled.

Note that respondents could have answered as per option 3 (employed less than 15 hours) while 4 - "Helping family member" was not included as an answer category in the Icelandic election study.

10 - other is a "catch-all" category for those temporarily not working, for example due to health reasons, vacation, or parental leave.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2010

Note that different from the CSES definition, in the Irish election study full-time work means up to 30 hours and part-time less than 30 hours weekly. A category for part time "less than 15 hours" was not in the Irish election study data.

Also note a slightly different wording in some of the answers.

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	At work full-time (30+ hrs)
02.	At work part-time (<30hrs)
03.	[NOT IN USE IN IRISH DATA]
04.	Relative assisting/unpaid family worker
05.	Unemployed and seeking work
06.	Student
07.	Retired
08.	Engaged in home duties
09.	Long term sick or disabled
10.	Other

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2010

For current employment status in Israel, there are no frequencies in the choice option 4. "helping family member" although this option was offered to respondents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2010

The Latvian data in this question is a composition from originally three questions (D14, D141, D1420). For this reason some decisions on collapsing the answers into the CSES categories had to be taken.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories
01.	Works full time (D141) and is - an entrepreneur (D14), or

=====

	- a salaried worker (D14), or
	- currently on maternity leave (D14)
04.	All helping family members (D14), even if working full time (D141)
05.	Includes persons on maternity leave (D14) who also said they had not worked (D1420) or they have no job (D1420)
08.	Including one person on maternity leave (D14) who also said I'm taking care of my children (D1420)
10.	Others not in labor force, including persons on maternity leave (D14) who also said they did not have a job before birth of a child (D1420)
11.	Persons on maternity leave (D14) who answered - refused/don't know/missing in D141 and on a paid child-care leave in D1420

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2010

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time
02.	Employed - half-time
03.	Employed - just at some times

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2010

The DPES provides a reduced number of categories for this variable:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Works 36 or more hours per week
02.	Works 12-35 hours per week
03.	Works less than 12 hours per week
11.	Does not work

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2010

This variable is constructed on the basis of two variables from the DPES study: "V415 Position in work community" and "V446 Social economic category respondent". The following table shows the construction of this variable.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	03. Paid employment (V415)
	04. Co-working (V415)
	05. Self-employed (V415)
02.	02. Works less than 12 hours per week (V415)
05.	01. Does not work (V415)
06.	12. Student (V446)
07.	10. Pensioner, under 65 (V446)
	11. Pensioner, 65 and older (V446)
09.	09. Disabled (V446)
10.	13. Other not active (V446)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2010

Ten variables have been used to derive C2010:

Bak4 How many hours a week do you usually work in your job?

Bak5a Do you consider yourself as working, student, retired, pensioner or receiving disability benefit, domestic worker, unemployed, conscript, draftee?

Bak5c Do you have tasks that involve leading/supervising the work of others?

Bak5d What is your primary occupation?

Bak6 Description of job in primary occupation (employed, independent with hired help, independent without hired help, family member)

Bak7 Employer description (privately owned firm, joint-stock company, organization, local service, county service, public

service)

Bak9b Did you have any tasks which involved supervising the work of others?

Bak9c What was your last primary occupation?

Bak11 Former job description (employed, independent with hired help, independent without hired help, family member)

Bak13 Former employer description privately owned firm, joint-stock company, organization, local service, county service, public service)

Furthermore, C2012 does not include a category for helping family members, as well as permanently disabled persons.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (32+ hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part-time (15-32 hours weekly)
03.	Employed - less than 15 hours weekly
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, home duties
10.	Others, not in labor force

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2010

Note that categories "2. Employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)", "3. Employed - less than 15 hours", and "4. Helping family members" is not used in the Peruvian data, due to the informal sector in Peru, which makes it hard to classify the weekly working hours.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2010

Note that categories on employment differ slightly from the CSES manner. Moreover, the Romanian data include several additional categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (30+ hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part-time (15-30 hours weekly)
03.	Employed - less than 15 hours
04.	Helping family member
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, home duties
09.	Permanently disabled
10.	Others, not in labor force, parental leave
11.	Entrepreneur, business owner, self-employees
12.	Day laborer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2010

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
11.	Self-Employed
12.	Retired, but with additional work

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2010

Note that the current employment status of South African citizens covers only the current labor force status, without any further differentiations. The questionnaire asked: "Do you have a job that pays a cash income? Is it full-time or part-time? And are you presently looking for a job (even if you are presently working)?" Codes "06. Student" and "08. Home duties" are from the original variables on respondent's occupational status (q134).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Full time (not looking)

	Full time (looking)
02.	Part time (not looking)
	Part time (looking)
05.	No (looking)
06.	Student (from q134)
08.	Housewife / works in the household (from q134)
10.	No (not looking)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2010

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
11.	Self-employed
12.	Employer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2010

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

For current employment status in Sweden, there are no frequencies in the choice option 4. "helping family member" although this option was offered to respondents

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2010

The original categories, used in the Swiss questionnaire, differ slightly from the general CSES coding, which is especially true for code 2 "Employed - Part Time (5-39 hours)".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (40 hours or more)
02.	Employed - part-time (5-39 hours)
04.	Helping family member
05.	Unemployed
06.	Vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, homemaker
09.	Permanently disabled
10	Others, not in labor force

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2010

The US-data of origin includes an additional category for temporarily unemployment (code 11).  
The weekly hours of work were asked separately and combined for C2010. If the information on working hours were not available, an additional category (code 12) was used.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
11.	Temporarily Laid Off
12.	Employed - no weekly hours specified

-----  
C2011 >>> MAIN OCCUPATION  
-----

D11. Main occupation of respondent.  
.....

## ARMED FORCES

## 01. ARMED FORCES

## LEGISLATORS, SENIOR OFFICIALS, AND MANAGERS

## 11. LEGISLATORS AND SENIOR OFFICIALS

## 12. CORPORATE MANAGERS

## 13. GENERAL MANAGERS

=====

PROFESSIONALS

- 21. PHYSICAL, MATHEMATICAL AND ENGINEERING SCIENCE
- 22. LIFE SCIENCE AND HEALTH PROFESSIONALS
- 23. TEACHING PROFESSIONALS
- 24. OTHER PROFESSIONALS

TECHNICIANS AND ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONALS

- 31. PHYSICAL AND ENGINEERING SCIENCE ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 32. LIFE SCIENCE AND HEALTH ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 33. TEACHING ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 34. OTHER ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS

CLERKS

- 41. OFFICE CLERKS
- 42. CUSTOMER SERVICES CLERKS
- 43. ADMINISTRATION OF CHARITABLE OR NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

SERVICES WORKERS AND SHOP AND MARKET SALES WORKERS

- 51. PERSONAL AND PROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS
- 52. MODELS, SALES PERSONS AND DEMONSTRATORS
- 53. TRADE, CONSUMER SERVICES

SKILLED AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS

- 61. MARKET-ORIENTED SKILLED AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS
- 62. SUBSISTENCE AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS

CRAFT AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS

- 71. EXTRACTION AND BUILDING TRADE WORKERS
- 72. METAL, MACHINERY AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS
- 73. PRECISION, HANDICRAFT, PRINTING AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS
- 74. OTHER CRAFT AND RELATED TRADES WORKERS

PLANT AND MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS

- 81. STATIONARY-PLANT AND RELATED OPERATORS
- 82. MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS
- 83. DRIVERS AND MOBILE-PLANT OPERATORS
- 84. OTHER PLANT AND MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS

ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS

- 91. SALES AND SERVICES ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS
- 92. AGRICULTURAL, FISHERY AND RELATED LABORERS
- 93. LABORERS IN MINING, CONSTRUCTION, MANUFACTURING AND TRANSPORT
- 94. OTHER POSITIONS IN ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS
- 96. OTHER OR NON-CLASSIFIABLE OCCUPATIONS (NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO CLASSIFY)

- 10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 20. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 30. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 40. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 50. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 60. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 70. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 80. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 90. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]



97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW  
 99. MISSING

## NOTES: C2011

Data are not available for BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008).

See also notes for C2010.

This variable reports the respondent's main occupation; that is, the job at which the respondent spends the most time or, if the respondent spends an equal amount of time on two jobs, it is the one from which the respondent earns the most money. For respondents who are currently employed, this variable reports their current occupation. For respondents who are retired or not currently working, this variable reports respondent's last occupation.

Coding conventions employ the first two-digits of 1988 ISCO / ILO International Standard Classification of Occupations Code from the International Labor Office, CH-1211, Geneva 22, Switzerland.

In some cases it has not been possible to strictly adhere to the ISCO/ILO conventions. Users will find that some categories have been added to the ISCO/ILO list in order to accommodate the occupations of respondents who were not easily classified. Please refer to specific Election Study Notes for clarification of additional codes.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2011

Australia used the AZNSCO-2, a modified version of the ISCO-88 COM, which had been transformed into the CSES standard coding scheme.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
12.	Generalist Managers
13.	Managers and Administrators
	Specialist Managers
	Farmers and Farm Managers
	Hospitality, Retail and Service Manager
13.	Hospitality, Retail and Service Manager
21.	Science, Building and Engineering
	Professionals
22.	Health Professionals
23.	Education Professionals
24.	Professionals
	Business and Information Professionals
	Social, Arts and Miscellaneous
	Professionals
	ICT Professionals
	Legal, Social and Welfare Professionals
31.	Science, Engineering and Related
	Professionals
32.	Health and Welfare Associate Professionals
34.	Associate Professionals
	Business and Administration Associate
	Professionals
	Managing Supervisors (Sales and Service)
	Other Associate Professionals
41.	Secretaries and Personal Assistants
	Other Advanced Clerical and Service Workers
	Intermediate Clerical Workers
	General Clerical Workers
	Inquiry Clerks and Receptionists

	Numerical Clerks
	Clerical and Office Support Workers
	Personal Assistants and Secretaries
42.	Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers
	Intermediate Sales and Related Workers
	Intermediate Service Workers
52.	Store persons
53.	Food Trades Workers
61.	Skilled Agricultural and Horticultural Workers
61.	Skilled Animal and Horticultural Worker
62.	Farm, Forestry and Garden Workers
71.	Construction Tradespersons
72.	Mechanical and Fabrication Engineering Tradespersons
	Automotive Tradespersons
	Electrical and Electronics Tradespersons
74.	Tradespersons and Related Workers
	Food Tradespersons
	Other Tradespersons and Related Workers
82.	Intermediate Machine Operators
83.	Intermediate Production and Transport Workers
	Road and Rail Transport Drivers
84.	Intermediate Plant Operators
	Other Intermediate Production and Transport Workers
91.	Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service Workers
	Elementary Clerks
	Elementary Sales Workers
	Elementary Service Workers
	Food Preparation Assistants
93.	Factory Labourers
94.	Labourers and Related Workers
	Cleaners
	Other Labourers and Related Workers
96.	Other Labourers

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2011

Respondents who were currently not in labor force were systematically asked what had been their main occupation before.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
20.	Professionals, not further distinguished
30.	Technicians and Associated Professionals, not further distinguished
40.	Clerks, not further distinguished
50.	Services Workers and Shop And Market Sales Workers, not further distinguished
80.	Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers, not further distinguished
90.	Elementary Occupations, not further distinguished

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2011

A number of people, who pointed out that they are not currently employed in the labor force (C2010), nevertheless answered the question about their current employment status. The question in the Belarussian questionnaire referred to present employment or last employment. For respondents who are currently employed, this variable reports their current occupation. For respondents who are retired or not currently working, this code captures their last occupation.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2011

The two variables from the deposited Brazil data do not match

the ISCO - 88 convention.

Employment issues were only defined in sector categories. This does not allow any detailed conclusions (e.g. a person's job training background). Hence, the level of details does not allow matching or even collapsing for C2011. The variable is therefore coded missing.

The two variables of the Brazilian election study read as follows:

Variable d4b In which place do you work?

- Industry
- Commerce
- Services
- Civil Servant
- Public/State enterprises
- Aid Organizations, NGO
- Agriculture/fish/animal farm
- Don't know / no answer

Variable d4c (Only if "Services" is the answer for question d4b)  
Which of these categories fits to the kind of services you do?

- Banks and financial institutions
- Hotel, lodge, tourism, restaurants
- Informatics and information organization
- General services of house and building maintenance
- Cleaners
- Maintenance of car and machines
- Health
- People and charge transportation and distribution

- Media, advertising and research
- Safety
- Education
- Other (open-ended)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2011

The Canadian study asked for respondent's occupational status in use of the National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2011, which was transferred into the ISCO-88 scale, according to the concordance table, provided by Statistics Canada.

Some of the respondents that mentioned to be retired, to care for family, or to be a student, but who also work in a paid job (see C2010), report their main occupational status in C2011.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2011

Note that the Chilean Election Study contains a question of respondents occupations with broader answer categories which could not be fitted into the ISO/ILO list of C2011. However, the answers were used for C2012. See the Election Study Notes of C2012.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C2011

Note that the Latvian election study asked respondents to categorize themselves in broader categories which do not fully fit to the ISCO table, especially in the values 60 to 96.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
10.	Higher managers and administrators
	Lower managers and administrators
20.	Self-employed professionals
	Employed professionals

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 40.<br>50.<br>60.<br>90. | Office clerks and lower white collar employees<br>Skilled workers in services and industry<br>Farmers and fishermen<br>Unskilled workers |
|--------------------------|--|

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2011  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2011

CSES Code 20. 30. 70. 80. 90.	Election Study Code/Category Professionals, not further distinguished Technicians and Associated Professionals, not further distinguished Craft and related trades workers, not further distinguished Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers, not further distinguished Elementary occupations, not further distinguished
--	--

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2011

For respondents who are currently employed, this variable reports their current occupation. For respondents who are retired or not currently working, this variable reports respondents' last occupation.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2011

Note that respondents' occupational status was asked only for those who were currently in the labor force (excluding unemployed persons), according to variable C2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2011

Note that due to filtering mistakes within the data collection there are no occupation codes for respondents working part-time. Socioeconomic status (C2012) was asked, see below. For full-time students, persons with home duties and permanently disabled were not ask for their former occupation. However, respondents who reported that they were retired, could answer C2011, indicating their previous main occupation.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2011

Note that in the Icelandic election study 2009, respondents who had reported that they were not currently employed, could not answer C2011.

CSES Code 10.	Election Study Code/Category Legislators, senior officials and managers not further distinguished
------------------	---

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2011

Note that the categorization in the data originally contained 4 digits. This was shortened to our two-digits use of the ISCO-88. For a greater level of details we refer to the original data in the Irish Election Study. Some values of the original codes suggest that ISCO-08 from 2008 was used. However, since the broader two-digit code stayed largely the same with the change from ISCO-88 to ISCO-08, the transfer of the codes looks appropriate.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2011

A number of people, who pointed out that they are not currently employed in the labor force (C2010), nevertheless answered the question about their current employment status. The question in the questionnaire referred to present employment or last employment. For respondents who are currently employed,

this variable reports their current occupation. For respondents who are retired or not currently working, this code captures their last occupation.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
99.	Never Worked

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2011

Note that the Latvian election study asked respondents to categorize themselves in broader categories which do not fully fit to the ISCO table, especially in the values 60 to 96.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
10.	Top level and mid level managers
20.	Highly skilled specialist ((doctor, lawyer, teacher etc)
30.	Skilled specialist (nurse, technician, inspector)
50.	Service and sales person
60.	Skilled worker
90.	Unskilled worker
96.	Other

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2011

Due to the way C2010 is constructed here, some respondents who are coded as not being in labor force in C2010 have valid occupation codes in C2011.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
90.	Elementary Occupations, nothing otherwise specified
98.	Don't know / Not answered

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2011

Respondent's main occupation is available only for persons in labor force, according to C2010.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2011

Note that the Romanian data provides information on respondent's occupational status only in broader categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Army forces
10.	Manager, entrepreneur
20.	Liberal / intellectual professions (teacher, physician, economist, lawyer, engineer)
30.	Technician, foreman
40.	Office clerk
50.	Sales and services occupation
60.	Agricultural and fishery worker, subsistence agricultural and fishery worker
70.	Craftsman
80.	Skilled worker
90.	Unskilled worker in non-agricultural sectors
	Day laborer in agriculture
96.	Others, not specified
	Works abroad (unspecified)
99.	inactive (in school, student, housewife, home duties)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2011

Note that the respondents main occupation of South African citizens bases on slightly different list of categories that do not perfectly match with the ISCO scale, used in CSES. Moreover, take care about the fact that the listed categories also include employment in the informal sector.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Armed service
10.	Professional - businessperson (owns small or larger business)
20.	Professional - manager / foreman / supervisor Professional - businessperson (works in company for others)
40.	Professional - mid level professional worker
50.	Professional - upper level professional worker
61.	Worker - clerical worker
62.	Retail worker
70.	Agrarian - small scale commercial farmer - medium scale commercial farmer - large scale commercial farmer
90.	Agrarian - subsistence farmer - peasant farmer
92.	Worker - artisan / skilled manual worker in the formal sector and in the informal sector
93.	Worker - unskilled manual worker in the formal sector and in the informal sector
94.	Worker - trader / hawker / vendor, selling goods at the market / street
96.	Agrarian - farm worker
97.	Worker - fisherman
98.	- miner
99.	Worker - domestic worker / maid / char / house help
	Other, (not specify)
	Other - student
	- housewife / works in the household
	Never had a job

The distinction between the formal and the informal sector is of great importance in South Africa. The informal sector primarily refers to e.g. traders, hawkers, or vendors, not being officially registered, selling things like phone cards, cigarettes. Appropriate persons do not have formal eight hour working day, are paid in cash, and their place of the business may shift from time to time, or even from day to day. Politically most important, people working in the informal sector do not pay VAT.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2011

This variable was constructed from the original data set by the collaborator. However, we do not have the original categories that were employed because the matching was performed by the Swedish collaborator.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
97.	Never been working
98.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

A number of respondents, who pointed out that they are not currently employed in the labor force (C2010), nevertheless answered this question, meaning their last place of work.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2011

In contrast to the CSES implementations for skip pattern on C2010, Switzerland asked the follow up question C2011 only for those who were full or at least part time employed, while housewives, students, etc. were excluded.

Furthermore, the ISCO88-code 13 "GENERAL MANAGERS" is not in use in Switzerland; instead general managers are included in code 10 "LEGISLATORS, SENIOR OFFICIALS AND MANAGERS", while code 11

"LEGISLATORS AND SENIOR OFFICIALS" is exclusive to statutory major corporations and code 12 "CORPORATE MANAGERS" only includes enterprises.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
10.	Legislators, senior officials and managers
11.	Legislators and senior officials in statutory Corporations
12.	Corporate managers of major enterprises
40.	Clerks, not specified

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2011

Additional scale numbers were used as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
50.	Servicemen
51.	Housekeeping, with domestic crafting
51.	Housekeeping, without domestic crafting
90.	Housekeeping, helping familial business with pay

Note that for respondents who are retired or currently not working, this variable reports respondent's last occupation.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2011

The Thai data defined the major part of respondents currently not in labor force (according to C2010) as "NON-CLASSIFIABLE OCCUPATION" (code 96). All these observations are defined as missing values in the CSES data.

### C2012 >>> SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

#### D12. Respondent's socio economic status.

1. WHITE COLLAR
2. WORKER
3. FARMER
4. SELF-EMPLOYED
5. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

#### NOTES: C2012

The categories are intended to distinguish among the following groups:

1. White Collar:  
Broad occupational grouping of workers engaged in non-manual labor: Managers, salaried professionals, office workers, sales personnel, and proprietors are generally included in the category.
2. Worker:  
Broad occupational grouping of workers engaged in manual labor.
3. Farmer:  
Normally persons self-employed in farming.

## 4. Self-Employed:

Self-employed occupations of all kinds, excluding self-employed farming. Includes, for example entrepreneurs, shop keeper, professionals like lawyers, medical doctors etc.

Data are not available for BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), DENMARK (2007), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

Note that there is some inconsistency between studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status (C2010) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2011-C2014). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in labor force. However, in some cases, for respondents categorized as not in labor force in C2010 (codes 6-12) the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.

Data on C2012 for respondents out of labor force are available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BELARUS (2008), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), ICELAND (2007), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NETHERLANDS (2010), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), ROMANIA (2009), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SWEDEN (2006), THAILAND (2007).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2012

Response categories 1-3 were created from C2011, according to ISCO codes. In addition, using the deposited detailed occupation variable (G6EMPLOY), farmers are extracted from the original category "13. Farmers and Farm Managers" (see ELECTION STUDY NOTES on C2011).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	ISCO codes 10-42, 52, 91;
02.	ISCO codes 51, 71-84, 92-94;
03.	ISCO codes 61, 62 (plus farmers from 13)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2012

The Austrian Election Study had further categories which were collapsed the following way to correspond to the CSES values:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White collar
02.	Worker
03.	Farmer
04.	Self-employed without employees Self-employed with employees
05.	Public sector/official
06.	Contract worker

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2012

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Publicly or privately paid: - as professionals (doctor, lawyer, accountant and others) - senior executive (management, director) - middle management executive
02.	Publicly paid farmer privately paid farmer publicly paid others in type of work



=====

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | migratory workers  |
|     | workers who are not self-employed                          |
| 03. | Self-employed farmer                                       |
| 04. | Self-employed  |
|     | - as professionals (doctor, lawyer, accountant and others) |
|     | - as publicly or privately paid business owners            |
|     | - as senior executives (management, directors)             |
|     | - in middle management                                     |

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2012

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2012

The variable was constructed with the help of two other existing variables. The categories were constructed as follows:

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| CSES Code | Election Study Category/Categories:  |
| 01.       | Respondents with codes 2-43 in C2011, or "Owner of a company"  |
| 02.       | Respondents with codes bigger 44 in C2011, or "Owner of a company", or "Self employed" but excluding "Farmers" |
| 03.       | Respondents with codes 61-62 in C2011, except "Self employed" and "Owner of a company"                         |
| 04.       | "Self employed"  |
| 05.       | Armed forces   |

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2012

For respondents who are currently employed, this variable reports their present socio-economic status. Those respondents who reported in this question that they are retired or currently not working (Finish election study codes 7-11, see below) were coded as missing.

However, note that there are several cases of persons who report being unemployed or retired in C2010, but do report a socio-economic status with values 1-3 in C2012. According to the collaborator for the Finish election study, there is a high probability that respondents answered question C2012 in compliance with their last status before unemployment/retirement - and, thereby responded to C2012 in the same way in which the previous question (C2011) had been asked.

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category                              |
| 01.       | Higher managerial occupation                              |
|           | Lower managerial / professional employee                  |
|           | Intermediate level employee (clerical, technical, admin.) |
| 02.       | Worker  |
| 03.       | Farmer  |
| 04.       | Other employer, self-employed, own account worker         |
| 09.       | Pensioner   |
|           | Student   |
|           | Housewife, house husband, homemaker                       |
|           | Unemployed  |
|           | Something else  |

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2012

Note that C2012 was asked irrespectively of respondent's current labor force status, according to C2010. See also notes on C2013.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2012

Variable from the original French data file are recoded in the following way:

- |           |                              |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category |
|-----------|------------------------------|

=====

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 01. | Executives of the Public, Professional Business Executives (cadres de la fonction publique, profess cadres d'entreprise) |
|     | Teaching Associate Professionals (professions intermédiaires de l'enseignement)  |
|     | Administration Associate Professionals (professions intermédiaires administration)                                       |
|     | Technicians (techniciens)  |
|     | Foremen (contremaîtres)  |
|     | Supervisors (agents de maîtrise)   |
| 02. | Workers (ouvriers)   |
| 03. | Farmers (agriculteurs exploitants)   |
| 04. | Artisans (artisans)  |
|     | Merchants (commerçants et assimilés)   |
|     | Chief of enterprises with 10 or more employees (chef d'entreprises de 10 salariés et plus)                               |
|     | Liberal Professions (professions libérales)  |
|     | Entrepreneur (chef d'entreprise)   |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2012

This variable only includes respondents who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2010. The German questionnaire includes two additional categories for respondent's socio-economic status.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Academic
06.	Civil servant

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2012

Note that respondents' socio-economic status was asked only for those who were currently in the labor force (excluding unemployed persons), according to variable C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2012

Of those not in labor force, only retired and persons who were for only a short term not working were consistently asked this question. See also note on C2011. Note that only self-employed persons in agri-business are coded as farmers here. Other respondents employed in agri-business were coded as "workers". This differentiation was possible due to a great level of detail on employment situations in the Icelandic election study.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2012

Note that only persons in labor-force were consistently asked this question. However, some respondents answered C2012 although they refused to answer C2010 or were unsure about their current employment status.

Further note that only self-employed persons in agri-business are coded as farmers here. Other respondents employed in agri-business were coded as "workers". This distinction was possible due to a great level of detail on employment situations in the Icelandic election study.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2012

Note that the level of detail in the Irish Election study data was not as high as the usual CSES level of details. Also note that persons currently not working (e.g. unemployed, retired) were asked to answer this question according to their former occupation.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

=====

05. Employed, not further specified

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2012

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White collar (non-manual workers, operators, for example Office staff, various specialists, sales representatives, etc
02.	worker (physical -employed, for example Skilled, unskilled workers, nursing assistants, etc.)
03.	Self-employed person (entrepreneur) as sole proprietor, self-employed in agriculture, small farms or fisheries sectors
04.	self-employed person (entrepreneur), self-employed in other sectors

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2012

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2012

Note that in the Mexican study of 2006, four respondents refused to answer C2010, but reported a socio-economic status in C2012. The same is true for the study of 2009, where 15 cases were coded as missing value in C2010, but included in C2012. This data remained unchanged.

Moreover, in both Mexican studies, the first category differs slightly from the CSES standard:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Owner White collar (office employee, bureaucrat, manager, professional, sales agent)
02.	Worker (manual labor)
03.	Farmer
04.	Self-employed

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2012

Response categories 1-3 were created from C2011, according to the ISCO codes.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	ISCO codes 0-42, 52;
02.	ISCO codes 51 52 70-83 90 91 93;
03.	ISCO codes 61

Note that there are 3 respondents who answered "Don't know" to the current employment status variable (C2010) and who provided an answer concerning their occupation (reported in C2011). Hence, they have valid codes in C2012 as well.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2012

Due to the way C2010 is constructed here, some respondents who are coded as not being in labor force in C2010 have valid codes for socio economic status in C2013.

Response categories 1-3 were created from C2011, according to the ISCO codes.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1.	ISCO codes 1-42;
2.	ISCO codes 51-53, 70-84, 90-94;
3.	ISCO codes 61 62
8.	Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2012

Seven variables have been used to derive C2012  
Bak5c Do you have tasks that involve leading/supervising the work of others?

Bak5d What is your primary occupation?  
 Bak6 Description of job in primary occupation (employed, independent with hired help, independent without hired help, family member)  
 Bak7 Employer description (privately owned firm, joint-stock company, organization, local service, county service, public service)  
 Bak9b Did you have any tasks which involved supervising the work of others?  
 Bak9c What was your last primary occupation?  
 Bak11 Former job description (employed, independent with hired help, independent without hired help, family member)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2012

Note that respondent's socio economic status was asked irrespectively of the current employment status (C2010). Respondents actually out of the labor force were asked about their previous occupation.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2012

Response categories 1-3 were created from C2011, according to ISCO codes. Self-employment was are extracted from the original variable on C2012.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	ISCO codes 10-42, 52;
02.	ISCO codes 51, 71-84, 91, 92-94;
03.	ISCO codes 61, 62
04.	Self-employment

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2012

Respondent's socio economic status is available only for persons in labor force, according to C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2012

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
5.	Others, not specified

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2012

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White collar - lower education White collar - medium education White collar - high education
02.	Unqualified worker Semi-qualified worker Qualified worker Highly qualified worker
03.	Farmer
04.	Self-employed - employing others Self-employed - not employing others
05.	Freelance
06.	Others, not specified

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2012

Information for helping family members (code 4 at C2010) were not available for South Korea.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2012

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
06.	Never been working
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2012

In contrast to the CSES implementations for skip patterns on C2010, Switzerland asked the follow-up question C2012 only for those who were full or at least part time employed, while housewives, students, etc., were excluded.

-----  
C2013 >>> EMPLOYMENT TYPE - PUBLIC OR PRIVATE  
-----

D13. Whether respondent's employment is private or public.  
.....

1. PUBLIC SECTOR
2. PRIVATE SECTOR
3. MIXED
4. "THIRD SECTOR"/NON-PROFIT SECTOR
5. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C2013

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010).

Note that there is some inconsistency between studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status (C2010) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2011-C2014). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for respondents categorized as not in the labor force in C2010 (codes 6-12) the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in the labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.

Data on C2013 for respondents out of labor force are available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BELARUS (2008), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), ICELAND (2007), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), PORTUGAL (2009), ROMANIA (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), THAILAND (2007), UNITED STATES (2008).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2013

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employee of Federal/State/Local Government
02.	Employee in private company or business
05.	Self-employed
06.	Employee in family business or farm

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2013

Note that this question was not asked in Austria. However, part of the information can be taken from C2012.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2013

The Brazilian election study did not employ the "mixed" category.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Public servant
02.	Autonomous Employee
04.	Third sector/NGO

There are also four respondents coded as not being in labor force in C2010 (code 06. STUDENT, IN SCHOOL, IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING), who answered this question. This data remain unchanged.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2013

Some of the respondents that mentioned to be retired, to care for family, or to be a student, but who also work in a paid job (see C2010), report their employment type in C2013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2013

The Chilean Election Study offered the answer self-employed in this question. Since it is unknown of these 192 respondents if they are privately or publicly paid, this answer could not be sorted into the CSES answer scheme of this variable. The 192 self-employed were thus coded as missing, here.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2013

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2013

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
05.	State, State Administration And Self-Government Administration
06.	Other

Note that "Other" was used by interviewers if they were unable to code the answer into the existing categories. This especially applies to self-employed respondents. Also see C2018.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C2013

Note that the Danish question on respondent's employment type differs slightly from the CSES wording. The Danish question of origin was: "Er du privat ansat, offentlig ansat eller selvstændig?" (Are you a private employee, public official or independent?), including the following categories:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Public Servant
02.	Private Employee
	Self-employed
09.	Not employed / out of business

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2013

Note that C2013 was only asked, if respondent was currently in labor force, according to C2010. See also notes on C2012.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2013

This variable only includes respondents who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2010.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2013

Note that respondents' employment type was asked only for those, those who were currently in the labor force (excluding

| unemployed persons), according to variable C2010.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2013

Note that as in C2011 persons working part-time were accidentally not asked this question. For full-time students, persons with home duties and permanently disabled, it had been intended not to ask for their (former) employment type. However, respondents who reported that they were retired, could answer C2011, indicating their previous main occupation.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2013

Note that in the Icelandic election study, respondents who had reported that they were not currently employed could not answer C2013. However, there are a few cases with respondents having refused to answer C2010 or being unsure about their current employment status who answered C2013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2013

Note that within this question the level of detail originally was higher in the Irish Election Study data. The categories were collapsed in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	Public sector Civil Service, Local authority health board or Vocational Education Committee (VEC)
02.	Private sector
03.	Mixed Non-commercial semi-state body/ Commercial semi-state body

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2013

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2013

In the Mexican study of 2006, four respondents refused to report their actual labor force status (C2010), but mentioned their current employment status. These data remain unchanged.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Government
02.	Private Company Own business Independent
03.	Government owned enterprise or decentralized organization
04.	Third Sector / Non-lucrative institution or organization

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2013

Mixed and non-profit were collapsed into mixed code 3.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2013

The Norwegian questionnaire asked for the employment type in a slightly different manner: "Are you employed by a privately owned firm, a joint-stock company, an organization, in municipal, counties or public service?" Given answers were coded due to public versus private sector, other categories had not been used. (See also variable notes on C2014).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2013

Note that respondent's employment type was asked irrespectively of the current employment status (C2010). Respondents actually out of the labor force were asked about their previous

occupation.

Moreover, the Norwegian questionnaire offered respondents six answer categories, which were grouped into two CSES categories by our Norwegian collaborators:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Municipal service
	County service
	Public service
02.	A privately owned firm
	A joint-stock company
	An organization

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2013

Note that the original variable includes an additional category for self-employment. According to C2012, appropriate cases were coded as missing values in C2013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2013

Respondent's employment type is available only for persons in labor force, according to C2010.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Self-employed
06.	Unpaid family worker

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2013

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2013

The Polish questionnaires of origin did not include a category for the "third sector / non-profit sector".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2013

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Public administration, military, police
	Public institution (health, education, etc.)
	Public company (energetic, traffic, etc.)
03.	Company (mainly) owned by state
	Company (mainly) privately owned
05.	Agricultural cooperative
	Farmer
06.	Self-employed, sector not specified

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2013

Information for helping family members (code 4 at C2010) were not available for South Korea.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2013

In Sweden, there are only public and private sectors. No mixed nor third sector/non-profit.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Public sector
02.	Private sector
06.	Never been working
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2013

The Swiss survey did not contain the category "4. Third Sector / Non-Profit sector". They did add another category, labeled "Other (i.e. joint ventures, third sector)".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------



## 05. Other (i.e. joint ventures, third sector)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2013

Note that the information about public or private sector was retrieved from the more detailed ILO occupation codes. In this more detailed ILO occupation coding all four-digit codes ending with 1 refer to an occupation in the public sector, all codes ending 2 refer to an occupation in the private sector.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2013

Note that the US question on the employment type differs from the CSES manner. C2013 sets up on two questions, asking "Are you employed by a federal, state or local government?" (v083237) and "Were you employed by a federal, state or local government?" (v083230).

1. Respondents who are actually in labor force (C2010<6) were coded according to v083237, as
  - "1. public sector", if the answer on v083237 was "yes";
  - "2. private sector", if the answer on v083237 was "no" or "not applicable";
  - "7. refused", if the answer on v083237 was "refused"
2. Respondents who are actually not in labor force (C2010>5) were coded according to v083230, as
  - "1. public sector", if the answer on v083230 was "yes";
  - "2. private sector", if the answer on v083230 was "no";
  - "7. refused", if the answer on v083237 was "refused";
  - "8. don't know", if the answer on v083237 was "don't know".

Consequently, C2013 allows distinguishing only between the "1. public sector" and "2. private sector". There are no categories for "3. mixed sector" or "4. third sector" in the US data.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Respondent works for the government, if actually in labor force
	Respondent worked for the government, if actually not in labor force
02.	Respondent doesn't work for the government, if actually in labor force
	Respondent never worked for the government, if actually not in labor force

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2013

Researchers should note that the distinction between the public and the private sector is determined by law. As well, there is no mixed sector (code 3.), by law.

## C2014 &gt;&gt;&gt; INDUSTRIAL SECTOR

## D14. Industrial sector of respondent's employment.

1. PRIMARY SECTOR: AGRICULTURAL, FORESTRY, FISHERIES
2. SECONDARY SECTOR: INDUSTRY: MINING, CONSTRUCTION MANUFACTURING
3. TERTIARY SECTOR: TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION AND OTHER PUBLIC UTILITIES, WHOLESALE TRADE, RETAIL TRADE, PERSONAL SERVICES, FINANCE, INSURANCE, AND REAL ESTATE BUSINESS, AND REPAIR SERVICES, ENTERTAINMENT AND REPAIR SERVICES, PROFESSIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
ACTIVE MILITARY DUTY
4. OTHER
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

8. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW

9. MISSING

NOTES: C2014

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), FRANCE (2007), IRELAND (2007), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

Note that there is some inconsistency among studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status (C2010) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2011-C2014). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for respondents categorized as not in labor force in C2010 (codes 6-12), the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.

Data on C2014 for respondents out of labor force are available for BELARUS (2008), BRAZIL (2010), CROATIA (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), ICELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NETHERLANDS (2010), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2007), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SWEDEN (2006), THAILAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2014

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Agriculture/Fishery/Animal Farm
02.	Industry
03.	Commerce/Services/Civil Services
04.	Public/State enterprises/NGOP

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2014

There are five respondents coded as not being in labor force in C2010 (code 06. STUDENT, IN SCHOOL, IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING), who answered this question. This data remain unchanged.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2014

This variable only includes respondents, who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2014

Note that respondents' industrial sector was asked only for those who were currently in the labor force (excluding unemployed persons), according to variable C2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2014

Note that as in C2011 persons working part-time were accidentally not asked this question. For full-time students, persons with home duties and permanently disabled it had been intended not to ask for their (former) employment type. However, respondents who reported that they were retired, could answer C2014, indicating their previous industrial sector. The Icelandic election study covered a greater level of detail, asking for the "field of work" with 15 answer categories. Those were collapsed into the 4 CSES codes.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2014

Note that in the Icelandic election study, respondents who had reported that they were not currently employed, could not answer C2014. However, there are a few cases with respondents having refused to answer C2010 or being unsure about their current employment status, who answered C2014.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2014

In the Mexican study of 2006, four respondents refused to report their actual labor force status (C2010), but mentioned their current employment status. These data remain unchanged.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2014

Note that the Dutch study includes two respondents in C2014, who failed to report their actual labor force status (C2010). These data remain unchanged.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Agriculture/Fishery/Animal Farm
02.	Industry
03.	Commerce/Services/Civil Services
04.	Public/State enterprises/NGOP

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2014

Due to the way C2010 is constructed here, some respondents who are coded as not being in labor force in C2010 have valid industrial sector codes in C2014.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1.	Agriculture and Fishery
2.	Industry (including construction)
3.	Commercial services/Non-commercial services
8.	Don't know / Not answered

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2014

The Norwegian questionnaire asked for the industrial sector in a slightly different way: "Are you employed by a privately owned firm, a joint-stock company, an organization, in municipal, county or public service?" Given answers were coded due to the primary, secondary or tertiary sector, while an additional categories, "others", was not used. (See also variable notes on C2013).

Moreover, 13 respondents, who failed to report their actual labor force status, mentioned their current employment status in C2014. These data remain unchanged.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2014

Note that respondent's industrial sector was asked irrespectively of the current employment status (C2010). Respondents actually out of the labor force were asked about their previous occupation.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2014

Respondent's industrial sector is available only for persons in labor force, according to C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2014

Information for helping family members (code 4 at C2010) was not available for South Korea.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2014

---

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
04.	Never been working
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

---



---

C2015 >>> SPOUSE: CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

---

D15. Current employment status of respondent's spouse.

.....

IN LABOR FORCE:

- 01. EMPLOYED - FULL TIME (32+ HOURS WEEKLY)
- 02. EMPLOYED - PART TIME (15-32 HOURS WEEKLY)
- 03. EMPLOYED - LESS THAN 15 HOURS
- 04. HELPING FAMILY MEMBER
- 05. UNEMPLOYED

NOT IN LABOR FORCE:

- 06. STUDENT, IN SCHOOL, IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING
- 07. RETIRED
- 08. HOUSEWIFE, HOME DUTIES
- 09. PERMANENTLY DISABLED
- 10. OTHERS, NOT IN LABOR FORCE
- 11. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 12. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

- 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

- 99. MISSING

NOTES: C2015

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), SLOVAKIA (2010), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SWEDEN (2006).

Spouses who are temporarily unemployed are coded UNEMPLOYED. Spouses on "workfare" or enrolled in a government job training program are coded EMPLOYED.

Note that there is some inconsistency among studies in the way responses to the questions about current employment status of spouses (C2015) were administered, affecting the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2016-C2019). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked for those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for spouses categorized as not in the labor force in C2015 (codes 6-12), the occupation variables may report their previous or last occupation.

There is variation in the manner in which the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other responses could also lead to a respondent being asked these questions. Consequently C2015 sometimes includes information of spouses from respondents who reported neither being married nor living together with a partner (C2004 is not code 1.). These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2004.

Table: Frequencies on C2015 for respondents without partner or spouse living in their household

## POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	44
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	48
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	58
GERMANY (2005)	221
HONG KONG (2008)	273
IRELAND (2007)	72
NETHERLANDS (2006)	50
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	35
POLAND (2005)	138
POLAND (2007)	119
ROMANIA (2009)	9
SLOVENIA (2008)	30
SPAIN (2008)	227
THAILAND (2007)	79

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2015

The Australian questionnaire divided up the category of unemployment, asking if the respondent is looking for a full or part time job:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories
01.	Working full-time for pay
02.	Working part-time for pay
05.	Unemployed-looking for full-time work
	Unemployed-looking for part-time work
06.	A full-time school or university student
07.	Retired from paid work
08.	Keeping house
10.	Others

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2015

For current employment status in Belarus, there are no frequencies in the choice option 4. "helping family members" although this option was offered to respondents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2015

The Brazilian 2010 election study does not differentiate full-time and part-time employment. Variable from the original data file are recoded, as explained in C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2015

Note that the election study asked about the head of household. However, since that is not necessarily the spouse but could be any person in the household, this variable could not be coded.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2015

The variable from the original French data file is recoded in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student or internship
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife/house duties
09.	Permanently disabled

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2015

The German classification of full and part-time working differs slightly from the original CSES coding schema:

---

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (35+ hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part-time (15-35 hours weekly)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2015

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
11.	Not Applicable (never employed)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2015

Occupational codes for persons not married according to C2004, value 1, may be due to a possible underrepresentation of unmarried partners in value 1 of C2004. Also see C2004.

Moreover, in difference to the CSES manner, full-time work means up to 30 hours and part-time less than 30 hours weekly.

A category for part time "less than 15 hours" was not in the Irish election study data.

Also note a slightly different wording in the Irish answer categories. Also see C2010 (respondent's employment status).

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	At work full-time(30+ hrs)
02.	At work part-time(<30 hrs)
03.	[NOT IN USE IN IRISH DATA]
04.	Relative assisting/unpaid family worker
05.	Unemployed and seeking work
06.	Student
07.	Retired
08.	Engaged in home duties
09.	Long term sick or disabled
10.	Other

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2015

For current employment status of spouse in Israel, there are no frequencies in the choice option "4. Helping family member" although this option was offered to respondents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2015

This variable was coded in the same way as C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2015

In the DPES, Marital status (V422) and presence of a partner in household (V440) are separate variables. Since the former emphasized the legal status of being (not) married, there are several respondents coded "never been married" in V422 and having a partner present in the household. As a result, there are a number of cases in CSES who are not coded as married in C2004 but with valid codes in the spouse variables (C2015-C2019).

The DPES provides a reduced number of categories for this variable:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employer private company
	Civil servant
	General manager - major share holder
	Self-employed
	Other active
05.	Receiver of unemployment benefit
06.	Student
07.	Pensioner, under 65
	Pensioner, 65 and older
09.	Disabled
10.	Receiver of social allowance (Bijstand)

11.	Receiver of other social benefit No income
-----	---

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2015

Note that code 9 in the election study from New Zealand is labeled "temporarily disabled" instead of "permanently disabled".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
09.	Temporarily disabled

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2015

Five variables were used to derive C2015:

Bak1 What is your current marital status?

Bak14 Is your spouse/partner currently in a paid employment?

Bak15a What is your spouse/partner's most important activity or source of income? (Student, domestic worker, old-age pensioner, unemployed, early retiree, receiving disability benefits, conscript, draftee)

Bak16b Does/did he/she have any tasks which involved supervising the work of others?

Bak16c What is your spouse/partner primary occupation?

Furthermore, C2015 does not include a category for employed 15 - 32 hours weekly, less than 15 hours weekly, helping family members, as well as permanently disabled persons.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (32+ hours weekly)
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, home duties
10.	Others, not in labor force

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2015

Note that spouses currently in labor force were not separated according to their weekly working hours. Instead, all spouses currently in labor force are coded 1.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full time (32+ hours weekly)
	Employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)
	Employed - less than 15 hours
04.	Helping family member
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, home duties
09.	Permanently disabled
10.	Others, not in labor force

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2015

Categories on employment differ slightly from the CSES manner, including several additional categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employed - full-time (30+ hours weekly)
02.	Employed - part-time (15-30 hours weekly)
03.	Employed - less than 15 hours
04.	Helping family member
05.	Unemployed
06.	Student, in school, in vocational training
07.	Retired
08.	Housewife, home duties
09.	Permanently disabled

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 10. | Others, not in labor force, parental leave   |
| 11. | Entrepreneur, business owner, self-employees |
| 12. | Day laborer                                  |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2015

- |           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category      |
| 11.       | Self-Employed                     |
| 12.       | Retired, but with additional work |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2015

- |           |                              |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category |
| 11.       | Self-employed                |
| 12.       | Employer                     |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2015

In contrast to the general CSES guidelines, C2015 was only asked for spouses, if the respondents was not the main earner of the household or if both, respondent and spouse earn equally much.

Furthermore, the original categories used in the Swiss questionnaire, differ slightly from the general CSES coding, which is especially true for code 2 "Employed - Part Time (5-39 hours)".

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category            |
| 01.       | Employed - Full Time (40 hours or more) |
| 02.       | Employed - Part Time (5-39 hours)       |
| 04.       | Helping family member                   |
| 05.       | Unemployed                              |
| 06.       | Vocational training                     |
| 07.       | Retired                                 |
| 08.       | Housewife, homemaker                    |
| 09.       | Permanently disabled                    |
| 10        | Others, not in labor force              |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2015

The US-questionnaire does not ask for the hours of work for spouses. All employed spouses had been coded into an additional category (code 12).

- |           |                                      |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Category         |
| 11.       | Temporarily Laid Off                 |
| 12.       | Employed - no weekly hours specified |

-----  
 C2016 >>> SPOUSE: OCCUPATION  
 -----

## D16. Spouse's occupation.

## ARMED FORCES

## 01. ARMED FORCES.

## LEGISLATORS, SENIOR OFFICIALS, AND MANAGERS

- |     |                                  |
|-----|----------------------------------|
| 11. | LEGISLATORS AND SENIOR OFFICIALS |
| 12. | CORPORATE MANAGERS               |
| 13. | GENERAL MANAGERS                 |

## PROFESSIONALS

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 21. | PHYSICAL, MATHEMATICAL AND ENGINEERING SCIENCE |
| 22. | LIFE SCIENCE AND HEALTH PROFESSIONALS          |



- 23. TEACHING PROFESSIONALS
- 24. OTHER PROFESSIONALS

TECHNICIANS AND ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONALS

- 31. PHYSICAL AND ENGINEERING SCIENCE ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 32. LIFE SCIENCE AND HEALTH ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 33. TEACHING ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS
- 34. OTHER ASSOCIATE PROFESSIONALS

CLERKS

- 41. OFFICE CLERKS
- 42. CUSTOMER SERVICES CLERKS
- 43. ADMINISTRATION OF CHARITABLE OR NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

SERVICES WORKERS AND SHOP AND MARKET SALES WORKERS

- 51. PERSONAL AND PROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS
- 52. MODELS, SALES PERSONS AND DEMONSTRATORS
- 53. TRADE, CONSUMER SERVICES

SKILLED AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS

- 61. MARKET-ORIENTED SKILLED AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS
- 62. SUBSISTENCE AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY WORKERS

CRAFT AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS

- 71. EXTRACTION AND BUILDING TRADE WORKERS
- 72. METAL, MACHINERY AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS
- 73. PRECISION, HANDICRAFT, PRINTING AND RELATED TRADE WORKERS
- 74. OTHER CRAFT AND RELATED TRADES WORKERS

PLANT AND MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS

- 81. STATIONARY-PLANT AND RELATED OPERATORS
- 82. MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS
- 83. DRIVERS AND MOBILE-PLANT OPERATORS
- 84. OTHER PLANT AND MACHINE OPERATORS AND ASSEMBLERS

ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS

- 91. SALES AND SERVICES ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS
- 92. AGRICULTURAL, FISHERY AND RELATED LABORERS
- 93. LABORERS IN MINING, CONSTRUCTION, MANUFACTURING AND TRANSPORT
- 94. OTHER POSITIONS IN ELEMENTARY OCCUPATIONS

- 96. OTHER OR NON-CLASSIFIABLE OCCUPATIONS (NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO CLASSIFY)

- 10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 20. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 30. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 40. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 50. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 60. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 70. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 80. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 90. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

- 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

- 99. MISSING

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SWEDEN (2006), UNITED STATES (2008).

See also notes for variable C2015.

(1) This variable reports the respondent's spouse's main occupation; that is, the job at which the respondent's spouse spends most of the time, or if the respondent's spouse spends an equal amount of time on two jobs, it is the one from which the respondent's spouse earns the most money. For spouses who are currently employed, this variable reports their current occupation. For spouses who are retired or not currently working, this variable reports the spouse's last occupation.

(2) Coding conventions employ the first two-digits of 1988 ISCO / ILO International Standard Classification of Occupations Code from the International Labor Office, CH-1211, Geneva 22, Switzerland.

In some cases it has not been possible to strictly adhere to the ISCO/ILO conventions. Users will find that some categories have been added to the ISCO/ILO list in order to accommodate the occupations of respondents who were not easily classified. Please refer to specific Election Study Notes for clarification of additional codes.

There is variation in the ways in which the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other responses could also lead to a respondent being asked these questions. Consequently C2016 sometimes includes information of spouses from respondents who reported neither being married nor living together with a partner (C2004 is not code 1.). These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2004.

Table: Frequencies on C2016 for respondents without partner or spouse living in their household:

#### POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	54
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	47
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	40
GERMANY (2005)	208
HONG KONG (2008)	3
ICELAND (2007)	1
IRELAND (2007)	69
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	22
POLAND (2007)	92
ROMANIA (2009)	9
SPAIN (2008)	217
THAILAND (2007)	71

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2016

Australia used the AZNSCO-2, a modified version of the ISCO-88 COM, which had been transformed into the CSES standard coding scheme.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
12.	Generalist Managers
13.	Managers and Administrators

	Specialist Managers
	Farmers and Farm Managers
13.	Hospitality, Retail and Service Manager
21.	Hospitality, Retail and Service Manager
	Science, Building and Engineering
	Professionals
22.	Health Professionals
23.	Education Professionals
24.	Professionals
	Business and Information Professionals
	Social, Arts and Miscellaneous
	Professionals
	ICT Professionals
	Legal, Social and Welfare Professionals
31.	Science, Engineering and Related
	Professionals
32.	Health and Welfare Associate Professionals
34.	Associate Professionals
	Business and Administration Associate
	Professionals
	Managing Supervisors (Sales and Service)
	Other Associate Professionals
41.	Secretaries and Personal Assistants
	Other Advanced Clerical and Service Workers
	Intermediate Clerical Workers
	General Clerical Workers
	Inquiry Clerks and Receptionists
	Numerical Clerks
	Clerical and Office Support Workers
	Personal Assistants and Secretaries
42.	Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service
	Workers
	Intermediate Sales and Related Workers
	Intermediate Service Workers
52.	Store persons
53.	Food Trades Workers
61.	Skilled Agricultural and Horticultural
	Workers
61.	Skilled Animal and Horticultural Worker
62.	Farm, Forestry and Garden Workers
71.	Construction Tradespersons
72.	Mechanical and Fabrication Engineering
	Tradespersons
	Automotive Tradespersons
	Electrical and Electronics Tradespersons
74.	Tradespersons and Related Workers
	Food Tradespersons
	Other Tradespersons and Related Workers
82.	Intermediate Machine Operators
83.	Intermediate Production and Transport Workers
	Road and Rail Transport Drivers
84.	Intermediate Plant Operators
	Other Intermediate Production and Transport
	Workers
91.	Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service
	Workers
	Elementary Clerks
	Elementary Sales Workers
	Elementary Service Workers
	Food Preparation Assistants
93.	Factory Labourers
94.	Labourers and Related Workers
	Cleaners
	Other Labourers and Related Workers
96.	Other Labourers

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2010): C2016

Note that the Latvian election study asked respondents to categorize themselves in broader categories which do not fully

=====

fit to the ISCO table, especially in the values 60 to 96.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
10.	Higher managers and administrators
	Lower managers and administrators
20.	Self-employed professionals
	Employed professionals
40.	Office clerks and lower white collar employees
50.	Skilled workers in services and industry
60.	Farmers and fishermen
90.	Unskilled workers

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2016

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
30.	Other technicians and associated professionals
90.	Elementary Occupations, not further distinguished

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2016

The status of spouses had only been sampled if the respondent was not at least "employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)", according to C2010.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2016

Occupational codes for persons not married according to C2004, value 1, may be due to a possible underrepresentation of unmarried partners in value 1 of C2004. Also see C2004.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2016

Note that 13 respondents failed to answer C2004 and refused to report the occupation of their spouses (C2016). These data remain unchanged.  
Moreover, the corresponding question in the Israeli questionnaire referred to present employment or last employment, exclusively.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
99.	Never Worked

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2016

The variable was coded in the same way as C2011.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2016

Spouse's main occupation is available only for spouses in labor force, according to C2015.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2016

Note that the Romanian data provides information on the occupational status of spouses only on broader categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Army forces
10.	Manager, entrepreneur
20.	Liberal / intellectual professions (teacher, physician, economist, lawyer, engineer)
30.	Technician, foreman
40.	Office clerk
50.	Sales and services occupation
60.	Agricultural and fishery worker, subsistence agricultural and fishery worker
70.	Craftsman
80.	Skilled worker
90.	Unskilled worker in non-agricultural sectors

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 96. | Day laborer in agriculture   |
| 99. | Others, not specified<br>Works abroad (unspecified)<br>inactive (in school, student, housewife, home duties) |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2016

In contrast to the general CSES implementation, C2016 was only asked for spouses, if the respondent was not the main earner of the household or if both respondent and spouse earn the same.

Furthermore, the ISCO88-code 13 "GENERAL MANAGERS" is not in use in Switzerland; instead general managers are included in code 10 "LEGISLATORS, SENIOR OFFICIALS AND MANAGERS", while code 11 "LEGISLATORS AND SENIOR OFFICIALS" is exclusive to statutory corporations and code 12 "CORPORATE MANAGERS" only includes major enterprises.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
10.	Legislators, senior officials and managers
11.	Legislators, senior officials in statutory Corporations
12.	Corporate managers of major enterprises

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2016

Note that respondents who do or did housekeeping either with or without domestic crafting as their main occupation were categorized under code 51, even if their current employment status (C2015) was "housewife".

Scale numbers and additional codes were used as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
50.	10. Servicemen
51	32. housekeeping, with domestic crafting
51	31. housekeeping, without domestic crafting
90	34. housekeeping, helping familial business with pay

C2017 >>> SPOUSE: SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

## D17. Spouse's socio-economic status.

1. WHITE COLLAR
2. WORKER
3. FARMER
4. SELF-EMPLOYED
5. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2017

The categories are intended to distinguish among the following groups:

1. White Collar:  
Broad occupational grouping of workers engaged in non-manual labor: Managers, salaried professionals, office workers,

sales personnel, and proprietors are generally included in the category.

2. Worker:

Broad occupational grouping of workers engaged in manual labor.

3. Farmer:

Normally persons self-employed in farming.

4. Self-Employed:

Self-employed occupations of all kinds, excluding self-employed farming. Included, for example, entrepreneurs, shopkeeper, professionals, such as lawyers, medical doctors etc.

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

There is variation in the manner the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other categories could also get these questions (see Election Study Notes). Moreover that there is some inconsistency among studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status of spouses (C2015) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2017-C2019). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for spouses categorized as not in labor force in C2015 (codes 6-12), the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.

Data on C2017 for respondents out of labor force are available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BELARUS (2008), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2007), ROMANIA (2009), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH KOREA (2008), THAILAND (2007).

There is variation in the ways in which the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other responses could also lead to a respondent being asked these questions. Consequently C2017 sometimes includes information of spouses from respondents who reported neither being married nor living together with a partner (C2004 is not code 1.). These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2004.

Table: Frequencies on C2017 for respondents without partner or spouse living in their household:

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	50
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	799
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	777
GERMANY (2005)	203
IRELAND (2007)	69
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	20
POLAND (2007)	95

ROMANIA (2009)	9
SLOVENIA (2008)	26
THAILAND (2007)	70

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2017

Response categories 1-3 were created from C2016, according to ISCO codes. Farmers are extracted from the original "13. Farmers and Farm Managers" category. (see ELECTION STUDY NOTES on C2016).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	ISCO codes 10-42, 52, 91;
02.	ISCO codes 51, 71-84, 92-94;
03.	ISCO codes 61, 62 (plus farmers from 13)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2017

Note that the election study asked about the head of household. However, since that is not necessarily the spouse but could be any person in the household, this variable could not be coded.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2017

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2017

The variable was constructed with the help of two other existing variables. The categories were built in the same scheme as C2012, see above.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2017

This variable only includes respondents' spouses who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2015. Moreover, the status of spouses had only been sampled if the respondent was not at least "employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)", according to C2010. The German questionnaire includes one additional category for the socio-economic status of respondent's spouse.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
06.	Civil servant

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2017

Note that within this question, the level of details in the Irish Election study data was not as extensive as the usual CSES level of details. Also see C2012.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Employed, not further specified

Occupational codes for persons not married according to C2004, value 1, may be due to a possible underrepresentation of unmarried partners in value 1 of C2004. Also see C2004.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2017

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
09.	Never Worked

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2017

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Inapplicable (not in labor force, never had a job)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2017

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

---

 5. Others, not specified

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2017

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White collar - lower education
	White collar - medium education
	White collar - high education
02.	Unqualified worker
	Semi-qualified worker
	Qualified worker
	Highly qualified worker
03.	Farmer
04.	Self-employed - employing others
	Self-employed - not employing others
05.	Freelance
06.	Others, not specified

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2017

Information for spouses, working as helping family members (code 4 at C2015) was not available for South Korea.

---

 C2018 >>> SPOUSE: EMPLOYMENT TYPE - PUBLIC OR PRIVATE
 

---

## D18. Whether spouse's employment is private or public.

- .....
1. PUBLIC SECTOR
  2. PRIVATE SECTOR
  3. MIXED
  4. "THIRD SECTOR"/NON-PROFIT SECTOR
  5. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2018

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SWEDEN (2006), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

There is variation in the manner the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other categories could also get these questions. (see Election Study Notes). Moreover that there is some inconsistency among studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status of spouses (C2015) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2017-C2019). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for spouses categorized as not in labor force in C2015 (codes 6-12), the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.



Data on C2018 for respondents out of labor force are available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BELARUS (2008), BRAZIL (2010), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PORTUGAL (2009), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007), THAILAND (2007).

There is variation in the ways in which the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other responses could also lead to a respondent being asked these questions. Consequently C2018 sometimes includes information of spouses from respondents who reported neither being married nor living together with a partner (C2004 is not code 1.). These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2004.

Table: Frequencies on C2018 for respondents without partner or spouse living in their household:

#### POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	54
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	40
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	45
GERMANY (2005)	205
IRELAND (2007)	444
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	191
ROMANIA (2009)	8
SPAIN (2008)	209
THAILAND (2007)	61

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2018

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Employee of Federal/State/Local Government
02.	Employee in private company or business
05.	Self-employed
06.	Employee in family business or farm

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2018

The Brazilian election study did not employ the "mixed" category.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Public servant
02.	Employee Autonomous
04.	Third sector/ NGO

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2018

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2018

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
05.	State, State Administration And Self-Government Administration
06.	Other

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2018

This variable only includes respondents' spouses, who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2015. Moreover, the status of spouses had only been sampled, if the respondent was not at least "employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)", according to C2010.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2018

Occupational codes for persons not married according to C2004, value 1, may be due to a possible underrepresentation of unmarried partners in value 1 of C2004. Also see C2004.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2018

Mixed and non-profit were collapsed into mixed code 3.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2018

The Norwegian questionnaire asked for the employment type in a slightly different manner: "Is/was this business/industry a privately owned firm, a joint-stock company, an organization, in municipal, county or public service?" Given answers were coded due to public versus private sector, other categories had not been used. (See also variable notes on C2019).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2018

Note that the Norwegian questionnaire offered respondents six answer categories, which were grouped into two CSES categories by our Norwegian collaborators:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Municipal service
	County service
	Public service
02.	A privately owned firm
	A joint-stock company
	An organization

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2018

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Self-employed
06.	Unpaid family worker

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2018

Information for spouses, working as helping family members (code 4 at C2015) were not available for South Korea.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2018

In contrast to the general CSES implementation, C2018 was only asked for spouses, if the respondents was not the main earner of the household or if both, respondent and spouse the same

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
05.	Other (i.e. joint ventures, third sector)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2018

Researchers should note that the distinction between the public and the private sector is determined by law. As well, there is no mixed sector (code 3.), by law.

## C2019 &gt;&gt;&gt; SPOUSE: INDUSTRIAL SECTOR

## D19. Industrial sector of spouse's employment.

1. PRIMARY SECTOR: AGRICULTURAL, FORESTRY, FISHERIES
2. SECONDARY SECTOR: INDUSTRY: MINING, CONSTRUCTION  
MANUFACTURING

- 
3. TERTIARY SECTOR: TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION  
AND OTHER PUBLIC UTILITIES, WHOLESALE TRADE, RETAIL  
TRADE, PERSONAL SERVICES, FINANCE, INSURANCE, AND  
REAL ESTATE BUSINESS, AND REPAIR SERVICES, ENTERTAINMENT  
AND REPAIR SERVICES, PROFESSIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES,  
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
ACTIVE MILITARY DUTY
  4. OTHER
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2019

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), FRANCE (2007), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

There is variation in the manner the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other categories could also get these questions. (see Election Study Notes).

Moreover that there is some inconsistency among studies in the way the responses to the questions about current employment status of spouses (C2015) affected the application of the follow-up occupation variables (C2017-C2019). The CSES standard is that the occupation variables are asked from those in the labor force. However, in some cases, for spouses categorized as not in labor force in C2015 (codes 6-12), the occupation variables may report respondent's last occupation. Hence, the responses concerning occupation that belong to respondents not in labor force presumably reflect their previous or last occupation.

Data on C2019 for respondents out of labor force are available for BELARUS (2008), BRAZIL (2010), CROATIA (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2007), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), THAILAND (2007).

There is variation in the ways in which the questions about respondent's spouse were administered in different election studies. In some cases only those categorized as "married or living together" in C2004 were asked the spouse questions, while in some surveys other responses could also lead to a respondent being asked these questions. Consequently C2019 sometimes includes information of spouses from respondents who reported neither being married nor living together with a partner (C2004 is not code 1.). These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2004.

Table: Frequencies on C2019 for respondents without partner or spouse living in their household:

## POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

GERMANY (2005)	205
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	21
POLAND (2007)	76
ROMANIA (2009)	7

| THAILAND (2007)

63

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2019

This variable only includes respondents' spouses, who were at least "employed - less than 15 hours", according to C2015. Moreover, the status of spouses had only been sampled, if the respondent was not at least "employed - part time (15-32 hours weekly)", according to C2010.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2019

The Norwegian questionnaire asked for the industrial sector in a slightly different way: "Is/was this business/industry a privately owned firm, a joint-stock company, an organization, in municipal, county or public service?" Given answers were coded due to the primary, secondary or tertiary sector, while an additional categories "others" had not been used. (See also variable notes on C2018).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2019

Information for spouses, working as helping family members (code 4 at C2015) were not available for South Korea.

-----  
C2020 >>> HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
-----D20. Household income quintile appropriate to the respondent.  
.....

1. LOWEST HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE
2. SECOND HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE
3. THIRD HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE
4. FOURTH HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE
5. HIGHEST HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE

6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

9. MISSING

| NOTES: C2020

Data are not available for LATVIA (2010) and SOUTH AFRICA (2009)

Income ranges shown are as originally reported by collaborators, including gaps between contiguous sets of ranges.

In some instances, deposited income data were not grouped into income categories or quintiles. For these cases, the data have been coded into quintiles, according to sample proportions (and not national statistics).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2020

This variable was derived from original variable H16. Respondents were asked: "What is the gross annual income, before tax or other deductions, for you and your family living with you from all sources? Please include any pensions and allowances, and income from interest or dividends". Respondents were offered a choice of 18 income categories:

| CSES Code Election Study Code/Category

01.	Less than 15,000 AU\$/year
02.	15,001 - 40,000 AU\$/year
03.	40,001 - 60,000 AU\$/year
04.	60,001 - 100,000 AU\$/year
05.	More than 100,001 AU\$/year

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 1,350 Euro
02.	1,350 - 1,949 Euro
03.	1,950 - 2,399 Euro
04.	2,400 - 3,599 Euro
05.	More than 3,600 Euro

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2020

For this question, respondents in Belarus were asked to rate their income on the following non-numeric scale instead of proposing a quintile distribution based on the sample. 56% of respondent chose the middle category, 93% of respondents are located between categories 1 and 3.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Very low
02.	Rather low
03.	Medium
04.	Rather high
05.	High

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2020

Quintile ranges were calculated proportional to the sample.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than - 400 R\$
02.	418 - 650 R\$
03.	680 - 900 R\$
04.	950 - 1,500 R\$
05.	More than 1,600 R\$

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2020

Quintile ranges were calculated proportional to the sample.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 600 R\$
02.	610 - 1,020 R\$
03.	1,021 - 1,500 R\$
04.	1,510 - 2,500 R\$
05.	More than 2,510 R\$

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 30.000 C\$
02.	30.000 - 49.999 C\$
03.	50.000 - 69.999 C\$
04.	70.000 - 99.999 C\$
05.	more than 100.000 C\$

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than \$165,000 Pesos
02.	\$ 165,000 - \$ 200,000 Pesos
03.	\$ 200,001 - \$ 300,000 Pesos
04.	\$ 300,001 - \$ 700,000 Pesos
05.	\$ 700,001 - \$1,000,000 Pesos
	\$1,500,001 - \$2,000,000 Pesos

\$2,000,001 - \$3,000,000 Pesos  
more than \$3,000,000 Pesos

Note that quintiles could not be calculated because the income of respondents was asked in ranges.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 2,000 Kuna
02.	2,001 - 4,000 Kuna
03.	4,001 - 6,000 Kuna
04.	6,001 - 8,000 Kuna
05.	More than 8,000 Kuna

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2020

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2020

Monthly income of household, in Czech Crowns (CZK):

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	0 CZK - 13,999 CZK
02.	14,000 - 22,999 CZK
03.	23,000 - 29,999 CZK
04.	30,000 - 39,999 CZK
05.	40,000 CZK and more

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 349,999 Danish Kroner
02.	350,000 - 499,999 Danish Kroner
03.	450,000 - 599,999 Danish Kroner
04.	600,000 - 799,999 Danish Kroner
05.	more than 800,000 Danish Kroner

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 3,300 Euro
02.	3,312 - 5,100 Euro
03.	5,112 - 6,900 Euro
04.	6,912 - 12,000 Euro
05.	More than 12,000 Euro

The Estonian question of origin refers to the monthly household income, which was extrapolated to the yearly income.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 15,001 Euro/year
02.	15,001 - 30,000 Euro/year
03.	30,001 - 40,000 Euro/year
04.	40,001 - 55,000 Euro/year
05.	More than 55,000 Euro/year

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 15,001 Euros
02.	15,001 - 25,000 Euros
03.	25,001 - 40,000 Euros
04.	40,001 - 60,000 Euros
05.	more than 60,000 Euros

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 1,500 Euro

02.	1,501 - 2,300 Euro
03.	2,301 - 3,000 Euro
04.	3,001 - 4,000 Euro
05.	More than 4,000 Euro

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 1,000 Euro
02.	1,001 - 1,500 Euro
03.	1,501 - 2,100 Euro
04.	2,101 - 3,000 Euro
05.	More than 3,001 Euro

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 1,200 Euro
02.	1,201 - 1,499 Euro
03.	1,500 - 1,999 Euro
04.	2,000 - 2,799 Euro
05.	More than 2,799 Euro

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 10,000 Euro/year
02.	10,001 - 15,000 Euro/year
03.	15,001 - 25,000 Euro/year
04.	25,001 - 40,000 Euro/year
05.	More than 40,000 Euro/year

Note that the distribution of respondents' income does not match quintiles. However, the Greek questionnaire asked for the income categories in the way mentioned above.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2020

Hong Kong implemented two additional categories (see below) while no missing data were included. Here, the value "9 MISSING" refers to all observations reporting "NO FIXED INCOME".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 9,999 US\$
02.	10,000 - 19,999 US\$
03.	20,000 - 29,999 US\$
04.	30,000 - 49,999 US\$
05.	More than 50,000 US\$
06.	No income

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2020

Monthly household income, before tax and other deductions

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 200,000 Kronur
02.	201,000 - 345,000 Kronur
03.	346,000 - 490,000 Kronur
04.	491,000 - 650,000 Kronur
05.	More than 650,000 Kronur

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2020

Monthly household income, before tax and other deductions

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 192,000 Kronur
02.	193,000 - 350,000 Kronur
03.	351,000 - 500,000 Kronur
04.	501,000 - 700,000 Kronur

## 05. More than 700,000 Kronur

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2020

Household income per week.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 240 Euros
02.	241 - 450 Euros
03.	451 - 700 Euros
04.	701 - 1,000 Euros
05.	More than 1,000 Euros

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 3,999 NIS
02.	4,000 - 5,499 NIS
03.	5,500 - 8,000 NIS
04.	8,001 - 12,999 NIS
05.	More than 12,999 NIS

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 3 Million Yen
02.	3 - 5 Million Yen
03.	5 - 7 Million Yen
04.	7 - 10 Million Yen
05.	More than 10 Million Yen

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2020

Ranges reflect annual family income.  
Research should take care about the distribution of observations, which are not grouped into income quintiles.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 52,560 Mexican Pesos
02.	52,561 - 87,600 Mexican Pesos
03.	87,601 - 122,640 Mexican Pesos
04.	122,641 - 175,200 Mexican Pesos
05.	More than 175,200 Mexican Pesos

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2020

Quintile ranges reflect annual family income.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 29,400 Mexican Pesos
02.	29,400 - 45,600 Mexican Pesos
03.	45,600 - 70,800 Mexican Pesos
04.	70,800 - 94,800 Mexican Pesos
05.	More than 94,800 Mexican Pesos

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2020

The original variable "V413 Disposable income of household (after taxes)" was coded in 20 categories each containing approximately 5% of respondents.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 19,592 Euro
02.	19,592 - 26,878 Euro
03.	26,879 - 34,895 Euro
04.	34,896 - 45,682 Euro
05.	More than 45,683 Euro

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2020



The original variable "V451 Spendable income of household" was coded in 20 categories each containing approximately 5% of respondents.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 24,889 Euro
02.	24,889 - 34,120 Euro
03.	34,121 - 44,127 Euro
04.	44,128 - 60,354 Euro
05.	More than 60,354 Euro
08.	Don't know / Not answered

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 27,000 NZ\$
02.	27,000 - 45,999 NZ\$
03.	46,000 - 70,999 NZ\$
04.	71,000 - 108,999 NZ\$
05.	More than 109,000 NZ\$

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 190,999 NOK
02.	191,000 - 300,999 NOK
03.	301,000 - 450,999 NOK
04.	451,000 - 570,999 NOK
05.	More than 570,999 NOK

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 340,001 NOK
02.	340,001 - 500,000 NOK
03.	500,001 - 700,000 NOK
04.	700,001 - 900,000 NOK
05.	more than 900,001 NOK

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 450 PEN
02.	450 - 1000 PEN
03.	1000 - 1600 PEN
04.	1600 - 2700 PEN
05.	more than 2700 PEN

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 3,999 Philippines Pesos
02.	4,000 - 5,999 Philippines Pesos
03.	6,000 - 9,999 Philippines Pesos
04.	10,000 - 14,999 Philippines Pesos
05.	more than 14,999 Philippines Pesos

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2020

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2020

CSES Code	Election study code/category
01.	Less than 849 Zloty
02.	850 - 1,200 Zloty
03.	1,201 - 1,699 Zloty
04.	1,700 - 2,299 Zloty
05.	More than 2,299 Zloty

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C2020

In general CSES guidelines request that income be

categorized in quintiles. However, the Portuguese questionnaire asked for categories as mentioned below.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 300 Euros
02.	301 - 750 Euros
03.	751 - 1,500 Euros
04.	1,501 - 2,500 Euros
05.	More than 2,500 Euros

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 500 RON per month
02.	501 - 1000 RON per month
03.	1001 - 1408 RON per month
04.	1409 - 2000 RON per month
05.	more than 2001 RON per month

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 400 Euros
02.	401 - 600 Euros
03.	601 - 800 Euros
04.	800 - 1,200 Euros
05.	More than 1,200 Euros

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 801 Euros
02.	801 - 1,200 Euros
03.	1,201 - 1,700 Euros
04.	1,701 - 2,500 Euros
05.	More than 2,500 Euros

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2020

Quintile ranges were not provided by national collaborator.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 600 Euros
02.	601 - 900 Euros
03.	901 - 1200 Euros
04.	1201 - 2100 Euros
05.	more than 2101 Euros

The Spanish questionnaire covers for total monthly income of the household, taking all sources into account. The coded CSES-variable does not fit income quintiles, due to the original coding of the Spanish income-variable.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2020

The income variable (D20) is divided into 20-20-20-20-20 and includes all respondents in the data set.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 161,253 Swedish Kroner
02.	161,254 - 244,408 Swedish Kroner
03.	244,409 - 337,166 Swedish Kroner
04.	337,167 - 432,251 Swedish Kroner
05.	More than 432,251 Swedish Kroner

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2020

Income in Switzerland was measured using the following question:

"Could you please tell me what is the monthly income of your household? Please include the income of all the persons who contribute to the household budget, taking into account not only salaries but also all other sources of income." Respondents were offered a choice of 11 income categories, which were then recoded into quintiles.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 4,000 CHF
02.	4,001 - 6,000 CHF
03.	6,001 - 8,000 CHF
04.	8,001 - 10,000 CHF
05.	More than 10,000 CHF

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2020

Note that in the Taiwanese sample income was not coded into even quintiles but was calculated to reflect the real income distribution. The original data contained 10 value codes:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 47,000 TWD
02.	47,001 - 65,000 TWD
03.	65,001 - 88,000 TWD
04.	88,001 - 138,000 TWD
05.	More than 138,000 TWD
08.	Hard to say

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2020

Note that the coding of C2020 does not follow the CSES manner for Thailand (2007). The variable includes a category for no income and only four additional categories on the actual income of respondents. Moreover, the distribution of the data does not reflect income quintiles.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No income
02.	Less than 5,000 Bath/month
03.	5,001 - 10,000 Bath/month
04.	10,001 - 10,000 Bath/month
05.	More than 15,000 Bath/month

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 600 TL
02.	600 - 850 TL
03.	851 - 1000 TL
04.	1001 - 1700 TL
05.	more than 1700 TL

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2020

The US-American questionnaire asked for the monthly household income of married respondents. Incomes for the remaining respondents base on the complete household, as long as all other household members were under age 18, or on the respondents' income, exclusively.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1.	Less than \$16,999 per year
2.	\$17,000 to \$34,999 per year
3.	\$35,000 to \$49,999 per year
4.	\$50,000 to \$89,999 per year
5.	more than \$90,000 per year

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2020

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

01. Less than 11,200 US\$  
 02. 11,201 - 17,400 US\$  
 03. 17,401 - 25,000 US\$  
 04. 25,001 - 38,700 US\$  
 05. More than 38,700 US\$

Research should care about the fact that for those respondents who refused to report a household income, C2020 was imputed by the Uruguayan collaborators, based on respondents occupation and the "wage agreements that determine the official level of pay of that occupation".

-----  
 C2021 >>> NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD  
 -----

D21. The exact number of persons in household - that is, the number of persons living together in the housing unit excluding paid employees and persons who pay rent for a room.  
 .....

01.-90. NUMBER OF PERSONS

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C2021

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), ISRAEL (2006), SPAIN (2008).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2021

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Eight and more household members

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2021

The German data for 2005 does not provide single values for more than eight people in one household

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Eight or more persons

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2021

Note that there are two respondents, who reported a number of zero household members, although the question of origin explicitly asks for the number of household members, including the current respondent.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2021

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2021

This question was asked slightly different in Thailand 2007: "Number of household members. (Living together in the household, excluding employees in the home and roomers)".

One consequence of the different wordings, the final data includes three empty households.

-----  
 C2022 >>> NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD UNDER AGE 18  
 -----

D22. Number of persons in household under the age of 18.  
 .....

00. -90. NUMBER OF PERSONS

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C2022

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), CHILE (2009), ISRAEL (2006), PERU (2011), SPAIN (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007).

There are some instances in which the number of persons in household is equal to or less than the number of persons under age 18. These data remained unchanged. For further details and explanations see Elections Study Notes on C2021 and C2022.

Table: Frequencies on C2022 for households, where the number children under age 18 is equal or even bigger than the total number of household members (C2021):

	EQUAL	BIGGER
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)		
AUSTRIA (2008)	17	1
BELARUS (2008)	2	0
CANADA (2008)	2	0
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	0	1
FINLAND (2007)	2	1
FINLAND (2011)	12	4
GERMANY (2005)	48	2
ICELAND (2007)	5	0
IRELAND (2007)	4	0
JAPAN (2007)	7	0
LATVIA (2010)	7	0
MEXICO (2006)	13	0
MEXICO (2009)	7	0
NETHERLANDS (2006)	1	0
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	3	0
POLAND (2007)	90	0
PORTUGAL (2009)	10	0
ROMANIA (2009)	1	0
SWEDEN (2006)	0	1
THAILAND (2007)	13	3

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2022

Brazilian variable is constructed by subtracting a variable that records the number of persons in household that are 16 years or older from the total number of person in household. Thus, the C2022 reports the number of persons in household under age 16.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2022

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Eight and more household members under age 18

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2022

There was no direct question asked to respondents concerning this item. It was computed by subtracting the number of people

over 18 years, registered on the electoral lists, to the total amount of individuals in the household.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2022

Note that the Finnish data include several cases where the number of household members under age 18 (C2022) is equal or even bigger than the total number of household members (C2021). According to the Finnish collaborators this has happened during the data coding process of the interviewing institution. These data remained unchanged.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2022

The German data of 2005 does not provide single values for more than eight people in one household.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2022

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2022

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2022

In the Norwegian studies, this question asks about individuals in the household under the age of 16, not 18.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2022

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2022

See ELECTION STUDY NOTES on C2021.

### C2023 >>> RELIGIOUS SERVICES ATTENDANCE

#### D23. Attendance at religious services.

1. NEVER
2. ONCE A YEAR
3. TWO TO ELEVEN TIMES A YEAR
4. ONCE A MONTH
5. TWO OR MORE TIMES A MONTH
6. ONCE A WEEK/MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

#### NOTES: C2023

This variable is an optional variable in the CSES battery. As a result, it was not carried in all of the studies. In some studies, this item was included but with different response categories.

Data are not available for BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), ESTONIA (2011), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), SPAIN (2008).

Researchers should note that the CSES questionnaire of origin does not include any filter instructions in the demographic section. Consequently, C2023 is asked irrespectively of individuals' religious denomination.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2023

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Less than once a year
03.	At least once a year
04.	Several times a year
05.	At least once a month
06.	At least once a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2023

Note that the categories 02, 03 and 06 in Austria are somewhat different.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Once or twice a year
03.	Three to eleven times a year
04.	Once a month
05.	Two or three times a month
06.	Once a week/more than once a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2023

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Only for ceremonies and feasts
03.	From time to time, in important holidays
04.	Once or twice per month
05.	Once a week
06.	Several times a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2023

Please note that respondents who mentioned not to belong to a religious denomination (code 93 in C2025) were excluded from the question on religious service attendance (C2023) in the German sample of 2009. In coordination with our German collaborators, those respondents were coded "1. NEVER" in C2023.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2023

Respondents, who mentioned to have no religious beliefs, due to C2024, were excluded from C2023, in the data of origin.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2023

Note that the Irish election study used a greater level of detail for this question or slightly different wording. Answer categories were collapsed to meet the CSES standard in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Categories:
01.	Never
02.	Once a year / less frequently
03.	Several times a year
04.	Once a month
05.	2-3 times a month
06.	Once a week
	Several times a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2023

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2023

This question was applied after respondents were asked their religious denomination. Those respondents who mentioned "Doesn't have a religion" skipped the current question and were assigned code "1. NEVER".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2023

For religious services attendance in Israel, there are no frequencies in the choice option 5. "two or more times a month" although this option was offered to respondents.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2023

Data for Japan includes several cases, where respondents did not identify themselves as "religious" (see C2024) but report a continuous religious service attendance. Japanese collaborators pointed out, that "this is nothing strange for Japanese. In many homes, especially in the country side, people have their own small Buddhist temple, or small Shinto altar. These are the targets of their daily religious practice, even they are not much religious in their mind. This is a kind of custom."

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2023

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2023

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	(Almost) never
03.	Several times a year
04.	Once a month
05.	2 or 3 times a month
06.	Once a week or more
08.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2023

Note that some of the Slovakian categories differ from the CSES codes. They were categorized in the following way:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Rarely
	Once a year
03.	Several times a year
04.	Once a month
05.	2-3 times a month
06.	Once a week
	Several times a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2023

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Once a year
	Less frequently
03.	Couple of times a year
04.	At least once per month
05.	2 to 3 times per month
06.	Once a week
	More than once a week

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2023

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
1.	Never
3.	Two or three times a year
4.	Once a month
5.	Two or three times a month



6.	At least once a week
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2023	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2023	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Never
02.	Only on special occasions/Once a year
03.	Several times a year
05.	Once or twice per month
06.	Once a week/Several times a week
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2023	
Categories for religious service attendance differ slightly from the common CSES codes. Moreover a category for "once a year" (code 2) was not included in the US-questionnaire.	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
3.	A few times a year
4.	Once or twice a month
5.	Almost every week

-----

C2024 >>> RELIGIOSITY

-----

D24. Religiosity.

.....

1. HAVE NO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS
2. NOT VERY RELIGIOUS
3. SOMEWHAT RELIGIOUS
4. VERY RELIGIOUS
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C2024

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), IRELAND (2007), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), SLOVENIA (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007), UNITED STATES (2008).

Researchers should note that the CSES questionnaire of origin does not include any filter instructions in the demographic section. Consequently, C2024 is asked irrespectively of individuals' religious denomination.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2024

Note that the Canadian question on religiosity differs from the CSES question wording: "In your life, would you say religion is:"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Not important at all/no religion
02.	Not very important
03.	Somewhat important
04.	Very important

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2024

Due to a mistake only a small proportion of the sample was asked about their religiosity.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2024

Data for Japan includes several cases, where respondents did not mention themselves as "religious" (see C2024) but report a continuous religious service attendance. Japanese collaborators pointed out, that "this is nothing strange for Japanese. In many homes, especially in country side, people have their own small Buddhist temple, or small Shinto altar. These are the targets of their daily religious practice, even they are not much religious in their mind. This is a kind of custom."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2024

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Not religious at all

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2024

This question was applied after respondents were asked their religious denomination. Those respondents who mentioned "Doesn't have a religion" skipped the current question and were assigned code "1. HAVE NO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2024

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2024

Note that the original DPES variable contains only two categories (Yes and No).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No
04.	Yes
08.	Don't know / no answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2024

Note that in the Slovakian Questionnaire, "not decided" was given as a valid answer option, unlike the volunteered "don't know".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	No religious beliefs
	Atheist
03.	Religious
04.	Very religious
08.	Not decided

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2024

The Spanish question on respondent's religiosity differs from the CSES manner: "According to your religiosity, using this scale, where would you place yourself, whereat 1 means "never practicing" and 5 means "strongly practicing"?" ("Y en cuanto a su grado de práctica religiosa me gustaría que se situase Vd. en la escala que le muestro en esta TARJETA DE RELIGIOSIDAD, donde 1 significa No practicante y 5 Muy practicante"), providing five substantial answer categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	1. No practicante
02.	2.
03.	3.
	4.

04. 5. Muy practicante

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2024

CSES Code Election Study Code/Category  
08. Volunteered: don't know/refused

In Sweden, there are no frequencies in the category 4. "very religious."

C2025 >>> RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION

D25. Religious denomination.

#### CHRISTIANISM

1000. CHRISTIAN (NO DENOMINATION GIVEN)

#### CATHOLIC

1101. ROMAN CATHOLIC

1102. EASTERN (GREEK RITE) CATHOLIC CHURCHES

1199. CATHOLIC, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

#### PROTESTANT

1200. PROTESTANT, NO DENOMINATION GIVEN

1201. ADVENTIST

1203. BAPTIST

1204. CONGREGATIONAL

1205. EUROPEAN FREE CHURCH (ANABAPTISTS,  
MENNONITES)

1206. HOLINESS

1207. FUNDAMENTALIST

1208. LUTHERAN

1209. METHODIST

1210. PENTECOSTAL

1211. PRESBYTERIAN

1212. CALVINIST

1213. SALVATION ARMY/SALVATIONIST

1214. CHRISTIAN BRETHEN

1215. CHURCHES OF CHRIST

1216. REFORMED CHURCHES

1217. PROTESTANT CHURCH OF THE NETHERLANDS

1298. PROTESTANT, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

1299. PROTESTANT, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

#### ANGLICAN

1300. EPISCOPALIAN, ANGLICAN, CHURCH OF ENGLAND,  
CHURCH OF IRELAND

#### INDEPENDENTS-NON-AFFILIATED

1401. INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST

1410. APOSTOLIC

1420. UNITED CHURCHES

1499. INDEPENDENT, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

#### NON-TRADITIONAL PROTESTANTS

1501. CHRISTIAN SCIENTISTS

1502. MORMONS, CHURCH OF LATTER DAY SAINTS

1503. UNITARIAN UNIVERSALISTS

1504. JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

1599. NON-TRADITIONAL PROTESTANT, OTHER  
[SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

#### ORTHODOX

1600. EASTERN ORTHODOX

1699. ORTHODOX, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

## JEWI SH

2000. JEWI SH

## I SLAM

3000. MUSLIM; MOHAMMEDAN; I SLAM (NO DENOMINATION GIVEN)

3100. SUNNI

3200. SHI'ISM

3210. ISMA'ILIS

3211. DRUSE

## BUDDHI SM

4000. BUDDHI ST

4100. THERAVADA

4200. MAHAYANA

## HINDUI SM AND OTHER RELIGIONS OF INDIA

5000. HINDU

5010. PARSI ISM

5020. VAISHNAVISM

5030. SHAI VISM

5040. SHAKTISM

5500. JAINISM

5600. SIKHISM

## INDIGENOUS RELIGIONS OF EAST ASIA

6100. CONFUCIANISM

6200. TAOISM

6300. SHINTO

6400. NEW RELIGIONISTS

6401. I-KUAN-TAO

6500. TRADITIONAL FOLK BELIEF/NICHIREN SHSHU

## ETHNORELIGIONS/OTHER BELIEVER

7100. PAGAN, HEATHEN, TRIBAL RELIGIONIST,  
TRADITIONAL RELIGIONIST, ANIMISM, SHAMANISM

7110. RATANA, MAORI

7200. SPIRITISM

7500. BAHAI

7900. EHTNORELIGIONIST, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

7901. EHTNORELIGIONIST, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

## NON BELIEVERS

8100. AGNOSTIC

8200. ATHEIST

8300. NONE

## OTHERS

9001. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

9002. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

9003. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

9004. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

9600. OTHER: NOT SPECIFIED

9997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

9998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

9999. MISSING

## NOTES: C2025

Data are not available for DENMARK (2007), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), SWEDEN (2006).

Researchers should note that the CSES questionnaire of origin does not include any filter instructions in the demographic section.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1410.	Armenian Apostolic
9001.	Other Non-Christian
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1199.	Old Catholic
1410.	Armenian Apostolic
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
7100.	Afro-Brazilian beliefs (Umbanda/Candomblé)
7200.	Spiritist beliefs (Espirita Kardecista, Espirita)
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1599.	Mórmon, Adventista, Testemunha de Jeová
7100.	Candomblé
	Umbanda
7200.	Espirita kardecista, espiritualista
7900.	Seicho-No-Ie, Messiânica, Perfeita Liberdade
7901.	Santo Daime, Esotérica
	Rastafari
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1216.	Christian reform
1420.	United church of Canada
	[Congregationalist / Methodist]
8300.	None, don't have one, atheist
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
9001.	Believer without specific religious denomination
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2025	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
1298.	Czech Brothers Evangelical Church (Protestants)
1299.	Brothers Church (Hussites, Protestants)
9001.	Other non-Christian religions
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2025	
Besides the most important religious denominations for Germany, no further information was given when an observation did not fit in one of the broad denominational categories.	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2025	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
9001.	Christian Alliance
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C2025	
Note that the respondents were not asked their religious denomination since the Icelandic population is very homogenous in that sense. Around 80% of the Icelandic population are members of the protestant church.	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2025	

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed list, including denominations for Roman Catholics, Protestants, Christians (no denomination given), Buddhist, Shinto and a reference category for other religion.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
9001.	Old Believers

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2025

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1216.	Dutch Reformed

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
1210.	(Pentecostal) subsumes Apostolic, Assembly of God, Church of Christ, Open Brethren, Church of Nazarene, Born Again Christian
1000.	Includes "Destiny"
7100.	Pagan spiritualism

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
9001.	Other non-Christian denomination (not specified)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C2025

The Portuguese questionnaire asked only for Roman Catholics as a single category, while all other religious denominations were summarized in a reference group for others (code 96).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1699.	Romanian Orthodox
1299.	Neo-Protestant (Pentecostal, Adventist, Baptist)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1216.	Reformed Christian Church in Slovakia

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
9001.	Other Non-Christian denomination, not specified

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
1299.	Quaker
1499.	Zionist Christian church
1699.	Coptic
7900.	Traditional / ethnic religion
1000.	Independent Christians

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2025

Researchers may wonder about the fact, that all in all, Christian denominations cover about 32.2% of all respondents, in contrast to Buddhist denominations that covers only 27.7%. However, this distribution is in line with the CIA World Factbook, based on the Korean Census 1995

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
6500.	Traditional Folk belief/Ni chi ren Shshu
9001.	Buddhism and Taoism (multiple beliefs)/all

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1298.	Assembly of God
1299.	Church of God
7900.	Native American

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2025

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1299.	Waldensians
7100.	Umbanda / Afro-Brazilians Religions
7200.	Basilio's Spirits
9002.	Pantheistic
9003.	Unification Church (Rev Moon)
9004.	Miracles Of Jesus / New Apostolic / Assembly Of God
9001.	Christian, none religion

The category "Christian, none religious" (code 87.) covers respondents without an official religious denomination that feel somehow affiliated to a Christian denomination.

-----  
C2026 >>> LANGUAGE USUALLY SPOKEN AT HOME  
-----

D26. This variable reports the language usually spoken in the respondent's household. If more than one language is spoken at home, this variable reports the language spoken most of the time.

- .....
- 001. AFRIKAANS
  - 002. ALBANIAN, ARVANITIKA
  - 003. ALBANIAN, GHEG
  - 004. ALBANIAN, TOSK
  - 005. ALLEMANNISCH
  - 006. ALSATIAN
  - 007. ARABIC, JUDEO-MOROCCAN
  - 008. ARABIC, LEVANTINE (ISRAEL)
  - 009. ARMENIAN
  - 201. ASHANTI (GHANA)
  - 237. ASYRIAN
  - 010. AVAR (RUSSIA)
  - 011. AWADHI (INDIA)
  - 012. AYMARA, CENTRAL (ARGENTINA, PERU)
  - 231. AZERI
  - 013. BASQUE
  - 234. BALKAR
  - 014. BELORUSSIAN
  - 015. BEMBA (ZAMBIA)
  - 016. BENGALI, BANGLADESHI, BANGLA (INDIA)
  - 017. BHOJPURI (INDIA)
  - 244. BICOLANO (PHILIPPINES)
  - 265. BISAYA (PHILIPPINES)
  - 270. B'LAAN (PHILIPPINES)
  - 202. BLUCH (PAKISTAN)
  - 263. BOHOLANO (PHILIPPINES)
  - 018. BOSNIAN
  - 019. BRETON
  - 020. BULGARIAN

260. CAGAYANO (PHILIPPINES)  
 258. CANTILAGNON (PHILIPPINES)  
 273. CAPIZNON (PHILIPPINES)  
 021. CATALAN  
 241. CEBUANO (PHILIPPINES)  
 276. CENTRAL THAI  
 022. CHECHEN (RUSSIA)  
 203. CHINESE, CANTONESE  
 023. CHINESE, HAKKA  
 024. CHINESE, MANDARIN  
 025. CHINESE, MIN NAN  
 026. CHUVASH (RUSSIA)  
 027. CROATIAN  
 028. CZECH  
  
 029. DANISH  
 030. DECCAN (INDIA)  
 204. DORIC (SCOTLAND)  
 031. DUTCH  
  
 032. ENGLISH  
 033. ERZYA (RUSSIA)  
 205. ESAN (NIGERIA)  
 034. ESTONIAN  
 206. EWE (GHANA)  
  
 209. FARSI (IRAN)  
 035. FINNISH  
 036. FRENCH  
 037. FRISIAN, WESTERN (NETHERLANDS)  
 038. FULACUNDA (SENEGAL)  
  
 207. GA (GHANA)  
 039. GAELIC, IRISH  
 208. GAELIC (SCOTLAND)  
 040. GAGAUZ (MOLDOVA)  
 041. GALICIAN  
 042. GASCON  
 043. GEORGIAN  
 044. GERMAN, STANDARD  
 045. GREEK  
 046. GUARANI, PARAGUAYAN  
 047. GUJARATI (SOUTH AFRICA, INDIA)  
  
 048. HEBREW  
 266. HIGAONON (PHILIPPINES)  
 274. HILIGAYNON (PHILIPPINES)  
 049. HUNGARIAN  
 051. HINDI  
  
 050. ICELANDIC  
 259. IFUGAO (PHILIPPINES)  
 242. ILOCANO (PHILIPPINES)  
 243. ILONGGO (PHILIPPINES)  
 210. INDONESIAN  
 211. IRANIAN  
 254. IRANUN (PHILIPPINES)  
 278. ISAN THAI  
 052. ITALIAN  
 249. ITAWES (PHILIPPINES)  
 212. IWO (UGANDA)  
  
 053. JAKATI (MOLDOVA)  
 213. JAMAICAN PATOIS  
 275. JAMINDANON (PHILIPPINES)  
 054. JAPANESE  
  
 280. KAMAE (THAILAND)  
 257. KAMAYO (PHILIPPINES)



```

055. KANNADA (INDIA)
056. KAONDE (ZAMBIA)
245. KAPAMPANGAN (PHILIPPINES)
057. KARAIM (LITHUANIA)
261. KARAY-AY (PHILIPPINES)
233. KARBADIN
058. KIRMANJKI (TURKEY)
235. KOMI
279. KORATCH (THAILAND)
066. KOREAN
232. KURDISH
059. KURMANJI (TURKEY)

060. LADINO (ISRAEL)
061. LALA-BISA (ZAMBIA)
062. LAMBA (ZAMBIA)
277. LANNA THAI
063. LATVIAN
064. LENJE (ZAMBIA)
065. LESSER ANTILLEAN CREOLE
268. LEYTENO (PHILIPPINES)
067. LIGURIAN
068. LITHUANIAN
069. LOMBARD
070. LOZI (ZAMBIA)
071. LUNDA (ZAMBIA)
072. LUVALE (ZAMBIA)

073. MACEDONIAN
251. MAGUINDANAON (PHILIPPINES)
074. MAITHILI (INDIA)
229. MALLORQUIN
267. MALAUEG (PHILIPPINES)
075. MALAY
076. MALAYALAM (INDIA)
077. MALINKE (SENEGAL)
214. MALTESE
253. MANOBO (PHILIPPINES)
250. MASBATEÑO (PHILIPPINES)
215. MENDE (SIERRA LEONE)
216. MIRPUARY/MIRPUR (PAKISTAN)
217. MNADINGGO (GAMBIA)
078. MAMBWE-LUNGU (ZAMBIA)
079. MANDINKA (SENEGAL)
080. MAORI
081. MAPUDUNGUN (CHILE)
082. MARATHI (INDIA)
083. MBOWE (ZAMBIA)
084. MINGRELIAN (GEORGIA)
085. MONTENEGRIAN
255. MUSLIM (PHILIPPINES)
086. MWANGA (ZAMBIA)

087. NEAPOLITAN-CALABRESE
088. NORWEGIAN
089. NSENGA (ZAMBIA)
090. NYANJA (ZAMBIA)
091. NYIHA (ZAMBIA)

092. ORIYA (INDIA)
093. OSETIN (GEORGIA)

218. PAHARI (PAKISTAN)
246. PANGASINENSE (PHILIPPINES)
094. PANJABI, EASTERN (INDIA)
236. PERSIAN
095. PIEMONTESE
096. POLISH
097. PORTUGUESE
098. PROVENÇAL

```

- =====
- 248. PULANGI -ON (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 219. PUSHTO (PAKI STAN)
  
  - 099. QUECHUA, ANCASH, HUAYLAS
  - 100. QUECHUA, SOUTH BOLIVIAN (ARGENTINA)
  - 101. QUECHUA, AYACUCHO
  - 102. QUICHUA, HIGHLAND, IMBABURA
  
  - 103. ROMANI, BALKAN
  - 104. ROMANI, CARPATHIAN
  - 105. ROMANI, VLACH
  - 106. RUMANIAN
  - 107. RUMANIAN, ISTRO
  - 108. RUMANIAN, MACEDO
  - 109. RUSSIAN
  
  - 110. SARDINIAN, LOGUDORESE
  - 220. SARAHI (PAKI STAN)
  - 111. SCHWYZERDUTSCH (SWITZERLAND)
  - 112. SERB
  - 113. SERBO-CROATIAN
  - 114. SERERE-SINE (SENEGAL)
  - 264. SIBANIN (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 115. SICILIAN
  - 116. SINDHI (SINGAPORE, INDIA)
  - 272. SIPANON (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 117. SLOVAK
  - 118. SLOVENIAN
  - 221. SOMALI
  - 262. SORIGAONON (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 119. SOTHO, NORTHERN (SOUTH AFRICA)
  - 120. SOTHO, SOUTHERN (SOUTH AFRICA)
  - 281. SOUTHERN THAI
  - 121. SPANISH
  - 222. SWAHILI
  - 122. SWATI (SOUTH AFRICA)
  - 123. SWEDISH
  
  - 240. TAGALOG (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 256. TAGON-ON (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 124. TAMIL (INDIA)
  - 125. TATAR (RUSSIA)
  - 269. T' BOLI (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 126. TELUGU (INDIA)
  - 127. TIBETAN
  - 128. TICANESE (SWITZERLAND)
  - 252. TIRURAY (PHI LI PPINES\_
  - 129. TONGA (ZAMBIA)
  - 130. TOUCOULEUR (SENEGAL)
  - 131. TSONGA (SOUTH AFRICA)
  - 132. TSWANA (SOUTH AFRICA)
  - 133. TUMBUKA (ZAMBIA)
  - 134. TURKISH
  - 223. TWI (GHANA)
  
  - 135. UKRAINIAN
  - 224. UGANDAN
  - 230. UDMURT
  - 136. URDU (INDIA)
  
  - 228. VALENCIANO
  - 225. VIETNAMESE
  - 137. VENETIAN
  
  - 247. WARAY (PHI LI PPINES)
  - 139. WELSH
  - 140. WOLOF (SENEGAL)
  
  - 138. XHOSA (SOUTH AFRICA)

141. YAHUDIC (ISRAEL)  
 142. YIDDISH  
 226. YORUBA (NIGERIA)
271. ZAMBAL (PHILIPPINES)  
 143. ZULU
980. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 981. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 982. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 983. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 984. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 985. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 986. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 987. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 988. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 989. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 990. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 991. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 992. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 993. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 994. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 995. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
996. OTHER LANGUAGE (NOT SPECIFIED)
997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
999. MISSING

## NOTES: C2026

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), GREECE (2009), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), JAPAN (2007), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVENIA (2008), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Other Eastern European language

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2026

Note that the Canadian question on the language usually spoken at home differs from the CSES question wording: "What is the first language you learned and still understand?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Other European
981.	Other Asian
982.	Other African
983.	English & French
984.	English & something else
985.	Inuit, native
986.	Lebanese
987.	Ethiopian
988.	Chinese (not further specified)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2026

Note that C2026 equals C2029 (Ethnicity), except for the missing values in C2026.  
 See also notes on C2029.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2026

Besides the most important languages spoken in Germany, no further information was given when an observation did not fit in one of the broad categories offered.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Transylvanian Saxon

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2026

Note that C2026 was not asked in the Greek questionnaire of 2009, "due to very high percentages of racial and linguistic homogeneity".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Chinese - Chaozhouese

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C2026

Note that the respondents were not asked about which language they usually speak at home. The collaborator reported that this was not applicable in Iceland.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2026

Note that respondents were not asked which language they usually speak at home due to a low variance.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Caucasian
981.	Bukharan

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2026

This question was not asked in Japan 2007, as the collaborators pointed out that the overwhelming majority of the population speaks Japanese.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Romani, Baltic
981.	Two languages, typically Russian and Latvian

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2026

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Dialect

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
995.	Philippine
996.	Other, subsuming for NZ: Pacific Island generic, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island, and Niuean

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2026

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2026

Note that the Polish respondents were not asked about the

language usually spoken at home. The Polish collaborators pointed out that questions like these "are no important issues in Poland - more than 90% of population speaks polish".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Romanian and Hungarian equally
981.	Romanian and Romanian equally
982.	Hungarian and Romanian equally
983.	Romanian, Hungarian, and Romanian equally
984.	Other language (except for Romanian, Hungarian)
985.	Romanian and other equally
986.	Romanian, Hungarian, and other equally

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Ruthenian (Slavish language spoken in Eastern-Slovakia and Western-Ukraine)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2026

Data on C2026 are not available for Slovenia (2008). According to our Slovenian collaborators, this question is more or less irrelevant for Slovenia, since "Slovenian is the most spoken language - over 90%".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
980.	Ndebele
981.	Venda / Tshivenda / Luvenda

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2026

The language spoken at home was not collected in South Korea, for as pointed out by the Korean collaborators, 100% of respondents speak Korean at home.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2026

The Swiss questionnaire did not include a question about the language usually spoken at home. As a proxy C2026 reports the language the interview language, according to the above list.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Both Mandarin and Taiwanese
	Mandarin and Taiwanese and other Chinese dialect
	Mandarin and Taiwanese and Japanese
981.	Both Mandarin and Hakka
982.	Both Taiwanese and Hakka
983.	Both Mandarin and other Chinese dialect
984.	Mandarin and Aboriginal language
985.	Aboriginal language
986.	Other Chinese dialect
987	Mandarin and Taiwanese and Hakka

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Chinese, not further specified
981.	Mountain People

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2026

The US-American questionnaire asked only the Latino population

about the language usually spoken at home.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	English and Spanish, equally

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
980.	Portunol (mixture of Portuguese and Spanish)

-----  
C2027 >>> REGION OF RESIDENCE  
-----

D27. This variable reports the respondent's region of residence. Regions are usually (but not always) based upon the social, cultural, or historical differences (though some correspond to administrative regions) that manifest themselves in political cleavages.

01.-80. REGION CODES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

99. MISSING

NOTES: C2027

Data are not available for IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), PERU (2011).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	New South Wales
02.	Victoria
03.	Queensland
04.	South Australia
05.	Western Australia
06.	Tasmania
07.	Australian Capital Territory
08.	Northern Territory

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Vorarlberg
02.	Tirol
03.	Salzburg
04.	Oberösterreich
05.	Kärnten
06.	Steiermark
07.	Burgenland
08.	Niederösterreich
09.	Wien

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	Brest
02.	Vitebsk
03.	Gomel
04.	Grodno
05.	Minsk (County)
06.	Mogilev
07.	Minsk (Capital)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Alagoas
02.	Bahia
03.	Ceará
04.	Maranhão
05.	Paraíba
06.	Pernambuco
07.	Piauí
08.	Rio Grande do Norte
09.	Sergipe
10.	Amazonas
11.	Distrito Federal
12.	Goiás
13.	Mato Grosso
14.	Mato Grosso do Sul
15.	Pará
16.	Espírito Santo
17.	Minas Gerais
18.	Rio de Janeiro
19.	São Paulo
20.	Paraná
21.	Rio Grande do Sul
22.	Santa Catarina

  

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2027	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	North
02.	North-east
03.	Center-east (sometimes referred to as Center West or Midwest)
04.	South east
05.	South

  

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2027	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01	Region de Tarapaca
02	Region de Antofagasta
03	Region de Atacama
04	Region de Coquimbo
05	Region de Valparaiso
06	Region del Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins
07	Region del Maule
08	Region del Bío Bío
09	Region de la Araucanía
10	Region de Los Lagos
11	Region de Aisen del General Carlos Ibanez del Campo
12	Region de Magallanes y la Antartica Chilena
13	Region Metropolitana
14	Region de los Rios
15	Arica y Parinacota

  

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2027	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
10.	Newfoundland
11.	Prince Edward Island
12.	Nova Scotia
13.	New Brunswick
24.	Quebec
35.	Ontario
46.	Manitoba
47.	Saskatchewan
48.	Alberta
59.	British Columbia

  

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C2027	
--	--

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Zagreb and Zagreb County
02.	Northern Croatia
03.	Slavonia
04.	Lika and Banovina
05.	Istria, Rijeka, Northern Croatian Maritimes and Gorski Kotar
06.	Dalmatia

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Hlavní město Praha
02.	Benšov
03.	Kladno
04.	Kutná Hora
05.	Mělník
06.	Mladá Boleslav
07.	Nymburk
08.	Praha - východ
09.	Praha - západ
10.	Příbram
11.	Rakovník
12.	České Budějovice
13.	Český Krumlov
14.	Jindřichův Hradec
15.	Prácheň
16.	Strakonice
17.	Tábor
18.	Domazlice
19.	Klatovy
20.	Plzeň - město
21.	Plzeň - sever
22.	Rokycany
23.	Čeb
24.	Karlovy Vary
25.	Sokolov
26.	Dičín
27.	Chomutov
28.	Litomyšl
29.	Louny
30.	Most
31.	Teplička v Řechách
32.	Ústí nad Labem
33.	Česká Lípa
34.	Jablonec nad Nisou
35.	Liberec
36.	Semily
37.	Hradec Králové
38.	Jičín
39.	Náchod
40.	Rychnov nad Kněžnou
41.	Trutnov
42.	Chrudim
43.	Pardubice
44.	Stavice
45.	Havlíčkův Brod
46.	Jihlava
47.	Pelhřimov
48.	Třebíč
49.	Zlín nad Sázavou
50.	Blansko
51.	Brno - město
52.	Brno - venkov
53.	Břeclav
54.	Hodonín
55.	Vyskov
56.	Znojmo
57.	Jeseník



58.	Olomouc
59.	Prostějov
60.	Pátek
61.	Šumperk
62.	Kroměříž
63.	Uherské Hradiště
64.	Vsetín
65.	Zlín
66.	Bruntál
67.	Frydek - Místek
68.	Karviná
69.	Nový Jičín
70.	Opava
71.	Ostrava - město

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Prague
02.	Central Bohemia
03.	South Bohemia
04.	Pilsen region
05.	Karlovy Vary region
06.	Ústí region
07.	Liberec region
08.	Hradec Králové region
09.	Pardubice region
10.	Vysočina region
11.	South Moravia
12.	Olomouc region
13.	Zlín region
14.	Moravian-Silesian region

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Copenhagen (Capital City)
02.	Zealand
03.	South Denmark
04.	Mid Jutland
05.	North Jutland

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	North Estonia
02.	West Estonia
03.	Central Estonia
04.	North-East Estonia
05.	South Estonia

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2027

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Uusimaa
02.	Varsinais-Suomi
03.	Itä-Uusimaa
04.	Satakunta
05.	Kanta-Häme
06.	Pirkanmaa
07.	Päijät-Häme
08.	Kymenlaakso
09.	South Karelia
10.	Etelä-Savo
11.	Pohjois-Savo
12.	North Karelia
13.	Central Finland
14.	South Ostrobothnia
15.	Ostrobothnia

- |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|
| 16. | Central Ostrobothnia |
| 17. | North Ostrobothnia   |
| 18. | Kainuu               |
| 19. | Lapland              |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2027

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Category

- |     |                            |
|-----|----------------------------|
| 01. | Alsace                     |
| 02. | Aquitaine                  |
| 03. | Auvergne                   |
| 04. | Bretagne                   |
| 05. | Bourgogne                  |
| 06. | Centre                     |
| 07. | Champagne-Ardenne          |
| 08. | Corse                      |
| 09. | Franche-Comté              |
| 10. | Languedoc-Roussillon       |
| 11. | Limousin                   |
| 12. | Lorraine                   |
| 13. | Basse-Normandie            |
| 14. | Midi-Pyrénées              |
| 15. | Nord-Pas-de-Calais         |
| 16. | Ile-de-France              |
| 17. | Pays-de-la-Loire           |
| 18. | Picardie                   |
| 19. | Poitou-Charentes           |
| 20. | Provence-Alpes-Côte D'Azur |
| 21. | Rhône-Alpes                |
| 22. | Haute-Normandie            |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C2027

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2027

The German data of 2005 did not include information about the region of residence. As an approximation, the federal states of Germany (the so called Bundesländer) had been used:

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Category

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 01. | Schleswig-Holstein                                  |
| 02. | Hamburg   |
| 03. | Niedersachsen (Lower Saxony)                        |
| 04. | Bremen  |
| 05. | Nordrhein-Westfalen (North Rhine-Westphalia)        |
| 06. | Hessen (Hesse)                                      |
| 07. | Rheinland-Pfalz (Rhineland-Palatinate)              |
| 08. | Baden-Württemberg                                   |
| 09. | Bayern (Bavaria)                                    |
| 10. | Saarland  |
| 11. | Berlin  |
| 12. | Brandenburg   |
| 13. | Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Mecklenburg-West Pomerania) |
| 14. | Sachsen (Saxony)                                    |
| 15. | Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt)                      |
| 16. | Thüringen (Thuringia)                               |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2027

Note that the categories for the region of residence equal those of the primary electoral districts, coded in C2031. However, researchers should note that according to Greek law, it is possible to vote in a district different than the one of residence. Consequently, C2027 and C2031 do not perfectly match.

For the labels of C2027, see appendices of the current codebook.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2027

The region of residence, given by C2027, equals the electoral

=====

districts of respondents, according to C2031

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Hong Kong Island
02.	Kowloon West
03.	Kowloon East
04.	New Territories West
05.	New Territories East

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Capital area (Reykjavik, Hafnarfjörður, Garðabær, Kópavogur, Álftanes, Seltjarnarnes, Mosfellsbær)
02.	Southwest peninsula (Suðurnes)
03.	West
04.	West Fjords
05.	North West
06.	North East
07.	East
08.	South

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2027

In the case of Japan 2007 the region of residence equals the PRIMARY ELECTORAL DISTRICT in C2031. (See codebook appendices).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Riga
02.	Vidzeme
03.	Kurzeme
04.	Zemgale
05.	Latgale

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2027

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/
01.	North
02.	Center West
03.	Center
04.	Southeast

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2027

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	North
02.	East
03.	West
04.	South

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2027

New Zealand regional differences are weak, primarily based on historical settlement patterns, and political differences between them. They can usually be decomposed into socio-demographic variables.

Regions have been defined by grouping electoral districts into the following:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Northland (north of Auckland)
02.	Auckland City and Suburbs
03.	Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Central North Island
04.	Other North Island
05.	Wellington City and Suburbs

## 06. South Island

Of these, Auckland and the South Island stand out as the most distinctive politically, with the South Island assumed to be more conservative in its voting habits and Auckland, the largest city and commercial centre, tending to be associated with change. Wellington, the capital, is to some extent shaped by its greater concentration of public sector employment.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2027

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Oslo fjord
02.	Inner East of Norway
03.	Southern Norway
04.	Western Norway
05.	Trøndelag
06.	Northern Norway

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2027

The regions of residence had been the baseline for the Philippine sampling process (for further details, see introduction of the current codebook). All four regions include a similar amount of respondents (n=300).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	National capital region
02.	Balance Luzon
03.	Visayas
04.	Mindanao

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2027

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2027

Polish regions are due to the administrative districts ("voivodship").

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Lower Silesian (dolnoslaskie)
02.	Kuyavian-Pomeranian (kujawsko-pomorskie)
03.	Lublin (lubelskie)
04.	Lubusz (lubuskie)
05.	Łódź (łódzkie)
06.	Lesser Poland (malopolskie)
07.	Masovian (mazowieckie)
08.	Opole (opolskie)
09.	Subcarpathian (podkarpackie)
10.	Podlaskie (podlaskie)
11.	Pomeranian (pomorskie)
12.	Silesian (slaskie)
13.	Świętokrzyskie
14.	Warmian-Masurian (warmińsko-mazurskie)
15.	Greater Poland (wielkopolskie)
16.	West Pomeranian (zachodniopomorskie)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	North
02.	Center
03.	Lisbon and Tagus Valley
04.	Alentejo
05.	Algarve

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Bucuresti

02.	Munteni a
03.	Ol teni a
04.	Dobrogea
05.	Mol dova
06.	Banat
07.	Cri sana-Maramures
08.	Transyl vani a

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Brati slava
02.	Trnava
03.	Trencín
04.	Ni tra
05.	Zilina
06.	Banska Bystrica
07.	Kosi ce
08.	Presov

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categori es:
01.	Pomurska
02.	Podravska
03.	Koroska
04.	Savi nj ska
05.	Zasavska
06.	Spodnj eposavska
07.	JV Sloveni ja
08.	Osrednj esl ovenska
09.	Gorenj ska
10.	Notranj sko - Kraska
11.	Gori ska
12.	Obal no - Kraska

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categori es:
01.	Eastern Cape
02.	Free State
03.	Gauteng
04.	Kwazul u Natal
05.	Li mpopo
06.	Mpumal anga
07.	Northern Cape
08.	North West
09.	Western Cape

Note that the region of residence (C2027) equals respondents' primary electoral district, coded in C2031 (also see codebook appendices).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Seoul
02.	Busan
03.	Daegu
04.	Incheon
05.	Gwangj u
06.	Daej eon
07.	Ul san
08.	Gyunggi
09.	Gangwon
10.	Chungbuk
11.	Chungnam
12.	Jeonbuk
13.	Jeonnam
14.	Gyungbuk

## 15. Gyungnam

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Andalucí a
02.	Aragón
03.	Asturi as
04.	Baleares
05.	Cataluña
06.	Canari as
07.	Cantabria
08.	Castilla-León
09.	Castilla-Lamancha
10.	Extremadura
11.	Galici a
12.	La Rioja
13.	Madrid
14.	Murci a
15.	Navarra
16.	País Vasco
17.	Comuni dad Val enci ana

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Stockhol ms
03.	Uppsal a
04.	Södermanl ands
05.	Östergöt l ands
06.	Jönköpi ngs
07.	Kronobergs
08.	Kal mar
09.	Gotl and
10.	Bleki nge
12.	Skåne
13.	Hall and
14.	Våstra götal and
17.	Värml and
18.	Örebro
19.	Västmanl and
20.	Kopparberg
21.	Gävl eborg
22.	Västernorr l and
23.	Jämtl and
24.	Västerbotten
25.	Norrbotten

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	German Speaking Part of Swi tzerl and
02.	French Speaking Part of Swi tzerl and
03.	Italian Speaking Part of Swi tzerl and

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2027

Region of Residence represents the respondents' big cities or counties of origin. Note that there were no respondents from 02 Tayyuan City, 05 Miao Li, 16 Peng Hu, and 20 Chiayi City.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Taipei County
02.	Yi Lan County
03.	Taoyuan County
04.	Hsinchu County
05.	Miao Li County
06.	Tai chung County
07.	Changhua County
08.	Nantou County

```

09. Yunlin County
10. Chiayi County
11. Tainan County
12. Kaohsiung County
13. Pingtung County
14. Taitung County
15. Hualien County
16. Peng Hu County
17. Keelung City
18. Hsinchu City
19. Taichung City
20. Chiayi City
21. Tainan City
63. Taipei City
64. Kaoshiung City

```

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	North
02.	Northeast
03.	East
04.	Central
05.	South

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Istanbul
02.	Aegean
03.	Mediterranean
04.	Southeast Anatolian
05.	West Anatolia
06.	Marmara
07.	Black Sea
08.	Central Anatolia
09.	Eastern Anatolia

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2027

C2027 reports the federal state, respondent is living in, according to the US-FIPS-codes of the NIST. .  
It reflects the first two digits of respondent's electoral district (see Election Study Note on C2031.)

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Alabama
04.	Arizona
06.	California
08.	Colorado
09.	Connecticut
10.	Delaware
11.	District of Columbia
12.	Florida
13.	Georgia
17.	Illinois
18.	Indiana
20.	Kansas
22.	Louisiana
25.	Massachusetts
26.	Michigan
27.	Minnesota
28.	Mississippi
32.	Nevada
34.	New Jersey
35.	New Mexico
36.	New York
37.	North Carolina
38.	North Dakota
39.	Ohio

40.	Oklahoma
41.	Oregon
42.	Pennsylvania
44.	Rhode Island
45.	South Carolina
47.	Tennessee
48.	Texas
51.	Virginia
53.	Washington
55.	Wisconsin

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2027

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Metropolitan
02.	East
03.	North-Center
04.	West
05.	South

## C2028 &gt;&gt;&gt; RACE

D28. This item reports the respondent's race.  
This variable is coded according to national standards.

001.-995. RACE CODES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

996. OTHER RACE (NOT SPECIFIED)

997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

999. MISSING

## NOTES: C2028

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), BELARUS (2008), BRAZIL (2006), CHILE (2009), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), ESTONIA (2011), FINLAND (2007), FINLAND (2011), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), GERMANY (2009), GREECE (2009), HONG KONG (2008), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), LATVIA (2010), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), ROMANIA (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SLOVENIA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008), TURKEY (2011).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White
02.	Black
03.	Brunet
04.	Yellow
05.	Indigenous

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Categories:
01.	Non-racial minority
02.	Racial minority

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2028



Note that C2028 was not asked in the Greek questionnaire of 2009, "due to very high percentages of racial and linguistic homogeneity".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2028

The Hong Kong questionnaire of origin does not include a question about the race of respondents. As our collaborators pointed out, "Hong Kong is a racially homogenous society, with over 95% of its population ethnic Chinese. To serve as a proxy, [one] may consult [C2026], which asked the main language usually spoken at home."

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C2028

Note that the respondents were not asked their race. The collaborator reported that this question was not applicable in Iceland.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2028-C2029

Note that respondents were not asked for their race or ethnicity due to a low variance for Irish citizens.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2028

This question was not asked in Japan 2007, as the collaborators pointed out that "almost all respondents had been Japanese and consequently of Asian race."

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2028

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Native
02.	Mixed Race
03.	White

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	Not Maori
02.	Maori

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	European (Caucasian)
02.	Asian
03.	African (Negroid)
04.	Indian
05.	Polynesian
06.	Micronesian
07.	Melanesian
08.	Australoid
09.	American Indian

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2028

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2028

Note that the Polish respondents were not asked about their race. In contrast, C2028 has been coded afterwards by the Polish collaborators, who pointed out that questions like these "are no important issues in Poland - more than 90% of population (...) are of European race (...)".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	European

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	European
02.	Asian
03.	African
04.	Indian

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2028

Data for C2026 are not available for Slovenia (2008). According to our Slovenian collaborators, this question is "not relevant" in Slovenia since we have 99% Caucasian race".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Black
02.	Colored
03.	Asian
04.	White

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
02.	Asian

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Thai
02.	China
03.	Malay
04.	India
05.	Cambodia
06.	Laos

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2028

A question about respondent's race was not included in the Turkish survey. According to the CSES collaborators, researchers might code all Turkish respondents as belonging to the Caucasian race.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
1.	White
2.	Black / African-American
3.	Latino
4.	Asian
5.	Native Americans
6.	Hispanics

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2028

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	White
02.	Black
03.	Mixed with India / Indigenous
04.	Yellow

C2029 >>> ETHNICITY

D29. This variable reports the ethnic identity of respondents.

001.-995. ETHNICITY CODES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

996. OTHER ETHNICITY (NOT SPECIFIED)

997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

999. MISSING

NOTES: C2029

See also notes for variable C2028.

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), FRANCE (2007), GERMANY (2005), HONG KONG (2008), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), JAPAN (2007), LATVIA (2010), MEXICO (2006), MEXICO (2009), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TURKEY (2011).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
001.	Byelorussian
002.	Russian
003.	Polish
004.	Ukrainian
005.	Tatar
006.	Jew
007.	Georgian

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Canadian
002.	Australian
003.	Austrian
004.	Bahamian
005.	Bangladeshi
006.	Black / African
007.	British
008.	Chinese
009.	Croatian
010.	Czech
011.	Danish
012.	Dutch
013.	English
014.	Salvadoran
015.	Ethiopian
016.	French
017.	Finnish
018.	German
019.	Greek
020.	Guyanese
021.	Haitian
022.	Holland
023.	Hungarian
024.	Irish
025.	Italian
026.	Indian
027.	Israeli
028.	Jamaican
029.	Japanese
030.	Jewish
031.	Korean
032.	Lebanese

033.	Macedoni an
034.	New Zeal ander
035.	Netherl ands
036.	Ni geri an
037.	Norwegi an
038.	Paki stani
039.	Filipi no
040.	Pol ish
041.	Portuguese
042.	Russi an
043.	Scotti sh
044.	Serbi an
045.	Si kh
046.	Somal ia
047.	Sl ovaki an
048.	Spani sh
049.	Sri Lankan
050.	Swedi sh
051.	Tami l
052.	Tri ni dadi an
053.	Ukrai ni an
054.	Vi etnamese
055.	Yugosl avi an
056.	Wel sh
057.	Ameri can
058.	Other European ethnici ty
059.	Other Asi an ethnici ty
060.	Other central Ameri can ethnici ty
061.	Other south Ameri can ethnici ty
062.	Other Afri can ethnici ty
063.	Other Cari bbean ethnici ty
064.	Arabi c/middle eastern ethnici ty
065.	Other north Afri can ethnici ty
066.	Mennonite
067.	Anglo Saxon / White Anglo-Saxon Protestant / Caucasi an / whi te, etc.
068.	Acadi an
069.	Inuit, Métis, Abori ginal , native
070.	Quebecois

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
018.	Bosni an
027.	Croati an
049.	Hungari an
052.	Itali an
103.	Roma
112.	Serbi an

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2029  
Not asked. Almost everybody is expected to be Czech.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categori es:
001.	Estoni an
002.	Russi an
003.	Ukrai ni an
004.	Bel orussi an

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Fi nns
002.	Finno-Swedes

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categori es:
-----------	----------------------------------

001. Finnish speaking Finns  
002. Swedish speaking Finns

Note that C2029 equals C2026 (Language usually spoken at home), except the missing values in C2026.  
See also notes on C2026.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C2029

Respondents of Germany were not asked about their ethnicity.  
As a proxy, CSES-data include respondent's country of birth.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Germany
002.	Germans of the former Regions of Germany in Eastern Europe
005.	Turkey
006.	Italy
007.	Poland
008.	Serbia
010.	Croatia
013.	Netherlands
014.	Belgium
015.	France
017.	Austria
018.	Czech Republic
020.	United States
021.	Russia
023.	India
024.	Iran
025.	Kazakhstan
026.	Hungary
027.	Rumania
028.	Great Britain
029.	Kyrgyzstan
030.	Colombia
031.	Morocco
032.	Norway
033.	Pakistan
035.	Spain
036.	Ukraine
037.	Albania
039.	Lebanon

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Greek
002.	Albanian
003.	Kurdish
004.	Armenian
005.	Austrian
006.	German
007.	Hungarian
008.	Polish

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2029

The Hong Kong questionnaire of origin does not include a question about the ethnicity of respondents. As our collaborators pointed out, "Hong Kong is a racially homogenous society, with over 95% of its population ethnic Chinese. To serve as a proxy, [one] may consult [C2026], which asked the main language usually spoken at home."

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C2029

Note that the respondents were not asked their ethnicity.  
The collaborator reported that this question was not applicable in Iceland.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2028-C2029

Note that respondents were not asked for their race or ethnicity due to a low variance for Irish citizens.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2029

CSES CODE	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	North Africa/Ethiopia
002.	Asia
003.	East Europe
004.	West and Central Europe
005.	America/Australia/South Africa
006.	R. native of Israel -father native of Israel
007.	R. native of Israel -father native of North Africa
008.	R. native of Israel -father native of Asia
009.	R. native of Israel -father native of East-Europe
010.	R. native of Israel -father native of W. or central Europe
011.	R. native of Israel -father native of America/Australia/South Africa
012.	Arab Sample
997.	No answer for himself and/or father [sic]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C2029

This question was not asked in Japan 2007, as the collaborators pointed out that "almost all respondents had been Japanese."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	European
002.	Maori
003.	Polynesian/Melanesian
004.	Generic Asian
005.	None of the above
006.	African
007.	Asian North East (Chinese, Korean)
008.	Indian, Sri Lankan
009.	South East Asian
010.	'New Zealander'

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Indigenous
002.	Afro-Peruvian
003.	White
004.	Mestizo

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Bicolano
002.	Ifugao
003.	Igorot
004.	Ilocano
005.	Ilonggo
006.	Cebuano
007.	Chinese
008.	Japanese
009.	Maguindanao
010.	Maranao
011.	Spanish
012.	Tagalog
013.	Tausug
014.	Yakan
021.	Waray

---

022.	Bi saya
023.	Kapampangan
024.	Subano
025.	Leyte Ño
026.	Hi gaonon
027.	Kenkaney
028.	Si qui j odnon
029.	Akl anon
030.	Kamayo
031.	Bohol ano
032.	Suri gaonon
033.	Mandaya
034.	Bagobo
035.	Zambal enya
036.	Pangasi nense
037.	B' Laan

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C2029

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2029

Note that the Polish respondents were not asked about their ethnicity. Polish collaborators pointed out that questions like these "are no important issues in Poland - more than 90% of population (...) are (...) of Polish ethnicity".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Polish

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Romani an
002.	Hungari an
003.	Roma
004.	German

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Slov ak
002.	Hungari an
003.	Roma

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categori es:
001.	Sloveni an
002.	Ital ian
003.	Hungari an
004.	Austri an
005.	German
006.	Croat ian
007.	Serbi an
008.	Montenegri n
009.	Bosni an, Musl im
010.	Macedoni an
011.	Al bani an
012.	Gipsy

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2029

According to our collaborators, language is a common measure for the ethnicity in South Africa.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2029

Note that in the Taiwanese election study respondents were asked to tell their mothers' and fathers' but not their own ethnicity. The below list of respondents' ethnicity represents a combination, calculated from their parents' ethnicity.

Codes 01-04 are respondents whose parents are of the same ethnicity.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Taiwanese Hakka
002.	Taiwanese Min-Nan
003.	Mainlander
004.	Aboriginal
005.	Foreigner
006.	Overseas Chinese
007.	Taiwanese Hakka/Min-Nan
008.	Taiwanese Hakka/Mainlander
009.	Taiwanese Hakka/Aboriginal
010.	Taiwanese Hakka/Overseas Chinese
011.	Taiwanese Min-Nan/Mainlander
012.	Taiwanese Min-Nan/Aboriginal
013.	Taiwanese Min-Nan/Foreigner
014.	Mainlander/Aboriginal
015.	Mainlander/Foreigner

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Thai
002.	Chinese
005.	Cambodian

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2029

A question about respondent's ethnicity was not included in the Turkish survey. According to the CSES collaborators, researchers might use the language question (C2026) as a proxy for C2029.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
010.	American Indian or Native American; tribal mentions
020.	Canadian; not specified as French-Canadian
030.	Canadian, of French origin
040.	Mexican [excl 863 explicit mention "Chicano" / "Mexican-American"]
050.	Central American
080.	Cuban
090.	Dominican Republic
100.	Haitian
110.	Jamaican
120.	Puerto Rican
130.	West Indian--not from one of the above countries
140.	West Indian--NA which country
160.	South American--any country
180.	English, British
190.	Irish [not specified Northern Ireland, 220]
200.	Scottish
210.	Welsh
230.	Scot-Irish
240.	British Isles; from 2 or more countries of the British Isles
280.	French
290.	German; also Pennsylvania Dutch
310.	Netherlands, Holland; Dutch
320.	Swiss
330.	From Western Europe; 2 or more countries of Western Europe
350.	Danish
360.	Finn, Finnish
370.	Norwegian
380.	Swedish
390.	Icelander
400.	Scandinavian; reference to 2 or more Scandinavian



	countries
430.	Czechoslovakian, Slavic
432.	Czech (specific); Bohemian (part of Czech Republic)
433.	Slovenian
450.	Hungarian
470.	Lithuanian
480.	Polish
490.	Russian; from U. S. S. R.
500.	Ukrainian
510.	Eastern Europe; reference to 2 or more countries of Eastern
550.	Greek
570.	Yugoslavian
600.	Italian
610.	Portuguese
620.	Spanish
640.	European; general mention of Europe; reference to 2 or more countries of Europe not codeable above
670.	Indian [East Indian; not American Indian 010]
680.	Southeast Asia--from Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Burma,
690.	Chinese
700.	Japanese; Japanese American
710.	Korean
720.	Asian
730.	Egyptian
740.	Iranian, Persian
780.	Lebanese
820.	Armenian
825.	Middle-Eastern; general mention of Middle East; reference to 2 or more Near-East/Middle-Eastern countries not codeable above
830.	African; from any African country excluding only Egypt [see 730]
840.	South Pacific Islander, excluding native Hawaiian
860.	White, Caucasian
861.	'Anglo'
862.	Black; Negro; American Black; African American
863.	Chicano; Mexican-American; Hispanic; Latin American
864.	Asian-American, excluding Japanese American
865.	"Bi-racial"
869.	Other U. S. ethnic group mentioned
872.	Jewish
873.	Other religious groups
890.	"American" specifically mentioned as only mention; "Just American" as only mention; "U. S. citizen" as only mention
891.	U. S. region (e.g. 'Southerner') or state mentioned
899.	None

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C2029

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Spaniard
002.	Lusitanian
003.	Italian
004.	Other Europeans
005.	Middle East
006.	Creole
007.	Afro

-----  
C2030 >>> RURAL OR URBAN RESIDENCE  
-----

D30. Rural /Urban Residence.  
.....

1. RURAL AREA OR VILLAGE
2. SMALL OR MIDDLE-SIZED TOWN
3. SUBURBS OF LARGE TOWN OR CITY
4. LARGE TOWN OR CITY

7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

9. MISSING

## NOTES: C2030

Instead of using the CSES-schema, some countries employ the amount of inhabitants for the size of respondent's place of residence. These measurements do not fit the categories generally used for C2030. Consequently, we advice users to carefully read the Election Study Notes of the current variable.

Data are not available for CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), HONG KONG (2008), TAIWAN (2008), UNITED STATES (2008).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	A rural area or village
02.	A small country town (under 10,000 people)
03.	A larger country town (over 10,000 people)
04.	A large town (over 25,000 people)
	A major city (over 100,000 people)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village
	Rural area or village close to a city
	Rural small town
02.	Small industrialized town
	Middle-sized town with little industry
	Middle-sized town little industry with much industry
03.	Suburbs of large town or city
04.	Centre of large town or city

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C2030

The original variable contained five categories that somewhat differ from the CSES categories. The following table shows adjustments of the codes to the CSES standards:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village
02.	Own population is less than 50,000
03.	Town population is from 50,000-200,000
04.	Population is over 200,000
	City population is over 1 000,000

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2030

The original variable in the data from Brazil contained three categories that somewhat differ from the CSES categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	[NOT IN USE IN BRAZILIAN DATA]
02.	Interior
03.	Metropolitan Region
04.	Capital

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2030

The original variable contained five categories that somewhat differ from the CSES categories. The following table shows adjustments of the codes to the CSES standards:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Small
02.	Medium
03.	Metropolitan area
04.	Capital
	Big

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 10,000 inhabitants
02.	10,000 through 99,999 inhabitants
03.	100,000 through 499,999 inhabitants
04.	500,000 and more inhabitants

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C2030

This variable was constructed from another variable "size of the municipality you live in".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2030

This variable was constructed from another variable "type of place you live in". Note that 14 respondents did not find themselves represented within the existing categories. Those 14

answers were assigned with the 'missing' value 9.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C2030

Note that the Danish question on respondent's type of residence differs slightly from the CSES wording. The Danish question of origin was: "Hvilken type by bor du i?" (What kind of city do you live in?), including the following categories:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	A rural area ("Et land distrikt")
02.	Town with less than 10,000 inhabitants ("En by med under 10.000 indbyggere")
	town between 10,000 and 50,000 inhabitants ("En by med 10.000 - 50.000 indbyggere")
04.	City between 50,001 and 500,000 inhabitants ("En by med 50.001 - 500.000 indbyggere")
	Metropolitan area ("Hovedstadsområdet")

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2030

The original variable in the data from Finland differs somewhat from CSES in the value labels' definitions:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Sparsely populated rural area
02.	Population centre in a rural area
03.	City/town suburb
04.	In a city center/town center

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Sparsely populated rural area
02.	Population centre in a rural area
03.	City or town suburb
04.	City or town center

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural (less than 2,000)
02.	Urban units (2,000-20,000)
03.	Urban units (20,000-100,000)
04.	Urban units (100,000-200,000)
	Urban units (200,000 and more)
	Paris and its suburbs

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural areas and small villages in the Greek mainland and islands
02.	Semi-rural areas in the Greek mainland and islands
03.	Suburban areas in the Greek mainland and islands
04.	Urban areas in the Greek mainland and islands: Large towns or cities, including Athens and other metropolitan cities

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2030

The Hong Kong questionnaire of origin does not include a question about "rural or urban residence". As our collaborators pointed out, "Hong Kong is a small and modern city, and most of the area can be regarded as urban, with divisions between rural and urban very unclear."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2030

This variable was calculated by the Icelandic collaborator based on information about postal codes. The distinction between respondents living in a rural area or village and a small or middle sized town could be biased, as the postal codes do not in all instances make a distinction between a town and the rural area surrounding it. In those instances it is due to that in the postal area includes a village and the rural area surrounding it. However, this sample should be close to the population, as 8.3% are categorized in the sample as living in a rural area or a village, and according to information from Statistics Iceland, the percent of the population living in rural areas was 7.4% on January 1, 2007.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village (less than 200 persons)
02.	Small or middle sized town (200-19.999 persons)
03.	Suburbs of large town or city (20.000-99.999 persons)
04.	Large town or city (more than 100.000 persons)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C2030

This variable was calculated by the Icelandic collaborator based on information about postal codes. The distinction between respondents living in a rural area or village and a small or middle sized town could be biased, as the postal codes do not in all instances make a distinction between a town and the rural area surrounding it. In those instances it is due to that in the postal area includes a village and the rural area surrounding it. However, this sample should be close to the population, as 10.1% is categorized as living in a rural area or a village, and according to information from Statistics Iceland the percent of the population living in rural areas was 6.5% in 2009.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village (less than 200 persons)
02.	Small or middle sized town (200-19.999)

=====

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | persons)   |
| 03. | Suburbs of large town or city<br>(20 000-99.999 persons) |
| 04. | Large town or city (more than 100 000<br>persons)        |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Open country Village (200-1,499)
02.	Town (1,500-2,999) Town (3,000-4,999) Town (5,000-9,999) Town (10,000 or more)
03.	Dublin County (outside Dublin City)
04.	Waterford City Galway City Limerick City Cork City Dublin City

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2030

Category 3, "Suburbs of Large Town or City" was not included in the Israeli survey instrument. Respondents were asked to choose between categories 1, 2, or 4.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Rural area or village (including Kibbutzim, Moshavim)
02.	Small or middle-sized town (all cities except Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa)
04.	Large city (Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa)
07.	REFUSED
08.	Don't KNOW

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C2030

The following codes were used from the Latvian election study:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Village, rural area
02.	Urban setting other than in category 4, or district centre
04.	Daugavpils, Liepaja, Jelgava, Ventspils, Jurmala, Riga

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C2030

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C2030

Classification of residence follows the National Institute of Statistics and Geography. Categories are:

CSES Code	Election Study Code
01.	Locality with less than 2500 inhabitants.
04.	Urban locality with more than 2500 inhabitants.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2030

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2030

Note that the DPES study used 5 categories for this variable.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Very low
02.	Low
03.	Medium
	High
04.	Very high

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	A rural area or settlement (under 10,000)
02.	A country town (under 10,000)
03.	A larger country town (10,000-25,000)
04.	A large town (over 25,000)
	A major city (over 100,000)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Rural area or village (less than 199 persons)
02.	Small or middle sized town (200-19.999 persons)
03.	Suburbs of large town or city (20 000-99.999 persons)
04.	Large town or city (more than 100 000 persons)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	less than 1,000 inhabitants
02.	1,000 - 19,999 inhabitants
03.	20,000 - 99,999 inhabitants
04.	more than 99,999 inhabitants

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Rural area
03.	Urban area - non capital
04.	Urban area - capital city

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village
02.	Small town (<30,000)
	Middle-sized town (30,000-100,000)
04.	Large town (100,000-200,000)
	City (>200,000)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Rural, not further specified
04.	Urban, not further specified

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Less than 2,000 inhabitants
02.	Between 2,000 and 10,000 inhabitants
03.	Between 10,001 and 100,000 inhabitants
04.	More than 100,001 inhabitants

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C2030

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Volunteered: don't know/refused

In Sweden there is no detailed information on how these categories were compiled by the collaborator.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C2030

There were two categories in the Swiss survey. Towns over 10,000 inhabitants as well as municipalities and towns situated within a metropolitan area were coded 2 (urban). The rest were coded 1 (rural municipalities).

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Rural area or village
02.	Town or city
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2030	
In contrast to the CSES schema, the Thai questionnaire did not include a category 1 "rural area of village".	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2030	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	A rural farm or a stand-alone rural house
	A village
02.	A small city / town
03.	The outer neighborhoods, slums of a big city
04.	A big city center

-----  
C2031 >>> PRIMARY ELECTORAL DISTRICT  
-----

D31. Primary electoral district of respondent.  
.....

00001. -90000. [SEE APPENDIX II FOR CODE VALUE LABELS]

99999. MISSING

NOTES: C2031

Wherever possible, this variable uses official district identification numbers.

In some cases, respondents' electoral districts were identified "indirectly," through postal codes, etc., by the CSES staff (always with the help of the appropriate collaborator(s)). Where postal codes, etc., were ambiguous, cases are coded missing.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C2031  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C2031

Note that the electoral districts in Brazil are equivalent to the states, with the exception of one: the Federal District. For procedural reasons, five electoral districts in the region North (Acre, Amapa, Rondonia, Roraima) and Center (Tocantins) were left out of the data sampling procedure. According to the National Household Survey PNAD2003 these 5 states represent 2% of the population.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C2031

Note that the electoral district is unknown for several respondents. For such observations, the first two digits of C2031 reflect the province, according to C2027, while the remaining three digits are "999".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C2031

The 15 regions were used as electoral districts. A region usually includes several electoral districts.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C2031

Note that the CSES coding schema does not distinguish between the three electoral districts of Tallinn City.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
1.	Tallinn West (district 1)
	Tallinn East (district 2)
	Tallinn South (district 3)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C2031

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C2031

Note that the electoral district Åland was excluded from sampling.

For more details on the sampling process, see introduction part of the current codebook, as well as the official Finnish Design Report, available at the CSES-website ([www.cses.org](http://www.cses.org)).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C2031

Note that the categories of the primary electoral districts equal those of the regions of residence, coded in C2027. However, research should care about the fact, that according to Greek law it is possible to vote in a district different than the one of residence. Consequently, C2027 and C2031 do not perfectly match.

Moreover, C2031 includes missing values for 69 respondents. Research, interested in the district results of respondents might use C2027 as a proxy for the missing cases of C2031, but should keep in mind that C2027 does not necessarily reflect the real electoral district of respondents.

For the labels of C2031, see appendices of the current codebook.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C2031

The electoral district of respondents, given by C2031, equals the region of residence, according to C2027

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C2031

In Israel, the entire country is a single electoral district. All cases are coded "00001".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C2031

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2031

In the Netherlands, the entire country functions as a single electoral district. Hence, it is coded "00001".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C2031

Researchers should note that C2031 actually includes 183 missing values. This also affects the information on the district variables C4001 to C4005.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C2031

Slovakian Elections are held in one nationwide electoral district. C2031 is hence coded "1" for all respondents.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C2031

The Taiwan collaborator was unable to provide primary electoral districts for the respondents. However, in Taiwan the residential regions closely relate to primary electoral districts. Accordingly, the region variable (C2027) has been employed as a proxy for C2031. It should be noted that some regions were divided into multiple electoral districts. Specifically, Taipei County (code 00001) contains three primary districts, Taipei City (code 00063) contains two primary districts and Kaohsiung City (code 00064) contains two primary districts.



Also note that there were no respondents from 02 Tayyuan Ci ty, 05 Miao Li, 16 Peng Hu, and 20 Chiayi Ci ty.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C2031

Note, at the time of the third data release, labels for the Thai districts according to the micro data were not available. (See also variable notes on C4001 - C4005).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C2031

Note that for three observations the official electoral district is unknown. Instead, the respondent's city of living, i.e. Ankara (code 6), Istanbul (code 34) and Izmir (code 35), is coded in C2031.

C2032 >>> DAYS INTERVIEW CONDUCTED POST ELECTION

Number of days after the election interview conducted.

001.-900. NUMBER OF DAYS

999. MISSING

NOTES: C2032

If the election was held on more than one day or involved multiple rounds, this variable reports the number of days from the first day of the election and/or the first round.

Data are not available for GERMANY (2005), ICELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), MEXICO (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), PERU (2011), PHILIPPINES (2010), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), THAILAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C2032

The first day of the election, 28.05.2010, was used to calculate C2032. For 13 respondents whose day of interview was not reported in C1027, the variable C2032 is missing.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C2032

Since the date of interview was accidentally not collected, this variable could not be calculated. However, all interviews were held within three months after the election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C2032

Since the source data contain information about the month of interview, but not day, this variable is coded missing. However, interviews were within a month after the election (the election were on June 9, and all interviews were completed in the month of June).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C2032

Note that the day of the interview is unknown (see notes on C1027). Consequently, C2032 cannot be calculated.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C2032

Note that C2032 refers to the first round of presidential elections, November 22nd, 2009.

## ))) CSES MODULE 3 MICRO-LEVEL DATA: SURVEY VARIABLES

C3001\_1 >>> Q1a. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-EGOCENTRIC-FIRST MENTION  
 C3001\_2 >>> Q1b. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-EGOCENTRIC-SECOND MENTION

Q1a. What has been the most important issue to you personally in this election?

Q1b. What has been the second most important issue to you personally in this election?

001.-899. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM CODES  
 [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

900. OTHER PROBLEM (NOT SPECIFIABLE)  
 901. NO PROBLEM

997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

999. MISSING

NOTES: C3001\_1-C3001\_2

This is usually an open-ended question. Collaborators coded this variable in a detailed way and with a minimum of at least twenty categories.

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), GERMANY (2005), PERU (2011), POLAND (2005), SOUTH AFRICA (2009).

Coding Strategy:

- A. The order of responses was kept, except if the response on the first question was missing and the response on the second question included a substantial answer. Then the substantial answer was coded in C3001\_1, while C3001\_2 was coded as missing (code 99).
- B. Common answers, such as "other problem" (code 900) or "no problem" (code 901) were coded into common categories
- C. Repeated mentions in C3001\_1 and C3001\_2 were kept.

Table: Frequencies on C3001\_2 for respondents that repeated their problem mention of C3001\_1:

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	1
BELARUS (2008)	6
BRAZIL (2010)	78
CROATIA (2007)	68
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	90
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	68
DENMARK (2007)	577
ESTONIA (2011)	50
FINLAND (2007)	42
FINLAND (2011)	42
FRANCE (2007)	59
GERMANY (2009)	222
ICELAND (2007)	31
ICELAND (2009)	82
IRELAND (2007)	339
ISRAEL (2006)	34
JAPAN (2007)	33

---

LATVIA (2010)	128
MEXICO (2006)	60
MEXICO (2009)	84
NETHERLANDS (2006)	33
NETHERLANDS (2010)	19
NORWAY (2009)	34
PHILIPPINES (2010)	64
POLAND (2007)	96
PORTUGAL (2009)	19
ROMANIA (2009)	62
SLOVAKIA (2010)	52
SLOVENIA (2008)	15
SPAIN (2008)	2
SWEDEN (2006)	2
SWITZERLAND (2007)	2
THAILAND (2007)	153
TURKEY (2011)	42
UNITED STATES (2008)	133
URUGUAY (2009)	29

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

Australia offered a closed-list of items for C3001.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Taxation
002.	Immigration
003.	Education
004.	The environment
005.	Industrial relations
006.	Health and Medicare
007.	Defense and national security
008.	Global warming
009.	Management of water
010.	Unemployment
011.	Treatment of aborigines
012.	Interest rates
013.	The war in Iraq
014.	Terrorism

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	A low retirement benefit, salary, the lack of money
002.	Problems with health (personal and close people)
003.	High tuition fees
004.	Inefficient functioning of the housing / community amenities
005.	problems in finding a job, with employment
006.	Problems of the lost investments
007.	Cancelling reduced payment provided to retirees and students
008.	Problem of the possible prolongation of the retirement age
009.	Little information about the candidates before the elections
010.	Problem of making the living conditions better
011.	Legitimacy of the elections, their fairness
012.	A low level of public health services
013.	A low level of education
014.	The problem of going abroad, of getting a visa
015.	The fear of losing a job
016.	The absence of democracy in the country
017.	The growth of prices
018.	There is no assurance in tomorrow, the fear of future
019.	Bureaucracy, corruption
020.	The relations between our country and the EU
021.	Family relations

022.	Ecological problems
023.	Changing power
024.	The absence of worthy candidates
025.	The problems of business development, high taxes
026.	Depression
027.	Lack of free time, the absence of possibilities to have rest
028.	Criminality
029.	The spread of alcoholism
030.	The necessity to enforce the country's defense potential
031.	The necessity to improve ecology
032.	Fighting crime
033.	To improve the conditions for business
034.	Violating human rights
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Rebellions in prisons
002.	Combat of corruption / Money laundering
003.	Social programs of income redistribution / projects of federal government (Bolsa Family Grant / Bolsa School Grant / Zero Hunger / University for All)
004.	Scandals involving government
005.	The state investment of collected money
006.	Employment / new Jobs / unemployment
007.	Salary / low salaries / raise of salaries
008.	Public Safety / Violence / improvements in safety
009.	Education / improvement in education
010.	Health / improvements in hospitals / lack of health investments
011.	Improvement of highways / improvements of streets
012.	Ethics in politics
013.	Party coalitions / political coalitions
014.	Combat of hunger
015.	Combat of poverty
016.	New candidates / new options of candidates
017.	Economy growth in 2007 / Economy / Changes in Economy
018.	Reduction of public expenditures
019.	The buying of the corruption dossier (a fake dossier that would incriminate opposition candidates)
020.	Null vote campaign
021.	General Issues related to the election
022.	Corruption involving the Workers' party
023.	Imprisonment of corrupt politicians
024.	Debates among politicians
025.	policies for young people
026.	Proposals of politicians / promises of politicians / candidacy of Lula
027.	Reelection of president
028.	The victory of Cid Gomes (running for governor in the state of Ceará)
029.	The Brazilian oil Company in Bolivia
030.	Prohibition of campaign at the polling place
031.	Social Security reform
032.	Investments in shipyards
033.	The modernity of Electronic vote / the velocity of vote counting / the ballot box
034.	The construction of steel industry in the state of Ceará
035.	The ending of subway construction
036.	The absence of Lula at the TV debate
037.	Inflation
038.	Impunity / the lack of justice
039.	Disarmament
040.	The basic sanitation conditions

041. Victory of PSDB  
 042. The agrarian reform  
 043. The laws in defense of women  
 044. Chances that Lula loses election  
 045. To combat organized crime  
 046. Lula does not answer to the corruption problems  
 047. Drugs / fighting drug crime  
 048. Attacks among candidates  
 049. The victory of Palocci (former PT minister of treasure)  
 050. The victory of Maluf (former conservative governor of the state of Sao Paulo)  
 051. The payment of the external debt  
 052. Popular housing  
 053. The National Institute of Social Security  
 054. Candidate Alcido turned the electoral trends (PP governor candidate of the state of Goias)  
 055. The reduction of taxes  
 056. The victory of Requião (PMDB governor candidate of the state of Paraná)  
 057. The defeat of Osmar (PMDB federal deputy of the state of Paraná)  
 058. The fact that Lula says he does not know about corruption  
 059. The fact that Lula always worked  
 060. People's desire for change  
 061. Defeat of governor Lucio (PSDB candidate running for reelection in the state of Ceará)  
 062. Victory of Wagner (PT governor candidate of the state of Bahia)  
 063. The defeat of Alckmin (the opposition candidate to presidency in the 2nd round)  
 064. Privatization of firms  
 065. PCC / "the first command of capital" (the most important crime organization)  
 066. The attempt to remove the president Lula  
 067. Highway toll  
 068. Support to agriculture  
 069. Surprises of the election 2nd round  
 070. The election of a woman to government  
 071. The maintenance of the free tax zone  
 072. Democracy  
 073. The adviser of Lula - Jose Dirceu (former ministry of Civil House)  
 074. The leaving of Zeca (PT governor of the state of Mato Grosso do Sul)  
 075. Deputies' salaries  
 076. The entrance of Clodovil in politics as deputy (Clodovil was a fashion designer)  
 077. Increase the number of public universities  
 078. The presidential election  
 079. The defamation of Lula  
 080. The prostitution of minor age people  
 081. The shift of politicians  
 082. The indifference to the Brazilian people  
 083. The government promises of Geraldo Alckmin (PSDB former governor of Sao Paulo)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

The original questionnaire provided an open answer question. Problem mentions were categorized subsequently by the CSES (national) collaborator.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Education
002.	Health
004.	Salary and employment
005.	Abortion debate
006.	Safety

=====

010.	Income transfer programs
018.	Woman in presidency
021.	Lula government and Workers' Party in power
026.	Economic stability
032.	Development and stability
077.	Electoral campaign in general
082.	General issues, values
102.	Social policy and public services
185.	Corruption
209.	Presidential campaign

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
005.	Who wins, general interest in outcome
006.	Party platform / what the parties stand for
010.	Create jobs
020.	General mention: debt, finances
025.	Government spending, government waste
026.	Balance the budget / budget
030.	Economy
031.	Economy & health
032.	Economy & environment
033.	Health care & environment'
035.	Agriculture
036.	BSE
039.	Oil & gas (fuel) prices
045.	Afghan war
046.	Election timing
047.	Canada wheat board
048.	Military / military spending / defense
049.	Arts & culture
050.	Taxation issues
057.	Health care issues
058.	Health & taxes combined
059.	Health & jobs combined
060.	Social programs, services, welfare / health & programs
061.	Seniors: pensions / retirement issues & health
062.	Family benefits, childcare funding & programs
063.	Jobs & health & welfare combined
064.	Health care & education combined
065.	Educational issues, programs & funding
070.	Same sex marriage issue
071.	Crime / violence, gun crime, justice system
072.	Poverty as agenda issue
073.	Abortion (pro or con)
074.	Rights / justice issues: aboriginal, women, immigrants, etc.
075.	Environmental / ecological issues
076.	Moral issues, family values (regardless of direction)
077.	Gun control / registry, bill c68
078.	Immigration as an issue
079.	Foreign affairs / us relations, security issues
080.	Quebec sovereignty / interests
081.	National unity
082.	Federal / provincial relations, "fiscal inequality"
083.	Electoral reform & procedural reform issues
084.	Canada's future, stability
090.	Sponsorship issue, corruption, dishonesty / honesty
091.	Ethics & Effectiveness: accountability / transparency / leadership
092.	Desire for majority government
093.	Desire for minority government
094.	Defeat conservatives / elect liberals
095.	Defeat liberals / elect conservatives

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment, Not enough Jobs
002.	Work, Labor situation
003.	Firing, instability at work
004.	Poverty, extreme poverty
005.	Economy, economic problems, bad situation
006.	Economic Crisis
007.	Inflation, high prices, cost of living
008.	Low income, bad income, not enough Money
009.	Retired People, pensions, bad pensions
010.	Inequality, social inequality, inequality between Rich and poor
011.	Strikes, problems with unions, labor conflicts
012.	Crime, assaults, burglaries, insecurity, safety
013.	Drug Addiction, drugs, drug
014.	'Transantiago', transport, transport problems Santiago
015.	Congestion, traffic jam
016.	Domestic violence, violence against women, femicide
017.	Education, studies, little money for education, credit
018.	Poor quality of education, poor education
019.	Health, Auge plan, public health
020.	Bad hospital care, poor health care
021.	Housing
022.	Corruption, bribes, weird things, government corruption
023.	Lack of leadership from the president, without leadership
024.	political, politicians, politics, bad Administration
025.	Alcoholism
026.	Pollution, environmental problems, smog
027.	Lack of opportunities / little chance for Youth
028.	Justice, bad justice, justice system,
029.	Pedophilia, attacks on children
030.	Problem with Bolivia, Argentina gas problem
031.	Problems bordering Peru, tensions with Peru
032.	Gas, gas crisis, fuel, energy issues
033.	International Problems (Venezuela, Bolivia, etc.)
038.	Cash Transfer
899.	Other economical problems
898.	Other social problems
897.	Other political problems

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment
002.	Economy
003.	Pensions
004.	Health care
005.	Wages and living standard
006.	Agriculture
007.	European Union accession
008.	Protected ecological zone in the Adriatic
009.	Joining the NATO
010.	War veterans
011.	Corruption
012.	Justice system and crime
013.	Concern if favored or least favored party will win
014.	Social justice
015.	National pride and patriotism
016.	Competence and quality of government
017.	Schools
018.	Taxes

019.	Foreign Policy
020.	Privatization
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C3001_1-C3001_2	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
010.	Elections - turnout
011.	Elections - campaign
012.	Elections - media
013.	Elections - success of particular parties
014.	Elections - results
015.	Elections - party manifestos, policies
016.	Problems of electoral and constitutional systems
017.	KSCM
018.	Elections - change
019.	Other related to politics (not dissatisfaction)
020.	Taxes
021.	Budget
022.	Business
023.	Salaries and income, living standards
024.	Economy and economic reforms (generally)
025.	Inflation
026.	Underground / gray economy and its solutions
027.	Stock-market, shares, banks
028.	Bankruptcy, company take-over from foreign companies
031.	Healthcare
032.	Education
033.	Unemployment, work and employment
034.	Pensions
035.	Family policy
036.	Housing policy
037.	Social policy (general)
038.	Environment
039.	Agriculture
040.	Culture
041.	Corruption
042.	Criminality
043.	Drugs, drug policy
044.	Courts, judiciary
045.	Minorities, minorities policy
046.	Transport policy
047.	Energy policy
048.	Migration
049.	Information policy
050.	EU
051.	Foreign policy
052.	Defense and security of country
053.	Police
061.	Bad politicians
062.	Bad laws
078.	Orientation towards future
079.	Democracy
080.	Moral issues
081.	Norms and values
082.	Religion
083.	Sport
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Government formation, including composition
002.	Consensus
003.	Progress for the country (not specified)
004.	The future
005.	Stability
006.	Planning
007.	Enhance the understanding of political questions
008.	Enhance the understanding of EU questions



009.	Domestic politics
010.	Moral and ethical issues
011.	Trust/credibility
012.	Other non-political answers
020.	Credibility of politicians
021.	Fulfillment of election promises
022.	Political consensus
023.	Self-interest of politicians
024.	Increase the electoral threshold
025.	Politicians looking after the interest of citizens
026.	Democracy/human rights
027.	Public administration (the dominance of the capital etc.)
028.	Municipalities
029.	Bureaucracy
030.	Simplification of the law
031.	Reduction in committees, councils etc.
032.	Other specific answers about politicians, public administration and democracy
033.	The Municipality Reform
040.	The economy
041.	Income policy
042.	Employment, unemployment (including employment policies)
043.	Youth unemployment
044.	Maintain employment in country
045.	Privatization
046.	Balance of payments/ external debt
047.	Global competitiveness
048.	Interest rates
049.	Inflation
050.	Production and investment
051.	Competition and property
052.	Early retirement scheme (maintaining it)
053.	Abolishing the early retirement scheme
054.	"The pension bomb"
055.	The devaluation of private pensions
056.	Other specific answers about the economy
060.	Industrial policy
061.	Agriculture/ fishery
062.	Ecology
063.	Conditions for industries
064.	Trade problems
065.	Small business owners
066.	Reduction in working hours
067.	Salary (including collective bargaining)
068.	Equal pay, equal rights for women
069.	Moonlighting (evading taxes)
070.	Other specific answers about industry and trade unions
071.	Workers from Eastern Europe
072.	Lack of workers
080.	Taxes generally
081.	VAT and tariffs
082.	Public sector
083.	Increase in public expenditure
084.	Redistribution of public expenditure
085.	Reduction in public expenditure
086.	Other answers about the public sector
087.	Tax reform/ tax level
088.	Income tax (levels of income tax)
089.	Tax cuts
090.	Tax freeze
091.	Coordination tax (reduction)
092.	House ownership
093.	Regulations
094.	Budgetary policies
095.	The budget
096.	Other specific answers about taxes

---



---

100.	Too many refugees/immigrants
101.	No more refugees/immigrants
102.	Expulsion of refugees/immigrants
103.	Family reunification (negative)
104.	Asylum and immigration policy too soft
105.	Economic refugees (negative)
106.	Crime committed by immigrants/refugees
107.	Forced marriages
108.	Second generation immigrants
109.	Other negative comments about immigrants and Muslims in Denmark
110.	Integration of refugees/immigrants
111.	Refugees and immigrants
112.	Immigration, asylum and integration policies
113.	Ensure better integration of refugees/immigrants (positive remarks)
114.	Fighting racism
115.	Too restrictive immigration / asylum policies
116.	Unemployment amongst refugees and immigrants
117.	Other positive comments about refugees / immigrants
118.	Other specific answers about refugees / immigrants
120.	Social problems (including social policies)
121.	Poverty
122.	Conditions for the disabled
123.	Homelessness
124.	Drug addiction/ alcoholism
125.	Care for the mentally ill
126.	Illness
127.	Polarization
128.	Elderly people
129.	Pensions
130.	Nursing homes
131.	Policies for the elderly
132.	Families with children/ child care
133.	Children's rights
134.	Maternity leave
135.	Policies regarding children
136.	Education
137.	Schools
138.	Vocational training
139.	Higher education
140.	Research
141.	Further education, re-training
142.	Financial support for students
143.	Health care
144.	Waiting lists
145.	Private hospitals
146.	No cuts in the health care system
147.	Health care generally
148.	Housing problems
149.	Housing for young people
150.	Welfare (welfare state)
151.	Inequality and redistribution
152.	Maintaining welfare policies
153.	Cutting welfare policies
154.	Citizen's salary
155.	User payment
156.	Outsourcing
157.	Transfer payments
158.	Welfare reforms, benefits etc.
159.	Maintaining the welfare state
160.	Violence
161.	Crime
162.	Law and order
163.	Legal affairs
164.	Police
165.	Other specific answers about welfare policies
166.	Youth problems

167.	Regional problems
168.	Culture policies
169.	Church issues
180.	Foreign policy
181.	EU, common market, EMU
182.	EU opt-outs
183.	EU enlargement
184.	Skepticism towards the EU
185.	EU generally (including the EU Constitution)
186.	EU (positive)
187.	NATO, Middle East
188.	Cuts in defense expenditure
189.	Defense/ security policies
190.	Defense policies
191.	Development Aid (global inequality)
192.	Stopping development aid
193.	World peace
194.	War
195.	Terror
196.	Iraq war
197.	Globalization
198.	Improved international relations
199.	Other specific foreign policy answers
210.	Environment (including energy policy)
211.	Pollution
212.	Food
213.	Animal welfare
214.	Other specific environment questions
215.	Infrastructure
216.	Traffic, speed limits
217.	Public transport
218.	Bridges
219.	Other specific traffic answers
230.	Personal freedom
231.	Respect for the individual
232.	Acceptance of other people
233.	Solidarity
234.	Everyone can and should contribute to society
235.	Maintain Danish culture
236.	Unseat the current government/administration
237.	Get a centre-right government/administration
238.	Get a socialistic government/administration
239.	Keep current government/administration
240.	Other specific political statements
899.	Diffuse answers; everything

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment
002.	Economic crisis, economic sustainability
003.	Living standard, people's welfare
004.	Low salaries
005.	Low pensions, situation of pensioners
006.	Price increase, high cost of living, inflation
007.	Housing costs, costs related to home ownership
008.	General problems of educational system
009.	Free education, free higher education, availability of education
010.	Mother's pension, parental benefit
011.	Child allowance, family allowance, birth allowance
012.	The situation of families with children, family policy
013.	Tax system, tax politics, high taxes
014.	Abolition of land tax
015.	Progressive income tax, income tax reform
016.	Corruption
017.	Social inequality, social stratification
018.	Social matters, social guarantees, social

	benefits
019.	Emigration of workforce
020.	Medicine and healthcare, healthcare financing
021.	Russian-language schools' transmission to Estonian language, survival of Russian-language education
022.	Integration, the situation of minorities in Estonia
023.	Immigration
024.	The situation of Russians in Estonia, "Russian matters"
025.	Survival of Estonian nationality, language, culture
026.	Relations with neighboring countries
027.	Relations with Russia
028.	Security policy, state security
029.	Administrative reform, administrative capacity
030.	Regional policy
031.	Fading of rural areas, stimulation of rural life
032.	Agricultural policy
033.	Party constellation in parliament
034.	Political feud, battles over power, lack of Consensus
035.	Imperfect electoral system, alteration of electoral system
036.	Imperfect political system
037.	Need to increase turnout in voting, low turnout
038.	Unreliability of politicians, not keeping promises, lying
039.	State remains distant from public
040.	Honest, fair elections
041.	Raising of retirement age
042.	Citizenship issues

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Pensioner issues / pensions
002.	Taxation of pensioners, subsistence
003.	Health care resources / labor shortage / working conditions
004.	social and health care in general
005.	wage level in health care
006.	Care of the elderly
007.	Status of family caregivers, home care
008.	Mental health care
009.	Employment / unemployment
010.	Special issues of labor policy, coping at work
011.	Status and support of families with children
012.	Education
013.	Taxation / tax policy
014.	Correcting individual taxes, tax deductions
015.	Maintaining welfare / the welfare state, social policy
016.	Special issues of welfare / social policy
017.	Low income / poverty issues
018.	Growth of income disparity / social inequality / social justice
019.	Social security
020.	Status of students
021.	Increasing the study grants / subsistence of students
022.	Energy policy
023.	Nuclear power
024.	Climate / climate change, natural disasters
025.	Nature conservation / environmental issues
026.	Traffic policy
027.	Housing policy, rents
028.	Regional policy / keeping the whole of Finland

- inhabited
- 029. Municipal policy / issues
  - 030. Agricultural issues
  - 031. Entrepreneur issues, prerequisites for entrepreneurship
  - 032. Fairer wages / social justice
  - 033. worker issues, worker welfare
  - 034. Equality / (gender) equality
  - 035. Status / issues of minorities / special groups
  - 036. Immigrant policy
  - 037. Finnishness, Finland for Finns
  - 038. Economy / economic policy / special issues of Finnish economic policy
  - 039. Development of Finland in general
  - 040. NATO
  - 041. Foreign and security policy
  - 042. EU / EU policy, in general
  - 043. Peace
  - 044. Swedish language
  - 045. Government base and prime minister
  - 046. Other issues connected to elections and voting
  - 047. Values, morals
  - 048. Beating racism / tolerance / value pluralism / multiculturalism
  - 049. Changing Finnish policies / regime change / protest
  - 050. Animal protection
  - 051. Giving up economic growth / reducing consumption
  - 052. Gender-neutral marriage law
  - 053. Crime / domestic security / more police officers
  - 054. Grey economy
  - 055. Human rights
  - 056. Cultural policy
  - 057. Finnish economy / sustaining welfare / raising retirement age
  - 058. Poverty / universal basic income / exclusion / marginalization
  - 059. Negative EU issues / support indebted countries / stability funds

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

The original questionnaire provided an open answer question. Problem mentions were categorized afterwards, which yielded repeated mentions in C3001\_1 and C3001\_2.

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Work and employment
002.	Purchasing power, wages and inflation
003.	Pensions, elderly people
004.	Poverty and social justice
005.	Housing and urban policy
006.	Health and welfare
007.	Immigration and integration
008.	Law and order
009.	Europe
010.	Foreign policy
011.	Education and research
012.	Environment and ecology
013.	Taxes and fiscal policy
014.	National debt and public deficits
015.	Economic development and competitiveness
016.	Justice
017.	Public services
018.	Politics and institutions
019.	Other social issues
020.	Other economic issues

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
010.	Health situation
020.	Financial situation
030.	Unemployment Hartz IV
040.	Problems at work
050.	Security law
060.	Infrastructure
070.	Education
080.	Adjustments on politics
100.	Political processes
110.	Political conflicts and scandals
120.	Federal election campaign
140.	Federal election
150.	Regional elections
170.	Further mentions political processes
200.	Political structures
210.	Reform of governance
220.	Formal institutions
230.	Principles of state organization
240.	Normative order
250.	Further mentions political structures
310.	Foreign policies
330.	Defense policies
340.	Inner security policies
350.	Infrastructure policies
360.	Environment policies
370.	Social policies
380.	Labor market policies
381.	Unemployment
387.	Employment
390.	Economy policies
391.	Economy financial crisis
410.	Education policies
420.	Culture leisure policies
430.	Financial policies
440.	East German policies
450.	Further mentions policies
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Economic crisis
002.	Corruption
003.	Unemployment
004.	Pensions
005.	Public administration
006.	Failure of the government
007.	The need for change of government
008.	Education
009.	Foreign policy
010.	Health
011.	Immigration
012.	Crime
013.	Environment
014.	Cost of life
015.	Poverty
016.	Tax evasion
017.	Poor public administration
018.	Agriculture
019.	Low birth rates
020.	Drugs
022.	No cooperation of parties
026.	Election of the president of the republic
027.	Lack of trust towards politicians
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Universal suffrage
002.	Performance of LegCo members

003.	Past performance of LegCo members
004.	Political institutions and their reform and development
005.	Whether LegCo members truly represent the public
006.	Whether LegCo members keep their election pledges
007.	Whether LegCo members help the public
008.	Whether LegCo members help the respondent
009.	Party affiliation of the candidates
010.	Quality or ability of LegCo members
011.	Beloved candidates elected
012.	Monitoring of the government
013.	Campaign or policy platforms
014.	Dominance of the LegCo by one party or political balance
015.	Good governance of the government
016.	Executive-legislature relationship
017.	Other political issues
018.	Economy
019.	Minimum wage
020.	(Un)employment
021.	Taxes
022.	Inflation
023.	Lehman incident
024.	Livelihood of the public
025.	Old-age allowance
026.	Social welfare
027.	Healthcare services
028.	Tax on foreign domestic servants
029.	Housing
030.	Education
031.	Transportation fees
032.	Social harmony
033.	Fair or open election
034.	Rule of law
035.	Environmental protection
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3001_1-C3001_2	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C3001_1-C3001_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Foreign Policy
002.	Joining the European Union / adopting the euro
003.	Not joining the European Union / not adopting the euro
004.	The Economic crisis / bank crisis / currency crisis
005.	The Economy
006.	Economical stability
008.	Reducing public expenditure / fair distribution of public expenditure
009.	Taxes
010.	Wages / living standards / taxes
011.	Change of government / throwing the rascals out / voting in parties that have been in opposition
012.	Prices / inflation / interest rates
013.	Agriculture
014.	Fisheries
015.	The fishery quota system
016.	Holding those accountable who were responsible for the bank crisis
017.	Continuation of building up power stations / energy issues / big industry
018.	Reducing / stopping big industry
019.	Restoration / saving the country / nation
020.	Social welfare
021.	Equality, gender issues
022.	Equality, living standards
023.	Icesave (bank)
024.	Education
025.	Health matters

---

026.	Family matters
027.	Improving the image of Iceland (internationally)
028.	Welfare of companies
029.	Welfare of the households / the people (the Economic crisis)
030.	Employment
031.	Regional policy
032.	Transportation / Regional policy
033.	Democracy / democratic reform / honesty / political trust
034.	European issues / European Union / EEA / EFTA / the Euro
035.	Environmental issues
036.	The elderly / people with disability
037.	Immigration
039.	Energy issues / power stations
040.	Nationalistic issues / guard the independency of the country

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

See codes on C3002\_1-C3002\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
008.	General security
009.	The Palestinian problem
010.	Leaving the occupied territories
011.	The settlements
012.	Palestinian terror
013.	Solutions for the evacuated people
014.	The governing of the Hamas at the PLO
015.	The demographic problem / the wall
016.	The Arabs
017.	The nuclear Iranian threat
018.	Foreign policy
019.	Israeli status in the world
020.	Independent foreign policy
021.	Peace process
022.	The building of Palestinian state
023.	Better relations with the Arab states
024.	Economy
025.	Better standard of living
026.	Unemployment
027.	Internal and society problems
028.	Poverty, welfare
029.	Young couples, x-soldier, residence
030.	Education
031.	Teenagers
032.	Old people
033.	Health
034.	Crime, drugs
035.	Violence
036.	Violence in the family, between young people
037.	Transportation
038.	Immigration problems
039.	Environmental issues
040.	The religious character of Israel
041.	The separation of religion from state
042.	Problems between the Jewish and the Arabs in Israel
043.	Foreign workers
044.	Corruption
045.	Enforcement of rule of law
046.	Personal rights
047.	Election rules, candidate selection
048.	The government functioning
049.	Civil war
050.	Security / society, security / economy



051.	Everything
053.	Returning the kidnapped soldiers
054.	Personal security / internal security
056.	Engagement

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001.	Administrative reform
002.	Employment issues
003.	Pension
004.	Tax
005.	Agriculture
006.	Evaluation of minister
007.	Change of government
008.	Constitutional revision
009.	Corruption
010.	Political reform
011.	Economic stimulus package
012.	Public work
013.	Economic issues
014.	Untroubled living conditions
015.	Foreign affairs
016.	War in Iraq
017.	Abduction by North Korea agents
018.	Defense
019.	Education
020.	Welfare
021.	Aging society
022.	Birth dearth
023.	Public safety
024.	Environmental issues

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001.	Employment, jobs
001.	Personal or family income
003.	Old-age pensions
004.	Economic development, overcoming the crisis
005.	Ethnic issues
006.	Social welfare
007.	Taxes
008.	Selection of competent, reputable politicians
009.	Lack of trustworthy politicians
010.	Voting in elections
011.	Education
012.	Health care
013.	Corruption
014.	Honest politics
015.	Influx of new faces in to politics
016.	Choosing the least of evils
017.	Emigration
018.	Delivering on promises of politicians
019.	State budget, public finances
020.	Strategy for development of Latvia
021.	Relations with Russia
022.	General development, well-being of the country
023.	Citizenship issues
024.	Farming
025.	Social, income inequality
026.	Living conditions, like prices, costs etc
027.	Youth issues
028.	Child-care benefits, family policy issues
029.	Public infrastructure, roads
030.	Immigration
031.	Culture, sports
032.	Environmental issues
033.	Attitudes, inertia, distrust in population and Parliament

034.	Criminality
035.	Foreign policy
036.	Bureaucracy

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
011.	Employment
012.	Crime
013.	Clean election
014.	Uncontested election
015.	Electoral turnout
016.	Change of President
017.	Education
018.	Senior citizens
019.	Poverty
020.	Democracy
021.	Post electoral Conflict
022.	Candidates offers
023.	Better wages
024.	Credit for living quarters
025.	Problems among candidates
026.	See if AMLO wins
027.	Assistance to women
028.	Honesty
029.	Continuity of government policies
030.	Assistance to farmers
031.	Economy
032.	Health services
033.	Change of power
034.	Lower the expenses
035.	Corruption
036.	Drug consumption
037.	Lower prices
038.	NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement)
039.	Human Rights
040.	Video scandals
041.	Not privatize electricity
042.	Migration
043.	Drug trafficking
044.	Change in the economic model
045.	Handicapped
046.	The future
047.	Assistance to neighborhoods
048.	Lower salaries of public servants
049.	Family integration
050.	The debate
051.	Not making clear the electoral preferences
052.	Drinkable water service
053.	Kidnapping
054.	The problem of the women killed at Cd. Juarez
055.	Violence
056.	Pavement / roads
057.	Assistance to the youth
058.	That for the first time the Mexicans could vote from abroad
059.	The international observers should not intervene
060.	Election of deputies & senators
061.	Social programs
062.	The dirty electoral campaign of the PAN
063.	Remove pensions to the ex presidents / government employees
064.	Equality
066.	Good job from the observers of parties
067.	Foreign debt
068.	Respect the vote of the citizens
069.	Not to affect the foreign investment
070.	Inflation
071.	Drug pushing

072.	Giving grants
073.	Credibility of the institutions / IFE
074.	Taxes
075.	Pensioners
076.	Economic Stability
077.	State-owned petroleum company: Petróleos Mexicanos (PEMEX)
078.	Government corruption
079.	Bad organization of the electoral commission (IFE)
080.	Participation of the member staff voting booth
081.	Stability in the country
082.	That Calderon is supported by the businessmen
083.	Uncertainty for the results
084.	The intervention of President Fox in the elections
085.	The elections for president municipal
086.	Fulfill the campaign promises
087.	Improve the standard of living
088.	Popular health services
089.	Choosing the Mexico City mayor
090.	Implement more rigid laws
091.	Social equality
092.	Intervention of the media
094.	Pollution
095.	The PRI lost votes
100.	Conflict between Obrador and Calderón
101.	Public services
102.	Support to the fishing industry
103.	Bureaucracy
104.	Support to the street boys
105.	That they try to buy the vote with money / provisions
106.	Public works
107.	Respect laws
108.	Economic Crisis

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
002.	Victory of the PRI
003.	Drinking Water
004.	Combat Drug Trafficking
005.	Corruption of Police / Politicians / Government
006.	Public Works / Infrastructure
007.	Paving
008.	Promote Voting
009.	Abstention
010.	Elections
011.	Fight Crime
012.	Lighting
013.	Rising Prices / Inflation
014.	Cancel Vote
015.	Support for the Elderly
016.	Communication Channels
017.	Unemployment / Employment Generating
018.	Support for Students / Scholarships
019.	Education / Support for Schools
020.	Support for Single Mothers / Women Support
021.	Support for Agriculture
022.	Youth Support
023.	Helps Communities / Rural Support
024.	Help the Poor
025.	Help People / Financial Aid
026.	Wage Increase
027.	Proposals Candidate / Proposals Party
028.	Fighting Crime
029.	Economics / Economic Crisis
030.	Democracy
031.	Drugs / Drug Addiction

032.	Better Jobs
033.	Deputies / Election of Deputies
034.	Poverty
035.	Death Penalty
036.	Improve Clinics / Hospitals / free Medicines
037.	Transparency / That Votes are Legal / Legality
038.	Kidnapping
039.	Governor Election
040.	Change in Government / Rulers Change
041.	Election Results
042.	Attacks between the Parties
043.	Improving Public Services
044.	Parties do not Fulfill their Promises
045.	Housing
046.	My Vote
047.	Security at the Polling Station

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

011.	Democratic reform
012.	Bureaucracy
013.	State control
014.	Process of voting
021.	Europe
022.	Admission Turkey
023.	European constitution
024.	Foreign policy
031.	Military missions
032.	Defense policies
041.	Economy / economic growth
051.	Taxes
052.	Mortgage rate deduction
053.	Financial policies
061.	Crime
062.	Safety
063.	Terrorism
064.	Punishment / justice system
067.	Ethical subjects
071.	Immigration policy
072.	Integration policy
073.	General pardon
074.	Islam
075.	Foreigners
080.	Agriculture
081.	Environment
090.	Education
091.	Culture
101.	Elderly policy
102.	Pensions
103.	Ageing population
104.	Family policy / childcare
105.	Policy on poverty
106.	Social policy
107.	Welfare services
108.	Distribution of income
109.	Attention lowest incomes
110.	Employment
120.	Traffic
121.	Traffic jams / public transport
122.	Mobility
131.	(Health)Care
132.	Market forces health care
133.	New health care system
140.	Environment
141.	Animal rights
142.	Nuclear energy
143.	Housing
150.	Norms and values
155.	Sharing

160.	Christian politics
161.	Social policies
170.	Functioning politics
171.	Cabinet formation
172.	Too many parties
173.	Continuation / change of policy
174.	Distribution of seats
175.	More social Netherlands
998	Don't know / no answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

Note that there are several cases whose answers are categorized in the same way in C3001\_1 and C3001\_2.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
011	Democratic reform
012	Bureaucracy
013	State control
021	Europe
024	Foreign policy
031	Military missions
032	Defense policy
041	Economy/Economic growth
042	Financial crisis/Economic crisis
051	Taxes
052	Mortgage rate reduction
053	Financial policies
054	Cut-backs
055	Debt/Deficit
061	Crime
062	Safety
063	Terrorism
064	Punishment/Justice system
067	Ethical subjects (abortion/euthanasia etc)
071	Immigration policy
072	Integration policy
074	Islam
075	Foreigners
076	Discrimination
080	Agriculture
090	Education
091	Culture
092	Student support
101	Elderly policy
102	Pensions
103	Retirement age/Ageing population
104	Family policy/Childcare/Youth policy
105	Policy on poverty
106	Social policy
107	Welfare services
108	Distribution of income
109	Attention lowest incomes
110	Employment
120	Traffic
121	Road pricing
122	Mobility
131	Health Care
132	Market forces health care
133	New health care system/No claim/Health
140	Environment
141	Animal rights
142	Nuclear energy
143	Housing (housing market/rent/social housing)
150	Norms and values/Moral standards
160	Christian politics
170	Functioning politics
171	Cabinet formation
173	Continuation/Change of policy
174	Distribution of seats

175	(Lack of) Solidarity/Social cohesion
176	Wilders/PVV
998	Don't know / Not answered
999	Impossible to code

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001.	Health
002.	Education
003.	Economy
004.	Welfare
005.	Law and Order
006.	Maori
007.	Tax
008.	Political Discontent
009.	Social Discontent
010.	Unemployment
011.	Rights
012.	Elderly
013.	Immigration
014.	Wages
015.	Foreign Policy
016.	Environment
017.	MMP and Coalitions
018.	Defense
019.	Transport
020.	Privatization

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

011.	Employment
012.	Taxes
013.	Social equalization / distribution
015.	Industrial / trade politics
016.	Interest rates
017.	Oil funds
018.	Raising prices
019.	(Other) economic issues
021.	Care for the elderly
022.	Health service
023.	Age pensioners
024.	Welfare benefits
025.	Sickness benefits
026.	Modernization of public sector
027.	Housing
028.	Poverty
029.	(Other) health / social issues
031.	Kindergartens
032.	Cash benefit for families with small children
035.	(Other) child and family issues
039.	School and educational issues
041.	Abortion
042.	Gay rights
043.	(Other) welfare issues
045.	(Other) moral / religious issues
046.	EU
051.	NATO
052.	Disarmament of nuclear weapons
053.	Defense and security policy issues
054.	Climate change / policy
055.	(Other) foreign policy issues
056.	Environmental issues
057.	public transportation
058.	Oil politics / distribution of national resources
059.	Communication / transport
061.	Decentralization / support for sparsely populated areas

062.	Agricultural / fishery policies
066.	Criminal policy
067.	Immigration / refugee policy
068.	Aid to developing countries
069.	Party politics
071.	The question of government alternatives
072.	Gender equality
073.	Fighting bureaucracy
074.	Public vs. Private
076.	Working life
077.	Vehicle excise duty
078.	Local government
079.	Culture
081.	UN
082.	Fight against terrorism
083.	Peace
084.	National income after the oil-age
085.	Trade
086.	Alternative energy sources
087.	Financial crisis

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Election fraud (vote buying, fraud in counting votes using PCOS machine)
002.	Better election experience due to automation (cleaner and faster election results, election process is easier and more peaceful)
003.	Issues about the accuracy and efficiency of the PCOS machine and how secured it is against fraudulent activities
004.	Long waiting lines (due to many voters, few PCOS machine compared to no. Of voters, consolidation of some precincts etc)
005.	Problems with the PCOS machine and / or PCOS memory card(defective, reject some ballots)
006.	Name not found in the voter's in the precinct / hard to find their names in the precinct
007.	New election technology/automated election using PCOS machine
008.	Corruption (general)
009.	Training of Bei's / orientation of voters on how to use the PCOS machine
010.	PCOS machine (general)
011.	Media killings and politics-related crimes (includes massacre, bombing)
012.	PCOS machines and memory cards anomalies (some machines/cards were stolen, replaced or hidden)
013.	Looking forward on the election results (who will win as president, vice-president, etc.)
014.	Conflict among political parties and candidates / exposing the issues involving the candidate to the public
015.	Winning of Noynoy Aquino as president
016.	Issues about Noynoy (vices , psychological problem)
017.	Transition to new administration/ expectations from the new administration that they would fulfill their promises
018.	Losing candidates can't accept defeat / some filed complaints
019.	Issues on vice-pres. Election (Binay won as vice-pres / vp candidate Roxas complained about the results/ delayed proclamation of vice-pres)
020.	Issues involving former president arroyo (running for congressman post, midnight appointment, hello Garci)
021.	Happy with the results of the election / candidates they voted won

022.	Many weren't able to vote during election
023.	Not well organized election / some Bei's not trained well / voter's not knowledgeable about the new system
024.	Doubt on the counting of votes / results of election
025.	Issues about the contract with Smartmatic / edible ink and the large amount of money spent for automation

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

The implemented Polish election survey 2005 was a pilot study for the third module of CSES. The questions about the most important egocentric problems facing the country were not included.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment: no workplaces, no work for educated people...
002.	Problem of poverty: social assistance...
003.	Low wages, undignified wages, raise wages, better wages etc.
004.	Increase of pensions, revalorization, problems of pensioners...
005.	Increasing prices, high prices, too high prices
006.	Social and economic inequalities
007.	Accommodation problems
008.	Better conditions of life - in general, material situation...
009.	Education system, reform of education system, education...
010.	Health service, malfunctioning of health service, reform
011.	Problems of countryside and agriculture
012.	Problems of young people, no perspectives for young people...
013.	Migration, departure of specialists from country
014.	Bad conditions of work, bad labor law, exploitation
015.	Moral issues, 'sex-affair'
016.	Assurance of security, assurance of order, crime
017.	Bad law, bad regulations
018.	Bad governance, conflicts between politicians, unstable government
019.	Bringing back calm into politics, criticism of governing...
020.	Corruption, thieving, bribery, affairs, swindle, scandals
021.	Bureaucracy, incompetent clerks, reform of state admin.
022.	State - church relations
023.	Lustration, problems with past, dealing with politicians past
024.	Budget, budget deficit, public finances, economy...
025.	Economy, economic development, maintaining economic growth
026.	Taxes
027.	Bad condition of roads, construction of roads, motorways...
028.	Euro 2012 - general + constructions of stadiums
029.	Low enterprise development
030.	To make good use of European Union grants and funds
031.	Lack of independence of state's energy management, oil, gas
032.	Bad condition of roads, construction of roads, motorways...



033.	Euro 2012 - general + constructions of stadiums
034.	Launch of the euro cash
035.	Withdrawal of polish troops from Iraq, Afghanistan
036.	Poland in EU, integration with EU, satisfying EU criteria
037.	Foreign policy of Poland, international relations
038.	Peace in the world - generally
039.	Anti-rocket shield
040.	Confrontation of parties in the campaign; who - Po or PiS?
041.	Removal of PiS from power, voices against PiS and coalition
042.	Voices for continuation of PiS government
043.	Voices for PO
044.	General answers regarding elections - debates, manifestos...
045.	General answers such as: 'providing better future'...
046.	Position of the church, state - church relations
047.	Realization of pre-election promises, democracy
048.	Lustration, problems with the past, politicians' past
049.	Bad conditions of work, bad labor law, exploitation
050.	Protection of polish identity, polish traditions, culture, faith
051.	General answers such as: 'it should be better'...
052.	General answers regarding positive aspects of campaign
053.	General answers regarding negative aspects of campaign
899.	Everything is important, there is a lot of important issues / problems

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment
002.	Economic / financial situation
003.	Education
004.	Health
005.	Security / criminality
006.	Public work
007.	Governance of the country
008.	The reforms
009.	Corruption
010.	Absolute majority
011.	Tax reduction
012.	Country's development
013.	Abstention / call to vote
014.	Justice
015.	Crises
016.	Wages
017.	Maintenance of PS in the government
018.	Support for the elderly, children and other groups
019.	Failure of political promises
020.	National minimum wage
021.	Teacher's situation
022.	Change of government
023.	Social security
024.	Lack of understanding between the parties
025.	Agriculture
026.	Control deficit
027.	Poverty
028.	Support for small and medium enterprises
029.	Wi retapping
030.	Political stability
031.	Foreign debt

032.	Marriage between same-sex
033.	Environment
034.	EU funds
035.	Bad investments
036.	The allocation of subsidies to those who do not need
037.	Allocation of houses to those who need the most
038.	The price increase / decrease in purchasing power
039.	Better treatment for the disabled
040.	Living expenditure
041.	Social inequality
042.	The opposition is weak
043.	State budget
044.	Urbanism
045.	Increase in the unemployment fund
046.	Political program of parties
047.	Formation of government
048.	The country's future
049.	Improvement of living standards
050.	Housing support
051.	Public investments
052.	Policies towards work
053.	Abortion
054.	Freedom of speech
055.	Migration policies

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Economy
002.	Agriculture
003.	Social policy / protection
004.	Government formation
005.	Fairness of elections
006.	Election of the president
007.	Elections outcome
008.	Wages / pensions / living standard / poverty
009.	Employment / unemployment
010.	Economic crisis
011.	Electoral fight between the candidates
012.	Political issues / reform
013.	Country welfare / stability
014.	Education
015.	Corruption
016.	Candidates (personality / projects)
017.	Health / health system
018.	Positive change

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Standard of living
	Prices, high costs of living, lack of money
	Low income, low pensions
	Social inequality, social injustice in the society
	Social care, social benefits, pensioners, young families
	Social policies, social security
	Uncertainty, fear from the future
002.	Housing
	Lack of apartments
	Expensive housing
	Public policies (national, regional, local) for housing
003.	Health care
	Expensive medicaments
	Insufficient quality of health care and health services
	Corruption of medical doctors and medical personnel

	Immoral reform of health care system
004.	Education system
	Fees in schools
	Poor quality of education system
	Reform of education system
	Low wages of teachers
005.	Unemployment
	Lack of job opportunities (in general, in regions, for specific social groups, e.g. young people, graduates)
	Releasing from jobs, cancelling of jobs
	Fears from losing the jobs
006.	Politics, political culture
	quality of democracy
	Conduct of politicians
007.	Economy
	Economic reforms (tax reform, pension's reform etc.)
	Economic and fiscal development (exchange rate, GDP, inflation; public debt, state budget)
	High income taxes and mandatory payroll taxes
	Privatization (unfair in terms of rules, as an unsocial policy)
	Barriers for private companies, for entrepreneurs and small stakeholders
	Public debt, insolvency, state insolvency
	Investments, FDI
008.	Security, crime
	Mafia, murders, organized crime
	Security of citizens, critiques on police
009.	Ethical issues
	Interpersonal relations without trust
	Alcohol and drugs abuse (of youth)
	Divorces, insufficient respect for families
010.	Corruption
011.	Foreign policy
	Relations between EU and NATO
	Bad image of Slovakia abroad
	International relations
	Relations with the neighboring countries - above all Hungary
012.	Relations with Hungarian minority
	Tensions in the relations between Slovaks and Hungarian minority
	Weak guarantees for the rights of minorities
	Security of borders
013.	Environmental issues
	protection of nature and environment
014.	Regional and local problems
	Marginalization of regions, politicians in capital do not care about other parts of Slovakia
015.	Roma minority
	relations with Roma
	Problems of cohabitation with Roma minority
016.	Bureaucracy
	Bureaucracy in public administration
017.	Racism, discrimination
018.	Judiciary
	legislation, rule of law
019.	Greek loan
020.	General election
021.	Global crises
	Economic and financial global crises (in general terms)
022.	Transport issues
	payments for using roads, construction of roads, infrastructure
023.	Floods
024.	Coalition building
	Post-election development, quarrels among

	political parties
025.	Left parties did not win
	Former PM Fico/former coalition/leftists did not
	win the elections
889.	All issues

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Economic crisis, recession
002.	Crisis in Slovenia
003.	(Un)Employment
004.	Political culture, political parties
005.	Erased
006.	Relations, border with Croatia
007.	Tajcoon, privatization, economic criminal
008.	Patria
009.	Political human resources
010.	Corruption
011.	Legislation, law-equality
012.	Workers rights
013.	After-war executions, past, reconciliation
014.	Housing proclamation
015.	Social security, equality, justice
016.	Poverty, high costs of living
017.	Health
018.	Pensions, pensioners
019.	Higher income, standard
020.	Education
021.	Young people
022.	Church, influence in society
023.	Pre-electoral promises
024.	Electoral results, change of government
025.	Ecology

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
100.	Economy
110.	Economic development
111.	Economic recovery
112.	Economic stability
113.	Stabilization of ordinary people's living
114.	Price stability
115.	Employment
116.	Unemployment
117.	Youth unemployment
200.	Politics
210.	Political ideology
211.	Political stability
212.	Political apathy
213.	Women's political participation
214.	Broadcasters' political participation
215.	Electoral and political participation
216.	Management of government affairs
217.	Regime change
220.	Party policy
221.	Internal strife within party
222.	Inter-party strife
223.	Party preference
224.	Other party-related issues
310.	Public policy pledge
311.	Candidate nomination
312.	Turnout rate
313.	Candidates morality and qualification
314.	Absence of fair election
320.	Number of seats for each party
321.	Election results for each party
322.	Emergence of minor political parties
323.	Pro-Park Geun-Hye alliance

324. Election results of independent candidate  
 325. Election results of famous politicians  
 326. Evaluation on Roh Moo-hyun administration  
 327. Other Election-related issues  
 410. Stability  
 420. Education  
 430. Welfare  
 440. Rectitude and morality  
 441. Corruption  
 450. Social polarization  
 451. Ideological conflict  
 460. Regional conflict  
 461. Regional development  
 462. Regionalism  
 470. Crimes against children  
 480. Environmental problems  
 490. North Korea nuclear problems  
 491. North-South Korean problem  
 492. South Korea-U.S. Relations  
 500. Government policy  
 510. Real Estate policy  
 511. Crematorium construction  
 512. Grand Korean waterway  
 513. Re-development and re-construction  
 514. Deregulation on business  
 515. Other policy-related issues

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001. Economy  
 002. Employment  
 003. Prices  
 004. Taxes  
 005. Mortgages  
 006. Agriculture  
 010. Social policies  
 011. Pensions  
 012. Health  
 013. Education  
 014. Immigration  
 015. Dependency  
 016. Family policy  
 017. Gender violence  
 020. Foreign policy  
 021. International cooperation  
 022. Defense  
 023. Terrorism  
 024. Citizen's security  
 030. Institutional policy  
 031. Form of government  
 032. Constitutional reforms  
 033. Institutional cooperation  
 034. Rights  
 035. Justice  
 036. Political agreements  
 037. Corruption  
 040. Future challenges  
 041. Research  
 042. Climate change  
 043. Infrastructures and urbanism  
 044. Housing

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

The Swedish study of 2006 includes 144 respondents in C3001\_1 that answered "ingen viktig fråga för val av parti" (No important question which would influence the vote choice). These cases have been coded as "901. NO PROBLEM".

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Taxes
002.	Lower taxes
003.	Higher taxes for rich people / high-income earners
004.	Marginal taxes
006.	VAT on food
007.	Fight tax evasion / economic crime, introduce a general clause, fight speculative profits
009.	Indirect taxes / selective purchase taxes / share tax
010.	Local taxation issues
011.	Tax deductions (not including deductions for housing, see code 121)
012.	Temporary austerity tax
013.	Balancing of one tax against another
014.	Capital tax
015.	Tax on real estate
020.	Swedish economy
021.	Financial and currency policy, interest levels, foreign loans
022.	Wage level, wage policy
023.	Trade policy, free trade, trade balance, open competition
025.	Costs in general. Increased prices, inflation
026.	Private economy
028.	Recession
029.	Budget deficit, national debt
030.	Public sector
031.	Reduction of public service
035.	Privatization
040.	Social policy / security issues
041.	Social reforms
042.	Social benefits
043.	Care
044.	Welfare society, social security
047.	Distribution policy
048.	Homelessness
049.	Segregation
050.	Pensions - pensioner issues
051.	Swedish pension fund - Tilläggspension (ATP)
052.	Private pension insurance
053.	The new pension system
054.	Pension fund
060.	Care of elderly
063.	Private room for people that are hospitalized over a long period
068.	Home-help service
069.	Transportation service
070.	Health care / health insurance
071.	Dental service / dental reform services
072.	Disability issues
073.	Sickness benefit / qualifying period (not qualifying period for care of child, see code 78)
074.	Private health care / privatization of health care
075.	Care center
076.	Queues within the health care system
077.	AIDS-problem
078.	Qualifying period for care of sick child
079.	Psychiatric Care
085.	Family policy / child care
086.	Child-care allowance
089.	Parents' insurance
092.	Daycare centre
100.	Educational policy, research
101.	More discipline and orderliness in school
103.	Compulsory school, school in general
107.	University / research
108.	Student's economy

111.	Youth's and children's future and problems
115.	Cultural issues
120.	Housing policy in general
130.	Decentralization - regional industrial location - regional policy
140.	Agricultural policy
145.	Fisheries (n.b. not related to environment)
150.	Bureaucracy - too much bureaucracy, complications with forms, corporatism
153.	Personal integrity, social security number
160.	Environment / environmental control / environment protection
162.	Traffic, motorism, exhaust emissions and unleaded petrol
168.	Greenhouse effect, global warming, climate change
170.	Communications, traffic, speed limits, Swedish state railways, airlines, low prices, public transportation
177.	Congestion charges
180.	Law and order, treatment of offenders, police, criminality
181.	Juvenile crime
182.	Violence in public places
183.	Law and order
186.	Violence against women
190.	Religion, moral and ethics, Christian upbringing in school, spiritual values, women priests
192.	Abortion
206.	Copyright on the web
210.	Peace issue, international disarmament
220.	Swedish foreign and security policy
222.	Defense policy / defense expenditure
224.	Aid to developing countries, issues related to developing countries
227.	NATO-membership
230.	International issues in general
240.	Employment, unemployment
241.	Juvenile unemployment
243.	Employment in the public sector
244.	Working environment / strain
247.	Unemployment benefit fund
248.	Sick leave, early retirement, occupational health service
249.	Other labour market issues
250.	Commercial policy, industrial policy, ship yards, textile, steel, forests
251.	Conditions for businesses (including small business)
260.	Energy policy, coal, oil, renewable sources of energy, energy-saving
261.	Nuclear power in general
262.	Start of nuclear phase-out
281.	Labour legislation
295.	Equal opportunity for women and men, women's rights, allocation of quotas, sexism
296.	Equal opportunity for women and men in working life
299.	Homosexual couple's right to adopt children
300.	Community governed by law / rule of law
310.	Immigration policy
311.	Refugee issues
312.	Racism, hostility towards foreigners
313.	Language test for immigrants
315.	Segregation, integration immigrants / Swedish people
320.	Other concrete issues
325.	Issues on the future, visions
330.	Ideology (general, other)
331.	Socialism
335.	Equality, equalization, solidarity

338.	Democracy
340.	Right-wing politics / right-wing extremism
342.	Change of system
343.	Green ideas, green ideology, non-growth, ecological balance
344.	Justice
346.	Freedom of choice, liberty
347.	Democratic liberties and rights; freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, property rights
348.	Feminism
350.	Party politics (general opinion on parties)
351.	Party-political collaboration
360.	Confidence in parties and politics
370.	Party leader
372.	Other Candidate issues
380.	Class society (group references)
390.	Government issue, composition of cabinet
392.	Government alternatives crossing the border of the usual block division
393.	Stability and continuity
394.	Renewal, Change of power
500.	Local and municipal issues
598.	All questions
800.	EU- General
803.	EU - The European Economic and Monetary Union
805.	EU - Employment issues
835.	EU - Self government / federal state
839.	Withdraw / Stay as a member of the EU
889.	No important question which would influence the vote for a party
998.	Don't Know / No Answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Pension
002.	Retirement provisions
003.	Unemployment
004.	Poverty
005.	Asylum seekers
006.	Foreigners
007.	Drugs
008.	EU, Europe
009.	Right extremism
010.	Finances
011.	Refugees
012.	Xenophobia
013.	Health system
014.	Globalization
015.	Inflation
016.	Integration
017.	Climate
018.	Consociationalism
019.	Health insurances
020.	Crime
021.	Neutrality
022.	Politicians
023.	Political style
024.	Political system
025.	Racism
026.	Pensions
027.	Pension age
028.	Security
030.	Social security
031.	Social inequality
032.	Taxes
033.	Terrorism
034.	Environment
035.	Economic development



036.	Education
037.	Gender equality
038.	Relation to other countries
039.	Individual freedom
040.	Youth crime
041.	Crime by foreigners
042.	Transportation, Traffic
043.	Energy
044.	Swiss People's Party (SVP) and Christoph Blocher
045.	Federal council climate
046.	Family policy
047.	Youth unemployment
048.	Lack of cohesion in society
049.	Islam
050.	Guarantee of social security
051.	Abuse of social security
052.	Security of work place
053.	Political polarization
054.	Freedom of movement
055.	Violence
056.	Lack of tolerance
057.	Loss of common values
058.	Agriculture
059.	Grievances in businesses
060.	Language
061.	Youth general
062.	Basic right, human rights
063.	Demography
064.	Land use planning
065.	Airport
066.	Army
067.	Right wing policy
068.	International solidarity
069.	Swiss identity
070.	Nuclear power
071.	Salaries
072.	Living conditions
073.	Image of Switzerland
074.	Child protection
075.	Overpopulation
076.	National cohesion
077.	Smoking
078.	Media
079.	Consumer society
080.	Industrial peace
081.	Future
082.	Culture
083.	Bank Secret
084.	Peace
085.	Cross-border commuters
086.	Dog laws
087.	The left
097.	Several most important problems

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Economic development problem
002.	Cross-Strait direct link
003.	Problem about unification and independence
004.	National identification
005.	Alternation of power
006.	Political stability problem
007.	Diplomacy or international status problem
008.	Judicial reform problem
009.	Educational reform problem
010.	Environmental protection problem
011.	Problem about the gap between the rich and the poor
012.	Unemployment problem

013.	Aborigines problem
014.	Social welfare problem
015.	Crime problem
016.	Government administration
017.	Candidate's personal morality
018.	Candidate's ability
019.	National defense security problem
020.	Grand china market
021.	People's livelihood question
022.	Ethnic groups problems
023.	The State Affairs Fund Scandal
024.	Democracy problems
025.	Public infrastructure
026.	Referendums
027.	Cross-Strait relations
028.	Keep Taiwan's sovereignty
029.	Vote-buying problems
030.	Fairness of election
031.	Result of election
032.	Bribery problem
033.	Social stability problem
034.	Government personnel
035.	MA Ying-jeou's policy
036.	Resuming (joining) the United Nations
037.	Green card problems
038.	Officer's salary
039.	Country competency
040.	Open up the cross-Strait sightseeing
041.	Dictatorial leadership
042.	Taiwan future problem
043.	Media chaos
044.	Financial reform
045.	Tax cuts
046.	Denizen bride's right ensuring
047.	Open up the mainland china's record of formal schooling
048.	Illegal lobbying and corrupt practices by means of privilege
049.	Fairness and justice

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

- 001. Economy
- 002. Unemployment
- 003. Violence and Crime
- 004. Corruption
- 005. AIDS
- 006. Sufficiency Economy
- 007. Safety of Life and Property
- 008. Education

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

- 001. AKP's success / AKP, incumbent government in power
- 002. Discussion of constitutional changes
- 003. Arguments and bickering between the parties
- 004. Independent candidates supported by the peace
- 005. AKP's failure
- 006. Problems of democracy/democratization
- 007. Prime minister Erdogan
- 008. Problem of turban / hat / headdress
- 009. CHP's success
- 010. CHP's failure
- 011. Economy
- 012. Court cases of Ergenekon / Bal yoz
- 013. Unemployment
- 014. Tape scandals

015.	Kurdi sh problem
016.	Terror
017.	Various projects/empty promi ses
018.	Election results
019.	MPs in prison
020.	Education
021.	Stability
022.	Nationalist action party (MHP)
023.	Military / intervention of military into politics
024.	EU, USA, foreign affairs and problems with other countries
025.	Women's' rights

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

Note that although the most and the second most important problems were asked separately, respondents were allowed to give multiple answers on both questions. Unfortunately the order of response is not available. Instead the lowest answer category is included in C3001\_.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Defense spending
002.	Middle East
003.	Iraq
004.	War
005.	Terrorism
006.	Veterans
007.	National defense (all other)
008.	Foreign aid
009.	Foreign trade
010.	Protection of US jobs
011.	Serbi a/Bal kans
012.	China
013.	International affairs (all other)
014.	Energy crisis
015.	Energy prices
016.	Energy (all other)
017.	Environment
018.	Natural resources (all other)
019.	Education and training
020.	School funding
021.	Education (all other)
022.	Aids
023.	Medi care
024.	Health (all other)
025.	Wel fare
026.	Poverty
027.	Employment
028.	Housing
029.	Social securi ty
030.	Income (all other)
031.	Crime
032.	Race relations
033.	Illegal drugs
034.	Police problems
035.	Guns
036.	Corporate corruption
037.	Justice (all other)
038.	Budget
039.	Size of government
040.	Taxes
041.	Immi grati on
042.	Campaign fi nance
043.	Politi cal corrupti on
044.	Ethics
045.	Government power
046.	Budget priori ties
047.	Parti san poli tics
048.	Politi cians

---

049.	Government (all other)
050.	The economy
051.	Stock market
052.	Economic inequality
053.	Recession
054.	Inflation
055.	Economics (all other)
056.	Agriculture
057.	Science
058.	Commerce
059.	Transportation
060.	Community development
061.	Abortion
062.	Child care
063.	Overpopulation
064.	Public morality
065.	Domestic violence
066.	Family
067.	Young people
068.	Homosexuality
069.	The media
070.	Everything

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3001\_1-C3001\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Retirement / Pensions
002.	Economic / Economic Policy
003.	Economy
004.	Public Safety
005.	Drugs
006.	Poverty
007.	Taxation
008.	Equality / Social Matters
009.	Human Rights / Amnesty Law
010.	Employment / Unemployment
011.	Wage Level / Salary
012.	Education
013.	Welfare Policies
014.	Health Policies / National Health System
015.	National Budget
016.	Housing
017.	Smoking Policy
018.	Public Administration Reform
019.	Corruption
020.	Jails / Prison System
021.	Abortion Law
022.	Condition Of The City
023.	Public Employees / Bureaucracy
024.	Local Government
025.	Woman's Rights / Equal Rights
026.	Unfairness Campaign
027.	Foreign Policy
028.	Opportunities For Young
029.	Union / Strikes
030.	Investments
031.	Political Commitment
032.	Political Inefficacy
033.	Childhood
034.	Inflation
035.	Tough On Crime / Immutability Age
036.	Public Policies
897.	Other Political Problem
898.	Other Social Problem
899.	Other Economic Problem

---

C3002\_1 >>> Q2A. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-SOCIOTROPIC-FIRST MENTION  
C3002\_2 >>> Q2B. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM-SOCIOTROPIC-SECOND MENTION

Q2a. What do you think is the most important political problem facing [COUNTRY] today?

Q2b. What do you think is the second most important political problem facing [COUNTRY] today?

001.-899. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM CODES  
[SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

900. OTHER PROBLEM (NOT SPECIFIABLE)

901. NO PROBLEM

997. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

998. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

999. MISSING

NOTES: C3002\_1-C3002\_2

This is an open-ended question. Collaborators coded this variable in a detailed way and with a minimum of at least twenty categories.

Coding Strategy:

- The order of responses was kept, except if the response on the first question was missing and response on the second question included a substantial answer. Then the substantial answer was coded in C3002\_1, while C3002\_2 was coded as missing (code 99).
- Common answers, such as "other problem" (code 900) or "no problem" (code 901) were coded into common categories
- Repeated mentions in C3002\_1 and C3002\_2 were kept.

Table: Frequencies on C3002\_2 for respondents that repeated their problem mention of C3002\_1:

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRIA (2008)	37
BRAZIL (2010)	83
CHILE (2009)	3
CROATIA (2007)	42
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	194
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	102
DENMARK (2007)	14
ESTONIA (2011)	47
FINLAND (2007)	71
FINLAND (2011)	89
FRANCE (2007)	79
GERMANY (2009)	136
ICELAND (2007)	27
ICELAND (2009)	67
IRELAND	380
ISRAEL (2006)	68
JAPAN (2007)	31
LATVIA (2010)	53
MEXICO (2006)	42
MEXICO (2009)	64
NETHERLANDS (2006)	72
NETHERLANDS (2010)	60
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	43
NORWAY (2009)	23
PERU (2011)	77
PHILIPPINES (2010)	44
POLAND (2005)	34
POLAND (2007)	38
PORTUGAL (2009)	16
ROMANIA (2009)	52

---

SLOVAKIA (2010)	35
SLOVENIA (2008)	38
SPAIN (2008)	3
SWEDEN (2006)	15
THAILAND (2007)	36
TURKEY (2011)	35
UNITED STATES (2008)	66
URUGUAY (2009)	5

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

Australia offered a closed-list of items for C3002.

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

Note that in the Austrian Election Study 92 respondents mentioned up to 6 problems for C3002\_1 and 35 respondents up to 5 mentions for C3002\_2. For both variables only the first mention was used. An exception was made for a few singular cases in C3001\_1 which only gave a meaningful second mention. In those cases, the second mention of the most important problem was used.

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
010.	Unemployment
011.	Youth unemployment / apprenticeship positions
020.	Economy
021.	Wages / pay
030.	Inflation / price increases
040.	Finances / budget
050.	Taxes
060.	Social security / social justice
070.	Education policy
080.	Health policy
090.	Retirement provision
091.	Pensions
092.	Elderly care
100.	Family policy
101.	Youth / young people / students
110.	Immigration / migration
111.	Foreigners
112.	Criminality of foreigners
113.	EU and foreigners / EU's eastern borders
114.	Integration
115.	Islam
120.	Environment
121.	Climate change
122.	Floods
123.	Genetic engineering
130.	Energy
131.	Energy supply
132.	Renewable energy
140.	Traffic
141.	Public transport
142.	Transit traffic
150.	Cooperation of political parties
160.	Crime
170.	Equal rights of men and women
180.	Agriculture
190.	Racism / xenophobia
191.	Demonization and negative image of the right
200.	EU
201.	EU positive
202.	EU negative
203.	EU enlargement
210.	Administrative reform
220.	Institutional order
221.	Political system

222.	Politicians
223.	Corruption
224.	Disenchantment with politics

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment
002.	Corruption
003.	Lack of ethics
004.	Health / lack of health investments
005.	Violence / lack of safety investments
006.	Politicians that do not fulfill their promises
007.	Unequal income distribution / social inequality
008.	High salaries of deputies / increase of deputies salaries
009.	Lack of punishment for corrupt politicians
010.	Lack of political union / lack of political parties union
011.	Lack of money for public investments
012.	Drug dealers / to combat drug dealers
013.	Low salaries / low minimum salary
014.	Combat of hunger
015.	Growing of the country / economic development
016.	Lack of political reform / too many political parties
017.	Education / investments in education
018.	Bureaucracy in public services
019.	Taking decisions without popular consultation
020.	Lack of infrastructure
021.	Agrarian reform
022.	Bad public administration
023.	Organized crime
024.	Lack of popular housing
025.	Social responsibility
026.	Lack of investments in civil construction
027.	Lack of attention to what population needs
028.	Impunity / lack of justice
029.	Inflation / price of food
030.	Poverty / misery
031.	Holes in highways
032.	Politicians that only think about themselves / do not solve problems
033.	Increase of school transportation costs
034.	Political disorganization
035.	Lack of honesty
036.	Corrupt policemen
037.	Lack of sensibility
038.	Assistance to street children
039.	Lack of shame of politicians / lack of character
040.	Legislation
041.	The powerful men that are arrested
042.	Lack of proposals of the candidates
043.	Disrespect to institutions
044.	Beggars
045.	Slow process to approve amendments
046.	High taxes
047.	The buying of dossiers
048.	Accidents in transit
049.	The universities still are for few people
050.	The minimum age to retire
051.	External debt
052.	Nepotism
053.	Lula does not have power to decide
054.	Lack of support to agriculture
055.	The tributes

056.	Democracy
057.	Politicians / the 'mob' of politicians
058.	High interests taxes
059.	Depreciation of the REAL
060.	Basic sanitation conditions
061.	Lack of will to work
062.	The incompetence of politicians
063.	The Bolsa Familia' program (family grant program)
064.	The capitalists that explore the poor
065.	Politicians who do not have party fidelity
066.	The Worker's Party

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
001.	Corruption in general
002.	Political corruption
006.	Drugs and criminality
007.	Fight against inequality
010.	Employment and salary
011.	Functioning of the political system
013.	Health policy
016.	Bad quality of education
024.	Problems in economy and investment
036.	Bad health services
073.	Development and economic situation
098.	Problems in electoral system
130.	Unethical behavior of politicians
152.	Bad public administration
162.	Values and issues in general
311.	Organization of political system

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See Election Study Notes on C3001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See Election Study Notes on C3001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment
002.	Economy
003.	Pensions
004.	Health care
005.	Education
006.	Agriculture
007.	Inflation
008.	Infrastructure
009.	Taxes
010.	Foreign debt
011.	Privatization
012.	Crime
013.	Corruption
014.	Justice system
015.	European Union accession
016.	Joining the NATO
017.	Protected ecological zone in the Adriatic
018.	Relations with Slovenia
019.	Foreign policy
020.	Domestic policy in general
021.	War veterans
022.	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY)
023.	National pride and patriotism
024.	Social justice
025.	Poverty
026.	Actions of political parties



027.	Quality of government
028.	Behavior of politicians
029.	Wages and living standard
030.	Political rights and equality
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C3002_1-C3002_2	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3002_1-C3002_2	
See codes on C3001_1-C3001_2.	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3002_1-C3002_2	
See codes on C3001_1-C3001_2.	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3002_1-C3002_2	
See codes on C3001_1-C3001_2.	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3002_1-C3002_2	
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C3002_1-C3002_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code / Categories:
001.	Foreign and security policy / international Relations / development aid / Russia
002.	EU / EU policy / bailouts / financial stability funds
003.	NATO membership
004.	Peace / threats to peace
005.	Functioning of democracy / democracy / bureaucracy / corruption
006.	Politicians' and officials' actions / competence / impeccability / or fairness
007.	Economic development / global economy / economic globalization
008.	Employment / unemployment / youth unemployment
009.	Entrepreneur issues / prerequisites for Entrepreneurship
010.	Health care in general
012.	Education and know-how
013.	Poverty / low income issues / inequality / income disparity / social exclusion / suffering
014.	Housing situation / homelessness / housing prices
015.	Equality / (gender) equality
016.	Taxation and national economy
017.	Status of municipalities / municipal economy
018.	Regional policy / regional development / Regional inequality
019.	Nature conservation / environmental issues / Ecological lifestyle
020.	Elderly issues / care of the elderly
021.	Youth issues
022.	Issues of families with children
024.	Single parent issues
025.	Employee issues / subsistence / prices / cost of living
026.	Agriculture / agricultural issues
027.	Criminality / insecurity / the preservation of law and order / beggars / criminal sentences
028.	Selfishness / values / the lack or preservation of morals
029.	Immigrants / foreigner issues / multiculturalism: positive attitude / more multiculturalism and tolerance
030.	Nuclear power
032.	Alcohol / (illegal) drugs / other intoxicants
034.	Independence / loss of independence
035.	Social security / the conservation of welfare / the support for special groups
036.	Welfare services and securing of services (in general)

037. Shortage of nurses / nurse salaries / the shortage of doctors
038. Pensioner issues / pensions / pensions are too small
039. Status of young people and students / inadequacy of grants / benefits
040. Special issues of employment opportunities and workplaces (e.g. age racism / burn out / insecurity)
041. Retirement / baby boomers / aging
042. Energy policy / energy prices
043. Correct allocation of political decisions
044. Climate change / natural disasters
045. Immigrants / refugees: neutral attitude
046. Immigrants / refugees: negative attitude
047. Nationalism / rise of the true Finns
048. Weakened status of Swedish language
049. Mental health problems / mental health services
050. Poor protection of minority rights / support by legislation
051. Growing racism
052. Taxation
053. National economy / public economy / debts

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

The original questionnaire provided an open answer question. Problem mentions had been categorized afterwards, which yielded repeated mentions in C3002\_1 and C3002\_2.

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

Germany provided a closed-list of issues to the respondents:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Unemployment / labor market
002.	Hostility towards foreigners
003.	Foreigners / applicants for political asylum
004.	Petrol / gas / electricity / energy / oil price
005.	Education / school / vocational training
006.	Family promotion / -politics
007.	Health care system reform
008.	Budget / indebtedness of state
009.	Street crime / violence / drugs / public security
010.	Pensions (reforms) / old-age provision
011.	Social injustice
012.	Taxes / tax reforms
013.	Fight against terrorism / public security
014.	Environmental pollution / -problems / climate
015.	Economic situation
021.	Problems of government formation
022.	Chancellor question
023.	Election results
024.	Questions of coalition formation
025.	Politicians should not ...
026.	Political apathy / discontent
027.	Foreign- / European-policy
028.	German unification
029.	Welfare state / social policy
030.	Necessity of reform / reform blockades
031.	Bureaucratization of Germany
032.	Price stability / raising cost of living

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Universal suffrage
002.	Performance of LegCo members
003.	Hong Kong - mainland relationship
004.	Political institutions and their reform and development
005.	Whether LegCo members truly represent the public
006.	Whether LegCo members keep their election pledges
007.	Whether LegCo members help the public
008.	Whether LegCo members help the respondent
009.	Party affiliation of the candidates
010.	Quality or ability of LegCo members
011.	Beloved candidates elected
012.	Monitoring of the government
013.	Campaign or policy platforms
014.	Dominance of the LegCo by one party or political balance in the LegCo
015.	Good governance of the government
016.	Executive-legislature relationship
017.	Political quarrels
018.	Economy
019.	Minimum wage
020.	(Un)employment
021.	Taxes
022.	Inflation
023.	Lehman incident
024.	Livelihood of the public
025.	Whether LegCo members are pro-mainland
026.	Social harmony
027.	Fair or open election
028.	Rule of law
029.	Environmental protection
030.	Article 23 legislation
031.	Too much subordination of Hong Kong to mainland
032.	Government favoritism toward the business or Government-business conspiracy
033.	Unequal income distribution

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Abortion
002.	Crime
003.	Northern Ireland
004.	Corruption
005.	Infrastructure
006.	Health
007.	Inflation
008.	Unemployment
009.	Taxes
010.	Environment
011.	EU
012.	Immigration
013.	Economy
014.	Policy
015.	Rural

016. Education  
017. Political

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3002

The Russian version of the questionnaire speaks of problems but not political problems. This might also apply to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic).

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
011.	Corruption
012.	Electoral Fraud
013.	Arguments between parties
014.	The elections in general
015.	The election of President
016.	López Obrador / protests / PRD / AMLO
017.	Economic crisis
018.	Honesty
019.	Unemployment
020.	Insecurity
021.	Economy
022.	Parties' ambitions
023.	Poverty
024.	Democracy
025.	Relation with the United States
026.	They don't keep promises
027.	Land
028.	Bad organization
029.	Bad politicians
030.	Housing
031.	Inflation
032.	Education
033.	To attend the commerce
034.	Support to the natives
035.	Foreign debt
036.	Migration
037.	Low salaries
038.	Recount of the votes in the election
039.	Political assassinations
040.	Drug pushing
041.	Political instability
042.	Bad use of power
043.	Support to the women
044.	Not to accept that he lost the elections
045.	Raise of services prices
046.	The public servants rob
047.	Drug trafficking
048.	Social inequality
049.	Lack of credibility in the institutions
050.	Party unifications
051.	Conflict with the result / popular unhappiness
052.	Respect for the authorities
053.	Lack of credibility in the politics
054.	No elected President
055.	Problems with the magister of Oaxaca
056.	Lack of organization of the electoral court (TRIFE)
057.	Respect among politicians

058.	Drug consumption
059.	Laws should be applied
060.	Lack of business growth
061.	The bad influence of the mass media
062.	Campaign proposals
063.	Violence / murders
064.	Kidnapping
065.	Implement a communist government
066.	Pollution
067.	Mismanagement of the resources
068.	Corruption in the electoral commission
069.	Respect the winner
070.	Social instability
071.	Social programs
072.	Public services
073.	Corruption among politics
074.	Health services
075.	International conflicts
076.	Political debate
077.	Banking Fund for the Protection of Savings (FOBAPROA - Fondo Bancario de Protección al Ahorro)
078.	Support for senior citizens
079.	Change of government
080.	Attract more investments
081.	Future of the country
082.	Annul the elections
083.	Party divisions
084.	There's no support from the Congress
085.	Country stability
086.	Corrupt policemen
087.	Smuggling
088.	Reduce the number of legislators at the Congress
089.	Child abduction
090.	Let AMLO (Andrés Manuel López Obrador) work
091.	Candidates badly prepared
092.	Corruption in the government
093.	Corruption / favoritism
094.	Public works
095.	Felipe Calderón / PAN
096.	None
100.	Vicente Fox
101.	Vandalism / gangs
102.	Lower the salaries to the government employees
103.	The problem of the Puebla's governor
104.	Bureaucracy
105.	Too many candidates
107.	Guerrillas' conflicts
108.	Drainage
109.	Doesn't help people
110.	They only seek their own benefit
111.	Pavement / roads
112.	Alcoholism
113.	No to accept that AMLO (Andrés Manuel López Obrador) won
114.	Improve the diet
115.	That Felipe Calderón declares himself as the winner
116.	Respect the citizens' votes
117.	Human rights
118.	Overpopulation
120.	state-owned petroleum company: Petróleos Mexicanos (PEMEX) (C3002_)
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3002_1-C3002_2	
CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
002.	Rising Prices / Inflation
003.	Unemployment / Better Jobs
004.	Corruption / Stop Corruption

005.	Drug Trafficking / Organized Crime
006.	Credibility of Political Parties / Politicians
007.	Crisis / Economic Crisis / Shortage
008.	Crime / Fight Crime / More Surveillance / Organized Crime
009.	Democracy-Enhancing / Democracy
010.	Disagree in the Chamber of deputies / No Political Agreements
011.	Mistrust in Politicians / Political Leaders
012.	Drugs / Drug Addiction
013.	Economy / Improve the Economy / Economic Growth
014.	Education
015.	Bad Government / Bad Decisions of Government / Bad Governments
016.	Insecurity / Insecurity in Country / Security / Violence
017.	Poverty / Extreme Poverty
018.	Kidnappings / Abductions Combat
019.	Influenza
020.	Tragedy in the Nursery ABC in Sonora
021.	Divisions within the Parties / Fighting among Parties
022.	Fights between Party / Party Disputes / Dirty War
023.	Too many Political Parties / Political Parties
024.	Politics / Politicians' Fight / Bad Politicians
025.	Lack of Money / Money
026.	Unaccomplished Promises / Default
027.	They are (all) Thieves / They are not Honest
028.	Everything and Everyone
029.	Oil
030.	Governance
031.	Health

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
011	Democratic reform
012	Bureaucracy
013	State control
021	Europe
024	Foreign policy
031	Military missions
032	Defense policy
041	Economy/Economic growth
042	Financial crisis/Economic crisis
051	Taxes
052	Mortgage rate reduction
053	Financial policies
054	Cut-backs
055	Debt/Deficit
061	Crime
062	Safety
063	Terrorism
064	Punishment/Justice system
071	Immigration policy
072	Integration policy
074	Islam
075	Foreigners
076	Discrimination
090	Education
092	Student support
101	Elderly policy
102	Pensions
103	Retirement age/Ageing population
104	Family policy/Childcare/Youth policy
105	Policy on poverty

106	Social policy
107	Welfare services
108	Distribution of income
110	Employment
120	Traffic
121	Road pricing
122	Mobility
131	Health Care
133	New health care system/No claim/Health
140	Environment
142	Nuclear energy
143	Housing (housing market/rent/social hou
150	Norms and values/Moral standards
160	Christian politics
170	Functioning politics
171	Cabinet formation
172	Too many parties
173	Continuation/Change of policy
174	Distribution of seats
175	(Lack of) Solidarity/Social cohesion
176	Wilders/PVV
998	Don't know / Not answered
999	Impossible to code

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001.	Corruption
002.	Crime and insecurity
003.	Poverty
004.	Unemployment
005.	Terrorism
006.	Drug traffic
007.	Bad justice administration
008.	Social inequality
009.	Poor quality of public education
010.	Poor quality of health system

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

## CSES Code Election Study Code/Categories:

001.	Graft and corruption (general)
002.	Poverty / economic crisis
003.	Inflation / higher prices of commodities
004.	Income/wages / salaries too low
005.	Debt of Philippines
006.	Maguindanao massacre
007.	Election fraud / vote buying
008.	Unemployment / lack of job opportunities
009.	Education problem (general)
010.	Media killings and politics-related crimes
011.	Crime (general)
012.	Hunger / food poverty / malnutrition
013.	Political dynasty
014.	Transition to new administration / expectations from the new administration that they would fulfill their promises
015.	Unfulfilled promises of politicians
016.	Insurgency due to NAP's, Abu Sayyaf etc. / conflict between Christians and Muslims
017.	Growing population

018.	Switching of members of political parties /
019.	conflict among political parties and candidates
020.	Bureaucracy problems/ no unity among elected
021.	officials
020.	Housing problems
021.	Illegal activities (gambling, smuggling, drugs)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	unemployment
002.	poverty, social assistance
003.	low wages
004.	problems of the retired, pensioners
005.	increasing prices, high prices
006.	social and economic inequalities
007.	uncertain future
008.	housing construction problems
009.	poor life conditions
010.	unequal access to education
011.	health service functioning
012.	social insurance reform
013.	rural/agricultural situation
014.	women discrimination
015.	civic rights: insufficient, etc.
021.	security, crime
022.	law and judicial problems
023.	terrorism
031.	bad rule, coalition/party conflicts
032.	strikes, protests, blockades
033.	corruption, bribery
034.	bureaucracy, incompetent officials
035.	public money waste (also from EU)
036.	political scandals, corruption
037.	parliamentary investigation commissions failure
041.	budget deficit, public finance
042.	economy
043.	taxes
044.	mining, steel industry, railways
045.	companies liquidation
046.	privatization and re-privatization
047.	FDI, wholesale of polish property
048.	obstacles for entrepreneurship
049.	ue subventions
050.	energy sovereignty (oil, gas)
051.	poor roads
061.	war in Iraq, polish troops presence
062.	EU - Poland relationship
063.	relations with foreign countries
064.	relations with Russia
065.	policy towards Ukraine and Belarus; minorities
066.	relations with Germany
067.	relations with USA
071.	low population growth/birth rate
072.	minority rights & tolerance
073.	social anomy, disintegration
074.	problems with and of young people
075.	ecology, environmental pollution
076.	natural disasters, flood
077.	abortion
078.	role of church in the state/country
079.	elections, democracy
080.	unnecessary disorganized lustration
081.	speeding and finalizing lustration
082.	emigration in search of better jobs
083.	family pathology: alcoholism, narcotics
084.	workplace exploitation
085.	liquidation of senate, cutting number of mps
086.	value crisis, lack of authority
087.	other problems



088. there are no problems

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

The original data for Poland (2007) included nine observations, which did not mention a most important sociotropic problem in C3002\_1, but named a second problem in C3002\_2. In contrast, the corresponding respondents mentioned a party to solve the given problem in C3003\_1, but not in C3003\_2. In the actual CSES data, reported answers on the second sociotropic problem were coded as most important problems, while the second mention was defined as a missing value for all of these nine observations. Data on C3003\_1-C3003\_2 remained unchanged.

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2 for POLAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Economy
002.	Economic crisis
003.	Political crisis / instability
004.	Election of the president / validation
005.	Election fraud
006.	Corruption
007.	Poverty / income / living standard
008.	Employment / unemployment
009.	Agriculture
010.	External debt / loan
011.	Political / institutional reform
012.	Fight between politicians / political parties
013.	Government formation/lack of government
014.	Human quality of the political class (lack of competence, morality)
015.	Health
016.	Foreign policy
017.	Education

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes and remarks on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

For codes on C3002\_1-C3002\_2 see C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

Note that the wording of the questions on C3011\_ differ slightly from the CSES manner: "At the time of the election, what would you say were the most important problems facing the country at that time?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
001.	Management of the economy
002.	Wages, incomes and salaries
003.	Unemployment
004.	Poverty / destitution
005.	Rates and taxes
006.	Loans / credit
007.	Farming / agriculture
008.	Food shortage / famine
009.	Drought
010.	Land
011.	Transportation

012.	Communications
013.	Infrastructure / roads
014.	Education
015.	Housing
016.	Electricity
017.	Water supply
018.	Orphans / street children / homeless children
019.	Services (other)
020.	Health
021.	Aids
022.	Crime and security
023.	Corruption
024.	Political violence
025.	Discrimination / inequality
026.	Democracy / political rights
027.	Discipline
028.	Lack of services
029.	Country is ruled by capitalist
030.	Law is in favor of the richer
031.	Respect
032.	Social service grand

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
110.	Economic problem
111.	Economic development
112.	Economic stability
113.	Economic recovery
114.	Rising prices
115.	Stabilization of ordinary people's living
116.	Income disparity
117.	Unemployment
118.	Other problems about economy
211.	Political apathy
212.	Political distrust
213.	Political instability
214.	Corrupt relations between politics and business
215.	Abuse of political power
216.	Self-interestedness of politicians and parties
217.	Qualification of politicians
218.	Politics not for people
219.	Other problems about politics
220.	Inter-party strife
221.	Internal strife within party
222.	problems of party politics
223.	Emergence of minor political parties
224.	Politics led by a gigantic ruling party
225.	Factional Politics
226.	Other party-related problems
230.	Conflict surrounding the candidate nomination
231.	Absence of fair election
232.	Unfulfilled public pledge
310.	Lack of morality
311.	Corruption
312.	National security
313.	Social instability
314.	Social polarization
315.	Ideological conflict
316.	Regional conflict
317.	Regional disparity
318.	Regionalism
319.	Environmental problems
320.	Education problems
321.	Welfare problems
322.	Real Estate problems
323.	Private education problems
324.	Tax burden
410.	Lack of policy alternatives
411.	Grand Korean waterway project

- 
- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 412. | Privatization of Medical insurance     |
| 413. | Other policy-related problems          |
| 510. | Diplomacy                              |
| 511. | North-South Korean problem             |
| 512. | Reunification of North and South Korea |
| 513. | North Korea nuclear problems           |
| 514. | South Korea-U. S. Relations            |
| 515. | FTA(Free Trade Agreement)              |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

For codes on C3002\_1-C3002\_2 see C3001\_1-C3001\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

The Swedish study of 2006 includes 47 respondents in C3002\_1, as well as 1 case in C3002\_2, that answered "ingen viktig fråga för val av parti" (No important question which would influence the vote choice). These cases have been coded as "901. NO PROBLEM".

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

A question for the second most important sociotropic problem was not included in the Swiss questionnaire.

See codes on C3001\_1-C3001\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Categories:                                 |
| 101.      | Black-and-gold politics problem                                 |
| 102.      | Bribery problem   |
| 103.      | Illegal lobbying and corrupt practices by means of privilege    |
| 104.      | Problem about administrative degeneration and corruption        |
| 105.      | Military nationalization problem                                |
| 106.      | Unfair judiciary or judicial reform problem                     |
| 107.      | Political stability problem                                     |
| 108.      | Constitutional reform problem                                   |
| 109.      | Problem about Åj ublackÅj v intervening politics                |
| 110.      | Incapability of government                                      |
| 111.      | Ideological problem   |
| 112.      | Media chaos   |
| 113.      | Neutral administration  |
| 114.      | Government personnel  |
| 115.      | Election of justice   |
| 116.      | Political trust problem   |
| 117.      | Separation of power   |
| 118.      | Social justice  |
| 201.      | Cross-Strait problem  |
| 202.      | Problem about unification and independence or National identity |
| 203.      | Cross-Strait direct link  |
| 204.      | Cross-Strait trade  |
| 301.      | Taiwan future problem   |
| 302.      | Diplomacy or international status problem                       |
| 303.      | Problem about resuming the United Nations                       |
| 304.      | Problem about China's military assaulting Taiwan                |
| 305.      | National defense security problem                               |
| 401.      | Traffic problem   |
| 402.      | Problem about houses or price of houses                         |
| 403.      | Public order problem  |
| 404.      | Social welfare problem  |
| 405.      | Medical insurance problem                                       |
| 406.      | Social morality problem   |

=====

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| 407. | Problem about the labor and capital                 |
| 408. | Aborigines problem                                  |
| 409. | Ethnic harmony problem                              |
| 501. | Economic development problem                        |
| 502. | Industry moving abroad problem                      |
| 503. | Problem about prices of commodities                 |
| 504. | Unemployment problem                                |
| 505. | Problem about stock market stability                |
| 506. | Public infrastructure                               |
| 507. | Tax problem   |
| 508. | People's livelihood question                        |
| 509. | Country competency                                  |
| 510. | Social stability problem                            |
| 511. | An agricultural product import                      |
| 512. | Financial reform                                    |
| 601. | Agricultural problem                                |
| 602. | Problem about the gap between the rich and the poor |
| 603. | Educational reform problem                          |
| 604. | Recreation problem                                  |
| 605. | Environmental protection problem                    |
| 701. | Mayoral special expense fund                        |
| 702. | State fund embezzlement scandal of Chen hui-bian    |
| 703. | Democracy stability                                 |
| 704. | Candidate's ability                                 |
| 705. | Candidate's personal morality                       |
| 706. | Dictatorial leadership                              |
| 707. | Alternation of power                                |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

- |           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| CSES Code | Election Study Code/Categories:   |
| 001.      | Revolution against the government |
| 002.      | Lack of Public Hearings           |
| 003.      | Government controlled by business |
| 004.      | Instability of politics           |
| 005.      | Corruption                        |
| 006.      | Political Violence                |
| 007.      | Political Rights                  |
| 008.      | Social Disruption and Inequality  |

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

See codes on C3001\_.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

Note that although the most and the second most important problems were asked separately, respondents were allowed to give multiple answers on both questions. Unfortunately the order of response is not available. Instead the lowest answer category is included in C3002\_.

For codes on C3002\_, see C3001\_.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3002\_1-C3002\_2

For Codes of C3002-1-C3002\_2 see notes on C3001-1-C3001\_2.

-----

C3003_1	>>> Q3a. PARTY/CANDIDATE COMPETENCE-FIRST SOCIOTROPIC PROBLEM
C3003_2	>>> Q3b. PARTY/CANDIDATE COMPETENCE-SECOND SOCIOTROPIC PROBLEM

-----

Q3a. Thinking of the most important political problem facing [COUNTRY]: which [party/presidential candidate] do you think is best in dealing with it?

Q3b. And the second most important political problem facing  
[COUNTRY]: which [party/presidential candidate] do you think is  
best in dealing with it?

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)

90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)

91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTE: C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Note that the CSES standard does not require respondents to  
say which party/candidate is best to solve the most  
important sociotropic problems if they gave an answer  
in C3002\_1-C3002\_2. In contrast, C3003\_1-C3003\_2 could be  
asked to each respondent, irrespective of the mention in  
C3002\_1-C3002\_2.

Table: Frequencies on C3003\_1/\_2 for respondents that did  
not mention a problem or that mentioned "no problem"  
(code 901) in C3002\_1/\_2:

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)	C3002_1		C3002_2	
	no mention	no problem	no mention	no problem
AUSTRALIA (2007)	33	0	30	0
AUSTRIA (2008)	6	1	9	0
BELARUS (2008)	5	0	0	0
BRAZIL (2006)	80	17	248	0
BRAZIL (2010)	0	0	2	0
CANADA (2008)	408	0	0	0
CROATIA (2007)	24	0	47	0
DENMARK (2007)	9	0	17	0
ESTONIA (2011)	93	0	148	0
FINLAND (2007)	16	0	20	0
FINLAND (2011)	44	0	82	0
FRANCE (2007)	255	0	23	0
GREECE (2009)	0	0	87	0
HONG KONG (2008)	96	2	108	0
ICELAND (2007)	46	0	76	0
LATVIA (2010)	4	5	31	6
MEXICO (2006)	201	0	361	0
MEXICO (2009)	0	5	0	4
NETHERLANDS (2006)	8	0	19	0
NETHERLANDS (2010)	25	0	37	0
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	159	0	311	0
NORWAY (2005)	0	0	36	0
NORWAY (2009)	0	0	8	0
PERU (2011)	58	0	66	0
PHILIPPINES (2010)	92	0	653	0
POLAND (2005)	1	0	0	0
POLAND (2007)	11	0	29	0
ROMANIA (2009)	118	0	233	0
SLOVAKIA (2010)	1	0	10	0
SLOVENIA (2008)	4	0	17	0
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	5	5	0	0
SPAIN (2008)	23	0	49	0
SWITZERLAND (2007)	0	7	0	0
THAILAND (2007)	25	0	48	0
UNITED STATES (2008)	79	0	131	0

URUGUAY (2009)250572

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

The question was not asked open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties and the options to choose "other party" and "no party".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3003\_2

In Brazil, this was a close-ended question with the choices made available to the respondents shown on the list below.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
04.	Dilma (PT)
08.	José Serra (PSDB)
14.	Marina Silva (PV)
17.	Zé Maria (PSTU)
18.	Ivan Pinheiro (PCB)
19.	Levy Fidelix (PRTB)
21.	Eymael (PSDC)
22.	Rui Costa Pimenta (PCO)
26.	Plínio (PSOL)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Code 90 includes the answer "a DC"

Code 98 includes one answer: "Depends on the candidate, the personality is important".

Code 99 includes one respondent who answered "someone of the left" (C3003\_1) and one who answered 'someone of the governing coalition' (C3003\_2). Further, it includes one answer "I'm disillusioned, it does not interest me" (C3003\_1).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

In France this was a close-ended question.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

See the Election Study Notes on C3002\_1-C3002\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed list for the five major Japanese parties (see codebook appendices).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

LATVIA provided a closed list of parties of which the respondents could choose their answer.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
88.	Parties have to cooperate to solve it, one party cannot do it.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3003\_1

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Note that the Peruvian study asks for the presidential candidates that are best to deal with the sociotropic problems, as listed in the Peruvian party table (see codebook appendices).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

=====

The Philippine questionnaire of origin asked for the presidential candidate that is best to deal with the most important problem, according in C3002\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

See notes on C3002.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

The Romanian questionnaire of origin asked for presidential candidates that are best to deal with the most important political problem.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

The South African questionnaire of origin includes an initial filter question on C3003\_1. First, respondent were asked if any other party than the African National Congress (ANC) could have handled the problems, mentioned in C3002\_, better. Second, respondents were asked which party this would be. The coding of C3003\_1 reflects the ANC if respondents did negate the first question. If respondents mentioned yes in the first question, the response on the second question is coded as the party to deal with the mentioned problem of C3002\_, best.

Note that these questions were asked generally about both problem mentions of C3002\_. Consequently, C3003\_2 is coded as missing (code 99) for all cases.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Respondents were asked, which candidate they expect to be best in dealing with the most important sociotropic problems, as presented in the Uruguayan party table in the current Codebook Appendices.

-----  
C3004 >>> Q4. WHO IS IN POWER CAN MAKE DIFFERENCE  
-----

Q4. Some people say that it doesn't make any difference who is in power. Others say that it makes a big difference who is in power. Using the scale on this card, (where ONE means that it doesn't make any difference who is in power and FIVE means that it makes a big difference who is in power), where would you place yourself?

.....

1. IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE WHO IS IN POWER
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
5. IT MAKES A BIG DIFFERENCE WHO IS IN POWER
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

| NOTES: C3004

Data are not available for IRELAND (2007), SWITZERLAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3004

Question wording from the Russian questionnaire was somewhat different from the CSES original questionnaire (this might apply to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic)). The scale ranges from "it is not important" (or "it does not matter") who is in power to "it is important" (or "it matters") who is in power.

In the Russian questionnaire, question reads: "In your opinion, to what degree it matters or it does not matter who is in power? Please make your answer according to the following 5 point scale, where ONE means that it doesn't matter who is in power, and FIVE means that it matters who is in power."

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3004

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3004

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3004

See note on C3005.

-----  
C3005 >>> Q5. WHO PEOPLE VOTE FOR MAKES A DIFFERENCE  
-----

Q5. Some people say that no matter who people vote for, it won't make any difference to what happens. Others say that who people vote for can make a big difference to what happens. Using the scale on this card, (where ONE means that voting won't make any difference to what happens and FIVE means that voting can make a big difference), where would you place yourself?

- .....
1. WHO PEOPLE VOTE FOR WON'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE
  - 2.
  - 3.
  - 4.
  5. WHO PEOPLE VOTE FOR CAN MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

NOTES: C3005

Data are not available for GERMANY (2005), POLAND (2005).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3005

Question wording from the Russian questionnaire was somewhat different from the CSES original questionnaire. (this might apply to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic)). The scale ranges from "for whom people vote for is not important (or it does not matter)," to "for whom people vote for is important (or it matters)."

In the Russian questionnaire, it reads: "Some people consider that it does not matter for who people vote for because it does not make a difference. Others say that it matters for who to vote for because it makes a difference. What is your opinion? Please locate your position on a five-point scale, where ONE



means that it does not matter for who to vote for, and FIVE means that it matters for who to vote for."

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3005  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3005

CSES Code Election Study Code/Category  
08. Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3005

Note that about one half of the Peruvian sample answered that "5. Who people vote for makes a big difference". In contrast, frequencies on C3004 ("Who people vote for ...") are relatively equal distributed. Both variables had been double checked with the raw data and remain unchanged.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3005

The Polish election survey 2005 was a pilot study for the third module of CSES. The questions about the political efficacy of the vote choice ("who people vote for makes a difference") were not included.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3005

Notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

-----  
C3006 >>> Q6. GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE: GENERAL  
-----

Q6. Now thinking about the performance of the [government in [CAPITAL]/president] in general, how good or bad a job do you think the [government/president in [CAPITAL]] has done over the past [NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LAST GOVERNMENT TOOK OFFICE, BEFORE THE CURRENT ELECTION] years? Has [it/he/she] done a very good job? A good job? A bad job? A very bad job?  
.....

1. VERY GOOD JOB
2. GOOD JOB
3. BAD JOB
4. VERY BAD JOB
6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C3006

Data are not available for CHILE (2009).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3006

Note that this variable refers to the caretaker government which came into office in May 2009, after the previous government had failed a vote of confidence. However, the Czech Election Study asked this question twice, for both, the caretaker government, and the previous one. Researchers who are interested in the evaluation of the government which had been in office right after the 2006 election are advised to ask

| for the data at the Czech Election Study.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3006

The Danish question on the general government performance was "Og tilsvarende vil vi gerne h re din vurdering af regeringens arbejde generelt de sidste 3  r." (And accordingly, we want to hear your assessment of government performance in general the last 3 years.), including the following categories:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Very good (meget godt)
02.	Good (godt)
03.	Bad (d�rligt)
04.	Very bad (meget d�rligt)
08.	Neither good nor bad (hverken godt eller d�rligt)

Note that the data of origin did not include a category "8. DON'T KNOW". Consequently, the CSES-category 8. refers to those respondents, who mentioned "neither good nor bad".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3006

Wording of the Hong Kong 2008 question slightly differs from the questions of origin of CSES:  
"Overall speaking, how satisfied are you with the performance of the HKSAR Government over the past year?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Very satisfied
02.	Satisfied
03.	Unsatisfied
04.	Very unsatisfied

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C3006

Note that due to the breakdown of the government coalition, there were two governments in power. This question only refers to the first, majority coalition of the Independence Party and the Social Democratic Alliance which was formed after the election in 2007 and lasted until February 1, 2009. The Icelandic election study also contains a separate question

concerning the second, minority coalition between the Social Democratic Alliance and the Left Green Movement, which was in power from February 1, 2009 until the new government after elections on April, 25, 2009 was formed.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3006

Note that the question in Ireland referred explicitly to the government's parties Fianna F il and PD instead of just using the word "government".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3006

Response options from the Russian questionnaire were somewhat different from the CSES original questionnaire. This might apply to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic). While options 1 and 2 are equivalent to CSES original coding scheme, option 3 (bad job) translates into "not very good job", while option 4 (very bad job) translates into "poor job" in the Russian questionnaire.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3006

In 2009, the Mexican questionnaire included a fifth answer.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

## 06. Regular (more or less)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3006

Question wording of C3006 in the DPES questionnaire was somewhat different than in the original CSES formulation: "When we look at the achievements of the government in The Hague in the past three years. Has the government according to you done a very good; good; bad; or very bad job?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	997. Don't know / no answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3006

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
8.	Don't know / Not answered

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3006

Question wording of C3006 in the Norwegian questionnaire was somewhat different than in the original CSES formulation. The question was: "We have in the last four years had a government consisting of the Christian Peoples Party, the Conservative Party, and the Liberal Party. How well did this government perform in general?"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3006

Note that the Norwegian question on the government performance was asked slightly different from the CSES wording: "In the last four years, we had a government consisting of Labor Party, Social Left Party and Centre Party. How well did this government perform in general?" ("Vi har de fire siste årene hatt en regjering bestående av Arbeiderpartiet, Sosialistisk Venstreparti og Senterpartiet. Hvor god jobb synes du denne regjeringen i alminnelighet har gjort? Har den gjort en...").

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Very good job
02.	Good job
03.	Bad job
04.	Very bad job
06.	Neither good nor bad

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3006

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
6.	Neither good nor bad

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3006

Note that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3006

Note that the question wording in this variable was slightly different from the CSES formulation. The Taiwan (2008) question wording is as follows: "Concerning Chen Shui-bian's overall performance during his presidency, are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?"  
The supplementary codes "It depends" and "no opinion" were recoded as "Don't know".

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	very satisfied
02.	somewhat satisfied

- 
- |  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
|  | 03. | somewhat dissatisfied                         |
|  | 04. | very dissatisfied                             |
|  | 08. | VOLUNTEERED: don't know/it depends/no opinion |
- 

---

C3007\_1 >>> Q7. IS THERE A PARTY THAT REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS

---

Q7. Would you say that any of the parties in [COUNTRY] represent your views reasonably well?

- .....
- 1. YES
  - 5. NO
  - 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  - 9. MISSING

NOTES: C3007\_1

Data are not available for NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010).

C3007\_1 is a filter question for C3007\_2. Respondents who mentioned that no party that represents their views best (C3007\_1 is code 5) are not allowed to name a party in C3007\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3007\_1

This question has not been included in the Australian questionnaire 2007; instead C3007\_1 was created due to the answer of B21P6 "No party represents views well"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3007\_1

Note that the Norwegian question on parties, representing respondent's views best, was asked slightly different from the CSES manner: "Would you say that there is a party in Norway that represents your views reasonably well?" ("Vil du si at det er noe parti i Norge som representerer dine synspunkter rimelig bra?").

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3007\_1

Notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

---

C3007\_2 >>> Q7A. PARTY THAT REPRESENTS R'S VIEWS BEST

---

Q7A. Which party represents your views best?

- .....
- 01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]
  - 89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
  - 90. OTHER PARTY (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
  - 91. NONE OF THE PARTIES
  - 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

## 99. MISSING

NOTES: C3007\_2

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010).

C3007\_2 is filtered by C3007\_1.  
For further details see Variable Notes on C3007\_1.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3007\_2

The question was not open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties containing the options "other party" and "no party".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3007\_2

Code 99 also included one respondent's answer 'I don't vote for parties but only for persons'.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3007\_2

Code 90 refers to mentions of parties which were not running in the election, but also refers to answers which did not make sense, such as the 'King'

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3007\_2

Note that the underlying question on C3007\_2 was asked independently from the previous question about a party that represents respondent's views best (C3007\_1). Respondents who did not explicitly report that there is a party which represents their views best (C3007\_1) were coded as missing values in C3007\_2. As a consequence, substantial party mentions of 487 respondents were coded as missing values in C3007\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3007\_2

Note that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

Furthermore, this question was asked slightly differently in Switzerland. Instead of asking for a party that represents the respondent's views best, the Swiss questionnaire evaluated each party separately.  
As a consequence, C3007\_2 includes 164 respondents who mentioned more than one party representing their views best (code 88).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3007\_2

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

-----  
C3008\_1 >>> Q8. IS THERE A LEADER WHO REPRESENTS R' S VIEWS  
-----

Q8. Regardless of how you feel about the parties, would you say that any of the [individual party leaders/presidential candidates] at the last election represents your views reasonably well?

.....

1. YES
5. NO

7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW  
 9. MI SS I NG

NOTES: C3008\_1

Data are not available for SLOVENIA (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007).

C3008\_1 is a filter question for C3008\_2. Respondents who mentioned that no party leader represents their views best (C3008\_1 is code 1) are not allowed to name the appropriate leader in C3008\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3008\_1  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3008\_1

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3008\_1

Note that the Norwegian question on party leaders, representing respondent's views best, was asked slightly different from the CSES manner: "No matter of the parties, do you think there is any party leader who represents your views reasonably well?" ("Uansett hvordan du ser på partiene, synes du det er noen partiledere som representerer dine synspunkter rimelig bra?").

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3008\_1

Note that the question wording in this variable was slightly different than the CSES question. In Taiwan it was asked as follows: "Regardless of how you feel about the parties, would you say that any of the presidential candidates in this election represents your views?"

-----  
 C3008\_2 >>> Q8A. LEADER WHO REPRESENTS R' S VIEWS BEST  
 -----

Q8a. Which [party leader/presidential candidate] represents your views best?  
 .....

0001-8899. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

8900. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)

8901-8999. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (SPECIFIED)  
 [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

9000. OTHER LEADER (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)

9100. NONE OF THE LEADERS

9997. REFUSED

9998. DON' T KNOW

9999. MI SS I NG

NOTES: C3008\_2

For value labels of party leaders/candidates/members, see party tables in Appendix I. The first two digits of the given codes correspond to the party with which the politician is associated.

Data are not available for SWITZERLAND (2007).

C3008\_2 is filtered by C3008\_1.  
For further details see Variable Notes on C3008\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3008\_2

In France this was a close-ended question in randomized order.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3008\_2

As a representative of party E (The Greens) Joschka Fischer was mentioned in the German questionnaire. However, researchers should note that J. Fischer resigned from leadership in 1998 already, but still remained the most important politician of the German Greens.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3008\_2

The official leader of The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions in 2008 has been Cheng Yiu-Tong, who was not mentioned in C3008\_2.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3008\_2

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed-list for the five major Japanese parties.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3008\_2

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3008\_2

These data were coded as "mentioned/not mentioned", and multiple mentions were allowed. As a result, the respondents' rank ordering of the leaders could not be determined. Leaders are reported in order of their popularity in the sample (e.g., if there were 3 respondents mentioning leaders A and B, they were ascribed to the one with the larger number of mentions overall).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3008\_2

Jeanette Fitzsimmons was one of the Greens two co-leaders, and the senior of the two. The other was Russell Norman. Tania Turia was Maori Party co-leader, again the most senior. The other was Pita Sharples.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3008\_2

Between 2005 and 2007, Wladyslaw Frasyniuk changed from Unia Wolnosci to Partia Demokratyczna.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3008\_2

The Slovenian data do not allow differing between

- a) Andrej Bajuk and Ljudmila Novak, who replaced Andrej Bajuk as the party leader of New Slovenia - Christian People's Party after the parliamentary election of 2008.
- b) Bojan Srot, who is the president of the Slovenian People's Party, and Radovan Zerjav, the Slovenian Minister of Transport.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3008\_2

Note that the first person mentioned, code starting with 01 is the president or presidential candidate, while the second one, starting with 02, is the vice-president or vice presidential candidate (for details see party table in the current Codebook Appendices).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3008\_2

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) did not run

for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates. However, the Turkish survey asks respondents to evaluate Selahattin Demirtas (code 0401) as the leader of the BDP.

```
-----
C3009_A >>> Q9A. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY A
C3009_B >>> Q9B. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY B
C3009_C >>> Q9C. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY C
C3009_D >>> Q9D. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY D
C3009_E >>> Q9E. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY E
C3009_F >>> Q9F. LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY F
C3009_G >>> Q9G. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G
C3009_H >>> Q9H. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3009_I >>> Q9I. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
-----
```

Q9a-i. I'd like to know what you think about each of our political parties. After I read the name of a political party, please rate it on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you strongly dislike that party and 10 means that you strongly like that party. If I come to a party you haven't heard of or you feel you do not know enough about, just say so. The first party is [PARTY A].

Using the same scale, where would you place, [PARTY B]?

Using the same scale, where would you place, [PARTY C]?

Using the same scale, where would you place, [PARTY D]?

Using the same scale, where would you place, [PARTY E]?

Using the same scale, where would you place, [PARTY F]?

00. STRONGLY DISLIKE

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. STRONGLY LIKE

96. HAVEN'T HEARD OF PARTY

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT/DON'T KNOW WHERE TO RATE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3009

Researchers should pay attention to the fact that C3009 includes several observations in which parties are scored equally.

Table: Frequencies on C3009\_ for respondents that scored all parties equally. These data remain unchanged.

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	113
AUSTRIA (2008)	11
BELARUS (2008)	57
BRAZIL (2006)	27
BRAZIL (2010)	17
CANADA (2008)	24
CHILE (2009)	9
CROATIA (2007)	5
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	12
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	5



DENMARK (2007)	3
ESTONIA (2011)	5
FINLAND (2007)	8
FINLAND (2011)	2
FRANCE (2007)	4
GERMANY (2005)	2
GERMANY (2009)	12
GREECE (2009)	6
HONG KONG (2008)	16
ICELAND (2007)	6
ICELAND (2009)	3
IRELAND (2007)	18
ISRAEL (2006)	22
JAPAN (2007)	33
LATVIA (2010)	3
MEXICO (2006)	13
MEXICO (2009)	44
NETHERLANDS (2006)	5
NETHERLANDS (2010)	7
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	12
NORWAY (2005)	2
NORWAY (2009)	7
PERU (2011)	13
PHILIPPINES (2010)	7
POLAND (2005)	27
POLAND (2007)	73
PORTUGAL (2009)	20
ROMANIA (2009)	3
SLOVAKIA (2010)	8
SLOVENIA (2008)	18
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	5
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	19
SPAIN (2008)	7
SWEDEN (2006)	2
SWITZERLAND (2007)	14
TAIWAN (2008)	406
THAILAND (2007)	101
TURKEY (2011)	5
UNITED STATES (2008)	255
URUGUAY (2009)	16

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party in one of the appropriate variables on C3009\_, C3011\_ or C3014\_, but evaluated the same party in another variable. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3009\_, C3011\_, and C3014\_ for respondents, not to know a certain party in one variable, but evaluating the same party in another variable:

PARTY	_A	_B	_C	_D	_E	_F	_G	_H	_I
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)									
BRAZIL (2006)	34	21	37	42	51	45	0	0	0
BRAZIL (2010)	3	20	25	0	90	0	0	73	69
CHILE (2009)	4	5	4	4	4	0	5	0	0
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
DENMARK (2007)	6	5	4	17	7	22	50	26	72
FINLAND (2007)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
FINLAND (2011)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FRANCE (2007)	3	0	9	0	3	2	33	0	0
GREECE (2009)	0	0	2	1	2	13	0	0	0
HONG KONG (2008)	7	10	11	18	0	6	19	16	0
ICELAND (2007)	13	14	17	22	30	63	0	0	0
ICELAND (2009)	6	7	13	12	123	63	0	0	0
ISRAEL (2006)	2	3	3	3	8	9	0	0	0
JAPAN (2007)	96	96	99	94	92	0	0	0	0
LATVIA (2010)	12	11	11	15	20	23	0	0	0
MEXICO (2006)	4	7	2	31	52	51	57	64	0
MEXICO (2009)	35	40	48	96	101	127	121	127	0

NETHERLANDS (2006)	176	178	200	195	392	233	373	328	493
NETHERLANDS (2010)	11	14	18	9	34	26	29	58	192
NORWAY (2005)	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	29	0
NORWAY (2009)	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	19	0
POLAND (2005)	17	18	16	19	34	26	184	97	0
POLAND (2007)	3	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
ROMANIA (2009)	2	0	3	7	10	0	11	0	0
SLOVAKIA (2010)	0	1	32	3	15	1	8	0	0
SLOVENIA (2008)	80	83	88	98	88	85	81	92	0
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	11	16	21	22	27	24	30	27	0
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	2	2	8	4	3	15	19	0	0
SPAIN (2008)	6	9	67	87	69	9	92	89	98
SWEDEN (2006)	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	7	27
SWITZERLAND (2007)	19	17	24	21	22	20	3	0	0
THAILAND (2007)	2	3	3	16	18	19	30	36	0
TURKEY (2011)	2	3	2	6	7	18	6	10	7
UNITED STATES (2008)	69	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3009\_D, C3009\_F, C3009\_G

Respondents' evaluation of parties D (PR), F (PSB), and G (PP) were not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, data about these parties are included in the district-as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3009\_A-C3009\_I

The Danish questionnaire offered a slightly different answer for code "96. HAVEN'T HEARD OF PARTY". The original wording was "Does not have sufficient knowledge about the party to answer the question" ("Ved ikke nok om partiet"). Thus, there are several respondents that mentioned not to know a party in C3009\_ who were able to answer C3011\_ on that same party.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
96.	Does not have sufficient knowledge about the party to answer the question

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3009\_G

Respondent's evaluation on the National Democratic Party (NPD), was not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, the NPD is included in the district-as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3009\_E

In general, the order of parties A to I follow the election results of parties' vote share. In contrast, respondents were not asked to evaluate the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (PARTY E), which only consists of missing values.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3009\_A-C3009\_I

In the Russian questionnaire, the wording refers more to support, rather than strongly like- strongly dislike. The question ranges between "does not support at all" to "greatly support." While in Hebrew, the chosen terminology varies in terms of "attraction/repulsion".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3009\_

The Philippine part of the CSES mainly focuses on the presidential election of 2010, which defines the order of parties (A through I) in C3009\_ (see codebook appendices). Consequently, there is no party affiliation of the two independent presidential candidates (J. Peralas and J. Madrigal). Thus, parties G and H remain unobserved and are coded as missing values (code 99) in C3009\_G and C3009\_H. See also notes on C3011\_ and C3014\_.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3009\_A-C3009\_I

Notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3009\_D

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

However, the Turkish survey asks respondents to evaluate the BDP on the like-dislike scale.

```
-----
C3010_A >>> Q10A. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER A
C3010_B >>> Q10B. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER B
C3010_C >>> Q10C. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER C
C3010_D >>> Q10D. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER D
C3010_E >>> Q10E. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER E
C3010_F >>> Q10F. LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER F
C3010_G >>> Q10G. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3010_H >>> Q10H. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3010_I >>> Q10I. LIKE-DISLIKE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I
-----
```

Q10a-i. And what do you think of the presidential candidates/party leaders? After I read the name of a presidential candidate/party leader, please rate them on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you strongly dislike that candidate and 10 means that you strongly like that candidate. If I come to a presidential candidate/party leader you haven't heard of or you feel you do not know enough about, just say so. The first is [LEADER A].

Using the same scale, where would you place, [LEADER B]?  
 Using the same scale, where would you place, [LEADER C]?  
 Using the same scale, where would you place, [LEADER D]?  
 Using the same scale, where would you place, [LEADER E]?  
 Using the same scale, where would you place, [LEADER F]?  
 .....

00. STRONGLY DISLIKE

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. STRONGLY LIKE

96. HAVEN'T HEARD OF LEADER

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. DON'T KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT/DON'T KNOW WHERE TO RATE

99. MISSING

## NOTES: C3010

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008).

Researchers should note that C3010 includes several observations for which all leaders are scored equally, namely for BELARUS (2008), GERMANY (2009), HONG KONG (2008), SOUTH KOREA (2008), MEXICO (2006 & 2009), POLAND (2005), SWEDEN (2006), and TAIWAN (2008).

Table: Frequencies on C3010\_ for respondents that scored all parties equally. These data remain unchanged.

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	28
BELARUS (2008)	83
BRAZIL (2010)	5
CANADA (2008)	27
CHILE (2009)	6
CROATIA (2007)	5
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	24
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	3
DENMARK (2007)	2
ESTONIA (2011)	8
FINLAND (2007)	4
FINLAND (2011)	11
FRANCE (2007)	3
GERMANY (2005)	2
GERMANY (2009)	2
GREECE (2009)	6
HONG KONG (2008)	24
ICELAND (2007)	5
ICELAND (2009)	9
IRELAND (2007)	19
ISRAEL (2006)	21
JAPAN (2007)	50
LATVIA (2010)	6
MEXICO (2006)	11
MEXICO (2009)	8
NETHERLANDS (2006)	7
NETHERLANDS (2010)	16
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	5
NORWAY (2005)	5
NORWAY (2009)	6
PERU (2011)	10
PHILIPPINES (2010)	20
POLAND (2005)	4
POLAND (2007)	47
PORTUGAL (2009)	16
ROMANIA (2009)	3
SLOVAKIA (2010)	7
SLOVENIA (2008)	10
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	6
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	3
SPAIN (2008)	10
SWITZERLAND (2007)	24
TAIWAN (2008)	8
THAILAND (2007)	145
TURKEY (2011)	8
UNITED STATES (2008)	169
URUGUAY (2009)	16

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party leader in one of the following variables (C3010\_, C3012\_ or C3015\_) but still evaluated the same party in another variable. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3010\_, C3012\_, and C3015\_ for respondents who did not know a certain party leader in one variable, but evaluated the same party leader in another variable:

PARTY	_A	_B	_C	_D	_E	_F	_G	_H	_I
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)									
BRAZIL (2006)	0	7	20	0	57	0	0	0	32
BRAZIL (2010)	1	0	1	0	0	46	0	0	0

CHILE (2009)	0	4	3	0	0	0	3	2	0
FINLAND (2007)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FINLAND (2011)	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
FRANCE (2007)	1	0	1	1	9	12	6	0	0
ICELAND (2007)	23	27	26	33	39	55	0	0	0
MEXICO (2006)	6	3	2	0	0	0	53	48	0
MEXICO (2009)	47	37	62	0	49	0	0	0	0
ROMANIA (2009)	2	0	1	8	16	6	11	0	0
SLOVENIA (2008)	82	87	76	82	88	90	87	100	0
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	2	5	3	0	23	3	0	0	0
THAILAND (2007)	3	3	2	9	11	27	4	40	0
UNITED STATES (2008)	52	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
URUGUAY (2009)	1	6	7	57	92	0	0	0	0

Likewise, some respondents mentioned that they never heard about the left-right scale before, in C3011\_, C3012\_ or C3013, but evaluated some of the parties in C3011\_. These data remain unchanged. For further details, see Variable Notes on C3013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3010\_E

C3010\_E refers to Julia Gillard, member of the Australian Labor Party and Australian Prime minister since 2010.

C3010\_F refers to Peter Costello, the former Australian Minister of Finance (Treasurer of Australia).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3010

This variable was not included in the Austrian Election Study because it was considered to be less applicable in Austria.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3010\_I

Note that the A-F scheme of parties and party leaders here represents the most popular parties according to the parliamentary elections' vote shares in descending order. For party F we do not have any information. Heloísa Helena, from party P-Sol only played a minor role in the parliamentary votes' results but was important in the presidential election. She was thus added to letter I.

Note that in the election study from Brazil there were also questions about two candidates from governor's elections, José Serra (PSDB) from São Paulo and Aécio Neves (PSDB) from Minas Gerais.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3010

Respondents' evaluation of parties B (PMDB), D (PR), E (Democrats), G (PP), H (PDT), and I (PTB) were not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, data about these parties is included in the district-as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3010

Although Party D (PDS) had a double leadership in 2005, the German collaborators selected Oskar Lafontaine as the party leader for PDS.

As a representative of party E (The Greens) Joschka Fischer was mentioned in the German questionnaire. However, researchers should note that J. Fischer resigned from leadership in 1998 but still remains the most important politician of the German Greens.

Respondent's evaluation on the National Democratic Party, (C3010\_G) was not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, the NPD is included in the district- as well as in

the macro-part of the CSES data.

C3010\_H refers to Mr. Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg of the Bavarian CSU. Even if he is no official leader of this party, he is the most important minister and most popular politician of the CSU.

C3010\_I refers to Mr. Gregor Gysi who forms a double leadership of the Left-Party together with Oskar Lafontaine, mentioned in C3010\_D.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3010\_E

In general, the order of parties A to I follow the election results of parties' vote share. In contrast, respondents were not asked to evaluate the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (PARTY E), thus it consists of missing values.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3010\_A-C3010\_F

In parties or alliances with two leaders the question was asked about Janis Urbanovics (B), Roberts Zile (D) and Ainars Slesers (E).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3010

The Polish questionnaire did not evaluate the like-dislike scale for a leader of the Polish Peasant Party (PSL).

The Polish questionnaire did not evaluate the like-dislike scale for a leader of the Democratic Party (PD).

The Polish study asked respondents to evaluate both of the Kaczynski brothers on the like-dislike-scale. Due to the fact that both played a major role in the 2005 election, information for Jaroslaw Kaczynski was kept in an additional variable C3010\_I, while Lech Kaczynski was kept in C3010\_A.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3010\_F

Data on C3010\_F refer to Bojan Srot.

Data on C3010\_H refer to Ljudmila Novak.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3010\_G

This question was asked slightly differently in South Korea. Instead of an open-ended question, important politicians were named in the questionnaire, excluding leaders from party G (New Progressive Party).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3010

Note that unlike other countries, the question considered two leaders from each parties. Given that in this presidential election, voters select both president and vice president, both figures are important here.

Also note that answers "It's hard to say" and "No opinion" were recoded as "Don't know".

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
3010_A.	Ma Ying-Jeou (presidential candidate) KMT
3010_B.	Frank Hsieh (presidential candidate) DPP
3010_H.	Vincent Siew (vice-pres. candidate) KMT
3010_I.	Su Tseng-Chang (vice-pres. candidate) DPP

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3010\_D

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

However, the Turkish survey asks respondents to evaluate Selahattin Demirtas on the like-dislike scale as the leader of the BDP.

```

-----
C3011_A >>> Q11A. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY A
C3011_B >>> Q11B. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY B
C3011_C >>> Q11D. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY C
C3011_D >>> Q11D. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY D
C3011_E >>> Q11E. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY E
C3011_F >>> Q11F. LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY F
C3011_G >>> Q11G. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G
C3011_H >>> Q11H. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3011_I >>> Q11I. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
-----

```

Q11a-i. In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place [PARTY A] on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?

Using the same scale, where would you place [PARTY B]?

Where would you place [PARTY C]?

Where would you place [PARTY D]?

Where would you place [PARTY E]?

Where would you place [PARTY F]?

.....

00. LEFT

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. RIGHT

95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF LEFT-RIGHT

96. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF PARTY

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3011

Researchers should note that C3011\_ includes several observations where parties are all scored equally.

Table: Frequencies on C3011\_ for respondents that scored all parties equally. These data remain unchanged.

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

AUSTRALIA (2007)	161
AUSTRIA (2008)	15
BELARUS (2008)	17
BRAZIL (2006)	50
BRAZIL (2010)	7
CANADA (2008)	83
CHILE (2009)	3
CROATIA (2007)	11
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	17
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	1
DENMARK (2007)	2
ESTONIA (2011)	15
FINLAND (2007)	20

---

FINLAND (2011)	11
FRANCE (2007)	5
GERMANY (2005)	13
GERMANY (2009)	22
GREECE (2009)	5
HONG KONG (2008)	5
ICELAND (2007)	27
ICELAND (2009)	15
IRELAND (2007)	53
ISRAEL (2006)	57
JAPAN (2007)	79
LATVIA (2010)	29
MEXICO (2006)	38
MEXICO (2009)	75
NETHERLANDS (2006)	12
NETHERLANDS (2010)	18
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	15
NORWAY (2005)	10
NORWAY (2009)	8
PERU (2011)	20
PHILIPPINES (2010)	3
POLAND (2005)	47
POLAND (2007)	45
PORTUGAL (2009)	20
ROMANIA (2009)	3
SLOVAKIA (2010)	27
SLOVENIA (2008)	30
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	18
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	30
SPAIN (2008)	5
SWEDEN (2006)	3
SWITZERLAND (2007)	35
TAIWAN (2008)	248
THAILAND (2007)	378
TURKEY (2011)	9
UNITED STATES (2008)	212
URUGUAY (2009)	11

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party in one of the appropriate variables on C3009\_, C3011\_ or C3014\_, but evaluated the same party in another variable. These data remain unchanged. For further details, see Variable Notes on C3009\_.

Likewise, some respondents mentioned that they never heard about the left-right scale before, in C3011\_, C3012\_ or C3013, but evaluated some of the party in C3011\_. These data remain unchanged. For further details, see Variable Notes on C3013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3011

Respondents Left-Right ratings of parties D (PR), F (PSB), and G (PP) were not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, data about these parties were included in the district-as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3011\_

The Danish questionnaire offered a slightly different answer for code "96. HAVEN'T HEARD OF PARTY". The original wording was "Does not have sufficient knowledge about the party to answer the question" ("Ved ikke nok om partiet"). Thus, there are several respondents that mentioned not to know a party in C3009\_ who were able to answer C3011\_ on that same party.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
96.	Does not have sufficient knowledge about the party to answer the question



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3011\_D

Researchers should take note of a difference between the mean-scoring of respondents and the expert evaluation of the Social Democrats on the left-right-scale. As our Estonian collaborators mentioned, "The Social Democrats are programmatically clearly leftwing, they have however frequently been a junior partner in a coalition with the conservative Pro Patria and Res Publica Union and with the liberal Reform Party. This has contributed towards a public perception of being more centrist than their program and policy statements would actually indicate. The different score therefore reflects a slight contradiction between their formal position and their actions while being a coalition partner."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3011\_G

Respondent's evaluation on the National Democratic Party (NPD), was not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, the NPD is included in the district- as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3011

Researchers should be aware that there are some differences between the sample mean of party evaluation on the 'left-right' -scale and the expert scoring, especially for the League of Democrats, the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood, and the Liberal Party. Accordingly, our collaborators pointed out that the "Left-Right division has a complicated meaning in Hong Kong. There are at least 3 dimensions: (1) 'left' for 'pro-Beijing' (...), and 'right' for 'pro-KMT' (KMT stands for Kuomintang, the ruling party in China before 1949 and Taiwan after 1949); (2) 'left' for advocating liberal / socialist / anti-market socio-economic policies, and 'right' for advocating conservative / capitalist / pro-market policies; and (3) 'left' for approving a radical approach to fighting for rights and changes, and 'right' for disapproving a radical approach. The three dimensions do not coincide for individual parties. Some parties are pro-Beijing, advocating liberal / socialist / anti-market socio-economic policies, but disapprove a radical approach (e.g. Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong). Other parties are advocating liberal / socialist / anti-market socio-economic policies, and approve a radical approach to fighting for rights and changes (e.g. League of Social Democrats)."

In contrast, the expert score was based on the assessment of the parties according to the second dimension, while respondents might have given their score based on one rather than other dimensions.

In general, the order of parties A to I follows the election results of parties' vote share. Respondents were not asked to evaluate the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (PARTY E), thus it consists of missing values.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3011

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3011

Note the somewhat unusual distribution of the Left-Right ratings of the parties, leaning towards the extremes. Note also that the party placements highly correlate with the evaluation of the corresponding parties on the like-dislike scale. The authenticity of the data have been verified with the collaborators. These features seem to represent relatively consistent features of the survey results in Mexico, reported across time, and by various survey projects (e.g., Latinobarometro, WVS).

For more insight into the results obtained using Left-Right scales in Mexico, consult Beltrán, 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3011\_

The Philippine part of the CSES mainly focuses on the presidential election of 2010, which defines the order of parties (A through I) in C3011\_ (see codebook appendices). Consequently, there is no party affiliation of the two independent presidential candidates (J. Perlas and J. Madrigal). Thus, parties G and H remain unobserved and are coded as missing values (code 99) in C3011\_G and C3011\_H. See also notes on C3009\_ and C3014\_.

Moreover, respondents' party evaluation on the left-right scale (C3011\_) differs from the expert scoring, coded in C5017\_. According to our collaborators, the left-right scale is mainly unknown in the Philippines. In addition, Philippine elections are highly personalized, diminishing the relevance of political parties in the electoral campaigns.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3011\_G

Researchers should note that in comparison with the expert evaluation, respondents' mean differs by about 1.5 points. Our Portuguese collaborators emphasize that this might be due to differences in the criteria of evaluation: "Experts made their evaluation taking into account not only the position of the party regarding economic issues but also regarding (...) moral issues, and others like the position of CDS/PP facing criminality. This positions the party the right spectrum, (...). In the case of the respondents, their evaluation probably concentrated on more salient issues - namely economy - where the position of the party is closer to the center, (...)."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3011

Note that the wording of the questions on C3011\_ differ slightly from the CSES questionnaire: "In politics, people sometimes talk of "left" (or "radical") and "right" (or "conservative"). Where would you place [PARTY] on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3011\_

Note that a majority of respondents tend to the neutral midpoint (code 5), when evaluating political parties. Also see Election Study Notes on C3012\_.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3011\_D

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates. However, the Turkish survey asks respondents to evaluate the BDP on the like-dislike scale.

```
-----
C3012_A >>> Q12A. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER A
C3012_B >>> Q12B. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER B
C3012_C >>> Q12C. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER C
C3012_D >>> Q12D. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER D
C3012_E >>> Q12E. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER E
C3012_F >>> Q12F. LEFT-RIGHT - LEADER F
C3012_G >>> Q12G. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3012_H >>> Q12H. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3012_I >>> Q12I. LEFT-RIGHT - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I
-----
```

Q12a-i. And again, using the same scale where would you place [LEADER A]?  
Where would you place [LEADER B]?

Where would you place [LEADER C]?  
 Where would you place [LEADER D]?  
 Where would you place [LEADER E]?  
 Where would you place [LEADER F]?  
 .....

00. LEFT

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. RIGHT

95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF LEFT-RIGHT

96. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF LEADER

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE

99. MISSING

#### NOTES: C3012

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), AUSTRIA (2008), BELARUS (2008), CANADA (2008), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), DENMARK (2007), GERMANY (2005), GREECE (2009), HONG KONG (2008), ICELAND (2009), IRELAND (2007), ISRAEL (2006), JAPAN (2007), LATVIA (2010), NETHERLANDS (2006), NETHERLANDS (2010), NEW ZEALAND (2008), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), POLAND (2005), POLAND (2007), PORTUGAL (2009), SLOVAKIA (2010), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), TURKEY (2011).

Researchers should note that C3012 includes several observations where respondents scored all party leaders equally. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3012\_ for respondents who scored all party leaders equally.

#### POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

BRAZIL (2006)	1
BRAZIL (2010)	4
ESTONIA (2011)	14
FINLAND (2007)	44
FINLAND (2011)	15
FRANCE (2007)	4
GERMANY (2009)	23
ICELAND (2007)	22
MEXICO (2006)	9
MEXICO (2009)	13
PERU (2011)	19
PHILIPPINES (2010)	22
ROMANIA (2009)	6
SLOVENIA (2008)	21
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	1
TAIWAN (2008)	277
THAILAND (2007)	333
UNITED STATES (2008)	164
URUGUAY (2009)	8

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party leader in one of the following variables (C3010\_, C3012\_ or C3015\_) but still evaluated the same party leader in another variable.

These data remain unchanged. For further details, see Variable Notes on C3010\_.

Likewise, some respondents mentioned that they have never heard about the left-right scale before, in C3011\_, C3012\_ or C3013, but evaluated some of the party leaders in C3012\_. These data remain unchanged. For further details, see Variable Notes on C3013.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3012

This variable was not included in the Austrian Election Study because it was considered to be less applicable to Austria.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3012\_I

Please note that we do not have any information on party F. Heloísa Helena from party P-Sol only played a minor role in the parliamentary votes' result but was important in the presidential election. She was thus added additionally to letter I. Note that in the election study from Brazil, there were also questions about two candidates from governor's elections, José Serra (PSDB) from São Paulo and Aécio Neves (PSDB) from Minas Gerais.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3012

Respondents' Left-Right rating of parties B (PMDB), D (PR), E (Democrats), G (PP), H (PDT), and I (PTB) were not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, data about these parties were included in the district-as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3012\_A-C3012\_I

The question was not asked in the Czech election study.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3012\_G

Respondent's evaluation on the National Democratic Party (NPD), was not part of the micro-questionnaire. In contrast, the NPD is included in the district- as well as in the macro-part of the CSES data.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3012\_H

C3012\_G refers to Mr Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg of the Bavarian CSU. Even if he is no official leader of this party, he is the most important minister and most popular politician of the CSU.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3012\_I

C3012\_H refers to Mr Gregor Gysi who forms a double leadership of the Left-Party, together with Oskar Lafontaine, mentioned in C3010\_D.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3012

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3012

Note the somewhat unusual distribution of the Left-Right ratings of the leaders, leaning towards the extremes. Note also that the leader placements highly correlate with the evaluation of the corresponding leaders on the like-dislike scale. The authenticity of the data have been verified with the collaborators. These features seem to represent relatively consistent features of the survey results in Mexico, reported across time, and by various survey projects (e.g., Latinobarometro, WVS).  
For more insight into the results obtained using Left-Right

| scales in Mexico, consult Beltrán, 2009.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3012\_D-C3012\_F

The party leader of the PRD [Party B] (Andrés Manuel López Obrador) was also the official party nominee of the PT [Party E] and Convergencia [Party F]. These three parties contested the election as the "Alianza por el Bien de Todos".

There is no question asking about leaders/candidates for these last two parties.

The same applies for the PV [Party D] who's candidate was Roberto Madrazo (from the PRI [Party C]).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3012\_F

Data refer to Bojan Srot.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C3012\_H

Data refer to Ljudmila Novak.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3012

This question was asked slightly differently in South Korea. Instead of an open-ended question, important politicians were named in the questionnaire, excluding leaders from party G (New Progressive Party).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3012I\_

Note that a majority of respondents tends to the neutral mid-point (code 5), evaluating political parties.

Also see Election Study Notes on C3011\_.

-----  
C3013 >>> Q13. LEFT-RIGHT - SELF  
-----

Q13. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

00. LEFT

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. RIGHT

95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN'T HEARD OF LEFT-RIGHT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE

99. MISSING

| NOTES: C3013

Researchers should note that C3013 includes several respondents who say they have never heard about the left-right-scale, but evaluated parties and leader on it, according to variables C3011 and C3012. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3011\_, C3012\_ and C3013 for respondents who have never heard about the left-right-scale, but

evaluated parties and leaders on it in any other variable.

#### POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

BELARUS(2008)	3
BRAZIL (2006)	96
BRAZIL (2010)	110
CROATIA (2007)	8
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	11
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	6
FINLAND (2007)	10
FINLAND (2011)	10
GREECE (2009)	16
ISRAEL (2006)	26
JAPAN (2007)	1
ROMANIA (2009)	7
SLOVAKIA (2010)	40
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	68
SPAIN (2008)	11
SWEDEN (2006)	175
TAIWAN (2008)	7
THAILAND (2007)	76
TURKEY (2011)	16

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3013

Note the somewhat unusual distribution of the Left-Right self-ratings of the respondents leaning towards the right.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3013

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3013

Note the somewhat unusual distribution of the Left-Right self-ratings of the Mexican respondents, strongly skewed towards the right. The authenticity of the data have been verified with the collaborators ("the scales represent the actual self-positioning of Mexicans in the scales"). This feature seems to represent a relatively consistent characteristics of the survey results in Mexico, reported across time, and by various survey projects (e.g., Latinobarometro, WVS). For more insight into the results obtained using Left-Right scales in Mexico, consult Beltrán, 2009.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3013

Note the somewhat unusual distribution of the Left-Right self-ratings of the respondents leaning towards the right.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3013

Note that the average of C3013 is about 6.2, exceeding the neutral mid-point of five. In the case of Romania, our collaborators assume "some sort of 'post-communism effect'. People are still sensitive to self-placing on the Left of the political spectrum, as they place the sign of equal between Left and communism. As the topic of communist (Russia-oriented) vs. anti-communist (West-oriented) has been a matter of political debate during the campaign, it is likely that this effect introduced a stronger bias towards Right than usually."

-----  
 C3014\_A >>> Q14a. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY A  
 C3014\_B >>> Q14b. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY B  
 C3014\_C >>> Q14c. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY C  
 C3014\_D >>> Q14d. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY D  
 C3014\_E >>> Q14e. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY E  
 C3014\_F >>> Q14f. OPTIONAL SCALE - PARTY F

```

=====
C3014_G >>> Q14g. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY G
C3014_H >>> Q14h. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY H
C3014_I >>> Q14i. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - PARTY I
-----

```

Q14a-i. In politics people sometimes talk of [SCALE VALUE AT POINT 0] and [SCALE VALUE AT POINT 10]. Where would you place [PARTY A] on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means [SCALE VALUE AT POINT 0] and 10 means [SCALE VALUE AT POINT 10]?

Using the same scale, where would you place [PARTY B]?

Where would you place [PARTY C]?

Where would you place [PARTY D]?

Where would you place [PARTY E]?

Where would you place [PARTY F]?

.....

00. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF [SCALE]

96. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN' T HEARD OF PARTY

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON' T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE

99. MISSING

#### NOTES: C3014

Note that an optional scale to evaluate parties was only asked in some elections studies. Data are available for CHILE (2009), ESTONIA (2011), ICELAND (2007), LATVIA (2010), MEXICO (2006), MEXICO (2009), PHILIPPINES (2010), TAIWAN (2008).

Researchers should note that C3014 includes several observations where respondents scored all party leaders equally. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3014\_ for respondents who scored all party leaders equally.

#### POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

CHILE (2009)	9
ESTONIA (2011)	7
ICELAND (2007)	18
LATVIA (2010)	12
MEXICO (2006)	24
MEXICO (2009)	53
PHILIPPINES (2010)	17
TAIWAN (2008)	147

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party in C3009\_ or C3011\_ but evaluated them in C3014\_. These data remain unchanged. See Variable Notes on C3009.

Likewise, some respondents mentioned that they never heard about the corresponding optional scale, but evaluated parties on it. These data remain unchanged. See Variable Notes on C3016.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3014\_A-C3014\_I

Respondents should evaluate on the scale from 0-10 how liberal or conservative the parties are.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Liberal
10.	Conservative

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3014\_A-C3014\_F

The optional scale refers to Russia as a security threat for Estonia. The question of origin was: "In politics people sometimes talk of Russia being a security threat to Estonia or a trustworthy partner. Where would you place "PARTY" on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means Russia is a security threat and 10 means Russia is a trustable partner?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Russia is a security threat
10.	Russia is a trustworthy partner

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3014\_E

Researchers should take note of a difference between the mean-scoring of respondents and the expert evaluation of the People's Union on the optional scale. As our Estonian collaborators mentioned, "The Peoples Union is not emphasizing their foreign policy agenda (it is a clearly rural party), but in actual questions on Russia (such as a discussion over signing a border treaty with Russia) they have usually sided with the conservative parties. I assume the divergence between the positions is caused by them being largely absent from public discussions on foreign policy issues, i.e. there is not much easily accessible information on their stance and hence also the more likely placement closer to the centre on the anti- or pro-Russia axis by the population. Their actual voting records in parliament, on the other hand, show a more anti-Russian bias, which the experts took into account."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3014

According to the length of the telephone interviews, an optional scale for the party evaluation was not included in the micro questionnaire of Hong Kong 2008. However, experts' evaluations are available in C5018\_A to C5018\_H, referring to the "pro-Beijing versus pro-Hong Kong"-scale.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3014

Respondents were asked for their placement of political parties (C3014) and self (C3016) on a scale of environmentalism: "Political parties differ on how environmentalist they are. Now I ask you to place the political parties on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means that the party is not environmentalist at all but 10 that it is very environmentalist. Where would you place (randomized order of the political parties) on such a scale?"

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
00.	Not at all environmentalist
10.	Very environmentalist

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3014

"People sometimes talk about parties advocating interests of



Latvians, and of parties advocating interests of Russophone residents. I will read a number of party names and will ask to evaluate position of each party on this. Please use scale from 0 to 10 where 0 stands for "advocates interests of Russophone residents" but 10 stands for "advocates interests of Latvians".

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
00.	Advocates interests of Russophone residents
10.	Advocates interests of Latvians

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3014

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3014

Question text: "People also talk about liberal and conservatives. Using the scale that appears on card 5 where 0 means liberal and 10 means conservative, where would you place...?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Liberal
10.	Conservative

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3014\_

The optional scale, used in the Philippine data, refers to the question: "Where would you place each political party I will mention, if number 0 means that the only thing important to [NAME OF PARTY] is eradicating graft and corruption in government and number 10 means that the only thing important to [NAME OF PARTY] is helping the poor?" These two dimensions illustrate the two most important issues in the electoral campaigns, reflecting political positions of the main contenders.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Only eradicating graft and corruption in government is important
10.	Only helping the poor is important

Note that the Philippine part of the CSES mainly focuses on the presidential election of 2010, which defines the order of parties (A through I) in C3011\_ (see codebook appendices). Consequently, there is no party affiliation of the two independent presidential candidates (J. Perlas and J. Madrigal). Thus, parties G and H remain unobserved and are coded as missing values (code 99) in C3011\_G and C3011\_H. See also notes on C3009\_ and C3012\_.

Moreover, respondents' party evaluation on the alternative scale (C3014\_) differs from the expert scoring, coded in C5018\_. According to our collaborators, Philippine elections are highly personalized, diminishing the relevance of political parties in the electoral campaigns.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3014

See notes on C3016.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3014\_A-B

Sometimes people will talk about the question of Taiwan's independence or the unification with China. Some people say that Taiwan should declare independence immediately. Other people say that Taiwan and China should unify immediately. Other people have opinions between these two positions. This card lists eleven positions from independence (0) to unification (10).

C3014\_A What position do you think KMT occupies?

C3014\_B What position do you think DPP occupies?

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
00.	Independence

10.	Uni fication
-----	--------------

98.	Don't know / hard to say
-----	--------------------------

```

C3015_A >>> Q15a. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER A
C3015_B >>> Q15b. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER B
C3015_C >>> Q15c. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER C
C3015_D >>> Q15d. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER D
C3015_E >>> Q15e. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER E
C3015_F >>> Q15f. OPTIONAL SCALE - LEADER F
C3015_G >>> Q15g. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER G
C3015_H >>> Q15h. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER H
C3015_I >>> Q15i. OPTIONAL SCALE - ADDITIONAL - LEADER I

```

Q15a-i. And again, using the same scale where would you place [LEADER A]?

Where would you place [LEADER B]?

Where would you place [LEADER C]?

Where would you place [LEADER D]?

Where would you place [LEADER E]?

Where would you place [LEADER F]?

00. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN'T HEARD OF [SCALE]

96. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN'T HEARD OF LEADER

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3015

Note that an optional scale to evaluate leaders was only asked in some elections studies. Data are available for CHILE (2009), ESTONIA (2011), MEXICO (2006), MEXICO (2009), PHILIPPINES (2010), TAIWAN (2008).

Researchers should note that C3015 includes several observations in which respondents scored all party leaders equally. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3015\_ for respondents who scored all party leaders equally.

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

CHILE (2009)	12
ESTONIA (2011)	5

MEXICO (2006)	17
MEXICO (2009)	29
PHILIPPINES (2010)	40
TAIWAN (2008)	180

Several respondents mentioned not to know a certain party in C3010\_ or C3012\_ but evaluated them in C3015\_. These data remain unchanged.  
See Variable Notes on C3010.

Likewise, some respondents mentioned that they have never heard about the corresponding optional scale, but evaluated parties on it. These data remain unchanged.  
See Variable Notes on C3016.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3015\_A-C3015\_I

The evaluation of leaders on the optional scale was not asked.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3015\_A-C3015\_F

The optional scale refers to Russia as a security threat for Estonia. The question of origin was due to the former questions about party positions: "And again, using the same scale where would you place "LEADER".  
For further details see notes on C3015\_A-C3015\_F.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Russia is a security threat
...	
10.	Russia is a trustworthy partner

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3015

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3015

Question text: "People also talk about liberal and conservatives. Using the scale that appears on card 5 where 0 means liberal and 10 means conservative, where would you place...?"

The party leader of the PRD (Andrés Manuel López Obrador) was also the official party nominee of the PT and Convergencia. These three parties contested the election as the "Alianza por el Bien de Todos". Accordingly, there is no question asking about leaders/candidates for these last two parties. The same situation applies for the PVEM whose candidate was Roberto Madrazo (from the PRI).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3015

See Election Study Notes on C3016.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3015\_

The optional scale, used in the Philippine data, refers to the question: "Where would you place each Presidential candidate I will mention, if number 0 means that the only thing important to [NAME OF CANDIDATE] is eradicating graft and corruption in government and number 10 means that the only thing important to [NAME OF CANDIDATE] is helping the poor?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Only eradicating graft and corruption in government is important
...	
10.	Only helping the poor is important

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3015\_A-B

Sometimes people will talk about the question of Taiwan's

independence or the unification with China. Some people say that Taiwan should declare independence immediately. Other people say that Taiwan and China should unify immediately. Other people have opinions between these two positions. This card lists eleven positions from independence (0) to unification (10).

C3015\_A What position do you think MA Ying-jeou occupies?

C3015\_B What position do you think Frank HSIEH occupies?

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
00.	Independence
...	
10.	Unification
98.	Don't know / hard to say

#### C3016 >>> Q16. OPTIONAL SCALE - SELF

Q16. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

00. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 01.  
 02.  
 03.  
 04.  
 05.  
 06.  
 07.  
 08.  
 09.  
 10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]  
 95. VOLUNTEERED: HAVEN'T HEARD OF [SCALE]  
 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW WHERE TO PLACE  
 99. MISSING

NOTES: C3016

Note that respondent's self-evaluation on an optional scale was only asked in some elections studies. Data are available for CHILE (2009), ESTONIA (2011), ICELAND (2007), LATVIA (2010), MEXICO (2006), MEXICO (2009), PHILIPPINES (2010), POLAND (2007), TAIWAN (2008).

Researchers should be aware that C3016 includes several respondents that say they have never heard about the optional scale, but evaluated parties and leaders on it, according to C3014 and C3015. These data remain unchanged.

Table: Frequencies on C3014\_, C3015\_ and C3016 for respondents that never heard about the left-right-scale, but evaluated parties and leader on it in any other variable.

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)

CHILE (2009) 2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3016

Respondents should evaluate on the scale from 0-10 how liberal or conservative they are.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Liberal
10.	Conservative

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3016

The optional scale refers to Russia as a security threat for Estonia. The question of origin was due to the former questions about party positions: "Where would you place yourself on this scale?".

For further details see notes on C3014\_A-\_F.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Russia is a security threat
10.	Russia is a trustworthy partner

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3016

Question text: "Political parties differ on how environmentalist they are. Now I ask you to place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means that you are not environmentalist at all but 10 that you are very environmentalist. Where would you place yourself on such a scale?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Not at all environmentalist
10.	Very environmentalist

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3016

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3016

Question text: "And using the scale that appears on card 5 where 0 means liberal and 10 means conservative, where would you place yourself?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Liberal
10.	Conservative

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3016\_

The optional scale, used in the Philippine data, refers to the question: "Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where the number 0 means that the only thing important is eradicating graft and corruption and the number 10 means that the only thing important is helping the poor?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
00.	Only eradicating graft and corruption in government is important
10.	Only helping the poor is important

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3016

The Polish study of 2007 asked for a self-placement of respondents on an optional scale, called "Liberal - Solidary". In contrast, respondents were not asked to evaluate Polish parties on this optional scale.

The question of origin was: "Politycy ostatnio często mówili o podziale na Polskę liberalną i Polskę solidarną. Gdzie umieścił(a)by siebie Pani na skali od 0 do 10, na której 0 oznacza Polskę solidarną a 10 Polskę liberalną?" ("Politicians often talk about recent division of Poland, contrasting liberal versus solidarity. Where would you place yourself on this scale, where 0 means solidarity and 10 means liberal?").

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
00.	Solidary
10.	Liberal
95.	Haven't heard of Liberal-Solidary

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3016

Question text: "Sometimes people will talk about the question of Taiwan's independence or the unification with China. Some people say that Taiwan should declare independence immediately. Other people say that Taiwan and China should unify immediately. Other people have opinions between these two positions. This card lists eleven positions from independence (0) to unification (10). Which position do you occupy? "

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
00.	Independence
10.	Unification
98.	Don't know / hard to say

## C3017 &gt;&gt;&gt; Q17. DIFFERENCES OF CHOICE OPTIONS

Q17. During the election campaign, would you say that there were major differences between the [parties/candidates], minor differences, or no differences at all?

- 1. MAJOR DIFFERENCES
- 2. MINOR DIFFERENCES
- 3. NO DIFFERENCES AT ALL
- 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
- 9. MISSING

## NOTES: C3017

Data are not available for DENMARK (2007), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3017

Australia 2007 asked for "differences of choice options" on a four-point-scale that has been recoded as the following:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	A good deal of difference between the parties
02.	Some difference between the parties
	Not much difference between the parties
03.	No difference between the parties

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3017

Note that in the original Austrian Election Study this question had a 4-point scale. It was recoded as follows:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	01. Major differences 02. notable differences
02.	03. Minor differences
03.	04. No differences at all

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3017  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3017

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3017

Notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

---

C3018 >>> Q18. CAMPAIGN INVOLVEMENT

---

Q18. How closely did you follow the election campaign? Very closely, fairly closely, not very closely, or not closely at all?

- 1. VERY CLOSELY
- 2. FAIRLY CLOSELY
- 3. NOT VERY CLOSELY
- 4. NOT CLOSELY AT ALL
- 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
- 9. MISSING

NOTES: C3018

Data are not available for TAIWAN (2008).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3018

Australia 2007 asked a slightly different question: "And how much interest would you say you took in the election campaign overall?"

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	A good deal
02.	Some
03.	Not much
04.	None at all

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3018

The Russian version speaks of following "pre-election propaganda," not the "campaign." Please note that this might apply to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3018

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
8.	Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3018

Notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

---

C3019 >>> Q19. SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRACY

---

Q19. On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in [COUNTRY]?

- .....
1. VERY SATISFIED
  2. FAIRLY SATISFIED
  4. NOT VERY SATISFIED
  5. NOT AT ALL SATISFIED
  6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

NOTES: C3019

Data are not available for CHILE (2009)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3019

The wording of this question in Russian refers to the level of democracy in Belarus, rather than the way democracy works. This formulation was chosen by the collaborator for the reason that it would be more understandable for the respondents in the new post-soviet countries.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3019

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3019

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
06.	Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3019

Question in the Russian questionnaire differs from the original English question: in the English, very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied and not at all satisfied are options placed in the actual body of the question, while in Russian, it simply asks the respondents if they are satisfied or not satisfied, without the nuances. The nuances are read as answer options only. This applies to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3019

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3019

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3019

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
7.	South Africa is no democracy

-----  
C3020\_1 >>> Q20. ARE YOU CLOSE TO ANY POLITICAL PARTY  
-----

Q20. Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular party?

- .....
1. YES



5. NO

7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED

8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

9. MISSING

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3020\_1

This variable was reconstructed from party identification question B1: "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Labor, National or what?"

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3020\_1

The wording in the Brazilian questionnaire slightly deviates from the original CSES question. It was asked as follows: "In general, is there any political party that you like?"

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3020\_1

The wording in the Latvian questionnaire deviates from the CSES standard. The question asked was: "Do you feel yourself a little closer to one of the political parties than the others?"

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3020\_1

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3020\_1

Note that the Mexican wording deviates from the original CSES question. It was asked as follows: "Regardless of which party you voted for during the last election, in general, do you sympathize with any political party in particular?"

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3020\_1

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3020\_1

Question text: "Do you think of yourself as an adherent to a certain political party?"

Note that this set of items was part of the pre-election survey.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3020\_1

Note that both C3020\_1 and C3020\_2 included a party list from which respondents could choose the one they felt close(r) to or add another party not listed. The answer 'no' was coded with 5, a party mention was coded with 1 - 'Yes'.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3020\_1

This item was not asked in the Norwegian Election Study; rather, it is reconstructed from the question (SPM.49A in original questionnaire): "Many people think of themselves as adherents to a particular party, while others feel no affiliation with any party. Would you say that you in general think of yourself as a Conservative, a Laborite, a SV supporter, etc., or don't you consider yourself affiliated with any particular party?" If a respondent identified a party, the case is coded "1. Yes" to this item. If respondents reported "No such ties," they are coded "2. No".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3020\_1

Note that questions on respondent's party ID was asked slightly different in the Norwegian sample:

a) C3020\_2 was not asked;

- b) C3020\_1 and C3020\_3 were combined into a single question;  
 c) C3020\_4 differs in regard to the provided answer-categories.  
 See also notes on C3020\_4.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3020\_1

Note that in the Taiwanese election study specific parties were named within the question text. It was asked as follows:

Among the main political parties in our country, including the KMT, DPP, NP, PFP, and TSU, do you think of yourself as leaning toward any particular party?

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3020\_1

Questions on C3020\_1 through C3020\_4 differ from the CSES-schema:

1. "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican or an Independent?"
2. "If R considers self a Democrat / Republican:  
Would you call yourself a strong or a not very strong Democrat / Republican?"
3. "If R's party preference is independent, no preference, other, don't know: Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican party or to the democratic party?"

## C3020\_2 &gt;&gt;&gt; Q20A. DO YOU FEEL CLOSER TO ONE PARTY

Q20a. Do you feel yourself a little closer to one of the political parties than the others?

1. YES
5. NO
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

## NOTES: C3020\_2

Data are not available for LATVIA (2010), NORWAY (2005), NORWAY (2009), SLOVENIA (2008), SWITZERLAND (2007).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3020\_2

The wording in the Brazilian questionnaire slightly deviates from the original CSES question. It was asked as follows: "And is there any party that you like, even if just a little bit?"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3020\_2

Note that respondents who answered 'No' in variable C3020\_1 were not asked this follow up question.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3020\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3020\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

A small number of cases do not follow the skip patterns for the Q20 series of questions (C3020\_1 - C3020\_4). Specifically, 9 respondents answered "Yes" to C3020\_1 and were still asked C3020\_2. These data remain unchanged.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3020\_2

Note that both C3020\_1 and C3020\_2 included a party list from which respondents could choose the one they felt close(r) to or add another party not listed. The answer 'no' was coded with 5, a party mention was coded with 1 - 'Yes'.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3020\_2

This variable is not available for Norway. See note C3020\_1 for details.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3020\_2

See codebook remarks on C3020\_1.

## C3020\_3 &gt;&gt;&gt; Q20B. WHICH PARTY DO YOU FEEL CLOSEST TO

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE  
90. OTHER PARTY (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

## NOTES: C3020\_3

Respondents' party mentions in C3020\_3 depend on the two former questions (C3020\_1 and C3020\_2). The party mention in C3020\_3 is kept only for those respondents that reported to be close (C3020\_1) or at least closer (C3020\_2) to one party. All other respondents are coded as missing values (code 99) in C3020\_3.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3020\_3

The question was not open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties and the option "other party".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3020\_3

Note that the Brazil data in C3020\_3 is a combination of two questions, which are different from the original CSES question. These are: "Which party do you like?" and the question "Which party?" if the respondent gave a positive answer to "Is there any party that you like, even if just a little bit?"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3020\_3

In France this was a close-ended question.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3020\_3

There is only data for those respondents who reported to be "close" to any party in C3020\_1, but not for those, who reported to "feel closer to one party" (C3020\_2).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3020\_3

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed-list for the five major Japanese parties (see codebook appendices).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3020\_3  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3020\_3

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3020\_3

For the construction on C3020\_3 see remark on C3020\_1.  
 Moreover, if respondents refused or mentioned "don't know" in C3020\_1, this answer is repeated in C3020\_3.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3020\_3

Note that questions on respondent's party ID was asked slightly different in the Norwegian sample. C3020\_1 (respondent feels close to a party) and C3020\_3 (party respondent feels close to) were combined in a single question.  
 See also notes on C3020\_1 and on C3020\_4.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3020\_3

Note that the underlying question on C3020\_3 was asked independently from the previous questions about a party respondent's feels close (C3020\_1) or at least closer to (C3020\_2). Respondents who did not explicitly report that they feel close (C3020\_1) or at least closer to (C3020\_2), were coded as missing values in C3020\_3. As a consequence, substantial party mentions of 388 respondents were coded as missing values in C3020\_3.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3020\_3

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3020\_3

See codebook remarks on C3020\_1, first.

---

C3020\_4 >>> Q20C. DEGREE OF CLOSENESS TO THIS PARTY

---

Q20c. Do you feel very close to this party, somewhat close, or not very close?

- .....
1. VERY CLOSE
  2. SOMEWHAT CLOSE
  3. NOT VERY CLOSE
  7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  9. MISSING

NOTES: C3020\_4

Respondents' party mentions in C3020\_3 depend on the two former questions (C3020\_1 and C3020\_2). The degree of closeness to the party, mentioned in C3020\_3, is kept only for those respondents that reported to be close (C3020\_1) or at least closer (C3020\_2) to one party. All other respondents are coded as missing values (code 99) in C3020\_3.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3020\_4

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3020\_4

In the Brazilian studies, this question was asked only to those respondents who answered affirmatively to the first question about closeness to a party (YES to C3020\_1). Note also that rather than "degree of closeness" the respondents were asked how strongly they liked the party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3020\_4

Note that the degree of closeness to a certain party was only asked to those respondents who mentioned that they feel close to a party according to C3020\_1, but not to those who mentioned that they feel closer to a party according to C3020\_2.

Moreover, the Danish question differs from the CSES wording: "Nogle er stærkt overbeviste tilhængere af deres parti, mens andre ikke er så overbeviste. Betragter du dig selv som stærkt overbevist tilhænger eller ikke stærkt overbevist?" (Some are strongly convinced adherents of their party, while others are not so convinced. Do you consider yourself as strongly convinced supporter or not strongly convinced?), including only two categories:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
01.	Strongly convinced (stærkt overbevist)
03.	Not very convinced (ikke stærkt overbevist)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3020\_4

Question wording in the Russian questionnaire differs from the original English question. In English it reads: "do you feel very close to this party, somewhat close, or not very close." In Russian, it reads: "to what extent is this party close to you," without the nuances offered in the body of the question. The nuances are read as answer options only. This also applies to other questionnaires (Hebrew, Arabic).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3020\_4

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3020\_4

The DPES study used somewhat different wording for the answer options (the question asks for party adherence, see C3020\_1):

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Very convinced
02.	Convinced
03.	Not convinced
08.	Don't know / no answer

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3020\_4

The original question asked "Do you consider yourself to be a strongly convinced supporter, or are you not a particularly convinced supporter of this party?" The Norwegian survey included two possible responses.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Strongly convinced
03.	Not particularly convinced

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3020\_4

Note that questions on respondent's party ID was asked slightly different in the Norwegian sample. The original question on C3020\_4 (degree of closeness) includes only two answer-categories.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Categories:
-----------	---------------------------------

- |  |     |                |
|--|-----|----------------|
|  | 01. | Very close     |
|  | 03. | Not very close |

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3020\_4

See codebook remarks on C3020\_1, first.

- |           |    |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| CSES Code |    | Election Study Code/Category                  |
|           | 1. | Strong (according to the first question)      |
|           | 2. | Weak (according to the first question)        |
|           | 3. | Independent (according to the third question) |

-----

C3021\_1 >>> Q21. CURRENT ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT 1

C3021\_2 >>> Q21. CURRENT ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT 2

-----

Q21. The wording of this item, which is to record voting in the national election, follows national standards.

This item ascertains whether or not the respondent cast a ballot, regardless of whether or not it was valid.

.....

1. R CAST A BALLOT
5. R DID NOT CAST A BALLOT
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

NOTES: C3021

According to the different types of elections included in the current CSES release, the following table gives an overview of respondent's electoral participation. C3021\_1 and C3021\_2 are based on this table.

For further information and restrictions, researchers are encouraged to look at the country specific notes for each of the variables.

Table: Summary of Type of Election Ballot Cast refers to.

	President	Lower House	Upper House
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)			
AUSTRALIA (2007)		C3021_1	
AUSTRIA (2008)		C3021_1	
BELARUS (2008)		C3021_1	
BRAZIL (2006)	C3021_1		
BRAZIL (2010)	C3021_1 C3021_2	C3021_1	C3021_1
CANADA (2008)		C3021_1	
CROATIA (2007)		C3021_1	
CHILE (2009)	C3021_1	C3021_1	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)		C3021_1	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)		C3021_1	
DENMARK (2007)		C3021_1	
ESTONIA (2011)		C3021_1	
FINLAND (2007)		C3021_1	
FINLAND (2011)		C3021_1	
FRANCE (2007)		C3021_1 C3021_2	
GERMANY (2005)		C3021_1	
GERMANY (2009)		C3021_1	
GREECE (2009)		C3021_1	

HONG KONG (2008)		C3021_1	
ICELAND (2007)		C3021_1	
ICELAND (2009)		C3021_1	
IRELAND (2007)		C3021_1	
ISRAEL (2006)		C3021_1	
JAPAN (2007)			C3021_1
LATVIA (2010)		C3021_1	
MEXICO (2006)	C3021_1	C3021_2	
MEXICO (2009)		C3021_1	
NETHERLANDS (2006)		C3021_1	
NETHERLANDS (2010)		C3021_1	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		C3021_1	
		C3021_2	
NORWAY (2005)		C3021_1	
NORWAY (2009)		C3021_1	
PERU (2011)	C3021_1	C3021_1	
PHILIPPINES (2010)	C3021_1		
POLAND (2005)		C3021_1	
POLAND (2007)		C3021_1	
PORTUGAL (2009)		C3021_1	
ROMANIA (2009)	C3021_1		
	C3021_2		
SLOVAKIA (2010)		C3021_1	
SLOVENIA (2008)		C3021_1	
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)		C3021_1	
SOUTH KOREA (2008)		C3021_1	
SPAIN (2008)		C3021_1	
SWEDEN (2006)		C3021_1	
SWITZERLAND (2007)		C3021_1	C3021_1
TAIWAN (2008)	C3021_1		
THAILAND (2007)		C3021_1	
TURKEY (2011)		C3021_1	
UNITED STATES (2008)	C3021_1		
URUGUAY (2009)	C3021_1	C3021_1	C3021_1

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3021

Australia has compulsory voting, hence this questions was not part of the Australian questionnaire in 2007. C3021\_1 was created using the actual vote choice for the House of Representatives (B11REPS), defining all observations as non-voters that reported a "vote blank".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

The 2006 and 2010 elections took place on the same day on multiple levels. This variable reports voting in the first round of the elections, not specifying whether the respondent skipped voting on some of the levels.

Due to compulsory voting, non-voters have to officially justify non-voting behavior on election day. The original election study data from Brazil contained more specific information for those who did not vote. For the sake of comparability, in the CSES study these were all recoded into value 5:

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Yes
05.	No, more than 70 years old
	(voting then voluntary)
	No, between 16 and 17 years old (voting
	(voting then voluntary)
	No, I did not want to
	No, I had to justify the absence

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
-----------	------------------------------

01. Yes  
 05. No, more than 70 years old (voting then  
 voluntary)  
 Didn't vote for personal option  
 No, showed justification in 1st round  
 No, and didn't showed justification  
 No, didn't have the necessary documentation

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

The second round of the presidential election took place after the election study interviewing was finished and could thus not be captured.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

C3021\_1 report to voting in the first round of the parliamentary elections.  
 C3021\_2 variable reports voting in the second round of the parliamentary elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

Differences between C3021\_1 and C3021\_2 may be due to several motives, i.e. registered voters living away from their district, and depending how far they are located, may only be able to vote for president, or president and senate, or president, senate and party list of deputy candidates.  
 Given these differences certain inconsistencies may occur for those respondents who cast vote for one but not the other.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3021\_1-C3021\_2

C3021\_1 refers to the vote for a party list.  
 C3021\_2 refers to the vote for a district candidate.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3021\_1

Data from this variable are from self reported behavior. However, when compared to official registers, some cases show differences between self-reported behavior and actual behavior. Of the people who have mentioned not having voted, 6 did differently according to the official records. The respondent ids of the 6 individuals are (variable C1009):  
 0000000376 0000001182 0000001405 0000001883 0000002238  
 0000002859.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3021\_1

Data from this variable are from self reported behavior. However, when compared to official registers, some cases show differences between self-reported behavior and actual behavior. Of the people who have mentioned not having voted, 16 did differently according to the official records. The respondent ids of the 16 individuals are (variable C1009):  
 0000000108 0000000251 0000000303 0000000306 0000000429  
 0000000436 0000000441 0000000474 0000000500 0000000604  
 0000001004 0000001311 0000001403 0000001411 0000001414  
 0000001775.

Conversely, of the people having mentioned that they voted, 89 have not voted according to the official records. The respondent ids of the 89 individuals are (variable C1009): 0000000015 0000000051 0000000055 0000000072 0000000075  
 0000000079 0000000140 0000000169 0000000184 0000000213  
 0000000247 0000000340 0000000415 0000000433 0000000463  
 0000000473 0000000554 0000000555 0000000556 0000000559  
 0000000560 0000000562 0000000624 0000000680 0000000686  
 0000000695 0000000725 0000000726 0000000743 0000000745  
 0000000754 0000000761 0000000784 0000000801 0000000804



```

0000000814 0000000820 0000000826 0000000827 0000000838
0000000842 0000000854 0000000867 0000000880 0000000890
0000000893 0000000900 0000000913 0000000921 0000000950
0000000977 0000000986 0000000998 0000001051 0000001053
0000001058 0000001078 0000001090 0000001108 0000001123
0000001129 0000001146 0000001173 0000001181 0000001216
0000001248 0000001335 0000001353 0000001379 0000001380
0000001436 0000001451 0000001487 0000001501 0000001513
0000001524 0000001530 0000001634 0000001637 0000001656
0000001657 0000001659 0000001665 0000001679 0000001684
0000001687 0000001723 0000001736 0000001769.

```

Moreover, for twelve respondents a comparison with the official register was not possible. The respondent ids of the 12 individuals are (variable C1009): 0000000160 0000000305 0000000324 0000000428 0000001070 0000001071 0000001073 0000001204 0000001363 0000001392 0000000210 0000001075.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3021\_1  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3021\_1

Note that C3021\_1 refers to the elections of the Sejm, the Lower House of the Polish Parliament, as well as to the Polish Senate. Both elections took place simultaneously. Moreover, C3021\_1 includes 17 missing values in 2005 and another 6 cases in 2007. All these observations mentioned that they would not have been eligible to vote. According to the explanations of our Polish collaborators, this might be caused by different reasons: "1) people who turned 18 just after the election day (...); 2) (...) people who are officially and legally taken their eligibility to vote (...); 3) (...) an interviewer's mistake".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3021\_

Respondent's ballot cast refers to the first (C3021\_1) and second (C3021\_2) round of the Romanian presidential elections in 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3021\_1

Data from this variable are from self-reported behavior. However, when compared to official registers, some cases show differences between self-reported behavior and actual behavior. Of the people who have mentioned having voted, 36 did differently according to the official records. Conversely, of the people having mentioned that they did not vote, 2 have voted according to the official records. the respondent ids of the 36 individuals who over reported vote are (variable C1009): 0000200019, 0000200086, 0000200439, 0000200573, 0000200736, 0000200886, 0000200915, 0000200928, 0000201294, 0000201345, 0000201348, 0000201387, 0000201501, 0000201578, 0000201729, 0000201801, 0000201965, 0000202187, 0000202399, 0000202447, 0000221082, 0000221086, 0000221178, 0000221181, 0000221265, 0000221412, 0000221445, 0000221501, 0000221535, 0000221572, 0000221587, 0000221662, 0000221710, 0000221746, 0000221758, 0000221822 the respondent ids of the 2 individuals who under reported vote are (variable C1009): 0000201650, 0000221418.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3021\_1

According to the US electoral system, the data included 499 registered citizens which were not registered as a voter. These cases were defined as "no answer" (code 8) in C3021\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3021\_1

Note that voting is strictly compulsory in Uruguay (see C5044\_1). Thus, the Uruguayan data include only voters, i.e. C3021\_1 reports a ballot cast (code 1.) for all respondents.

-----  
 C3022\_1 >>> Q21A. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED - FIRST MENTION  
 C3022\_2 >>> Q21A. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED - SECOND MENTION  
 C3022\_3 >>> Q21A. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED - THIRD MENTION  
 C3022\_4 >>> Q21A. CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED - FOURTH MENTION  
 -----

Q21a. If you would have voted, which [party or parties/candidate or candidates] would you have voted for?  
 .....

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
 90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
 91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES  
 92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT  
 93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3022

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), NETHERLANDS (2006), URUGUAY (2009).

The coding of C3022\_ depends on C3021\_1. Responses are kept for non-voters, only, according to C3021\_1 (is not code 1).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3022

Because Australia has compulsory voting (see remarks on C3021\_1), this question was not part of the Australian questionnaire.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3022\_1

The question was not open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties and the options "other party" and "no party".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3022\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3022\_1

This variable reports voting intentions in the first round of the presidential elections. The question was asked in a closed format with 6 candidates on the list. Only a single answer to this question was possible.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3022

In contrast to the general coding of the Croatian parties, C3022 does not divide between the Hrvatska seljacka stranka (HSS) and the Hrvatska socijalno liberalna stranka (HSLS) which formed an electoral coalition for the Croatian parliamentary election in 2007 (for more details, see Codebook Appendices).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3022

Rather than an open-ended question, Finland provided a

=====

closed-list from which up to four parties were chosen by respondents. Instead of providing a choice rank 1-4 here, in C3022\_1 are respondents' answers with one or more choices; in C3022\_2 those with 2 or more; in C3022\_3 the ones who chose 3 or more and in \_4 those who chose 4 parties. Due to this coding no rank order could be provided.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3022\_1

This variable reports voting intentions in the first round of the parliamentary elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3022

The German questionnaire of 2005 allowed respondents to mention only one party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3022

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a close list for the five major Japanese parties (see codebook appendices).

Furthermore, the provided data does not allow preference ordering of the mentioned parties.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3022\_1

The Dutch survey allowed respondents to mention only one party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3022\_1

The wording in the Norwegian questionnaire is somewhat different: "If there was compulsory voting in Norway, what party or parties would you have voted for?"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3022\_

Note that the question on C3022\_ was asked separately for each of the eight major Norwegian parties. However, none of the respondents mentioned more than three of them.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3022\_1

C3022\_1 refers to the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3022\_1

In origin, the Philippine question on C3022 asked for presidential candidates, non-voter would have voted for.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3022\_1-C3022\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3022\_1-C3022\_2

Note that the Polish studies used closed lists to ask respondents about their potential vote choice.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3022\_

Note that the Romanian questionnaire asked for presidential candidates, according to the party table in the appendices of the CSES codebook.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3022

In Thailand this question was asked separately for each party. The variables for C3022 do not reflect any preference order.

Additionally, one respondent (C1005=764020070000000269)

mentioned eight parties in this question which correspond to parties A through H. The data offer responses that refer to parties A through D only (responses that pertained to parties E through H were deleted).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3022\_1

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3022\_1-C3022\_4

According to the fact that voting is strictly compulsory in Uruguay (see 5044\_1), C3022\_ was not asked. See also notes on C3021\_1.

C3023\_PR\_1 >>> Q21b. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 1  
C3023\_PR\_2 >>> Q21b. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 2

If applicable and respondent cast a ballot in the presidential election:

Q21b. This variable reports the respondent's vote choice for president.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
90. OTHER CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
91. NONE OF THE CANDIDATES  
92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT  
93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3023\_PR\_

The coding of C3023\_PR\_ depends on C3021\_1. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3021\_1 (is not code 5), if C3021\_1 refers to presidential elections. For further details see Variable Note on C3021\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3023\_PR\_1

Note that the more detailed answers in the election study from Brazil were collapsed to fit the CSES standard (for more details see Codebook Appendices). In addition, the following values were recoded due to CSES standards.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	55. I don't remember
	08. I did not vote
99	99. Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3023\_PR\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3023\_PR\_1

This variable reports the respondent's vote choice for president in the first round of elections.



and the options "other party" and "no party". Respondents who answered "no party" but had reported that they had cast a ballot, were coded to having cast an invalid ballot. Note that one respondent reports a party whom to have voted for, although the question if he/she did cast a ballot (C3021\_1) had been answered negatively. It is unknown in which of the two questions the error/misunderstanding occurred in the interview.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3023\_LH\_DC

This variable reports first-round vote choice (there was no second round in 2008).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3023\_LH\_PL

Brazil has a party-list proportional system with seats allocated according to the simple quotient and highest average calculations. Respondents were asked for their vote choice of deputy candidates. The variable was later created by using the respective candidates' party affiliations. Since giving a candidate preference is optional for the voter, the data in this variable contains a lot of missing values. 7 respondents answered that they voted for a party list. Those answers have missing party affiliations, too. Also the high number of respondents who do not know whom they voted for may be partially resulted by the question, because it is usually more difficult to remember a candidate's name than a party voted for.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
88.	The respondent mentioned a candidate who did not contest on the question's level of election, e.g. a candidate from the state level and not the federal level.
90.	The party affiliation of the mentioned name was not found. The person could be either an independent candidate or the answer might be inappropriate.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3023\_LH\_PL

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
88.	Incorrect information on the candidate, e.g. the respondent mentioned a wrong party affiliation for a candidate or mentioned a candidate who did not participate on the electoral level to which the question refers.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3023\_LH\_PL

In contrast to the general coding of the Croatian parties, C3023\_LH\_PL does not divide between the Hrvatska seljacka stranka (HSS) and the Hrvatska socijalno liberalna stranka (HSLs) which formed an election coalition for the Croatian parliamentary election 2007 (for more details see Codebook Appendices).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3023\_LH\_PL

Researchers should note that the data of origin includes 12 cases which are defined as non-voters in C3021\_1, but who reported an invalid vote choice in C3023\_LH\_PL. These data remain unchanged.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3023\_LH\_DC

This variable reports voting in the first round of the parliamentary elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3023\_LH\_PL

Note that all persons who refused to answer if they had cast a ballot (C3021\_1) or answered "don't know" to this question, have the same answer codes in the follow-up question C3023\_LH\_PL.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3023\_LH\_DC

The electoral system of Hong Kong Legislative Council distinguishes between geographical and functional constituencies. In both constituencies 30 members are elected. The functional constituencies are professionals or economical and social interest groups. For the CSES data, only the vote choice of the geographical constituencies is included, in which all registered citizens are eligible to vote. Researchers interested in the individual vote choices within the functional constituencies might want to contact our collaborator in Hong Kong (see introduction part) to get access to the data of origin. Finally, researchers should note that in contrast to the given coding schema, referring to parties, the original answers had been candidate mentions. Compared to C3028\_LH\_ and C3030\_LH\_, C3023\_LH\_DC only includes candidates' parties that have been registered for respondents' geographical constituencies.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3023\_LH\_PL

92 means invalid or empty ballot.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3023\_LH\_PL

Despite having a mixed electoral system, in congressional elections Mexican voters cast a single vote in a simple plurality election. The PR seats are allocated according to the national distribution of votes. Thus, only the district vote choice variable is employed.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3023\_LH\_

The study of New Zealand 2008 included 1 respondent in C3023\_LH\_PL, as well as another one in C3023\_LH\_DC\_1, that mentioned an unspecified party. Both cases have been coded as "90. OTHER PARTY (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3023\_LH\_PL

See Election Study Notes on C3021\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3023\_LH\_PL

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3023\_LH\_PL

Note that the Polish studies used closed lists to ask respondents about their actual vote choice for the Lower House.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3023\_LH\_PL

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

---

C3023\_UH\_PL >>> Q21c. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE - PARTY LIST  
 C3023\_UH\_DC\_1 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE - DISTRICT CANDIDATE - 1  
 C3023\_UH\_DC\_2 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE - DISTRICT CANDIDATE - 2  
 C3023\_UH\_DC\_3 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -

=====

DISTRICT CANDIDATE - 3  
 C3023\_UH\_DC\_4 >>> Q21d. CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -  
 DISTRICT CANDIDATE - 4

-----

If applicable and respondent cast a ballot in the Upper House legislative election:

Q21c/d. These variable reports the respondent's vote choice for party list and/or district candidate in Upper House elections. See Election Study Notes for more information.

.....

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

- 89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
- 90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
- 91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES
- 92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT
- 93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT
- 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
- 99. MISSING

NOTES: C3023\_UH\_

The coding of C3023\_UH\_ depends on C3021\_1. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3021\_1 (is not code 5), if C3021\_1 refers to Upper House elections.

For further details see Variable Note on C3021\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3023\_UH\_PL

A lot of missing values in this variable may be due to the fact that respondents were not asked for the party, they had voted for, but only for their choice of a candidate for senate. However, the candidate preference vote is optional in the election. This variable was later created by using the senators' party affiliations. Also see the codebook entry on C3023\_UH\_PL.

Moreover, 248 voters did not know or could not remember the candidate they had voted for.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3023\_UH\_DC

Despite having a mixed electoral system, in congressional elections Mexican voters cast a single vote in a simple plurality election. The PR seats are allocated according to the national distribution of votes. Thus, only the district vote choice variable is employed.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3023\_UH\_DC\_1-C3023\_4  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3023\_UH\_DC\_1-C3023\_4

Note that the Polish studies used closed lists to ask respondents about their actual vote choice for the Upper House.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3023\_UH\_DC\_1

Senate elections had only been held for about one third of the seats (35 out of 100) in some of the federal states.

In the federal states of Mississippi and Wyoming Senate elections were held for extraordinary vacant seats, coded in C3023\_UH\_2 (see remarks on C3023\_UH\_2).  
 To identify respondent's federal state, see C2027.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3023\_UH\_DC\_2



C3023\_UH\_DC\_2 captures the vote choice of extraordinary vacant seats in the federal states of Mississippi and Wyoming, exclusively.  
To identify respondent's federal state, see C2027.

-----  
C3026 >>> Q21E. CURRENT ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE  
-----

If an open-list electoral system was used for the legislative election in question and respondent cast a ballot:

Q21e. This variable reports whether or not the respondent cast a preference vote for a candidate.

For instance, if votes are cast for party lists, but citizens can, in addition to that, mark a preference for one or more candidates on the party list, then Q21e may show answers to a question like this: "Did you simply vote for a party or did you also express a candidate preference?" In party list systems where voters have to vote directly for a candidate and cannot cast a vote just for the party list as such (e.g. Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland), the question for Q21e should read like this: "Do you consider the vote that you cast merely a vote for the party, or did you also mean it as a vote for a particular candidate?"

- .....
- 0. CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE IS NOT APPLICABLE
  - 1. RESPONDENT EXERCISED CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
  - 5. RESPONDENT DID NOT EXERCISE CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
  - 6. RESPONDENT CAST INVALID BALLOT
  - 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  - 9. MISSING

NOTES: C3026

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), FINLAND (2007), GREECE (2009), UNITED STATES (2008).

The coding of C3026 depends on C3021\_1. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3021\_1 (is not code 5).  
For further details see Variable Note on C3021\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3026

The question was not asked as such in the multiple election of 2006. However, the variable was created using the original answers to the question which candidate the respondent had voted for in the lower house election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3026

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
06.	Invalid or empty ballot.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3026

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3026

Question text: "V520 Did you vote for the first candidate on the party list or for another candidate?"

=====

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Other candidate
02.	First candidate
08.	Don't know / no answer

-----

C3027\_PR>>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, PRESIDENT  
 C3027\_LH>>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, LOWER HOUSE  
 C3027\_UH>>> Q22a. DID R CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS, UPPER HOUSE

-----

Q22a. Did you consider voting for any other  
 [party or parties/candidate or candidates]?

In the case of simultaneous elections (for instance, both presidential and parliamentary [Lower and/or Upper house contest]), question Q22a was repeated for each relevant election. See Election Study Notes for more information.

.....

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
- 9. MISSING

NOTES: C3027

Data are not available for CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), TAIWAN (2008).

The CSES questionnaire skips non-voters, according to C3021\_1-C3021\_2, from C3027\_PR-C3027\_UH, as well as from the follow-up questions C3028\_PR\_1-C3028\_UH\_9. In contrast, several country studies asked these questions to all respondents, irrespective of their current electoral participation. These data have been cleaned, according to the CSES skip pattern structure.

See Variable Notes on C3021, in addition.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3027\_LH

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3027\_LH

Note that in the case of New Zealand this variable refers to both party and candidate vote. If respondents considered voting for either party or candidate, the question was coded with 1 - yes.

To distinguish between party and candidate vote considerations of respondents, researchers are advised to look at C3028\_LH\_1-8. Within C3028\_LH\_1 to C3028\_LH\_4 respondents' answers to the question if they considered for other party votes are included. C3028\_LH\_5 to C3028\_LH\_9 is meant for respondents' answers to the question if they considered for other candidate votes. See also note C3028\_LH\_01-C3028\_LH\_08.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3027\_LH

A question on C3027\_LH was not included in the Spanish questionnaire of origin. Instead C3027\_LH was produced out of

| C3028\_LH\_1 through C3028\_LH\_5.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3027\_LH

The Swiss 2007 election was held simultaneously for both lower and upper houses (with the exception of 5 of the 46 seats of this last one). However, the employed question to measure the current variable makes explicit reference to the lower chamber. The translation is: "At the recent National Council elections, did you consider the possibility of voting for some other party than the one you actually voted for?"

Also, please take note that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded to a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

-----  
PRESIDENT

C3028\_PR\_1 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION  
C3028\_PR\_2 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND MENTION  
C3028\_PR\_3 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION  
C3028\_PR\_4 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH MENTION

LOWER HOUSE

C3028\_LH\_1 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_2 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_3 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_4 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_5 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIFTH MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_6 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SIXTH MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_7 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SEVENTH MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_8 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-EIGHTH MENTION  
C3028\_LH\_9 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-NINTH MENTION

UPPER HOUSE

C3028\_UH\_1 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FIRST MENTION  
C3028\_UH\_2 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-SECOND MENTION  
C3028\_UH\_3 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-THIRD MENTION  
C3028\_UH\_4 >>> Q22b. R DID CONSIDER VOTING FOR OTHERS-FOURTH MENTION  
-----

Q22b. Which ones?

In the case of simultaneous elections (for instance, both presidential and parliamentary [Lower and/or Upper house contest]), question Q22b was repeated for each relevant election. See Election Study Notes for more information.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES  
92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT  
93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

| NOTES: C3028\_

Data are not available for CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), TAIWAN (2008).

In the original questionnaire these questions were intended to capture spontaneous answers, with the respondent mentioning a set of parties, and the recorded values indicating the order of response. However, some studies have been asking these questions with a predetermined list of political parties, and asking about one party at a time. By asking these questions in this way, the order of the responses is lost.

Table: Summary of Availability of Preference Order.

	Yes	NO
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)		
AUSTRALIA (2007)		X
AUSTRIA (2008)		X
BELARUS (2008)	X	
BRAZIL (2006)	X	
BRAZIL (2010)	X	
CANADA (2008)	-	-
CHILE (2009)	-	-
CROATIA (2007)	X	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	X	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	X	
DENMARK (2007)		X
ESTONIA (2011)	X	
FINLAND (2007)		X
FINLAND (2011)	X	
FRANCE (2007)		X
GERMANY (2005)		X
GERMANY (2009)	X	
GREECE (2009)	X	
HONG KONG (2008)	X	
ICELAND (2007)	X	
ICELAND (2009)	X	
IRELAND (2007)	X	
ISRAEL (2006)	X	
JAPAN (2007)		X
LATVIA (2010)	X	
MEXICO (2006)	X	
MEXICO (2009)	X	
NETHERLANDS (2006)		X
NETHERLANDS (2010)	X	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		X
NORWAY (2005)		X
NORWAY (2009)		X
PERU (2011)		X
PHILIPPINES (2010)		X
POLAND (2005)		X
POLAND (2007)		X
PORTUGAL (2009)	X	
ROMANIA (2009)	X	
SLOVAKIA (2010)	X	
SLOVENIA (2008)		X
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)		X
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	-	-
SPAIN (2008)		X
SWEDEN (2006)		X
SWITZERLAND (2007)		X
TAIWAN (2008)	-	-
THAILAND (2007)		X
TURKEY (2011)	X	
UNITED STATES (2008)	X	
URUGUAY (2009)		X

Additionally, when asked about one party at a time, a minority of respondents end up mentioning many more parties than usual. To avoid adding many columns with extremely sparse data, we have included up to 9 variables for C3028\_LH with the intention to secure registering, if applicable, responses that refer to

=====

parties A through I.

Moreover, whenever a respondent mentioned more than 9 parties we included only those responses that refer to parties A to I. With this coding rule, we are only dropping the responses from two survey respondents (each from Finland and Sweden).

The coding on C3028\_ depends on C3027\_. Respondents that mentioned not having considered to vote for someone else (C3027 is code 5) are excluded from C3028\_.

See also variable note on C3027\_PR-C3027\_UH.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3028\_LH

The Australian questionnaire of 2007 allowed mentioning of only one party respondents would have voted for.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3028\_LH

The question was not asked open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties and the options "other party" and "no party". Respondents who answered "no party" but had reported that they had considered voting for others were coded as missing.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3028\_LH

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3028\_UH

Brazil has a party-list proportional system with seats allocated according to the simple quotient and highest average calculations. Respondents were asked for their alternative vote choice of deputy or senate candidates, respectively. The variable was later created by using the respective candidates' party affiliations. Since giving a candidate preference is optional for the voter, the data in this variable contains a lot of missing values.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
90.	The party affiliation of the mentioned name was not found. The person could be either an independent candidate or the answer might be inappropriate.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3028\_LH

The Croatian questionnaire of 2007 allowed respondents to mention up to five parties. However, no more than three mentions were given by any single respondent.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3028\_LH

Although answers reflect the order in which respondents answered this question, respondents were provided with a list of parties which ran in the election and they answered with that list in mind. The order of responses might thus reflect the order in the list.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3028\_LH\_

The Danish questionnaire asks C3028\_LH\_ for each party, separately. Thus, a preference order in C3028\_LH\_ is not applicable.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3028\_LH

Finland provided a closed-list of answers in which up to four parties could be chosen by respondents. Instead of providing a choice rank 1-4 here, in C3028\_1 are respondents' answers with one or more choices; in C3028\_2 those with 2 or more; in C3028\_3

=====

the ones who chose 3 or more and in C3028\_4 those who chose 4 parties.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3028\_LH

The German questionnaire of 2005 allowed mentioning only one party respondents would have voted for.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3028\_LH

Researchers should note that in contrast to the CSES coding scheme, referring to parties, the original answers had been candidate mentions. Compared to C3023\_LH\_DC, C3028\_LH\_ also includes candidates' parties outside respondents' geographical constituencies.

For further information see variable note on C3023\_LH\_DC.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3028\_LH

Note that all persons who refused to answer if they did consider voting for another party (C3027\_LH) or answered "don't know" to this question, have the same answer codes in the follow-up question C3028\_LH\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3028\_LH

The Polish study of 2007 used a closed list to ask for C3028\_LH\_1. Respondents who mentioned a party out of this list were coded as "OTHER PARTY" (for more detail see Codebook Appendices).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3028\_UH

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed-list for the five major Japanese parties.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3028\_LH

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3028\_LH

The Dutch survey reports this question separately for each party. The variables for C3028 do not reflect any preference order, but rather, if each party was mentioned by respondents.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / Not answered

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3028\_LH

Respondents' choices of "other parties" appear in variables C3028\_LH\_1 - C3028\_LH\_4 if they chose from 1 up to 4 other parties.

C3028\_LH\_5 - C3028\_LH\_8 were used as variables for the choice of other candidates from the candidate list vote. C3028\_LH\_5 contains respondents' one "other choice", C3028\_6 a second "other choice", and so forth up to C3028\_LH\_8 with respondents' fourth "other choices" but all not rank ordered.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
90.	Means that the person chose one of the "other parties" or "other candidates" which are not represented in parties 1-8 "Legalize Cannabis", "Family", "Kiwi", "Libertarianz", "NZ Pacific", "Bill and Ben", "Workers" and "Other party, not specified".

=====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3028\_LH

The Norwegian questionnaire of 2005 allowed mentioning only one party respondents would have voted for.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3028\_LH

Note that the question on C3028\_LH was asked separately for each of the eight major Norwegian parties. Thus, a rank order of response is not applicable.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3028\_LH\_1- C3028\_LH

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3028\_LH\_1- C3028\_LH

Note that the Polish studies used closed lists to ask respondents about parties they considered voting for in the Lower House.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3028\_LH

The South African questionnaire of origin asked for each single party separately. As a consequence, preference order is not applicable. Moreover, even though respondents had to respond for each party, none of them mentioned more than two parties in the variable set of C3028\_LH.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3028\_LH\_

Questions on C3028\_LH\_ were asked separately for each of the major parties, as reported in the current codebook appendices. Consequently, C3028\_LH\_1 through C3028\_LH\_5 do not reflect any preference order of respondents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3028\_LH

Sweden asked this question separately for each party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3028\_LH

This variable was applied differently in the Switzerland survey. Respondents were asked whether they considered voting for each party separately.

Additionally, responses make reference to lower house contest.

See note C3027\_LH for further details.

However, the additional mention variables C3028\_LH\_5 to C3028\_LH\_9 refer to party mentions.

Also notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3028\_LH

The additional mention variables C3028\_LH\_5 to C3028\_LH\_8 refer to party mentions.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3028\_LH\_

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

```
-----
C3029_PR    >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
C3029_LH    >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
              PRESIDENT
C3029_UH    >>> Q22c. ARE THERE OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE,
              LOWER HOUSE
```

---

 UPPER HOUSE
 

---

Q22c. And were there any [party or parties/candidate or candidates] that you would never vote for?

In the case of simultaneous elections (for instance, both presidential and parliamentary [Lower and/or Upper house contest], question Q22c was repeated for each relevant election. See Election Study Notes for more information.

- .....
- 1. YES
  - 5. NO
  - 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  - 9. MISSING

NOTES: C3029

Data are not available for CHILE (2009), FRANCE (2007), NORWAY (2005), SOUTH KOREA (2008), TAIWAN (2008).

The CSES questionnaire of origin skips non-voters, according to C3021\_1-C3021\_2, from C3029\_PR-C3029\_UH, as well as from the follow-up questions C3030\_PR\_1-C3030\_UH\_4.

In contrast, several country studies asked these questions to all respondents, irrespective of their current electoral participation.

These data remained unchanged.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3029\_LH

The original CSES questionnaire instructs interviewers to ask this question to each person, no matter if the respondent participated in the current election or not. However, in the case of Croatia, C3029\_LH was only asked to current voters.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3029\_LH

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3029\_LH

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / no answer

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3029\_LH

A question on C3029\_LH was not included in the Spanish questionnaire of origin. Instead C3029\_LH was produced out of C3030\_LH\_1 through C3030\_LH\_9.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3029\_LH

The Swiss 2007 election was held simultaneously for both lower and upper houses (with the exception of 5 of the 46 seats of this last one). However, the question (translated as "Is there one or more parties that you would not ever vote for?") was applied immediately after variables C3027\_LH and C3028\_LH, which explicitly refers to the lower chamber in the question wording. See note C3027\_LH for further details.

Also notice that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

---

 PRESIDENT
 

---



```

C3030_PR_1 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST MENTION
C3030_PR_2 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND MENTION
C3030_PR_3 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD MENTION
C3030_PR_4 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH MENTION

```

## LOWER HOUSE

```

C3030_LH_1 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST MENTION
C3030_LH_2 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND MENTION
C3030_LH_3 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD MENTION
C3030_LH_4 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH MENTION
C3030_LH_5 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIFTH MENTION
C3030_LH_6 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SIXTH MENTION
C3030_LH_7 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SEVENTH MENTION
C3030_LH_8 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-EIGHTH MENTION
C3030_LH_9 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-NINTH MENTION

```

## UPPER HOUSE

```

C3030_UH_1 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FIRST MENTION
C3030_UH_2 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-SECOND MENTION
C3030_UH_3 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-THIRD MENTION
C3030_UH_4 >>> Q22d. OTHERS FOR WHICH R WOULD NEVER VOTE-FOURTH MENTION

```

Q22d. Which ones?

In the case of simultaneous elections (for instance, both presidential and parliamentary [Lower and/or Upper house contest], question Q22d was repeated for each relevant election. See Election Study Notes for more information.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
 90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
 91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

## NOTES: C3030

Data are not available for FRANCE (2007), NORWAY (2005), SOUTH KOREA (2008), TAIWAN (2008).

In the original questionnaire these questions were intended to capture spontaneous answers, with the respondent mentioning a set of parties, and the recorded values indicating the order of response. However, some studies asked these questions with a predetermined list of political parties, and asked about one party at a time. By asking these questions in this way, the order of the responses is lost.

Table: Summary of Availability of Preference Order.

	Yes	NO
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)		
AUSTRALIA (2007)		X
AUSTRIA (2008)		X
BELARUS (2008)	X	
BRAZIL (2006)	X	
BRAZIL (2010)	X	
CANADA (2008)		X
CHILE (2009)	-	-
CROATIA (2007)	X	

CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	X	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	X	
DENMARK (2007)		X
ESTONIA (2011)	X	
FINLAND (2007)		X
FINLAND (2011)	X	
FRANCE (2007)	-	-
GERMANY (2005)		X
GERMANY (2009)	X	
GREECE (2009)	X	
HONG KONG (2008)	X	
ICELAND (2007)	X	
ICELAND (2009)	X	
IRELAND (2007)	X	
ISRAEL (2006)	X	
JAPAN (2007)		X
LATVIA (2010)	X	
MEXICO (2006)	X	
MEXICO (2009)	X	
NETHERLANDS (2006)		X
NETHERLANDS (2010)	X	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		X
NORWAY (2005)	-	-
NORWAY (2009)		X
PERU (2011)		X
PHILIPPINES (2010)	X	
POLAND (2005)		X
POLAND (2007)		X
PORTUGAL (2009)	X	
ROMANIA (2009)	X	
SLOVAKIA (2010)	X	
SLOVENIA (2008)		X
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)		X
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	-	-
SPAIN (2008)		X
SWEDEN (2006)		X
SWITZERLAND (2007)		X
TAIWAN (2008)	-	-
THAILAND (2007)		X
TURKEY (2011)	X	
UNITED STATES (2008)	X	
URUGUAY (2009)		X

Additionally, when asked about one party at a time, a minority of respondents end up mentioning many more parties than usual. To avoid adding many columns with extremely sparse data, we have included up to 9 variables with the intention to secure registering, if applicable, responses that refer to parties A through I. Moreover, whenever a respondent mentioned more than 9 parties we included only those responses that refer to parties A to I. With this coding rule we are only dropping less than 1% of the responses contained in the entire sample.

The coding on C3030\_ depends on C3029\_. Respondents that mentioned that there are no parties they would never vote for (C3027 is code 5) are excluded from C3030\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3030\_LH

Australia asked this question separately for each party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3030\_LH

The question was not open-ended. Instead, respondents could choose their answer from a party list with seven parties and the option "other party".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3030\_LH

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3030\_UH

=====

Brazil has a party-list proportional system with seats allocated according to the simple quotient and highest average calculations. Respondents were asked for the deputy or senate candidate for whom they would never vote for. The variable was later created by using the respective candidates' party affiliations. Since giving a candidate preference is optional for the voter, the data in this variable contains a lot of missing values.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
90.	The party affiliation of the mentioned name was not found. The person could be either an independent candidate or the answer might be inappropriate.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3030\_LH

The Croatian questionnaire followed the implementation for CSES closely, allowing respondents up to five party mentions at most. However, no more than four parties have been mentioned by any single respondent.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3030\_LH

Although answers reflect the order in which respondents answered this question, respondents were provided with a list of parties which ran in the election and they answered with that list in mind. The order of responses might thus reflect the order in the list.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3030\_LH\_

The Danish questionnaire asks C3030\_LH\_ for each party, separately. Thus, a preference order in C3030\_LH\_ is not applicable.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3030\_LH

Rather than an open-ended question, Finland provided a closed-list from which respondents could choose as many answers as they wished.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3030\_LH

The German questionnaire of 2005 asked this question separately for each of the parties which contested in the national election. The additional mention variables C3030\_LH\_5 to C3030\_LH\_9 refer to party mentions.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3030\_LH

Variables C3030\_LH\_5 to C3030\_LH\_9 refer to additional mentions of parties respondent would never vote for.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3030\_LH

Researchers should note that in contrast to the given coding schema, referring to parties, the original answers had been candidate mentions. Compared to C3023\_LH\_DC, C3030\_LH\_ also includes candidates' parties outside respondents' geographical constituencies. For further information see variable note on C3023\_LH\_DC. Moreover, according to the explanations of our collaborators, the label "'independents' in Hong Kong means 'not affiliated with any political parties' and does not necessarily mean that the candidates' political inclinations are different from those of major political parties".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3030\_UH

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed-list for the five major Japanese parties (see codebook appendices).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3030\_LH

The Dutch survey reports this question separately for each party. Up to 13 mentions were recorded. CSES retained mentions of parties A through I.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3030\_LH

The Dutch survey reports this question separately for each party. Up to 11 mentions were recorded. CSES dropped mentions of the category "Others", and of the party with lowest vote return (Trots op Nederland, Rita Verdonk). The variables for C3030\_LH do not reflect any preference order, but rather, if each party was mentioned by respondents.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / Not answered

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3030\_LH

Respondents' choices of "parties never vote for" appear in variables C3028\_LH\_1 - C3028\_LH\_4 if they chose from 1 up to 4 other parties.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
90.	Means that the person chose one of the "other parties" or "other candidates" which are not represented in parties 1-8 "Legalize Cannabis", "Family", "Kiwi", "Libertarianz", "NZ Pacific", "Bill and Ben", "Workers" and "Other party, not specified".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3030\_LH

Note that the question on C3030\_LH was asked separately for each of the eight major Norwegian parties. Thus, a rank order of response is not applicable.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3030\_LH\_1

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3030\_LH\_1

Note that the Polish studies used closed lists to ask respondents about parties they would never vote for in the Lower House.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3030\_LH

The South African questionnaire of origin asked for each single party separately. As a consequence, preference order is not applicable.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3030\_LH\_

Questions on C3030\_LH\_ were asked separately for each of the major parties, as reported in the current codebook appendices. Consequently, C3030\_LH\_1 through C3030\_LH\_7 do not reflect any preference order of respondents.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3030\_LH

Sweden asked this question separately for each party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3030\_LH

This variable was applied differently in the Switzerland survey. Respondents were asked which parties they would not vote for by asking for each party separately.

Additionally, responses make reference to lower house contest.

See note C3029\_LH for further details.

Also note that this variable was asked to a subset of the sample which responded by a follow-up mail/online questionnaire. See study description and variable note C1007 for further details.

However, the additional mention variables C3030\_LH\_5 to C3030\_LH\_9 refer to party mentions.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3030\_LH

The additional mention variables C3030\_LH\_5 to C3030\_LH\_8 refer to party mentions.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C3030\_LH\_

Note that the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP, code 4) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates.

## C3031 &gt;&gt;&gt; Q23. PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT

Q23. The wording of this item, which is to record voting in the previous national election, follows national standards.

This item ascertains whether or not the respondent cast a ballot, regardless of whether or not it was valid in the PREVIOUS election.

1. RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT
5. RESPONDENT DID NOT CAST A BALLOT
6. VOLUNTEERED: NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN LAST ELECTION
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

## NOTES: C3031

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008), TAIWAN (2008).

Table: Summary of Type and Year of Previous Election.

	President	Lower House	Upper House
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)			
AUSTRALIA (2007)			2004
AUSTRIA (2008)	-	-	-
BELARUS (2008)	2006	2004	
BRAZIL (2006)	2002		
BRAZIL (2010)	2006	2006	2006
CANADA (2008)		2006	
CHILE (2009)	2006		
CROATIA (2007)	2005	2003	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)		2002	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)		2006	

DENMARK (2007)		2005	
ESTONIA (2011)		2007	
FINLAND (2007)		2003	
FINLAND (2011)		2007	
FRANCE (2007)	2007		
GERMANY (2005)		2002	
GERMANY (2009)		2005	
GREECE (2009)		2007	
HONG KONG (2008)		2004	
ICELAND (2007)		2003	
ICELAND (2009)		2007	
IRELAND (2007)		2002	
ISRAEL (2006)		2003	
JAPAN (2007)		2005*	2005
LATVIA (2010)		2006	
MEXICO (2006)			2003
MEXICO (2009)	2006*		2006
NETHERLANDS (2006)		2003	
NETHERLANDS (2010)		2006	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		2005	
NORWAY (2005)		2001	
NORWAY (2009)		2005	
PERU (2011)	2006		
PHILIPPINES (2010)	2004		
POLAND (2005)		2001	
POLAND (2007)	2005	2005	
PORTUGAL (2009)	-	-	-
ROMANIA (2009)		2008	(2008)
SLOVAKIA (2010)		2006	
SLOVENIA (2008)		2004	
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	-	-	-
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	2007		
SPAIN (2008)	-	-	-
SWEDEN (2006)			
SWITZERLAND (2007)		2003	
TAIWAN (2008)	2004		
THAILAND (2007)		2005	
TURKEY (2011)		2007	
UNITED STATES (2008)	2004		
URUGUAY (2009)	2004	2004	2004

\* Ballot Cast mentioned in C3031

Not that the above table refers to the entire bloc of C3031-C3032\_ items.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3031

Australia has compulsory voting, hence this questions was not part of the Australian questionnaire in 2007. C3031 was created using the actual vote choice for the House of Representatives (B17), defining all observations as non- voters that did not report a vote choice, according to C3032\_LH\_DC. Researchers should note that some of the included non-voters in C3031 might not have been eligible to participate in the previous election.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3031

This variable was dropped in the Austrian Election Study because of the late timing of the study and the considered likelihood of inaccurate recall.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3031

Although elections on multiple levels took place on the same day, this question did not further specify the election nor the ballot cast (1 or 2). As the follow-up question "whom did you vote for" was asked for all electoral levels (presidential, legislative candidate etc.)

separately, it is also not impossible to draw conclusions to which part of the election respondents probably refer to with C3021\_1. Also see C3021\_1.

Also note that due to compulsory voting, non-voters have to officially justify non-voting behavior on election day, if e.g. they are absent from the city where they are registered. If for other reasons they do not vote, and do not justify this, they get fined with a symbolic amount of about US\$2.

The original election study data from Brazil contained more specific information for those who did not vote. For the sake of comparability, these were all collapsed under value 5 as detailed below:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Yes
05.	No, more than 70 years old (voting then voluntary)
	No, between 16 and 17 years old (voting (voting then voluntary)
	No, I did not want to
	No, I had to justify the absence

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3031

C3031 refers to the first round of presidential elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3031

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3031

Note that this question was part of the first wave, i.e. pre-election, survey.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
08.	Don't know / no answer

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3031

The questionnaire of origin asked about the participation the following way:  
 "So in the last 'Storting' election in 2001. Who did you vote for? ", followed by a list of parties and the additional options "Didn't have right to vote", "Wasn't able to vote/away", "Didn't vote for other reasons", which were used to process C3031. Moreover, Respondents who "refused" or mentioned "don't know" in the question of origin were coded similar in C3031 and C3032\_LH\_PL refers to the Norwegian parliament election in 2001.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3031

The Portuguese questions about the ballot cast and the vote choice in the previous election refer to the EU parliamentary (EP) election of June 7th, 2009. In general CSES does not include data from any other electoral tier than the national one. Hence, the information about previous Portuguese election is not included.

Researchers, who are interested in the data about the EP-election might get back to our Portuguese collaborators, as listed in the introduction part of this codebook.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3031

Note that C3031 refers to the legislative elections in 2008, without any specific reference to the Lower or Upper House. See also Election Study Notes on C3032\_LH\_DC.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3031

Data for this variable are from self-reported behavior. However, when compared to official registers, some cases show differences between self-reported behavior and

actual behavior. Of the people who have mentioned having voted, 94 did differently according to the official records. Conversely, of the people having mentioned that they did not vote, 12 have voted according to the official records. As well, of the people who reported not having been eligible to vote in the previous election 1 actually voted, and last, 6 respondent have answered that they voted in the previous elections despite but the official registers indicate that they were not eligible.

The respondent id's of the 94 individuals who over reported vote are (variable C1009):

0000200028, 0000200086, 0000200306, 0000200338, 0000200348,  
0000200353, 0000200381, 0000200465, 0000200495, 0000200597,  
0000200630, 0000200645, 0000200672, 0000200851, 0000200928,  
0000200963, 0000201004, 0000201038, 0000201117, 0000201284,  
0000201326, 0000201330, 0000201396, 0000201403, 0000201440,  
0000201443, 0000201574, 0000201578, 0000201585, 0000201729,  
0000201750, 0000201862, 0000201913, 0000201964, 0000202108,  
0000202109, 0000202258, 0000202283, 0000202399, 0000221037,  
0000221048, 0000221055, 0000221082, 0000221112, 0000221120,  
0000221140, 0000221156, 0000221178, 0000221199, 0000221226,  
0000221250, 0000221252, 0000221292, 0000221307, 0000221310,  
0000221317, 0000221322, 0000221342, 0000221412, 0000221414,  
0000221430, 0000221431, 0000221455, 0000221492, 0000221495,  
0000221503, 0000221531, 0000221533, 0000221567, 0000221576,  
0000221578, 0000221635, 0000221643, 0000221655, 0000221663,  
0000221667, 0000221671, 0000221676, 0000221682, 0000221696,  
0000221740, 0000221768, 0000221777, 0000221778, 0000221796,  
0000221801, 0000221817, 0000221860, 0000221914, 0000221915,  
0000221934, 0000221952, 0000221970, 0000221974.

The respondent id's (C1009) of the 12 individuals who under-reported, vote are (variable C1009): 0000200520, 0000200605,  
0000200714, 0000200798, 0000200820, 0000200833, 0000200935,  
0000201502, 0000201650, 0000201844, 0000202144, 0000202444.

The respondent id's (C1009) of the 6 individuals who said they voted, but were not eligible according to the official registers, are (variable C1009): 0000210119, 0000210190,  
0000210194, 0000210199, 0000210202, 0000221746.

The respondent id of the individual said he/she was not eligible to vote in the last elections, but voted according to the official registers is: 0000202207.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C3031

Note that voting is strictly compulsory in Uruguay (see C5044\_1).

C3032\_PR\_1 >>> Q23a. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 1  
C3032\_PR\_2 >>> Q23a. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT 2

If applicable and respondent cast a ballot in the presidential election:

Q23a. This variable reports the respondent's vote choice for president in the PREVIOUS election.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
90. OTHER CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
91. NONE OF THE CANDIDATES  
92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT  
93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW



## 99. MISSING

NOTES: C3032

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008).

The coding of C3032\_PR\_ depends on C3031. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3031 (is not code 5), if C3031 refers to presidential elections.

For further details see Variable Note on C3031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3032\_PR\_1

Note that C3031 refers to the district candidate vote choice of the Lower House election (C3032\_LH\_DC). C3031 is thus no filter variable for C3032\_PR\_1

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
04.	A. Kazulin - Belarussian Social Democratic Party
08.	S. Gaidukevich - Liberal Democratic Party of Belarus
16.	A. Milinkievic - United Democratic Forces of Belarus
17.	A. Lukashenko

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3032\_PR\_1

Note that the more detailed answers of non-voting were recoded to the CSES standard:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	01. Lula
02.	02. José Serra
03.	03. Antony Garotinho
04.	04. Ciro Gomez
05.	05. Zé Maria
92.	09. White Ballot
98.	55. I don't remember
	77. I don't know
99.	08. I voted none
	10. I did not vote
	99. Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3032\_PR\_2

Note that the more detailed answers of non-voting were recoded to the CSES standard:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	01. Lula
02.	02. Serra
92.	09. White Ballot
98.	55. I don't remember
	77. I don't know
99.	08. I voted none
	10. I did not vote
	99. Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3032\_PR\_1

This variable reports the voting in the first round of the 2006 presidential election.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
03.	2 Cristovam Buarque (PDT)

04.	7 Lula (PT)
08.	3 Geraldo Alckmin (PSDB)
12.	1 Ana Maria Rangel (PRP)
21.	5 José Maria Eymael (PSDC)
26.	4 Heloísa Helena (PSOL)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3032\_PR\_2

This variable reports the voting in the second round of the 2006 presidential election.

Since C3031 reports voting in the first round of the presidential elections, there are some respondents who answered negatively to C3031 and reported vote choice in C3032\_PR\_1.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
04.	02. Lula (PT)
08.	01. Geraldo Alckmin (PSDB)
92.	50. Invalidated vote
93.	60. Blank vote

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3032\_PR\_2

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Michelle Bachelet
02.	Sebastian Pinera

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3032\_PR\_1

Candidates of the previous presidential elections are listed below. CSES codes reflect the parties as mentioned in the codebook appendices.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Jadranka Kosor (HDZ)
02.	Stjepan Mesic (HNS)
03.	Doris Kosta (HSS)
04.	Đurda Adlesic (HSL)
05.	Slaven Letica (HSP)
11.	Anto Kovacevic (HKDU)
12.	Ivic Pasalic (HB)
13.	Tomislav Petrak (HPS)
14.	Miroslav Rajh (HSM)
85.	Miroslav Blazevic (Independent)
86.	Ljubo Sesic (Independent)
87.	Mladen Keser (Independent)
88.	Boris Miskic (Independent)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3032\_PR\_1

This question refers to the first round of the 2007 presidential elections. In France this was a close-ended question with the following choices (in randomized order):

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Dominique Voynet
02.	Olivier Besancenot
03.	Marie-George Buffet
04.	Ségolène Royal
05.	François Bayrou
06.	Nicolas Sarkozy
07.	Jean-Marie Le Pen
09.	Philippe de Villiers
10.	Frédéric Nihous
11.	Arlette Laguiller
12.	José Bové
13.	Gérard Schivardi

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C3032\_PR\_2

=====

This question refers to the second round of the 2007 presidential elections. In France this was a close-ended question with the following choices (in randomized order):

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
04.	Ségolène Royal
06.	Nicolas Sarkozy

Note that C3031 refers to the first round of the presidential elections. Instead, C3032\_PR\_2 includes the vote choice of several respondents who said no in C3031.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3032\_PR\_1

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Roberto Madrazo / PRI-PVEM
02.	Felipe Calderón Hinojosa / PAN
03.	López Obrador / PRD-PT-Convergencia
06.	Roberto Campa / Nueva Alianza
08.	Patricia Mercado / Alternativa

Andrés Manuel López Obrador was the candidate of the left-wing Coalition for the Good of All, which grouped PRD, PT and Convergencia. Roberto Madrazo ran as the candidate of the Alliance for Mexico coalition which joined the PRI and PVEM.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3032\_PR\_1-C3032\_PR\_2

Note that the Polish study of 2007 used closed lists to ask respondents about their previous vote choice for the Presidential Election of 2005.

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Henryka Bochniarz
02.	Marek Borowski
04.	Maciej Giertych
06.	Lech Kaczynski
07.	Jaroslav Kalinowski
08.	Janusz Korwin-Mikke
09.	Andrzej Lepper
12.	Adam Słomka
13.	Donald Tusk

Note that C3031 refers to the first round of the presidential elections. Instead, C3032\_PR\_2 includes the vote choice of several respondents who said no in C3031.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3032\_PR\_1

Response codes represent the party of each competing candidate. The candidates were:

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Jung, Dong-Young
02.	Lee, Myeong-Bak
03.	Lee, Hoi-Chang
04.	Kwon, Young-Ghi
05.	Moon, Kuk-Hyun
08.	Lee, In-Je

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3032\_PR\_1

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Lien Chan and James Soong (KMT)
02.	Chen Shu-Bian and Anette Lu (DPP)
98.	forgot

-----

```

C3032_LH_PL >>> Q23B. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE -
                    PARTY LIST
C3032_LH_DC >>> Q23C. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE LOWER HOUSE -
                    DISTRICT CANDIDATE

```

q23b. If applicable and respondent cast a ballot in the Lower House legislative election:

The Q23b item reports the respondent's vote choice for party list and/or district candidate in the PREVIOUS election.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

- 89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
- 90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)
- 91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES
- 92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT
- 93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT
- 97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
- 98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
- 99. MISSING

NOTES: C3032

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008).

The coding of C3032\_LH\_ depends on C3031. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3031 (is not code 5), if C3031 refers to Lower House elections.

For further details see Variable Note on C3031.

If party codes are not listed in the ELECTION STUDY NOTES, users should fall back on the codes listed in the party tables of the appendices.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3032\_LH\_PL

This variable was dropped in the Austrian Election Study because of the late timing of the study and the likelihood of inaccurate recall.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C3032\_LH\_DC

Note that most of the Belarusian opposition parties are unregistered. Hence, we are not able to provide information about the party affiliations of candidates.

CSES Code	Election Study Category/Categories:
01.	M.I. Rusyi (Agrarian Party of Belarus)
04.	S.S. Shushkevich (Belarusian social-democratic party - Hramada)
06.	Karpenko (Communist Party of Belarus)
08.	S.V. Gaidukevich (Liberal Democratic party)
09.	A.B. Lebedko (The Unified Civil Party)
50.	Shatko (No information)
51.	Janukovich (No information)
52.	Vnuchko (No information)
53.	Marachkin (No information)
54.	Vorontsevich (No information)
55.	Korol (No information)
56.	Shekel (No information)
70.	Glukhovskiy (Independent candidate)
71.	Khrol (Independent candidate)
72.	Isaev (Independent candidate)

- 
- |     |                                       |
|-----|---------------------------------------|
| 73. | Abramova (Independent candi date)     |
| 74. | Goncharenko ((Independent candi date) |
| 75. | Pàvlovi ch (Independent candi date)   |
| 76. | Zdanovi ch (Independent candi date)   |
| 77. | Kachan (Independent candi date)       |
| 78. | Solovi ev (Independent candi date)    |
| 79. | Belashevskiy (Independent candi date) |
| 80. | Orda (Independent candi date)         |
| 81. | Dubovi k (Independent candi date)     |

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3032\_LH

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3032\_LH

Respondents were asked for their vote of deputy candidate, but the candidates' party was not reported. This variable could not be used in this study.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C3032\_LH\_PL

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Národne demokratická strana National Democratic Party
02.	Demokratická liga Democratic League
03.	Ceská strana soci áln e demokratická Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD)
04.	Balbínova poetická strana Balbin Poetic Party
05.	Obcanská demokratická alliance Civic Democratic Alliance (ODA)
06.	Volba pro budoucnost Vote for Future
07.	Humanistická alliance Humanistic Alliance
09.	Nadeje Hope
10.	Nové hnutí New Movement
11.	Republikáni Mi rosl av Sl ádka Republicans of Mi rosl av Sl adek
12.	Cesta zmeny The Way of Change
13.	Ceská strana národne soci áln í Czech National Social Party
14.	Romská obcanská ini ci ati va CR Roma Civic Initiative
15.	Strana zdravého rozumu Common Sense Party
17.	Ceskoslovenská strana soci ali stická (CS) Czechoslovak Socialist Party
20.	Republikáni Republicans
21.	Sdružení nezávi sl ých Association of Independents
22.	Obcanská demokratická strana Civic Democratic Party (ODS)
23.	Komunistická strana Cech a Moravy Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM)
24.	Moravská demokratická strana Moravian Democratic Party
25.	Koalice KDU-CSL, US-DEU Coalition KDU-CSL and US-DEU KDU-CSL - Krestanská a demokratická uni e- Ceskoslovenská strana lidová - US-DEU - Uni e svobody-Demokratická uni e Christ ian Democrati c Uni on-Czechosl ovak Peopl es' party - Freedom Uni on-Democrati c Uni on
26.	Strana za zivotní jistoty Party for Li fe Securi ties
27.	Pravý Blok

28. Right Block  
Strana zelených  
Green Party

Note that party 17 only existed until 1993 with this name.  
Its successor in Czech Republic is party 13 "Česká strana  
národně sociální" - Czech National Social Party.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3032\_LH\_PL

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Strana zdravého rozumu Common Sense Party
02.	Ceske hnutí za národní jednotu Czech Movement for National Unity
03.	Balbinova poetická strana Balbin Poetic Party
04.	Liberalní reformní strana Liberal Reform Party
05.	Právo a Spravedlnost Law and Justice
06.	Nezávislí (independents)
07.	Česká pravice Czech Right
08.	Koruna Česka (monarch. strana) Czech Crown (royal party)
09.	Občanská demokratická strana Civic Democratic Party (ODS)
10.	Česká strana sociálně demokratická Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD)
11.	SNK Evropské demokrate SNK European Democrats (SNK ED)
12.	Unie svobody-Demokratická unie Freedom Union-Democratic Union (US-DEU)
13.	Helax-Ostrava se baví Helax-Ostrava has fun
14.	Právy Blok Right Bloc
15.	4 VIZE-www.4vize.cz 4 Visions-www.4vize.cz
16.	Česká strana národně socialistická Czech National Socialist Party
17.	Moravane Moravians
18.	Strana zelených Green Party (SZ)
19.	Humanistická strana Humanistic Party
20.	Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM)
21.	Koalice pro Českou republiku Coalition for the Czech Republic
22.	Národní strana National Party
23.	Folklor i Společnost Folklore and Society
24.	Křesťanská a demokratická unie-Československá strana lidová Christian Democratic Union-Czechoslovak Peoples' party (KDU-CSL)
25.	NEZ. DEMOKRATÉ (předseda Václav Zeman) Independent Democrats (Leader Václav Zeman)
26.	Strana rovnosti šancí Party of Equal Chances

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3032\_LH\_DC

Note, there is one respondent, who mentioned to cast a ballot  
for "Küllike Sallik", a candidate that was not included in any

=====

district or party lists in the Estonian election of 2007. The respondent's answer was coded as "90. OTHER CANDIDATE", which is the only observation included in this category in C3032\_LH\_DC.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3032\_LH\_DC

Only the vote choice of the geographical constituencies is included in the CSES data.

For further information see variable note on C3023\_LH\_DC.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3032\_LH

One answer category was originally coded "94". Since it is unclear what it represents, it was recoded into missing. Considering the Latvian questionnaire, it is likely that the code does not belong to a substantial answer of a party which the respondents voted for.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3032\_LH\_DC

This variable reports vote for the 2003 Lower House elections of 2003.

Note that for the previous election the alliance between PRI and PVEM was called "Alianza para todos".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3032\_LH\_DC

Note that a few respondents that mention a party also respond not having voted in C3031. The reason is that C3031 refers to presidential election exclusively. While most voters who cast a ballot for president also voted for lower and upper house candidates, some voters located away from their districts may not been able to vote for one contest.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3032\_LH\_PL

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
98.	Don't know / Not answered

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3032\_LH

See notes on C3031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3032\_LH\_PL

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3032\_LH\_PL

Note that the Polish study used closed lists to ask respondents about their previous vote.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3032\_LH\_PL

See remarks on C3031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3032\_LH\_DC

Note that the Romanian questionnaire asked about the previous legislative election in 2008, without any references to the Lower or Upper House. Respondents' mentions on their previous vote choice is coded in C3032\_LH\_DC.

See Election Study Notes on C3031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3032\_LH\_PL

Note that party PFP was not mentioned, here, because as candidates from the pan-blue coalition (KMT, NP, PFP), they were listed in party KMT.

Moreover, in the Taiwanese election study only the candidates' parties and not candidate names were mentioned.

CSES Code 98.	Election Study Category/Categories: Forgot
------------------	---

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3032\_LH

Parliament election that had been annulled by a military-appointed tribunal (see also Election Study Notes on Thailand in the introduction of the current codebook).

-----  
C3032\_UH\_PL >>> Q23B. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -  
PARTY LIST

C3032\_UH\_DC >>> Q23C. PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE UPPER HOUSE -  
DISTRICT CANDIDATE  
-----

q23c. If applicable and respondent cast a ballot in the Upper House legislative election:

The Q23c item reports the respondent's vote choice for party list and/or district candidate in the PREVIOUS election.

01-88. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

89. INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
90. OTHER PARTY/CANDIDATE (NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED)  
91. NONE OF THE PARTIES/CANDIDATES  
92. R CAST INVALID BALLOT  
93. R CAST BLANC BALLOT

97. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED  
98. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW

99. MISSING

NOTES: C3032

Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), PORTUGAL (2009), SOUTH AFRICA (2009), SPAIN (2008).

The coding of C3032\_UH\_ depends on C3031. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3031 (is not code 5), if C3031 refers to Upper House elections.

For further details see Variable Note on C3031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3032\_UH\_PL

As respondents were asked for their vote for Upper House candidates and not candidates' parties, this variable unfortunately could not be used in this study.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3032\_UH\_DC

The Republic Party (Partido da Republica, PR, code 27 in CSES) was founded on December 21, 2006 by the merger of the Liberal Party (Partido Liberal, PL) and PRONA.

CSES Code 29. 30.	Election Study Code/Category PL PRONA
-------------------------	---

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3032\_UH\_PL

Rather than an open-ended question, Japan provides a closed-list for the five major Japanese parties (see CODEBOOK APPENDICES).



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3032\_UH\_DC

Notice that a few respondents that mention a party also responds not having voted in C3031. The reason is that C3031 refers to presidential election exclusively. While most voters who cast a ballot for president also voted for lower and upper house candidates, some voters located away from their districts may not been able to vote for one contest.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3032\_UH

See Election Study Notes on C3031 and C3032\_LH\_DC.

-----  
C3035 >>> Q23D. PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE  
-----

If an open-list electoral system was used for the legislative election in question and respondent cast a ballot:

Q23d. This variable reports whether or not the respondent cast a preference vote for a candidate in the PREVIOUS election.

For instance, if votes are cast for party lists, but citizens can, in addition to that, mark a preference for one or more candidates on the party list, then Q23d may show answers to a question like this: "Did you simply vote for a party or did you also express a candidate preference?" In party list systems where voters have to vote directly for a candidate and cannot cast a vote just for the party list as such (e.g. Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland), the question for Q23d should read like this: "Do you consider the vote that you cast merely a vote for the party, or did you also mean it as a vote for a particular candidate?"

- .....
- 0. CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE IS NOT APPLICABLE
  - 1. RESPONDENT EXERCISED CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
  - 5. RESPONDENT DID NOT EXERCISE CANDIDATE PREFERENCE
  - 6. RESPONDENT CAST INVALID BALLOT
  - 7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
  - 8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
  - 9. MISSING

## NOTES: C3035

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BRAZIL (2006), BRAZIL (2010), CHILE (2009), DENMARK (2007), FINLAND (2007), GREECE (2009), PERU (2011), SWEDEN (2006), SWITZERLAND (2007), UNITED STATES (2008).

The coding of C3035 depends on C3031. Responses are kept for voters, according to C3031 (is not code 5).  
For further details see Variable Note on C3031.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3035

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3035

Question text: "V223 When you vote for a party you can choose from a list of candidates. Did you vote in 2003/2006 for the number 1 on the list or for another candidate?"  
Note that this question was part of the first wave, i.e. pre-election, survey.

=====

CSES Code	Election Study Code/Category
01.	Other candidate
02.	First candidate
08.	Don't know / no answer

-----

C3036\_1 >>> Q24A. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 1ST

C3036\_2 >>> Q24B. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 2ND

C3036\_3 >>> Q24C. POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 3RD

-----

## Q25-Q27. Political information items.

.....

1. CORRECT
5. INCORRECT
7. VOLUNTEERED: REFUSED
8. VOLUNTEERED: DON'T KNOW
9. MISSING

## NOTES: C3036

Some studies include a series of political information items, designed to test respondents' general knowledge. These items are of varying difficulty and responses are simply reported as correct or incorrect. The questions used, and their correct answers, are reported below.

Data are not available for BELARUS (2008), SLOVENIA (2008), TURKEY (2011), URUGUAY (2009).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C3036

Australia asked six questions about political knowledge out of which three were selected. To do so, the one with the highest as well as the one with the lowest number of correct answers were chosen. The third question was selected by calculating the minimal gap between the mean of all correctly given answers and the current frequencies of correct answer for the remaining four questions.

Question Text (C3036\_1): For each of the following statements, please say whether it is true or false. Australia became a federation in 1901. [Correct Answer: true]

Question Text (C3036\_2): For each of the following statements, please say whether it is true or false. The longest time allowed between Federal elections for the House of Representatives is four years. [Correct Answer: false]

Question Text (C3036\_3): For each of the following statements, please say whether it is true or false. No-one may stand for Federal parliament unless they pay a deposit. [Correct Answer: true]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C3036

Respondents were asked for party positions on the policy area of the opening of the Austrian job market to the new EU member states: What do these parties think concerning the opening of the Austrian job market to the New Member States of the EU? Please tell me if you do not know the position. Note that the variables' order was rearranged according to the percentage of correct answers.

C3036\_1: The FPÖ (is against is correct).  
 C3036\_2: The ÖVP (is in favor is correct).  
 C3036\_3: The SPÖ (is in favor is correct).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C3036

In Brazil, respondents had to answer a set of four multiple choice questions of which for CSES three were chosen according to their prospected difficulty (correct and false proportion of answers)

Statements to be answered were as follows:

C3036\_1 The president has a 4 year mandate. (is true)  
 C3036\_2 Geraldo Alckmin belongs to the PTB. (is false)  
 C3036\_3 The Chamber of deputies is elected by majoritarian vote. (is false)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): The president has a 4 year mandate.  
 [Correct Answer: Correct.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Geraldo Alckmin belongs to the PTB.  
 [Correct Answer: Wrong.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): The deputies of the House of Representatives are elected by majoritarian system. [Correct Answer: Wrong.]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Do you happen to recall the name of the Premier of your Province?

[Correct Answers depending on C2027:

10. Newfoundland: Danny Williams
11. Prince Edward Island: Robert Ghiz
12. Nova Scotia: Rodney MacDonald
13. New Brunswick: Shawn Graham
24. Quebec: Jean Charest
35. Ontario: Dalton McGuinty
46. Manitoba: Gary Doer
47. Saskatchewan: Brad Wall
48. Alberta: Ed Stelmach
59. British Columbia: Gordon Campbell]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Can you recall the name of the Republican running for president of the United States?  
 [Correct Answer: John McCain]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Do you happen to recall the name of a current cabinet Minister in the federal government?

[Multiple Correct Answer: Ambrose Rona, Baird John, Blackburn Jean-Pierre, Cannon Lawrence, Clement Tony, Day Stockwell, Emerson David, Finley Diane, Flaherty Jim, Fortier Michael]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C3036

Note that respondents were only asked two knowledge questions.

Question Text (C3036\_1): Name the cameras of the Congress.  
 [Correct Answer: Camara dos Deputados, Senado]

Question Text (C3036\_2): For how long does a deputy in general stay in office? [Correct Answer: For four years]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Who was the Croatian prime minister before Ivo Sanader, from 2000. to 2003.?  
 [Correct Answer: Iвица Račan]

Question Text (C3036\_2): For how many years is the Croatian president elected? [Correct Answer: for 5 years]

Question Text (C3036\_3): What is the legal electoral threshold in Croatia, i.e. how many percentage a party must get in the constituency in order to be counted for distribution of seats? [Correct Answer: 5%]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Was current President Vaclav Klaus elected based on the vote of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate? [Correct Answer: True]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Does the EU have 25 member states? [Correct Answer: True]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Is the Chamber of Deputies elected based on proportional representation or the majoritarian system? [Correct Answer: PR]

Note that there are relatively high proportions of respondents who answer "Don't know". This may be due to the Czech question text explicitly not insisting on an answer if the respondents were unsure.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C3036

Note that respondents were asked that if they don't know the answer they should not guess but answer don't know.

Question Text (C3036\_1): Was current President Vaclav Klaus elected based on the vote of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate? [Correct Answer: True]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Is the Chamber of Deputies elected based on proportional representation or majoritarian system?

[Correct Answer: PR]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Does the EU have 25 member states? [Correct Answer: FALSE]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Which parties does the current government consist of? [Correct answer: Konservative Folkeparti and Venstre]

Question Text (C3036\_2): How many members are there in parliament, when you don't count the four members from Greenland and Faroe Islands? [Correct answer: 175]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Which of the following public expenses do you think is biggest: Expenses to primary schools, expenses to old age pension, or to the defense? [Correct answer: Expenses to old age pension]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): According to your knowledge, how many members are in the Estonian parliament? [Correct answer: 101]

Question Text (C3036\_2): According to your knowledge, who is the

=====

president of the Bank of Estonia?

[Correct answer: Andres Lipstok]

Question Text (C3036\_3): According to your knowledge, in which  
What year did Estonia join the European Union?

[Correct answer: 2004]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question Text (C3036\_1): Who is eligible to vote in Finnish  
parliamentary elections?

[Correct Answer: All adult citizens of Finland]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Which of the following parties has the  
second largest number of seats in the newly elected Parliament?

[Correct Answer: National Coalition Party (KOK)]

Question Text (C3036\_3): What in your opinion does a  
parliamentary system of government mean?

[Correct Answer: That the government is dependent on the  
confidence of the parliament]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011) C3036\_1- C3036\_3

Question text (C3036\_1): Who of the following was the Finnish  
Foreign Minister in 2010? Erkki Tuomioja / Astrid Thors / Olli  
Rehn / 4 Alexander Stubb?

[Correct Answer: Alexander Stubb]

Question text (C3036\_2): Who is entitled to vote in Finnish  
parliamentary elections? Over 18 year old Finnish citizens  
living in Finland / Over 18 year old Fin. citizens regardless of  
country of residence / Besides Finns, over 18 year old EU  
citizens living in Finland / Over 18 Fin citizens who haven't  
lost the right due to crime?

[Correct Answer: Over 18 year old Fin. citizens regardless of  
country of residence]

Question text (C3036\_3): What is the European Union (EU) treaty  
that came into force at the end of the year 2009 called?

Geneva Convention / Schengen Agreement / Lisbon Treaty /  
Maastricht Treaty

[Correct Answer: Lisbon Treaty]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007) C3036\_1- C3036\_3

Question text (C3036\_1): "President has the right to dissolve  
national assembly." [Correct Answer: True.]

Question text (C3036\_2): "The deputies are elected by  
proportional representation." [Correct Answer: False.]

Question text (C3036\_3): "Michelle Alliot Marie is the president  
of RPR." [Correct Answer: True.]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): The election campaign, among other  
things, proposed to introduce a new citizens' insurance scheme  
for the health insurance, in which all citizens, including  
self-employed and civil servants pay for it. Can you tell me  
which party made this proposal? [Correct Answer: SPD]

Question Text (C3036\_2): It was also suggested that the labor  
market reforms - the so-called Hartz IV Reformen - should be  
canceled. Can you tell me which made this proposal?

[Correct Answer: Left.PDS]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Furthermore, it was suggested to cancel  
the escape of nuclear power. Can you tell me which party made

| this proposal? [Correct Answer: Left.PDS]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): We would like to know the actual threshold a party has to reach to achieve seats in the national parliament. [Correct answer: 5 percent]

Question Text (C3036\_2): For the parliament election of Germany, each voter has two votes. Could you please tell us, which of these two votes is crucial for the distribution of seats within the parliament? [Correct answer: second vote]

Question Text (C3036\_3): In which election are European citizens that do not have the German citizenship allowed to vote? [Correct answer: communal election]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Could you tell me how many parties are represented in parliament today? [Correct Answer: 5 parties]

Question Text (C3036\_2): How many years does one term of the President of the Republic last? [Correct Answer: 5 years]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Based on the current electoral law, what percentage of votes constitutes the threshold for entry of a political party into parliament? [Correct Answer: 3%]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): Correct or incorrect: Currently, the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong SAR is elected by a 800-member Election Committee. [Correct answer: The statement is correct].

Question text (C3036\_2): Correct or incorrect: Currently, the geographical constituency elections of LegCo Elections adopt the proportional representation system. [Correct answer: The statement is correct].

Question text (C3036\_3): Correct or incorrect: The terms of office of the Chief Executive and Legislative Council members in Hong Kong SAR both last for four years. [Correct answer: The statement is not correct].

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Do you know in what party Jónína Bjartmarz is? [Correct answer: Progressive Party]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Can you tell me who is the vice-chairman of the Independence Party? [Correct answer: Þorgerður Katrín Gunnarsdóttir]

Question Text (C3036\_3): And can you tell me how many electoral districts are in Iceland? [Correct answer: Six]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Do you know in what party Kolbrún Halldórsdóttir is? [Correct answer: Left Green Movement]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Can you tell me who is the vice-chairman of the Independence Party? [Correct answer: Þorgerður Katrín Gunnarsdóttir]

Question Text (C3036\_3): And can you tell me how many electoral districts are in Iceland? [Correct answer: Six]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): Who was the Minister for Finance at the time when the last Dail was dissolved? [Correct answer: Brian Cowen].

Question text (C3036\_2): Which Government Department received the most money in last year's budget? [Correct answer: Social Welfare].

Question text (C3036\_3): Which was the first party to announce that it would cut the standard rate of tax in the 2007 campaign? [Correct answer: Labour].

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): "To the best of your knowledge, which party got weaker in the 2006 elections? [Correct answer: Likud]

Question text (C3036\_2): "To the best of your knowledge, who is the Knesset's chairman? (Correct answer: Dalia Itzik]

Question text (C3036\_3): "To the best of your knowledge, what percentage of the government's budget is allotted to security? [Correct answer: between 10% - 40%]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Who is eligible for the Japanese prime minister?

- 1 the person who is the member of the lower house (the House of Representatives) only
- 2 the person who is the member of the lower house (the House of Representatives) or the upper house (The House of Cancellors)
- 3 every voter

[Correct Answer: 2.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Which is the requirement to have the initiative for proposing constitutional amendments?

- 1 more than two-thirds approval of the all members at the both house
- 2 more than majority approval of the all members at the both house
- 3 more than two-thirds approval of the attending members at both houses
- 4 more than majority approval of the attending members at the both house

[Correct Answer: 1.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Which is the name of the current electoral system of the lower house in Japan?

- 1 "chu-senkyoku-sei "
- 2 "shou-senkyoku-hi rei -dai hyo-hei you-sei "
- 3 "shou-senkyoku-hi rei -dai hyo-hei ri tsu-sei "

[Correct Answer: 3. - Japan has changed the electoral system in 1994, and the earliest election under the new system was 1996]

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): "Who is the current Latvian President?" [correct answer: Valdis Zatlers]

Question text (C3036\_2): "When was the Latvian Republic established?" [Correct answer: 1918]

=====

Question text (C3036\_3): "What is the name of the electoral system which is used in the election of the members of parliament? [correct answer: proportional (electoral) system]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): "Which are the chambers of Mexico's Congress?" [Correct answer: Deputies and Senators.]

Question text (C3036\_2): "Could you tell me the name of the governor of your state?" [The interviewer had a list of state-governors' names and classify the answer as correct or incorrect, directly]

Question text (C3036\_3): "On the whole, how many years does a Deputy stay on his charge?" [Correct answer: Three years.]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): "Could you tell me the name of the governor of your state?" [The interviewer had a list of state-governors' names and classify the answer as correct or incorrect, directly]

Question text (C3036\_2): "On the whole, how many years does a Deputy stay on his charge?" [Correct answer: Three years]

Question text (C3036\_3): "Which are the chambers of Mexico's Congress?" [Correct answer: Deputies and Senators]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C3036

The Dutch respondents were shown photographs of politicians and asked for their name, the party, and the function. In C3036, those respondents who provided correct answers to all three sub-questions were coded as providing the correct answers. Note that the political knowledge questions were part of the first wave, i.e. pre-election, survey.

Question Text (C3036\_1): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name; the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 1; Wouter Bos; PvdA; party leader.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name; the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 2; Rita Verdonk; VVD; minister.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name; the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 3; Maxime Verhagen; CDA; MP, leader of party group.]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C3036

The Dutch respondents were shown photographs of politicians and asked for their name, the party, and the function. In C3036, those respondents who provided correct answers to all three sub-questions were coded as providing the correct answers. Note that the political knowledge questions were part of the first wave, i.e. pre-election, survey.

Question Text (C3036\_1): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name; the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 1; Alexander Pechtold; D66; party leader.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name;



the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 2; Camiel Eurlings; CDA; minister.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): "I will now show you photographs of politicians. Could you tell me for each person the name; the party; and the function?" [Correct answer: Photo 3; Gerdi Verbeet; PvdA; MP, Speaker.]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question text (C3036\_1): For the MMP electoral system, party votes are used to allocate seats in parliament for all parties that cross the threshold.  
Can you recall which of the following a party has to do in order to cross that threshold? Win 5% of all party votes OR win at least one electorate? [Correct answer: True].

Question text (C3036\_2): The term of Parliament is four years. [Correct answer: False]

Question text (C3036\_3): It is not necessary to be a New Zealand citizen to be eligible to vote in New Zealand? [Correct answer: True]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question C3036\_1 is a "double" question. If the respondent is correct on both, it was registered as a correct answer. If the respondents only responds one of them correct, it is registered as incorrect. The same holds for incorrect answering on both.

Question text (C3036\_1): "Do you recall who the Minister of Modernization was the last year before the election?" [Correct Answer: Morten A. Meyer]

Question text (C3036\_2): "Six national referendums have been conducted in Norway. Do you happen to know when the last of them was, and what it was about?" [Correct Answer: 1994, EU-referendum]

Question text (C3036\_3): "Do you happen to know how many representatives there are on the Storting? [Correct Answer: 169]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C3036

Note that correct response on all three Norwegian knowledge items includes multiple answers. Response was defined as a correct answer if all appropriate items have been mentioned.

Question Text (C3036\_1): Do you happen to know which parties have been in government in the last election period? [Correct Answer: Labor Party, Social Left Party and Centre Party]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Do you know who was minister of transport in the last year before the election, and which party the person in question represent? [Correct Answer: Liv Signe Navarsete and Centre Party]

Question Text (C3036\_3): In recent years there has been disagreement about the development of new fields of oil and gas exploration on the Norwegian continental shelf. Can you say which two areas that have been particularly controversial? [Correct Answer: Lofoten and Vesteraalen]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C3003\_1-C3003\_2

Question Text (C3036\_1): Who is the current president of Ecuador? [Correct answer: Rafael Correa].

=====

Question Text (C3036\_2): What public position does Magdalena Chu currently occupy? [Correct answer: Head of the National Office of Electoral Processes (ONPE)].

Question Text (C3036\_3): In what year was the current Constitution of Peru enacted? [Correct answer: 1993].

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): What is minimum voting age requirement? [Correct Answer: 18 years.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): And how many years, in your knowledge, is a Senator's term of office? [Correct Answer: 6 years.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Who, based on your knowledge, has the final responsibility to decide if a law is constitutional or not? Is it the President, the Congress, or the Supreme Court? [Correct Answer: the Supreme Court.]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question text (C3036\_1): "A proposal about introducing linear tax was mentioned during the electoral campaign. Which party proposed such a solution? [Correct Answer: PO]

Question text (C3036\_2): "Which party wants to change state regime by strengthening the position of the president?" [Correct answer: PiS, Samoobrona]

Question text (C3036\_3): "Which party wants to transfer the majority of the foreign exchange reserves to the state budget to help the economy? [Correct answer: Samoobrona]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question Text (C3036\_1): To which military alliance Poland belongs?  
Answer categories: 1) Warsaw Pact; 2) ASEAN; 3) Visegrád Group; 4) NATO; 5) Weimar Triangle; 6) ANZUS; 7) Hard to say.  
[Correct Answer: NATO]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Who is currently the Chancellor of Germany?  
Answer categories: 1) Helmut Kohl; 2) Gerhard Schroeder; 3) Angela Merkel; 4) Hans Dietrich-Genscher; 5) Edmund Stoiber; 6) Konrad Adenauer; 7) Hard to say.  
[Correct Answer: Angela Merkel]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Which institutional body is established in Poland to resolve disputes on the constitutionality of the acts of Parliament?  
Answer categories: 1) the High Court; 2) the State Tribunal; 3) the Supreme Administrative Court; 4) the General Prosecutor's Office; 5) The Constitutional Tribunal; 6) Minister of Justice; 7) hard to say.  
[Correct Answer: The Constitutional Tribunal]

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Do you remember, which was the most voted party of the 2005 legislative election? [Correct Answer: Partido Socialista (PS)]

Question Text (C3036\_2): How many countries are parts of the European Union? [Correct Answer: 27]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Do you remember who the prime minister before Jose Socrates was? [Correct Answer: Pedro Santana Lopes]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C3036\_

Question Text (C3036\_1): In Romania, polling stations close at 9 PM. [Correct Answer: True.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): According to the Romanian legislation, electoral campaigns start 30 days before the election day. [Correct Answer: True.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): EU countries have an equal number of members in the European Parliament. [Correct Answer: False.]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): In your opinion, is the number of MPs in the National Parliament 200? (Only one response) [Correct Answer: No (150 members)]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Who was the speaker of the National Parliament until this June election? [Correct Answer: Pavol Paska]

Question Text (C3036\_3): The European Union currently consists of 25 member states? [Correct Answer: No (27 member states)]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C3036

Initial question text: "We would now like to know to what degree South Africans are familiar with certain public figures. For example, do you remember the name of the ..."

Question Text (C3036\_1): Deputy President? [Correct Answer: Kgalema Motlanthe.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Leader of COSATU? [Correct Answer: Zwelinzima Vavi.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Speaker of Parliament? [Correct Answer: Pravin Gordhan.]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): Which party is the governing party currently? [Correct Answer: Grand National Party]

Question Text (C3036\_2): How long does the President stay in office once elected? [Correct Answer: five years]

Question Text (C3036\_3): What is the name of the current Prime Minister? [Correct Answer: Seung-Su]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question Text (C3036\_1): In this list of persons I will read out now, could you tell me for each of them if you know of her/him or not? [Correct Answer: NOT APPLICABLE]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Do you remember what PP voted in each of the two votes regarding the parliamentary election of Rodríguez Zapatero as President of the Government of Spain? [Correct Answer: Against]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Do you know what is the interest rate that you are paying to your financial institution for postponing payments with your credit card? [Correct Answer is not available, yet]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C3036

Question Text (C3036\_1): On this card there are a number of statements. Could you say whether each of them is true or false. If you are not certain of the answer, you may say that you do not know whether the statement is true or false.

The Swedish parliament has 349 members.

[Correct Answer: CORRECT]

Question Text (C3036\_2): On this card there are a number of statements. Could you say whether each of them is true or false. If you are not certain of the answer, you may say that you do not know whether the statement is true or false.

During the 2002 - 2006 election period, Sweden had a single party Social Democratic government.

[Correct Answer: CORRECT]

Question Text (C3036\_3): Here is a list with names of different persons. Could you tell me which party each of them belongs to?

[Correct Answer: NOT APPLICABLE]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): What's the name of the current president of the Federal Council? [Correct answer: Micheline Calmy-Rey]

Question text (C3036\_2): How many parties are in the Federal Council? [Correct answer: 4]

Question text (C3036\_3): How many signatures do you need for a people's initiative at the federal level?

[Correct answer: 100,000]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C3036\_1-C3036\_3

Question text (C3036\_1): Who is the current president of the United States? [Correct answer: George W. Bush]

Question text (C3036\_2): Who is the current premier of our country? [Correct answer: Chao-Shiuan Liu]

Question text (C3036\_3): What institution has the power to interpret the constitution? [Correct answer: Grand Justices Council]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C3036

Question text (C3036\_1): How many MPs are required under the New Constitution? [Correct answer: 480 MPs]

Question text (C3036\_2): How many cluster (districts) are there under the proportional election system? [Correct answer: 8]

Question text (C3036\_3): Which cluster (district) number are you in (in MPs election)? [Correct answer depends on the place of residence of the current respondent, e.g. if the respondent is in Tak province, then he or she has to answer 1 to be correct.]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C3036

The US questionnaire asked respondents about the current political position of different persons. The initial question text was: What job or political office does [...] now hold?.

Question Text (C3036\_1): Dick Cheney

[Correct Answer: Vice president of the United States.]

Question Text (C3036\_2): Nancy Pelosi

[Correct Answer: Speaker of the House of Representatives.]

Question Text (C3036\_3): John Roberts  
 [Correct Answer: U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice.]

))) CSES MODULE 3 DISTRICT-LEVEL VARIABLES

NOTES:

(1) All variables in this section pertain to the first segment of the lower house. In elections in which the lower house was not elected, no data are reported here.

(2) Respondents' electoral districts are reported in C2031, with labels listed in Appendix II.

(3) According to the different types of elections, included in the current CSES release, the following table gives an overview of the election, district variables C4001 to C4005 refer to. For further information and restrictions, researchers are appealed to have a closer look at the country specific notes for each of the variables.

Table: Summary of Type of Election District Variables refers to.

	President	Lower House	Upper House
POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)			
AUSTRALIA (2007)		X	
AUSTRIA (2008)		X	
BELARUS (2008)		X	
BRAZIL (2006)		X	
BRAZIL (2010)		X	
CANADA (2008)		X	
CHILE (2009)	-	X	-
CROATIA (2007)		X	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)		X	
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)		X	
DENMARK (2007)		X	
ESTONIA (2011)		X	
FINLAND (2007)		X	
FINLAND (2011)		X	
FRANCE (2007)		X	
GERMANY (2005)		X	
GERMANY (2009)		X	
GREECE (2009)		X	
HONG KONG (2008)		X	
ICELAND (2007)		X	
ICELAND (2009)		X	
IRELAND (2007)		X	
ISRAEL (2006)		X	
JAPAN (2007)			X
LATVIA (2010)		X	
MEXICO (2006)		X	
MEXICO (2009)		X	
NETHERLANDS (2006)		X	
NETHERLANDS (2010)		X	
NEW ZEALAND (2008)		X	
NORWAY (2005)		X	
NORWAY (2005)		X	
PERU (2011)	X		
PHILIPPINES (2010)	-	-	-
POLAND (2005)		X	
POLAND (2007)		X	
PORTUGAL (2009)		X	
ROMANIA (2009)	X		
SLOVAKIA (2010)		X	

SLOVENIA (2008)		X	
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)		X	
SOUTH KOREA (2008)		X	
SPAIN (2008)		X	
SWEDEN (2006)		X	
SWITZERLAND (2007)		X	
TAIWAN (2008)	X		
THAILAND (2007)	-	-	-
TURKEY (2011)		X	
UNITED STATES (2008)	X		
URUGUAY (2009)		X	

Table: Summary of Used Sources on Election District Variables.  
[For more details on sources see CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION].

POLITY NAME (ELEC YEAR)	SOURCE
AUSTRALIA (2007)	Australian Election Commission
AUSTRIA (2008)	Bundesministerium für Inneres
BELARUS (2008)	Central Commission of the Republic of Belarus
BRAZIL (2006)	Tribunal Superior Electoral
BRAZIL (2010)	Tribunal Superior Electoral
CROATIA (2007)	Election Resources on the Internet
CANADA (2008)	Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive
	Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive
	Election Canada (for C4002)
CHILE (2009)	Servicio Electoral Republica de Chile
CZECH REPUBLIC (2006)	Czech Statistical Office
CZECH REPUBLIC (2010)	Czech Statistical Office
DENMARK (2007)	Statistical Office of Denmark
ESTONIA (2011)	Estonian National Electoral Committee
FINLAND (2007)	Finnish Ministry of Justice
FINLAND (2011)	Finnish Ministry of Justice
FRANCE (2007)	French Electoral Commission
GERMANY (2005)	The Federal Returning Officer
GERMANY (2009)	The Federal Returning Officer
GREECE (2009)	Hellenic Ministry of Interior
HONG KONG (2008)	Chief Electoral Officer of Hong Kong /
	Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive
ICELAND (2007)	NSD European Election Database
ICELAND (2009)	NSD European Election Database
IRELAND (2007)	General Election for the National
	Parliament of the Republic of
	Ireland 2007
ISRAEL (2006)	The Knesset
JAPAN (2007)	Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive
LATVIA (2010)	Central Elections Commission
MEXICO (2006)	Mexican Institute of Federal Elections
MEXICO (2009)	Mexican Institute of Federal Elections
NETHERLANDS (2006)	The Dutch Parliamentary Electoral
	Studies website
NETHERLANDS (2010)	The Dutch Parliamentary Electoral
	Studies website
NEW ZEALAND (2008)	New Zealand elections website
NORWAY (2005)	Statistics Norway
NORWAY (2009)	Statistics Norway
PERU (2011)	Oficina Nacional de Procesos
	Electoral
PHILIPPINES (2010)	- (presidential election)
POLAND (2005)	National Election Commission of Poland
	2005
POLAND (2007)	National Election Commission of Poland
	2007
PORTUGAL (2009)	Portuguese Minister of Interior
ROMANIA (2009)	- (presidential election)
SLOVAKIA (2010)	Statistical Office of the Slovak
	Republic

SLOVENIA (2008)	National Electoral Commission, Republic of Slovenia
SOUTH AFRICA (2009)	Electoral Commission of South Africa
SOUTH KOREA (2008)	National Election Commission of the Republic of Korea
SPAIN (2008)	Spanish Minister of Interior
SWEDEN (2006)	Valmyndigheten
SWITZERLAND (2007)	Federal Statistical Office of Switzerland
TAIWAN (2008)	Central Level Public Officials Election Result by Party Votes
THA (2007)	The Announcement of the Election Commission of Thailand.
TURKEY (2011)	Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive
UNITED STATES (2008)	Statistics of the Presidential and Congressional Election of November 4, 2008
URUGUAY (2009)	Electoral Court of Uruguay

-----  
C4001 >>> NUMBER OF SEATS IN DISTRICT  
-----

This variable reports the number of seats contested in each district of the first segment of the lower house of the legislature.

001-900. NUMBER OF SEATS CONTESTED IN ELECTORAL DISTRICT

999. MISSING

NOTES: C4001

Data are not available for PERU (2011), PHILIPPINES (2010), ROMANIA (2009), TAIWAN (2008), URUGUAY (2009).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C4001

Note that the electoral districts are sub districts within regions or bigger communities. The number of seats in district is thus very small and sometimes no seat is won.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C4001

Due to the cumulative coding of the electoral districts in C2031, respondents' districts in Tallinn City (districts 1, 2 & 3) are not distinguishable. Hence, seats in the three electoral districts of Tallinn City are missing.

Number of seats in the three districts of Tallinn City:

District 1:	Haabersti, Kristiine, Põhja-Tallinn	09
District 2:	Kesklinn, Lasnamäe, Pirita	11
District 3:	Mustamäe, Nõmme	08

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C4001

Note that C4001 reflects the seats in the 56 single- or multi-member district, 288 seats in total. In contrast, the remaining 12 seats of the Hellenic parliament originate from a single multi-member nationwide constituency for the State Deputies, which are not listed here.  
See also notes on C2031.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C4001-C4005

In Israel, the entire country functions as a single electoral district. Hence, figures entered in these variables correspond

| to the national election results.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C4001

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C4001

| The variable refers to the 300 single-member plurality districts.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4001

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C4001

| In The Netherlands, the entire country functions as a single electoral district. Hence, figures entered in these variables correspond to the national election results.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C4001

| See notes on C2031.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C4001

| Slovakia has only one nationwide district. Consequently, the data reported on district results are quite similar to the national results of the macro-section.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C4001

| Note, at the time of the first data release, labels for the Thai districts on C2031 were not available. (See also variable notes on C2031).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C4001

| Note that C4001 reports the number of electoral colleges, instead of the number of contested seats.

---

C4002      >>> NUMBER OF CANDIDATES IN DISTRICT

---

This variable reports the number of candidates who contested seats in each district. These data are reported for systems in which electors vote for candidates directly as well as for systems in which electors may cast a preference ballot (i.e., where a voter can indicate a candidate from a party list, in addition to casting a ballot for a party list).

0001-9000. NUMBER OF CANDIDATES WHO CONTESTED THE  
ELECTION IN THIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT

9999. MISSING

0000. NOT APPLICABLE

| NOTES: C4002

| Data are not available for AUSTRIA (2008), BELARUS (2008), CHILE (2009), CROATIA (2007), CZECH REPUBLIC (2006), CZECH REPUBLIC (2010), GERMANY (2005), MEXICO (2006), MEXICO (2009), NORWAY (2009), PERU (2011), PHILIPPINES (2010), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), SWEDEN (2006), TAIWAN (2008), THAILAND (2007), TURKEY (2011), URUGUAY (2009).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C4002

| Due to the cumulative coding of the electoral districts in C2031, respondents' districts in Tallinn City (districts 1,



2 & 3) are not distinguishable. Hence, C4002 is missing for these three electoral districts of Tallinn City.

Number of candidates in the three districts of Tallinn City:

District 1:	Haabersti, Kristiine, Põhja-Tallinn	68
District 2:	Kesklinn, Lasnamäe, Pirita	82
District 3:	Mustamäe, Nõmme	62

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C4002

This variable is coded "0000. Not Applicable", because the entire country is a single electoral district and voters vote for party lists, not candidates. The actual vote choice of voters is represented by party lists.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4002

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4002

This variable is coded "0000. Not Applicable", because the entire country is a single electoral district and voters vote for party lists, not candidates. The actual vote choice of voters is represented by party lists.

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C4002

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C4002

District variables reflect information for the Lower House election. Because of voting on the bases of party lists, this variable is not applicable for the Polish Lower House election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C4002

Slovakia has only one nationwide district. Consequently, the data reported on district results are quite similar to the national results of the macro-section.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C4002

Note, at the time of the first data release, labels for the Thai districts on C2031 were not available. (See also variable notes on C2031).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C4002

Note that C4002 reports the number of candidates in the federal state instead of in respondent's electoral district. To obtain the federal states, in use of C2031, users of the CSES have to delete the last two digits of C2031 (see also C2027).

#### C4003 >>> NUMBER OF PARTY LISTS IN DISTRICT

This variable reports the number of parties that presented lists and, thereby, contested seats in the district. These data are reported for those systems in which electors cast ballots for party lists.

001-900. NUMBER OF PARTIES THAT PRESENTED A LIST OF CANDIDATES IN THE ELECTION IN THIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT

999. MISSING

000. NOT APPLICABLE

## NOTES: C4003

Data are not available for AUSTRALIA (2007), BELARUS (2008), CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), FRANCE (2007), ICELAND (2007), ICELAND (2009), JAPAN (2007), NORWAY (2005), PHILIPPINES (2010), ROMANIA (2009), SWEDEN (2006), TAIWAN (2008), THAILAND (2007), URUGUAY (2009).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C4003

The problem of cumulative coding of the electoral districts of Tallinn City (districts 1, 2 & 3) does not cause any problems in C4003, due to an equal number of contesting parties in all electoral districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C4003

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C4003

According to the German electoral system, candidates are voted at the district level, while party lists are voted at the level of federal states (Laender). This variable is therefore coded '000. NOT APPLICABLE'.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C4003

Note that C4003 does not report the number of parties contesting within each electoral district, but the amount of parties, which gained at least one vote, according to the database of the Hellenic Ministry of Interior.  
See also notes on C2031.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C4003

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4003

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C4003

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C4003

See notes on C2031.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C4003

Slovakia has only one nationwide district. Consequently, the data reported on district results are quite similar to the national results of the macro- section.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C4003

Note, at the time of the first data release, labels for the Thai districts on C2031 were not available. (See also variable notes on C2031).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C4003

Note that C4003 reflects the number of major parties in each electoral district. Smaller parties were coded as "others" and taken into account only once.

```
-----
C4004_A >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY A
C4004_B >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY B
C4004_C >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY C
C4004_D >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY D
C4004_E >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY E
```

```

C4004_F >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY F
C4004_G >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY G
C4004_H >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY H
C4004_I >>> PERCENT VOTE IN DISTRICT - PARTY I

```

This variable reports the proportion of votes cast in favor of party [A/B/C/D/E/F] in this district. In majoritarian systems, in which more than one round of elections are held, this variable reports the proportion of the popular vote cast in favor of party [A/B/C/D/E/F] in the FIRST round.

000.00-100.00 PERCENT (0.00% TO 100.00%) OF THE VALID  
BALLOTS CAST IN THIS DISTRICT THAT WERE  
CAST IN FAVOR OF PARTY [A/B/C/D/E/F]

999.00. MISSING

NOTES: C4004

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

Data are not available for BELARUS (2008), PHILIPPINES (2010), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), THAILAND (2007).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C4004\_A-C4004\_E

Note that party C, the Bloc Québécois, only contests in the province of Quebec (see C2027).  
Parties not contesting in any of the electoral districts are coded as missing values (code 999.00) in C4004\_.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C4004\_D

In contrast to the general coding of the Croatian parties C4004\_D includes the results for the election coalition of Hrvatska seljacka stranka (HSS) and Hrvatska socijalno liberalna stranka (HSLs).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C4004\_D-C4004\_G

In the 2007 parliament election Hrvatska seljacka stranka (HSS) and Hrvatska socijalno liberalna stranka (HSLs) ran a coalition together. While the micro questionnaire asked for the two parties separately, district results are only available for the joint coalition. Its results had been coded to C4004\_D, while C4004\_G was defined as a missing value.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C4004\_A-C4004\_F

Due to the cumulative coding of the electoral districts in C2031, respondents' districts in Tallinn City (districts 1, 2 & 3) are not distinguishable. Hence, C4004\_A to C4004\_F base on the cumulated votes for each single party within the three districts, divided by the absolute amount of active voters:

Party	DISTRICT 1		DISTRICT 2		DISTRICT 3		Total	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%
C4004_A	12396	23.5	15468	21.8	16309	32.3	44173	25.4
C4004_B	17072	32.4	28440	40.0	12796	25.3	58308	33.5
C4004_C	10984	20.8	12337	17.4	10188	20.2	33509	19.2
C4004_D	7210	13.7	7870	11.1	7648	15.1	22728	13.0
C4004_E	324	0.6	392	0.6	237	0.5	953	0.6
C4004_F	1128	2.1	2782	3.9	1564	3.1	5474	3.1
Others	3608	6.8	3784	5.3	1740	3.4	9132	5.2
Total	52722		71073		50482		174277	

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007) C4004

Percentage votes for each party reported only for the first round of the elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C4004

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C4004

German voters got two votes for the election of the national Lower House, the first one to vote for a candidate within each district, and the second vote for the party list at the level of the federal states (the so called Bundeslaender). While the first vote equals the conditions of pluralism, the second vote gives the overall distribution of the Lower House. The given "percent vote in district by parties A to I", reflects the first vote.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C4004\_A

The CDU, mentioned in C4004\_A is not eligible for election in Bavaria (districts 213 to 257) and is consequently defined as a missing value for these districts (see also remarks on C4004\_F).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C4004\_F

The CSU, mentioned in C4004\_F is only eligible for election in Bavaria (districts 213 to 257) and is consequently defined as a missing value in all other districts (see also remarks on C4004\_A).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C4004\_G

C4004\_G reports the district results for the National Democratic Party (NPD), which was not included in the micro-questionnaire (see remarks on C3009, C3010, C3011, and C3012).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C4004\_

See notes on C2031.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C4004

Reported are the percentages of the 1st preferences of the preference vote, parties A-F.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C4004

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C4004\_A-C4004\_H

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C4004\_A-C4004\_H

These variables refer to the 300 single-member plurality districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C4004\_B, C4004\_E, C4004\_F

These entries refer to the election result of the Coalition for the Good of All (Parties B, E and F - PRD, PT and Convergencia, respectively).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C4004\_C / C4004\_D

These entries refer to the election result of the coalition Alliance for Mexico (Parties C and D - PRI and Mexican Green Ecological Party (PVEM)).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4004

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C4004

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C4004

Although party D "New Zealand First" was positioned fourth in the votes for party list, its vote is not listed in the official documents since the party did not enter parliament due to failing to meet either threshold for gaining seats - 5 per cent of the party vote or one or more electorate/constituency seats.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C4004

District results for the 2005 elections were not available. As an approximation, the results of 2009 had been used and cleaned up by gains/losses of each party.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C4004\_A-C4004\_D

See Election Study Notes on C2031.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C4004\_A-C4004\_H

Slovakia has only one nationwide district. Consequently, the data reported on district results are quite similar to the national results of the macro- section.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C4004\_H

Note that the Canarian Coalition (CC-PNC) was only available at Gran Canaria (district 35: 6.19%) and Santa Cruz de Tenerife (district 38: 39.35%).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C4004

Note, at the time of the first data release, labels for the Thai districts on C2031 were not available. (See also variable notes on C2031).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C4004

Note that district results were available only for the three major parties, i.e. AKP, CHP and MHP. The variables C4004\_D through C4004\_I are coded as missing values.

Moreover, the Peace and Democracy Party (BDP - C4004\_D) did not run for election as an officially listed party. Instead, their members contested as independent candidates. Consequently, the BDP is not included as a party in the district data.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C4004\_

Note that several district results are coded as missing values (code 999.00) due to different reasons:

C4004\_A is missing for the electoral district codes 0619 and 4821 due to a marginal vote share for the Democrats.

C4004\_B is missing for the electoral district codes 0632 and 0637 due to a marginal vote share for the Republicans

C4004\_A & C4004\_B are missing for the electoral district codes 1203 and 2205 due to not available information.

### C4005 >>> TURNOUT IN DISTRICT

This variable reports official voter turnout in each district.

## 001.00-100.00 PERCENT OF VOTER TURNOUT BY DISTRICT

999.00. MISSING

## NOTES: C4005

Please note: official turnout figures are calculated using different formulas. For instance, the denominator sometimes includes the total number of the voting age population, while other times it is the total number of registered voters.

Data are not available for CANADA (2008), CHILE (2009), LATVIA (2010), NORWAY (2005), PHILIPPINES (2010), ROMANIA (2009), SOUTH KOREA (2008), TAIWAN (2008), THAILAND (2007), UNITED STATES (2008).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C4005

Due to the cumulative coding of the electoral districts in C2031, respondents' districts in Tallinn City (districts 1, 2 & 3) are not distinguishable. Instead, C4005 reports the overall turnout for the three districts of Tallinn City, based on the amount of voters within these districts:

	eligible Voters	active Voters	Turnout
DISTRICT 1	76,189	53,136	69.74%
DISTRICT 2	104,478	71,406	68.35%
DISTRICT 3	69,816	50,823	72.80%
Total Voters	250,483	175,365	70.01%

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007) C4005

Figures report turnout from registered population in each electoral district in the first round.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C4005

German voters got two votes for the election of the national Lower House, the first one to vote for a candidate within each district, and the second vote for the party list at the level of the federal states (the so called Bundeslaender). While the first vote equals the conditions of pluralism, the second vote gives the overall distribution of the Lower House. The given "turnout in district by parties A to I", reflects the first vote.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C4005

See Election Study Notes on C2031.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C4005

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C4005

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C4005

The variable refers to the 300 single-member plurality districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C4005

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C4005

See Election Study Notes for C4001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C4005

For New Zealand turnout report includes only valid votes. If you would like to see the percentages for invalid votes and include those in turnout, we refer to the following website: [http://2008.electionresults.govt.nz/electionresults\\_2008/e9/html/e9\\_part9\\_1.html](http://2008.electionresults.govt.nz/electionresults_2008/e9/html/e9_part9_1.html) (website last checked on 07/12/2010).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C4005

Note that the Norwegian electoral system allows voting in advance. In contrast, C4005 reports the turnout at the polling station, exclusively.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C4005

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C4005

District variables reflect information for the Lower House election.

See Election Study Notes on C2031.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C4005

Slovakia has only one nationwide district. Consequently, the data reported on district results are quite similar to the national results of the macro- section.

In the case of C4005, researchers should note that the turnout reported C4005 differs from C5006\_1. While the later one includes envelopes sent from abroad, the current variable is based on the vote share within the country.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C4005

Information on turnout is only available on the Internet, on a website in Chinese. See: <http://db.cec.gov.tw/histQuery.jsp?voteCode=20080301P1A1&qryType=ctks&prvCode=00>

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C4005

Note, at the time of the first data release, labels for the Thai districts on C2031 were not available. (See also variable notes on C2031).

### ))) CSES MODULE 3 MACRO-LEVEL VARIABLES

#### I. DATA FROM THE MODULE 3 MACRO QUESTIONNAIRE

```

C5001_A >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5001_B >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5001_C >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5001_D >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5001_E >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5001_F >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5001_G >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5001_H >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5001_I >>> PERCENT VOTE - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY I

```

Percent of popular vote received by PARTY [A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I]  
in current (lower house) legislative election:

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF THE POPULAR VOTE THAT PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] RECEIVED

999.00. MISSING

NOTES: C5001-5009

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

All cases are coded missing if the election type (i.e. parliamentary) was not the focus of the election study. For example, all cases for Senate would be coded missing if the election was a presidential contest.

In case of electoral alliances/coalitions, returns of an alliance are entered for all its members.

For countries with mixed electoral systems (see C5058) the entries report the results from the segment containing the most seats. If there are an equal amount of seats in each segment the results come from the proportional representation segment.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5001

The entries represent the percentage of first preference votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5001

Please note that more than 85 percent of votes in the 2008 parliamentary election were allotted to independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5001\_D and C5001\_G

The entries refer to the combined election result obtained by the coalition Croatian Social Liberal Party (HSL) and Croatian Peasant Party (HSS). Despite the joint entries for percent vote, both parties hold separate seats in the legislative assembly, hence the entries in C5002\_D and C5002\_G refer to the seats they obtained separately.

In 4 electoral districts this alliance also includes the following regional parties:

Zagorska stranka (ZS) (Party of Zagorje)

Zagorska demokratska stranka (ZDS) (Democratic Party of Zagorje)

Primorsko-goranski savez (PGS) (Primorje Gorski kotar Alliance)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5001

These data report first round vote shares. These figures report first round election results.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5001

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5001

These data report the share of party list, or the "second" votes each party won nationally.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5001

The Legislative Council (LegCo) in Hong Kong is composed of 60 members, 30 of which are returned by geographical constituency elections and another 30 by functional constituency elections. These entries show the party vote of the geographical constituency part of the 2008 LegCo Elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5001

The July 29, 2007 elections were held to renew half of the House of Councillors, the upper house of Parliament. Thus lower house electoral results are not reported.



ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5001

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5001

The entries refer to the vote shares of the single member districts. Note that the results from the proportional representation lists are calculated using the national distribution of votes from the single member districts but excludes non valid votes, votes for parties that obtained less than 2% and votes for non-registered candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5001\_B/ C5001\_E/ C5001\_F

These entries refer to the election result of the Coalition for the Good of All (Parties B, E and F - PRD, PT and Convergencia, respectively).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5001\_C/ C5001\_D

These entries refer to the election result of the coalition Alliance for Mexico (Parties C and D - PRI and Mexican Green Ecological Party (PVEM)).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5001

These data report each party's share of the party vote for Parliament.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5001\_A

This entry represents vote returns of one of the members of the coalition that is coded as a single entity in presidential elections. This party is Liberal Party coalition (LP). The second member of this coalition is Nationalist People's Coalition (NPC), who won 15.9% of the votes for the House of Representatives.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5001

The 2009 contest only elected the president

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5001

These election results correspond to the proportional tier of the Parliament (the second segment). They reflect the nationwide proportion of votes cast for party lists. This data is provided since the results from single-member constituencies was not available. Notice that only 22% of the total amount of seats are allocated through the second segment.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5001

These election results correspond to the proportional tier of the Parliament (the second segment). They reflect nationwide proportion of votes cast for party lists, namely 80 seats out of 480 seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5001

The March 22, 2008 elections were held to elect the president of the Republic. Thus lower house electoral results are not reported.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5001\_D

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. We therefore have no way of separating the % vote for genuine independent candidates from those of the BDP.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5001

The Lower Chamber (Cámara de Representantes; House of Representatives) of the Uruguayan General Assembly consists of 99 members. Seats are assigned among parties in a single nationwide district, based on a proportional (d'Hondt) system. The system uses closed lists and Double Simultaneous Vote (DSV) in regional districts. DVS is the system by which the voter votes synchronously in a logical order: first by a party ("lema" or label or motto) and then a list of candidates ("lista" or list). There are two assignation levels: parties ("lemas") and lists (there are no "sublemas" as in the Senate votes). Voters cast a ballot with a "lema" and closed and blocked list. Votes by party ("lema") are counted in a single nationwide district by d'Hondt method, and this count determines the number of seats a party obtains. Votes by lists are counted by districts (following d'Hondt method), and this count determines the seat distribution within parties. Each party typically has several lists in each district. In order to contest the election, each electoral agent presents its own ballot (in the 2009 election there were 21 to 39 ballots by district). One electoral agent can be a party, a party fraction or a fraction of party fraction. Voters select one ballot (among these 21 to 39 ballots in each district, in the 2009 national election), and puts it in the ballot box. Ballot contains a presidential ticket, a closed list for Senate, and a closed list for the Lower Chamber. Each ballot must necessarily contain lists of a single party. Electors cast votes necessarily (for President and 2 chambers) for the same party. Hence, the elections results are basically identical for all three institutions - both houses of the Parliament, and for the President (first round). DVS is a mechanism which allows an intra-partisan contest at the time of the national election.

```
-----
C5002_A >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5002_B >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5002_C >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5002_D >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5002_E >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5002_F >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5002_G >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5002_H >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5002_I >>> PERCENT SEATS - LOWER HOUSE - PARTY I
-----
```

Percent of seats in lower house received by PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] in current (lower house) election:

```
.....
000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF THE SEATS THAT PARTY
                [A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] RECEIVED
999.00.          MISSING
```

NOTES: C5002

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

In case of electoral alliances/coalitions, returns of an alliance are entered for all its members.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5002

Please note that most seats in the 2008 Belarus parliamentary election were allotted to independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5002\_D / C5002\_G

Despite reporting combined voting results in C5001\_D and C5001\_G the entries in C5002\_D and C5002\_G refer to how many seats both parties hold independently.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5002  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5002

These data report the total number of seats allocated to each party after the election, resulting from both party list and candidate votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5002

Legislative Council (LegCo) in Hong Kong is composed of 60 members, 30 of which are returned by geographical constituency elections and another 30 by functional constituency elections. These entries show the party seat compositions of the geographical constituency part of the 2008 LegCo Elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5002

The July 29, 2007 elections were held to renew half of the House of Councillors, the upper house of Parliament. Thus lower house electoral results are not reported.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5002

These data report the total percentage of seats allocated to each party after the election, resulting from both party list and candidate votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5002\_A

This entry represents percent of the seats won by of one of the members of the coalition that is coded as a single entity in presidential elections. This party is Liberal Party coalition (LP). The second member of this coalition is Nationalist People's Coalition (NPC), who won 10.14% of the votes for the House of Representatives.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5002

These data report the total number of seats allocated to each party after the election, resulting from both party list and candidate votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5002

The March 22, 2008 elections were held to elect the president of the Republic. Thus lower house electoral results are not reported.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5002

See note for C5001.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5002\_D

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. The party has obtained 35 seats this way.

-----  
C5003\_A >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY A  
C5003\_B >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY B  
C5003\_C >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY C  
C5003\_D >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY D  
C5003\_E >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY E

```

=====
C5003_F >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5003_G >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5003_H >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5003_I >>> PERCENT VOTE - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY I
=====

```

Percent of popular vote received by PARTY [A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I]  
in current (upper house) legislative election:

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF THE POPULAR VOTE THAT PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] RECEIVED

999.00. MISSING

NOTES: C5003

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

In case of electoral alliances/coalitions, returns  
of an alliance are entered for all its members.

For countries with mixed electoral systems (see C5058) the  
entries report the results from the segment containing the most  
seats. If there are an equal amount of seats in each segment  
the results come from the proportional representation segment.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5003

The November 24th election was a half senate election whereby  
six senators were elected for each state (6 districts) and two  
for each Federal Territory (2 districts). The entries represent  
the percentage of first preference votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5003\_B / C5003\_C

These figures report the combined results for LP (Liberal Party  
of Australia) and LNP (Liberal-National Party - combined  
ticket).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5003\_A - C5003\_F

Senators are elected by simple majority for 8 year terms. Only  
part of the senate is renewed at each elections, two thirds in  
one elections and one third in the following election. In 2006,  
only one senator was elected for each state. Hence data for this  
variable represents percent vote for these 27 seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5003\_A - C5003\_F

The Brazilian Senate has 81 members, three for each state. The  
states elect two Senators each at one election, and one Senator  
each at the successive election, by simple majority for 8 year  
terms. 2010 was a two-Senator election, with each voter entitled  
to two votes. Since voters could cast two votes, the number of  
valid votes cast in each state can be up to twice the number of  
voters who cast votes. Hence data for this variable represents  
nominal percent vote for these 54 seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5003

The entries refer to the vote shares of the single member  
districts. Note that the results from the proportional  
representation lists are calculated using the national  
distribution of votes from the single member districts but  
excludes non-valid votes, votes for parties that obtained  
less than 2% and votes for non-registered candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5003\_B/ C5003\_E/ C5003\_F

These entries refer to the election result of the Coalition for the Good of All (Parties B, E and F - PRD, PT and Convergencia, respectively).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5003\_C/ C5003\_D

These entries refer to the election result of the coalition Alliance for Mexico (Parties C and D - PRI and Mexican Green Ecological Party (PVEM)).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5003

The 2009 contest only elected lower house members.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5003

The 2009 contest only elected the president

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5003

The Upper chamber (Cámara de Senadores; Senate) of the Uruguayan General Assembly consists of 31 members. Thirty members are elected by proportional representation (d'Hondt) in a single nationwide district, using closed list system and Triple Simultaneous Vote (TVS) mechanism. There is also one ex officio member - the Vice-President of the Republic (directly elected on ticket with President of the Republic).

In TVS the voter votes synchronously in a complex logical order: first by a party ("lema"), second by a fraction (called "sublema", means under-label or under-motto) and then by a closed and blocked list.

In TVS the votes are counted (and seats are distributed):

- a. First. The votes are counted exclusively at the level of parties ("lemas"). All seats are distributed exclusively at the level of parties ("lemas"), independently of the votes cast by fractions ("sublemas") and lists.
- b. Second. Within each party ("lema"), the votes are counted exclusively at level of fractions ("sublemas"). All seats of the party are distributed exclusively at the level of fractions ("sublemas"), independently of the votes cast by lists and independently of the votes cast by other parties.
- c. Third. Within each fraction ("sublema") the votes are counted only at the level of lists. All seats of the fraction ("sublema") are distributed exclusively at the level of lists, independently of the votes cast by other fractions ("sublemas") of the same party and independently of the votes cast by other parties.

Multiple Simultaneous Vote (MVS) is the generic name of the system, comprising the Double Simultaneous Vote (used in elections for the Uruguayan lower House) and TVS. The MVS is the inverse of apparentement, in which votes are cast by lists, which are added by the effect of apparentement.

In order to contest the election, each electoral agent presents its own ballot (in the 2009 election there were 21 to 39 ballots by district).

One electoral agent can be a party, a party fraction or a fraction of party fraction. Voters select one ballot (among these 21 to 39 ballots in each district, in the 2009 national election), and puts it in the ballot box. Ballot contains a presidential ticket, a closed list for Senate, and a closed list for the Lower Chamber. Each ballot must necessarily contain lists of a single party. Electors cast votes necessarily (for President and 2 chambers) for the same party. Hence, the elections results are basically identical for all three institutions - both houses of the Parliament, and for the President (first round).

Votes are counted by the above described Double Simultaneous Vote (DSV; Lower House), and Multiple Simultaneous Vote (MVS; Upper House). DVS or MVS is a mechanism which allows an intra-

| partisan contest at the time of the national election.

```
-----
C5004_A >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY A
C5004_B >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY B
C5004_C >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY C
C5004_D >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY D
C5004_E >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY E
C5004_F >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY F
C5004_G >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY G
C5004_H >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY H
C5004_I >>> PERCENT SEATS - UPPER HOUSE - PARTY I
-----
```

Percent of seats in upper house received by PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] in current (upper house) election:

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF THE SEATS THAT PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] RECEIVED

999.00. MISSING

NOTES: C5004

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

In case of electoral alliances/coalitions, returns  
of an alliance are entered for all its members.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5004

The 24 November 2007 election was a half senate election whereby  
six senators were elected for each state (6 districts) and two  
for each Federal Territory (2 districts). The entries represent  
the proportion of seats each party won on election day, not  
the senate party composition.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5004\_B/ C5004\_C

These figures report the combined results for LP (Liberal Party  
of Australia) and LNP (Liberal-National Party - combined  
ticket).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5004\_A - C5004\_F

Senators are elected by simple majority for 8 year terms. Only  
part of the senate is renewed at each elections, two thirds in  
one elections and one third in the following election. In 2006,  
only one senator was elected for each state. Hence data for this  
variable represents percent seats for these 27 seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5004\_A - C5004\_F

The Brazilian Senate has 81 members, three for each state. The  
states elect two Senators each at one election, and one Senator  
each at the successive election, by simple majority for 8 year  
terms. 2010 was a two-Senator election, with each voter entitled  
to two votes. Since voters could cast two votes, the number of  
valid votes cast in each state can be up to twice the number of  
voters who cast votes. Hence data for this variable represents  
the percentage of these 54 seats that each party won.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5004

The July 29, 2007 elections were held to renew half of the  
House of Councilors, the upper house of Parliament. Of  
the 121 seats, 73 were filled using a simple majority system

in geographical constituencies, while 48 were determined using a proportional representation system based on a single constituency covering the whole country. These figures represent election results from the simple majority districts.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5004

The 2009 contest only elected lower house members.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5004

See note for C5003.

-----  
 C5005\_A >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY A  
 C5005\_B >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY B  
 C5005\_C >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY C  
 C5005\_D >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY D  
 C5005\_E >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY E  
 C5005\_F >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY F  
 C5005\_G >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY G  
 C5005\_H >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY H  
 C5005\_I >>> PERCENT VOTE - PRESIDENT - PARTY I  
 -----

If multiple rounds, percent of vote received in first round.  
 .....

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF THE POPULAR VOTE THAT  
 PARTY [A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] RECEIVED

999.00. MISSING

NOTES: C5005

Parties are identified in Appendix I.

In case of electoral alliances/coalitions, returns of an alliance are entered for all its members.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5005\_A - C5005\_F

These figures report results of the first round of the presidential election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5005\_A - C5005\_F

These figures report results of the first round of the presidential election.

Candidate of Party A (Dilma Roussef - PT) was supported by the following parties:

PT (Party A),  
 PMDB (Party B),  
 PDT (Party H),  
 PSB (Party F),  
 PR (Party D),  
 PCdoB,

PRB,  
 PTN,

PSC, and PTC.

Electoral return of this alliance is entered for all its members (parties A, B, D, F, and H)

Candidate of Party C (José Serra - PSDB) was supported by the following parties:

PSDB (Party C),  
 DEM (Party E),

=====

PTB (Party I),  
PPS,  
PMN, and PTdoB.  
Electoral return of this alliance is entered for all its members  
(parties C, E, and I)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5005

These figures report the first round of the presidential  
elections held in December 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5005\_B/ C5005\_E/ C5005\_F

These entries refer to the election result of the Coalition  
for the Good of All (Parties B, E and F - PRD, PT and  
Convergencia, respectively). The presidential candidate of the  
coalition was from the PRD.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5005\_C/ C5005\_D

These entries refer to the election result of the coalition  
Alliance for Mexico (Parties C and D - PRI and Mexican Green  
Ecological Party (PVEM)). The presidential candidate of the  
coalition was from the PRI.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5005

These figures report results of the first round of the  
presidential elections. In the second round, Ollanta Humala won  
the contest with 51.4% of the vote against Keiko Fujimori.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5005\_F

APRA did not field a candidate in the presidential elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5005\_A - C5005\_F

These figures report results of the first round of the  
presidential elections. In the second round Trian Basescu  
obtained 50,33 of the vote, and Mircea Geoana 49,67%

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5005\_A - C5005\_F

These figures report results of the first round of the  
presidential election. See notes for C5001 and C5003.  
Voters vote by selecting one ballot and putting it into the  
ballot box.  
A ballot contains a presidential ticket, a closed list for  
Senate, and a closed list for the Lower Chamber. Each ballot  
must necessarily contain lists of a single party. Electors cast  
votes necessarily (for President and 2 chambers) for the same  
party. Hence, the elections results are basically identical for  
all three institutions - both houses of the Parliament, and for  
the President (first round).

-----  
C5006\_1 >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT - VERSION 1  
-----

Official voter turnout - Percentage of registered voters.

.....

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF REGISTERED VOTERS

999.00 MISSING

NOTES: C5006\_1



Source for this variable: CSES Macro Report Questions 4d-4e, and/or IDEA International Compulsory Voting Website ([http://www.idea.int/vt/compulsory\\_voting.cfm](http://www.idea.int/vt/compulsory_voting.cfm)).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5006\_1

In Austria all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5006\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5006\_1

Turnout refers to the figure recorded for the lower house election.

In Brazil voting is mandatory; but not for people 16-17 years old and above 70 years old.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5006

Figures reported are for the first round of the presidential elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5006\_1

This number refers to the voters in the 10 general electoral districts in Croatia. The turnout in the special 11th electoral districts for the Croatian citizens living abroad was 22.2% and in the special 12th electoral district for national minority voters it was 18.03 %. The turnout for the total electorate, in Croatia and abroad, was 57.17%.

The number of registered voters in Croatia is 4,073,630, which is 494,630 more than the estimated number of voting age population who live in Croatia. The difference may be caused by two factors: voters living temporarily abroad, but registered as voters in Croatia (and not in the 11th district for Diaspora voters) and inaccuracy of voters registers. Additional 404,950 voters are registered as Diaspora voters, who live permanently abroad and have no residence in Croatia.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5006\_1

In Czech Republic all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2. The official turnout (64.47) is slightly higher than the one reported by the CSES (64.42) because the former is based on the number of voters that turned out at the polling stations, and the CSES used the number of those who submitted their votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5006\_1

In Czech Republic all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5006\_1

In Denmark all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5006\_1

This variable reports first round turnout. Turnout at the second round of the French presidential election was 59.98%

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5006\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5006\_1

In Finland all eligible voters are registered automatically by the Ministry of Justice, thus, 5006\_1 is equal to 5006\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5006\_1

In Germany, people do not have to register to be able to vote. Hence, the turnout is calculated with respect to the number of persons entitled to vote rather than to the number of registered voters. The official turnout is also calculated in this manner.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5006\_1

In Greece all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5006\_1

These entries refer to the turnout in the geographical constituency part of the 2008 Legco Elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5006\_1

In Israel the total number of citizens eligible to vote is inferior to that of the registered voters. Hence, turnout considering voting age population is higher than among registered voters. (from IDEA)  
The explanation for this apparent anomaly usually lies either in the inaccuracy of the electoral roll or in the estimated number of eligible voters (VAP) (according to the IDEA website)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5006\_1

Voters' Register was not used in the Saeima elections in 2010. Voters could vote at any polling station at their choice. To participate in the Saeima elections a voter needed to have a valid Latvian citizen's passport where a mark about participation in elections was made. As a result, there is no basis to differentiate 5006\_1 and 5006\_2. The reported figure represents the official turnout, and is based on the estimated total number of voting age citizens.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5006\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5006\_1

Entries reflect the number of registered voters with valid ID. More specifically, and according to collaborator, in Mexico after citizens register to vote in offices of the Electoral Commission (IFE), they have to go back to pick up a valid ID that IFE issues called "Padrón" (Electoral Roll). Some citizens who requested their voting ID-Card do not claim it afterwards, and these ID's are destroyed since they can not show a valid ID on election day, and thus, they cannot vote. The list of those who registered and got their valid ID is called the "lista nominal" which is the actual list of voters.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5006\_1

Note from the Collaborator: Notice that the number of registered voters is larger than the voting age population (8%). In an extraordinary effort done in the 1990's, in a house by house visit the Electoral Commission made a census of all eligible voters. Independent estimates found that this original census covered close to 98% of the voting age population of the time (persons 18 years older and more). These differences indicate that the actual list of eligible voters ("lista nominal") has not been fully updated, most likely because of deceased voters who are not erased from the list. Another likely source of error might be due to errors in the estimate of age in limited census of 2005.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5006\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5006\_1

In Norway all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5006\_1

The number of registered voters is slightly higher than the number of voting age population since it contains citizens who live and vote outside the country.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5006\_1

In Portugal all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5006\_1

In Romania all voters are registered automatically. The numbers used by the Electoral Permanent Authority are supposed to include Romanian citizens living and working abroad. However, the electoral register is generally regarded as poorly updated by the authorities, holding many errors.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5006\_1

Every citizen of the Republic of Slovenia who is 18 years old by the election day and has not been declared legally incompetent has the right to vote and be elected a National Assembly deputy. The right to vote is exercised in the electoral unit of a person's permanent residence.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5006\_1

The Electoral Census Office, under the supervision of the CEC, is responsible for compiling the state-wide voter register under a passive system and for certifying postal voting registrations. The voter register includes voters residing both in Spain and abroad, the number of voter abroad being small, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5006\_1

Voting is compulsory in Thailand. However there remains differences between the calculations of voting age population and registered voters due to inaccuracies in one of the component values.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5006\_1

In Turkey all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5006\_1

In Uruguay, voting is compulsory and all eligible voters are registered automatically. However, C5006\_1 is not equal to C5006\_2 because the latter figure includes persons living outside of the country.

C5006\_2 >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT - VERSION 2

Official voter turnout - Percentage of voting age population.

000.00-100.00 PERCENT OF VOTING AGE POPULATION

999.00 MISSING

## NOTES: C5006\_2

Source for this variable: CSES Macro Report Questions 4d-4e, and/or IDEA International Compulsory Voting Website ([http://www.idea.int/vt/compulsory\\_voting.cfm](http://www.idea.int/vt/compulsory_voting.cfm)).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5006\_1

Estimated number of voting age population taken from IDEA.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5006\_1

In Austria all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5006\_2

Turnout refers to the figure recorded for the lower house election.  
In Brazil voting is mandatory; but not for people 16-17 years old and above 70 years old. Total voting age populations (16 years and older) is based on an estimate.  
(Source: <http://www.ibge.gov.br/>).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5006

Figures reported are for the first round of the presidential elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5006\_2

This number refers to overall national figures, where the voting age population is 3.579.000 according to 2006 estimates.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5006\_2

In Czech Republic all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2. The official turnout (64.47) is slightly higher than the one reported by the CSES (64.42) because the former is based on the number of voters that turned out at the polling stations, and the CSES used the number of those who submitted their votes.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5006\_2

In Czech Republic all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5006\_2

The reported turnout figure is slightly different from the official one (86.59%) because the CSES figure is based on the estimate of total voting age population, and the official figure on total number of voting age citizens.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5006\_1

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5006\_1

In Finland all eligible voters are registered automatically by the Ministry of Justice, thus, 5006\_2 is equal to 5006\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5006\_2

This variable reports first round turnout. Turnout at the second round of the French presidential election was

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5006\_2

These entries refer to the turnout in the geographical

constituency part of the 2008 Legco Elections. Note that there is a substantial difference between Number of Registered Voters (3,372,007 registered electors) and the Total Number of Voting Age Citizens (5.8 million).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5006\_2

In Greece all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5006\_2

In Israel the total number of citizens eligible to vote is less than the number of registered voters. Hence, turnout considering voting age population is higher than among registered voters. (from IDEA)  
The explanation for this apparent anomaly lies either in the inaccuracy of the electoral roll or in the estimated number of eligible voters (VAP) (according to the IDEA website).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5006\_2

See Election Study Notes for C5006\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5006\_2

Note from the Collaborator: Notice that the number of registered voters is larger than the voting age population (8%). In an extraordinary effort done in the 1990's, in a house by house visit the Electoral Commission made a census of all eligible voters. Independent estimates found that this original census covered close to 98% of the voting age population of the time (persons 18 years older and more). These differences indicate that the actual list of eligible voters ("lista nominal") has not been fully updated, most likely because of deceased voters who are not erased from the list. Another likely source of error might be due to errors in the estimate of age in the limited census of 2005.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5006\_2

This figure is based on the number of Voting Age Citizens, since according to the collaborator, it is difficult to separate it from the Voting Age Population.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5006\_2

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5006\_2

In Norway all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5006\_2

The number of registered voters is slightly higher than the number of voting age population since it contains citizens who live and vote outside the country.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5006\_2

In Portugal all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5006\_2

In Romania all voters are registered automatically. The numbers used by the Electoral Permanent Authority are supposed to include Romanian citizens living and working abroad. However, the electoral register is generally regarded as poorly updated by the authorities, holding many errors.

=====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5006\_2

See notes on C5006\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5006\_2

The Electoral Census Office, under the supervision of the CEC, is responsible for compiling the state-wide voter register under a passive system and for certifying postal voting registrations. The voter register includes voters residing both in Spain and abroad, the number of voter abroad being small, thus, C5006\_2 is equal to C5006\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5006\_2

Calculated from figures provided by IDEA international.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5006\_2

Voting is compulsory in Thailand. However there remains differences between the calculations of voting age population and registered voters due to inaccuracies in either values.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5006\_2

In Turkey all eligible voters are registered automatically, thus, C5006\_1 is equal to C5006\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5006\_2

This figure is based on the number of Voting Age Citizens, since according to the collaborator, it is difficult to separate it from the Voting Age Population.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5006\_2

In Uruguay, voting is compulsory and all eligible voters are registered automatically. However, C5006\_1 is not equal to C5006\_2 because the surplus of Registered Voters above the Voting Age Citizens is due to persons living outside the country.

-----  
C5007 >>> Party of the president before  
-----

Q2a. Party of the president before the election.

.....

01-89. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5007

Source: Macro report Q2a.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5007

The President of Belarus, Alexander Lukashenko does not hold a formal party affiliation. Also note that the presidential elections in Belarus were held 19 March 2006. Thus, the president before and after the current parliamentary election was the same.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5007

The President of the Republic shall be elected by the Riigikogu by default. His/Her term does not coincide with that of the parliament, which is four years. From <http://www.vvk.ee/past-elections/president-of-state-elections/>

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5007

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5007

The Finnish President is elected directly by popular vote for a six-year term. The previous presidential election was held on January 15, 2006 (next was held in January 2012). Thus, the president before and after the 2007 and 2011 parliamentary elections was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5007

"The Chief Executive (CE) in Hong Kong (some equivalent of the president elsewhere) is the highest government official of the HKSAR Government and does not belong to any political party, which is required by the Chief Executive Election Ordinance (Chapter 569, Laws of Hong Kong)." (From the Macro Report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5007

The Icelandic President is elected directly by popular vote for a four-year term. The current incumbent is Ólafur Ragnar Grímsson, who is now in his third term and was reelected in 2004 with 67.5% of the votes. Thus, the president before and after the 2007 parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5007

The Icelandic President is elected directly by popular vote for a four-year term. The current incumbent is Ólafur Ragnar Grímsson, who is now in his fourth term and returned unopposed in the last presidential contest of 2008. Thus, the president before and after the 2009 parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5007

The Irish President is elected directly by popular vote for a seven-year term. The last presidential election was held on 1st October 2004 (when Mary McAleese was re-elected for her second term). Thus, the president before and after the current parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5007

Latvian president is elected indirectly, in the Latvian Saeima. On 31 May 2007, the government candidate Valdis Zatlers defeated Aivars Endziņš. Zatlers is considered to be a non-partisan president.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5007

From a legal point of view, the president is not allowed to be a member of a political party during his term in office. However, he/she may be publicly endorsed by a specific party. Traian Basescu raced for his second term with the endorsement of the Democrat-Liberal Party (PD-L), as he had been the head of the party (at that time Democrat Party - PD) before his first term in office.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5007

The Slovak President is elected directly by popular vote for a five-year term. The last presidential election was held on March

21 (second round on April 4) 2009. Ivan Gasparovic, nominated by parties Smer, SNS, and HZD, was re-elected for his second term). Thus, the president before and after the current parliamentary election was the same.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5007

The President's term does not coincide with that of the parliament. The two rounds of the presidential elections were held in 2007.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5007

The President serves as both head of state and head of government in south Africa. Like Prime Ministers in other countries, the president is elected by the lower house and must enjoy the confidence of parliament to govern.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5007

The President's term does not coincide with that of the parliament.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5007

The president of Turkey is indirectly elected for a period of 7 years. The last presidential elections were held in 2007. As of 2014, presidential elections will be direct.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5007

Before the current election, the President of Uruguay was Tabaré Vázquez, elected in 2004 (Broad Front/Frente Amplio).

C5008 >>> Party of the Prime Minister before

Q2b. Party of the Prime Minister before the election.

01-89. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5008

Source: Macro report Q2b.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5008

The Prime Minister of Belarus, Sergei Sidorsky, does not hold a formal party affiliation.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5008

The prime minister prior to the elections, Jan Fischer, was non-partisan (in position from 08/05/2009 to 13/07-2010). He succeeded Mirek Topolánek (in position between 16/08/2006 to 08/05/2009) from the Civic Democratic Party. This was a caretaker government established after Topolánek and his government lost a confidence vote.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5008

Immediately before the 2009 election the prime minister (PM) was



Ms. Johanna Sigurdardottir from the Social Democratic Alliance. However, she took office only two months before the election after the resignation of Geir Haarde (from the Independence Party) who had been in office since the previous election in May, 2007. His resignation was related to the economic crisis of 2008.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5008

The Prime Minister was selected after the 2008 Legislative elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5008

2004-2008: Prime Minister Janez Jansa, the president of the Slovenian Democratic Party (SDS).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5008

There is no Prime Minister in South Africa. See C5007.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5008

Note from the Collaborator: "The Prime Minister did not have party affiliation. (Note that prime minister is simply chosen by the President. Usually he/she is not a political figure. In a broad sense, you could say that the Prime Minister belonged to the Grand National Party, simply because he was chosen by the President.)"

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5008

There is no formal PM in Switzerland. Instead, executive power is exercised by a collective organism called the Federal Council of Switzerland. This organism has seven members and is elected by the Federal Assembly (which is composed of two organs, the Council of States and National Council) for a four-year term. Since 1959 the Federal Council has been composed of a coalition of all major parties (SVP/UDC, SP/PS, FDP/PRD, and CVP/PDC), an arrangement called the "magic formula". Currently all parties have two members in the Federal Council, but the CVP/PDC which has only one. The Council elects each year among its members a president, but this position is presumably largely ceremonial. Consequently, this variable is coded with 97 "Not-applicable".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5008

Party of the Premier is the same as president since the president appoints the Premier.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5008

The party of the Prime minister in the period preceding the elections was the Thai Rak Thai (TRT). However, the TRT had been dissolved by the Constitutional Tribunal in May 2006, and the former prime minister Thaksin was exiled and barred from running in the 2007 elections, along with 111 former TRT executives. As a response, Thaksin's supporters formed the People's Power Party (PPP) prior to the elections, whose candidates included children of barred former TRT members. An interim legislative body was appointed by the King, the National Legislative Assembly on 12 October 2006, until the adoption of a new constitution on 19 August 2007 that would pave the road to a return to democracy.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5008

Uruguay is a presidential republic. President of Republic is simultaneously the President of Council of Minister (and member of that).

```

-----
C5009_A >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY A
C5009_B >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY B
C5009_C >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY C
C5009_D >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY D
C5009_E >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY E
C5009_F >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY F
C5009_G >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY G
C5009_H >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY H
C5009_I >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION BEFORE ELECTION - PARTY I
-----

```

Q2c. Number of cabinet posts (portfolios) held by PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] before the election.

00.00-99.00 NUMBER OF CABINET POSTS BEFORE ELECTION.

999.00 MISSING

NOTES: C5009

Parties are identified in Appendix I. Source: Macro report Q2c.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5009

This variable shows the composition of the Cabinet on October 29, 2010.

In addition to the portfolios coded in the entries, there was one post held by PCdoB, one post held PV, and 10 additional independent cabinet members. Note that Brazil has a presidential system.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5009

There were three cabinets between April 2006 and 2010. The figure reported in these variables are about the caretaker government established after Topolánek and his government lost a confidence vote, and was established on May 2009. These figures represent the numbers of portfolios nominated to non-partisans by each party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5009

In Hong Kong, the Executive Council (equivalent to the cabinet elsewhere) consists of the CE (1), official members (15 principal government officials known as "secretaries", who are CS, Financial Secretary, Secretary for Justice and 12 bureau secretaries) and unofficial members (15 before the 2008 Election). Altogether, the Executive Council had 31 members before the 2008 LegCo Elections. Before the Election, the CE and the official members were not members of any political parties; 4 of the 15 unofficial members were members of political parties (groups). (From the Macro Report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5009

Immediately before the 2009 election, government was in hands of a coalition between the Social Democratic Alliance and the Left Green Movement (in addition to 2 non-partisan cabinet members). However, this was a caretaker government that took office in February, 2009 after the breakdown of the previous government (a coalition between the Independence party and the Social Democratic with 6 seats each). The previous government led by Mr. Haarde, had taken office in May, 2007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5009\_A to C5009\_G

=====

Some ministers were in charge of 2 ministries, hence the higher count of portfolios than ministers.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5009\_A-C5009\_H

In addition to the portfolios (State Secretaries) coded in the entries, there were 4 additional independent ministers and 2 with unknown affiliation.

Note that Mexico has a presidential system. The cabinet is made up of eighteen portfolios held by state secretaries directly appointed by the President, and the Attorney-General (19 in total). Only the Secretary of Foreign Relations and the General Attorney need approval from the Senate. There is no voting in the cabinet, and the positions are not necessarily political.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5009

In addition to the 12 portfolios (State Secretaries) coded in the entries, there were 7 additional independent cabinet members. Note that Mexico has a presidential system. The cabinet is made up of eighteen portfolios held by state secretaries directly appointed by the President, and the Attorney-General (19 in total). Only the Secretary of Foreign Relations and the General Attorney need approval from the Senate. There is no voting in the cabinet, and the positions are not necessarily political.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5009

After the resignation of the cabinet (Balkenende-2) on 30 June, 2006, a caretaker government (Balkenende-3) was formed of 9 CDA (Party A)-and 8 VVD (Party D) ministers, which was installed on July 7, 2006.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5009

This variable shows party affiliation of six Cabinet Ministers. Out of the remaining 11 Ministers, one is a member of Unia Lewicy, and 10 are Independents.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5009

This variable shows party affiliation of 12 Cabinet Ministers. Out of the remaining 11 Ministers, one was a member of Stronnictwo Konserwatywno-Liberalne (SKL), and 10 are Independents.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5009

The figures represent the interim cabinet that was formed after the 2008 legislative elections fell. 10 ministers from the Democrat-Liberal Party hold 19 portfolios, and 2 independents hold the remaining 2 portfolios.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5009\_D

This entry refers to the Lakas-Kampi coalition. Lakas had 6 cabinet posts, while KAMPI had 2 cabinet posts. One additional seat belonged to PDSP (Philippine Social Democratic Party).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5009

To additional cabinet posts have been held by Akbayan (Citizens' Action Party) (party with the code 32 in the CSES list).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5009

4 Ministers were from the KMT, 21 from the DDP, and 20 were independents, for a total of 45 ministers including premier and

| vice premier

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5009\_A to C5009\_G

| These have no party entries because the Council for National Security, a military junta, had overthrown Thailand's elected government and abrogated the constitution on September 19 2006 and the ministers were appointed by the perpetrators of the coup.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5009\_A

| There were 14 cabinet members (13 ministers plus the President of the Republic, who is simultaneously the President of the Council of Ministers and a member of it, with an equal vote to each minister. The entire cabinet came from Party A (Broad Front/Frente Amplio).

-----  
C5010 >>> SIZE OF THE CABINET BEFORE  
-----

Q2d. The size of the cabinet before the election.

00.00-99.00 SIZE OF THE CABINET

999.00 MISSING

| NOTES: C5010

| Source: Macro report Q2d.

| Definitions:

| a) Parliamentary and Semi-Presidential Regimes:

| Cabinet size is defined by the total number of ministers (persons, not posts) in a defined government. Ministers are considered members of a cabinet when they exercise voting rights. This number includes both ministers with and without portfolio, but excludes deputy ministers, undersecretaries, parliamentary secretaries, ministerial alternates, given that in the majority of cases, they do not exercise full voting rights.

| b) Presidential Regimes:

| Cabinet size is defined by the total number of ministers or secretaries who head a ministry.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5010

| 17 ministerial posts plus the prime minister for a total of 18.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5010

| 38 individuals including the prime minister.  
| The number specified here represents the total number of ministerial positions in a Presidential cabinet. None of the cabinet members were from a formal political party.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5010

| 18 ministers including the prime minister. The number specified here represents the total number of ministers.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5010

| Three unaccounted portfolios were held by the Union of Freedom-Democratic Union (Unie svobody-Demokraticka unie;

US-DEU). US-DEU received 0.3% of the vote in the 2006 elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5010

There were three cabinets between April 2006 and 2010. The figure reported in these variables are about the caretaker government established after Topolánek and his government lost a confidence vote, and was established on May 2009. These figures represent the numbers of portfolios nominated to non-partisans by each party in the caretaker government.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5010

The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of 2011 was composed of 13 persons in total; 12 cabinet ministers and 1 Prime Minister.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5010

32 ministers including the prime minister. The number specified here represents the total number of ministers.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5010

13 ministerial posts, plus the Chancellor (from SPD) for a total of 14.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5010

15 ministerial posts, plus the Chancellor (from CDU) for a total of 16.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5010

The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of the 4th October 2009 was composed of 17 cabinet ministers in total: the Prime Minister (Kostas Karamanlis) and 16 ministers. Not counted are 1 alternate minister and 26 deputy ministers. This cabinet composition is based on the latest reshuffling of that government (as of 8/29 January 2009).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5010

See Election Study Notes for C5009.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5010

In addition to the Social Democratic Alliance and the Left Green Movement members there were also two non-party affiliated cabinet members.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5010

12 ministers including the prime minister. The number specified here represents the total number of ministers.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5010

One unaccounted portfolio was held by an independent.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5010

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5010

Note that Mexico has a presidential system. The cabinet is made up of eighteen portfolios held by state secretaries directly appointed by the President, and the Attorney-General (19 in total). Only the Secretary of Foreign Relations and the General Attorney need approval from the Senate. There is no voting in

| the cabinet, and the positions are not necessarily political.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5010

| The caretaker government had 17 ministers. See note for C5009.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5010

| Including the Prime Minister, the size of the Cabinet prior to the election was 16.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5010

| The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of 2010 was composed of 15 members including the prime minister.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5010

| The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of 2008 was composed of 18 persons in total; 15 cabinet ministers, 2 ministers without portfolio, and 1 Prime Minister.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5010

| The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of 2008 was composed of 16 persons in total; including 2 vice-presidents

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5010

| Total of 45 ministers including premier and vice premier

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5010

| These figures contain 26 ministers plus the prime minister for a total of 27.

| These have no party entries because the Council for National Security, a military junta, had overthrown Thailand's elected government and abrogated the constitution on September 19 2006 and the ministers were appointed by the perpetrators of the coup.

-----  
C5011 >>> Party of the president AFTER  
-----

Q3a. Party of the president AFTER the election.

.....

01-89. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

| NOTES: C5011

| Source: Macro report Q3a.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5011

| The President of Belarus, Alexander Lukashenko, does not hold a formal party affiliation. Also note that the presidential elections in Belarus were held 19 March 2006. Thus, the president before and after the current parliamentary election was the same.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5011

| The President of the Republic shall be elected by the Riigikogu

by default. His/Her term does not coincide with that of the parliament, which is four years. From <http://www.vvk.ee/past-elections/president-of-state-elections/>

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5011

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5011

The Finnish President is elected directly by popular vote for a six-year term. The previous presidential election was held on January 15, 2006 (next was held in January 2012). Thus, the president before and after the 2007 and 2011 parliamentary elections was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5011

See Election Study Notes for C5007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5011

The Icelandic President is elected directly by popular vote for a four-year term. The current incumbent is Ólafur Ragnar Grímsson, who is now in his third term and was reelected in 2004 with 67.5% of the votes. Thus, the president before and after the 2007 parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5011

The Icelandic President is elected directly by popular vote for a four-year term. The current incumbent is Ólafur Ragnar Grímsson, who is now in his fourth term and returned unopposed in the last presidential contest of 2008. Thus, the president before and after the 2009 parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5011

See Election Study Notes for C5007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5011

The Slovak President is elected directly by popular vote for a five-year term. The last presidential election was held on March 21 (second round on April 4) 2009. Ivan Gasparovic, nominated by parties Smer, SNS, and HZD, was re-elected for his second term. Thus, the president before and after the current parliamentary election was the same.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5011

The President's term does not coincide with that of the parliament. The two rounds of the presidential elections were held in 2007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5011

The President serves as both head of state and head of government in south Africa. Like Prime Ministers in other countries, the the president is elected by the lower house and must enjoy the confidence of parliament to govern.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5011

The President's term does not coincide with that of the parliament.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5011

After the 2009 election, President of Uruguay became José Mujica (Broad Front/Frente Amplio).

-----  
 C5012 >>> Party of the Prime Minister AFTER  
 -----

Q3b. Party of the Prime Minister AFTER the election.  
 .....

01-89. [SEE APPENDIX I FOR PARTY AND LEADER CODES]

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5012

Source: Macro report Q3b.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5012

The Prime Minister of Belarus, Sergei Sidorsky, does not hold a formal party affiliation.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5012

The Prime Minister remained the same after the presidential election (even if the government had suffered a motion of no confidence in October 2009).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5012

There is no Prime Minister in South Africa. See C5011.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5012

Note from the Collaborator: "The Prime Minister did not have a party affiliation. (Note that prime minister is simply chosen by the President. Usually he/she is not a political figure. In a broad sense, you could say that the Prime Minister belonged to the Grand National Party, simply because he was chosen by the President.)"

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5012

There is no formal PM in Switzerland. Instead, executive power is exercised by a collective organism called the Federal Council of Switzerland. This organism has seven members and is elected by the Federal Assembly (which is composed of two organs, the Council of States and National Council) for a four-year term. Since 1959 the Federal Council has been composed of a coalition of all major parties (SVP/UDC, SP/PS, FDP/PRD, and CVP/PDC), an arrangement called the "magic formula". Currently all parties have two members in the Federal Council, but the CVP/PDC which has only one. The Council elects each year among its members a president, but this position is presumably largely ceremonial. Consequently, this variable is coded with 99 "Not-applicable".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5012

Party of the Premier is the same as president because the president appoints the Premier.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5012

Uruguay is a presidential republic. President of Republic is simultaneously the President of Council of Minister (and member of that).

-----



```

=====
C5013_A >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY A
C5013_B >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY B
C5013_C >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY C
C5013_D >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY D
C5013_E >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY E
C5013_F >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY F
C5013_G >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY G
C5013_H >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY H
C5013_I >>> GOVERNMENT COMPOSITION AFTER ELECTION - PARTY I
-----

```

Q3c. Number of cabinet posts (portfolios) held by PARTY  
[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I] after the election.

00.00-99.00 NUMBER OF CABINET POSTS BEFORE ELECTION

999.00 MISSING

NOTES: C5013

Parties are identified in Appendix I. Source: Macro report Q2c.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5013\_B

One of the seven posts that belong to Party B (Austrian People's Party) is represented by one non-partisan minister, nominated by ÖVP (Austrian People's Party) and filling an ÖVP slot.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5013

This variable shows the composition of the in December 2010. In addition to the portfolios coded in the entries, there was one post held by PCdoB, and 10 additional independent cabinet members. Note that Brazil has a presidential system.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5013

From 04/09/2006- to 09/01/2007 there were 9 cabinet ministers from the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) and 6 non-partisans nominated by ODS.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5013

See Election Study Notes for C5009. After the Election, the CE and the 15 official members were not members of any political parties; 2 of the 14 unofficial members were members of political parties (groups).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5013

In addition to the portfolios (State Secretaries) coded in the entries, there were 4 additional independent ministers and 2 with unknown affiliation.

Note that Mexico has a presidential system. The cabinet is made up by eighteen portfolios held by state secretaries directly appointed by the President, and the Attorney-General (19 in total). Only the Secretary of Foreign Relations and the General Attorney need approval from the Senate. There is no voting in the cabinet, and the positions are not necessarily political.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5013

In addition to the 12 portfolios (State Secretaries) coded in the entries, there were 7 additional independent ministers.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5013

This variable shows party affiliation of 11 Cabinet Ministers. Out of the remaining 7 Ministers, one is a member of Partia Centrum (pa party that received 0.19% of votes), while 6 are Independents.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5013

This variable shows party affiliation of 13 Cabinet Ministers. The remaining 7 Ministers were Independents.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5013

The cabinet changes are not due to the presidential election but are the results of a motion of no confidence voted in October 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5013\_A

The collaborator lists 9 individuals (Excluding the Prime Minister). Two of which without a portfolio.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5013\_D

The collaborator lists 3 persons, one of which without a portfolio.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5013

After the elections 24 Ministers were from the KMT, 1 from the DDP, and 20 were independents, for a total of 45 ministers including premier and vice premier.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5013\_A

There are 14 cabinet members - 13 ministers plus the President of the Republic, who is simultaneously the President of the Council of Ministers and a member of it, with an equal vote to each minister. The entire cabinet came from Party A (Broad Front/Frente Amplio).

C5014 >>> SIZE OF THE CABINET AFTER

Q3d. The size of the cabinet after the election.

00.00-99.00 SIZE OF THE CABINET

999.00 MISSING

NOTES: C5014

Source: Macro report Q3d.

Definitions:

a) Parliamentary and Semi-Presidential Regimes:  
Cabinet size is defined by the total number of ministers (persons, not posts) in a defined government. Ministers are considered members of a cabinet when they exercise voting rights. This number includes both ministers with and without portfolio, but excludes deputy ministers, undersecretaries, parliamentary secretaries, ministerial alternates, given that in the majority of cases, they do not exercise full voting rights.

b) Presidential Regimes:  
Cabinet size is defined by the total number of ministers or secretaries who head a ministry.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5014

20 ministerial posts plus the prime minister for a total of 21.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5014

38 individuals including the prime minister.  
The number specified here represents the total number of ministerial positions in a Presidential cabinet. None of the cabinet members were from a political party

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5014

Six unaccounted portfolios were held by non-partisans nominated by the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) (Party A). That was the so called Topolánek I cabinet (04/09/2006-09/01/2007). In Topolánek II cabinet, the following shows the distribution of portfolios:

Party A	Civic Democratic Party (ODS)	9
Party D	Christian-Democratic Union-Czechoslovak People's Party (KDU-CSL)	4
Party E	Green Party (SZ)	3
	Non-partisans nominated by KDU-CSL	1
	Non-partisans nominated by SZ	1

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5014

The cabinet formed after the parliamentary election of 2011 was composed of 13 persons in total; 12 cabinet ministers and 1 Prime Minister.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5014

16 ministers including the prime minister.  
The number specified here represents the total number of ministers.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5014

15 ministerial positions, plus one minister without portfolio, but with voting rights in cabinet meetings (Federal Minister for Special Affairs Thomas de Maizière (CDU)).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5014

15 ministerial posts, plus the Chancellor (from CDU) for a total of 16.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5014

The cabinet which was formed after the parliamentary election of the 4th October 2011 was composed of 16 persons. The Prime Minister (George Papandreu), the vice-President of the government (Theodoros Pagalos), 15 ministers (including Papandreu as minister of foreign affairs). Not counted are 2 alternate ministers and 19 deputy ministers.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5014

See Election Study Notes for C5009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5014

In addition to the Social Democratic Alliance and the Left Green Movement members, there were two non-party affiliated cabinet members.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5014

25 ministers plus the prime minister. In addition to the parties mentioned in C5013, two remaining cabinet posts were held by members of the Pensioners Party (Gil).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5014

Two unaccounted portfolios were held by independents.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5014

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5014

Mexico has a Presidential System in which portfolios (State Secretaries) are designated directly by the president.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5014

Including the Prime Minister, the size of the cabinet is 17.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5014

The cabinet changes are not due to the presidential election but are the results of a motion of no confidence voted in October 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5014

The cabinet following the parliamentary election of 2010 was composed of 15 cabinet ministers, one prime-minister and once vice-prime minister for a total of 15 members.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5014

The cabinet following the parliamentary election of 2008 was composed of 19 persons in total including the Prime Minister, and one minister without portfolio.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5014

The cabinet prior to the parliamentary election of 2008 was composed of 18 persons in total; including 2 vice-presidents

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5014

These figures contain 35 ministers plus the prime minister for a total of 36.

-----  
C5015 >>> Number of parties participating in election  
-----

Q4a. How many political parties received votes in the election?  
.....

001-900. NUMBER OF PARTIES

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5015

Source: Macro report Q4a.

This variable reports number of participating political parties, not merely alliances or coalitions of political parties about which official information was available.

Independent candidates are not counted. Where coalitions are present member parties are counted separately.

This variable primarily concerns the Lower House election.

However, if a particular study is focused on the Upper House, or presidential election, it may report results for these elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5015

The entry refers to the number of parties competing in the lower house election. In the upper house election (senate) there were 28 competing parties.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5015

29 parties obtained votes in the electoral contest. From this number, 17 obtained 1 percent of the vote or more.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5015

There are no official figures on this. However, there were 7634 candidates (in 577 constituencies) and 70 parties were eligible for public subsidies.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5015

This figure reflects the number of parties participating in the geographical constituency elections. Political parties do not participate in the functional constituency elections. In addition to the 11 participating parties, the Independent candidates received 10% of the total vote on aggregate.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5015

This entry refers to the number of parties competing in the proportional representation nation-wide segment. In the single member district contest, nine parties competed.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5015

This entry (26) refers to the number of parties taking part in the 2010 Latvian elections. However, they participated within various electoral coalitions. There were 13 electoral lists that competed in the election.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5015

This entry (29 parties) refers to the total number of participating parties, including non-registered parties. There were 19 registered parties.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5015

This figure reflects the total number of parties participating in the election that obtained more than 0.01% of the popular vote. Very small joint party lists and coalitions are excluded from the calculations.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5015

Political parties in the Philippines are numerous and diverse ideologically. Different subsets of parties participated in the Presidential, Senate and Congress elections of 2010. Electoral Commission lists 131 registered/accredited political parties, as of January 11, 2010. In the Congress election, 29 parties participated in the congressional districts elections, while there are 43 parties (listed by the CSES collaborator) participating in the Party List elections (the secondary or proportional segment). The entry in this variable refers to the number of parties participating in the Congressional district elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5015

This entry refers to the number of parties competing in the Lower House election. In the Senate 108 Election Committees competed.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5015

This entry refers to the number of parties competing in the Lower House election. There were 10 electoral lists, one of which consisted of a coalition of 4 parties. In the Senate 29 Election Committees competed.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5015

10 political parties (individually or as part of electoral alliances) were represented by candidates in the presidential elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5015

This entry only counts parties obtaining more 0.1% of the vote or more. There were also a number of mostly local parties obtaining less than 0.1% that competed in a few cantons.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5015

In addition to the 7 parties listed, there is an aggregate category "other" that obtained 2.74% of the vote. There is no available information as to how many parties are contained in this category.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5015

In addition to the 7 parties listed, there is an aggregate category "other" that obtained 3.8% of the vote. There is no available information as to how many parties are contained in this category.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5015

The entry refers to parties participating as separate entities. Thus, for example, an entry in the election results list such as "Democratic; Working Families", is counted as being Democratic Party.

```
-----
C5016_A >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY A
C5016_B >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY B
C5016_C >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY C
C5016_D >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY D
C5016_E >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY E
C5016_F >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY F
C5016_G >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY G
C5016_H >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY H
C5016_I >>> IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY - PARTY I
-----
```

Q5. a-f. Ideological Family Party is Closest to:

- .....
01. ECOLOGY PARTIES
  02. COMMUNIST PARTIES
  03. SOCIALIST PARTIES
  04. SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTIES
  05. LEFT LIBERAL PARTIES
  06. LIBERAL PARTIES
  07. RIGHT LIBERAL PARTIES
  08. CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTIES
  09. CONSERVATIVE PARTIES

10. NATIONAL PARTIES  
 11. AGRARIAN PARTIES  
 12. ETHNIC PARTIES  
 13. REGIONAL PARTIES  
 14. INDEPENDENT PARTIES  
 15. OTHER
97. NOT APPLICABLE  
 98. NO IDEOLOGICAL FAMILY MENTIONED  
 99. MISSING

NOTES: C5016

Parties are identified in Appendix I. Source: Macro report Q5.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5016\_B & C5016\_D

Party B (Austrian People's Party) was also characterized as a Christian Democratic party. Party D (Alliance for the Future of Austria) was also characterized as a National party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5016\_C

The Bloc Quebecois was classified as both a National and Regional party by the collaborator, since it has both a regionalist and nationalist platform.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5016\_E

HSU is a party of pensioners.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5016\_F

HSP is a right wing party (extreme, radical, far right).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5016\_G

"New Alliance (H) (Party G) had at the time of the election only existed for 6 months. They have later moved in the direction towards being a Right Liberal Party and have changed their name to Liberal Alliance." (From the Macro report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5016\_H

Enhedslisten (Party H) was characterized as a "Social Party".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5016\_A

Party A (Centre party) was also characterized as a Liberal Party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5016\_D

The collaborator considers the Popular Orthodox Rally (LAOS) as an (extreme) right-wing populist party family. No response category matched the ideological profile of this party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5016\_C

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5016\_C

Party C (Left Green Movement) is characterized as an Left-Socialist/Ecology" party. Only the first characterization is coded in the data set.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5016\_D

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5016\_D

Party D (Progressive Party) is characterized as an "Agrarian/Liberal Center" party. Only the first

| characterization is coded in the data set.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5016\_F

| Party F (Civic Movement) is characterized as an "Protest" party

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5016

| Party A is referred to by collaborator as a "center party".  
 | Party C is referred to by collaborator as a "Religious party (Ultra Orthodox)".  
 | Party F is referred to by collaborator as a "Religious nationalist party".

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5016\_C

| Party C (Komei) was originally characterized as "Religious".

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5016\_B & C5016\_C

| Party B (Harmony Centre) was also characterized as an Ethnic Party (code 12). Party C (Union of Greens and Farmers) was also characterized as an Agrarian Party (code 11).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5016\_C

| Party C (PRI) was also characterized as a Social Democratic Party.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5016\_A

| PRI is characterized as belonging to "Social Democratic (moderate)" ideological family.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5016\_C

| Party A (PRD) was also characterized as a Social Democratic (radical) party

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5016\_G

| Party G (Christian Union) is characterized as Orthodox-Protestant.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5016\_G

| Party G (GroenLinks) was fully characterized as Ecology/Socialist

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5016\_H

| Party H (Christian Union) is characterized as Orthodox-Protestant party.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5016\_I

| Party I (Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij, SGP) is characterized as Orthodox-Protestant party.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5016\_D

| Party D (New Zealand First) was characterized as a "Populist/Nationalist" party.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5016\_H

| Party H (United Future) was characterized as a "Centre Liberal" party.



=====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5016\_B

Party B (Progress Party - FrP) was also characterized as a Populist party".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5016\_H

Party H (Red Electoral Alliance - Rød Valgallianse) was fully characterized as a "Radical socialist" party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5016\_A

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5016\_A

Full characterization for Party A (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość) was "National Parties/Conservative Parties (also slightly populist)".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5016\_B

"The assignment of PSD to an ideological family is difficult because, although it belongs to the center-right of the political spectrum, it has both liberal and conservative factions within it. It is assigned to the liberal family." (From the Macro report.)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5016\_D

Bloco de Esquerda (Left Block) is originally characterized as "Extreme Left" party, with the following clarification: "Left-libertarian on social/moral issues, close to Communist positions on the economy."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5016\_E

Coligação Democrática Unitária (CDU) is an electoral alliance formed by the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP) (CSES category 02) and the Greens (PEV) (CSES category 01).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5016\_D

The Romanian collaborator identified this political party as "Nationalist Left".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5016\_G

The Romanian collaborator identified this political party as combining "Christian" and "Nationalist" values.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5016\_B

Party B (Slovak Democratic and Christian Union-Democratic Party (SDKÚ-DS)) is characterized as "Christian Democratic party" and as "Center-right". Only the first characterization is coded in the data set.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5016\_D

Party D (Christian Democratic Movement (KDH)) is characterized as "Christian Democratic party" and as "Conservative party". Only the first characterization is coded in the data set.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5016\_E

Party E (Most-Híd) is fully characterized as "Hungarian minority interest - ethnic party, more center-right".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5016\_F

Party F (Slovak National Party (SNS)) is fully characterized as "Radical national party".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5016\_G

Party G (Party of Hungarian Coalition (SMK)) is fully characterized as "Ethnic based party, rather conservative".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5016\_D

The Democratic Party of retired persons is "issue specific" (source: macro report).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5016\_E

Independent Democrats is considered an ethnic party in terms of support base amongst colored citizens in Western Cape, but not party platform (source: macro report).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5016\_F

United Democratic Movement is considered an ethnic party in terms of support base amongst Xhosa speakers in Eastern Cape but not party platform (source: macro report).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5016\_G

According to the collaborator, Freedom Front Plus is probably more ethnic/racial but also conservative.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5016\_H

According to the collaborator, ACDP explicitly Christian and evangelical, so more important than conservative.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5016\_A to G

None of the proposed categories fit the political parties in Thailand.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5016\_E

The political party SP (Felicity Party) was categorized as a "religious (Sunni Islamist)" political party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5016\_F

The political party HAS parti (People's voice party) was categorized as a "Social Liberal Religious" party

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5016

Most Uruguayan parties actually represent coalitions of parties, organizations, and/or movements. Hence their ideological character is complex.

Taking this into account, the Uruguayan collaborator described ideological profile of the parties using multiple designations, as shown below. Only the first characterization listed is entered into the data-set.

Variable / Party	CSES code
C5016_A - Party A	03. Socialist 04. Social Democratic 02. Communist Left Libertarian
C5016_B - Party B	10. Nationalist 08. Christian Democratic 09. Conservative 07. Right Liberal

---

C5016_C - Party C	09. Conservative 07. Right Liberal (Center Right) Social Democratic
C5016_D - Party D	04. Social Democratic (Center Left) Christian Democratic
C5016_E - Party E	15. Revolutionary Left Libertarian

---



---

C5017\_A >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY A  
 C5017\_B >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY B  
 C5017\_C >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY C  
 C5017\_D >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY D  
 C5017\_E >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY E  
 C5017\_F >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY F  
 C5017\_G >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY G  
 C5017\_H >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY H  
 C5017\_I >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY I

---

Q6a. A-F. Parties' positions on the left-right scale  
(in the expert judgment of the CSES Collaborator):

00. LEFT

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. RIGHT

97. NOT APPLICABLE; NO LOWER HOUSE ELECTIONS

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5017

Parties are identified in Appendix I. Source: Macro report Q6a.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5017\_A - C5017\_G

Left-right positions are the result of a survey among the four principal investigators of the election study. The standard deviation of their responses are: Party A (.535), Party B (.488), Party C (.690), Party D (.378), Party E (.690), Party F (.900), Party G (.756).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5017\_E

according to the collaborator it is impossible to provide a proper Left-Right placement of the UDMR. The Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania (UDMR) is a political organization representing the Hungarian minority in Romania. Although not officially registered as a political party, it is the equivalent of an ethnic party that competes in every election and passes the threshold. Although affiliated to the European People's Party (EPP), it puts together several smaller platforms of different ideological orientations (christian-democratic, social democratic, liberal, etc.). These platforms stick together in order to pass the electoral threshold, as they all represent primarily the interests of the Hungarian minority.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5017\_G

The liberal party's policy positions and preferences are not only oriented towards 'pure' liberal economic ideals, but importantly also to welfare issues, especially in the protection of the minority groups.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5017\_A to G

All political parties in Thailand were coded 5 by the collaborator. This decision is largely based on the fact that, for all the political parties, the average score on the left-right scale is also 5 in the micro part of the data.

## C5018 &gt;&gt;&gt; ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION

Q6b. Were respondents asked to rank political parties on an alternative dimension, other than the left-right dimension?

1. YES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES FOR THE DIMENSION LABELS]  
 5. NO  
 9. MISSING

## NOTES: C5018\_A-F

See Variable Notes for the dimension labels.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5018

Label for left hand position: Russia is a security threat.  
 Label for right hand position: Russia is a trustworthy partner.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5018

Provided for information only in the macro report to give the full ideological perspective of the parties.  
 Label for left hand position: Libertarianism.  
 Label for right hand position: Authoritarianism.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5018

Name of dimension: Pro-Beijing vs. Pro-Hong Kong

Label for left hand position: Pro-Beijing.  
 Label for right hand position: Pro-Hong Kong.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5018

Name of dimension: Environmentalism

Label for left hand position: Not at all environmentalist.  
 Label for right hand position: Very environmentalist.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5018

Name of dimension: Progressive vs Conservative

Label for left hand position: Progressive.  
 Label for right hand position: Conservative.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5018

Name of dimension: Ethnic dimension

=====

Label for left hand position: Pro-Slavic.  
 Label for right hand position: Pro-Latvian.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5018  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5018

Name of dimension: Liberalism vs. Conservatism.

Label for left hand position: Liberal.  
 Label for right hand position: Conservative.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5018  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5018

Name of dimension: Liberal vs Solidary.

Label for left hand position: Liberal.  
 Label for right hand position: Solidary.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5018

In Taiwan a rating of political parties was provided on an alternative dimension. The same of the dimension is: Stance on Taiwan Independence vs. unification with mainland China. Scores closer to 0 represent preference for the independence of Taiwan, while scores closer to 10 signify preference for unification with mainland China.

-----  
 C5018\_A >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY A  
 C5018\_B >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY B  
 C5018\_C >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY C  
 C5018\_D >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY D  
 C5018\_E >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY E  
 C5018\_F >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY F  
 C5018\_G >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY G  
 C5018\_H >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY H  
 C5018\_I >>> ALTERNATIVE DIMENSION - PARTY I  
 -----

Q6b. a-f. Parties' positions on the alternative scale  
 (in the expert judgment of the CSES Collaborator):

.....

00. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES FOR THE DIMENSION LABELS]

01.

02.

03.

04.

05.

06.

07.

08.

09.

10. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES FOR THE DIMENSION LABELS]

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5018\_A-F

See Variable Notes for the dimension labels.

Parties are identified in Appendix I. Source: Macro report Q6a.

```

-----
C5019_1 >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 1ST
C5019_2 >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 2ND
C5019_3 >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 3RD
C5019_4 >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 4TH
C5019_5 >>> MOST SALIENT FACTORS IN ELECTION - 5TH
-----

```

Q7.1-5. In your view, what are the five most salient factors that affected the outcome of the election (e.g., major scandals; economic events; the presence of an independent actor; specific issues)?

.....

001.-899. MOST SALIENT FACTORS CODES  
[SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5019\_1-5

Entries below are presented according to the order of salience in the expert judgments of the CSES collaborators.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 060. Industrial Relations
- 004. Health
- 001. Education
- 061. Economic Management
- 062. Environment/Global warming.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the five most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 074. Severe intra-governmental conflicts between coalitional parties regarding tax policies, appropriate measurements fighting inflation and mandatory referendums about further EU contracts.
- 075. Time of realization and magnitude of the proposed tax relief and compensation for rising inflation especially for low income households.
- 076. Growing EU-skepticism and disillusionment with EU policies.
- 077. Intensified anti-immigration and islamophobic resentments in subgroups of the electorate.
- 078. Disillusionment with performance and leading figures of both coalitional parties.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 031. Steps towards developing relations with the EU
- 032. The oil and gas conflict with Russia in December 2007
- 033. The conflict between Russia and Georgia
- 034. The neutral position of Belarus in terms of the conflict between Russia and Georgia, non-recognition of Abkhazia's and South Ossetia's independence.
- 035. Cancelling social benefits

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 055. Re-election of president Lula. (At the time of election, President Lula had high levels of government approval).
- 056. Public debate about privatization and the role of state. President Lula as candidate has emphasized the role of state in economy and social policies. The main adversary (PSDB Alckmin) emphasized the positive aspects of privatization.
- 057. The role of media. Some political specialists affirm that the second round of election only happened because President Lula didn't appear in a campaign debate at television 3 days before the day of election. All surveys reported that President Lula would win for Presidency in the first round, due to his wide approval and popularity.
- 058. Corruption crisis affecting the president Party (PT). In 2005 there was a corruption scandal involving some politicians in the National Congress and some political parties, related to electoral financing campaign in 2002 and benefits to politicians at Parliament.
- 059. Social Programs. Bolsa Familia, a redistribution of income program was the landmark of the government, it changed the geographic distribution of votes for Lula to the poor areas of the country; the vote for Lula was historically concentrated in the richer areas of the country, identified to left vote.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the five most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 148. Continuity of President Lula's government. (At the time of election, President Lula had high levels of government approval, the highest in the 2 terms of mandate - 83% of approval)
- 149. Maintenance of federal social programs (specially the income transfer programs) and economic policy. Economic policy benefited middle classes and the consumption opportunities; in 2010 socioeconomic data revealed that the "C Class" was about 52% of the population.
- 150. Abortion and Religion. Near to the election day the campaign turned highly conservative, a strategy of the opposition to differentiate itself from the government electoral agenda. The government candidate Dilma Rousseff (Worker's Party) used to be a leftist militant in terrorist organizations during the military regime, and during the campaign publicly defined abortion as a public health problem, not a Catholic or religious issue. The main adversary (PSDB-Jose Serra) emphasized the role of religion in public issues. Analysts agree to that was the main cause the Government's candidate did not win the election in the first round, she won in the second round.
- 151. Corruption crisis affecting the government. In 2010 there was scandals involving some ministries.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the five most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 185. Healthcare
- 188. Partisanship
- 189. Party leaders
- 190. The environment
- 191. Strategic considerations (including minority government)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5019

This figure represents the number of parties who participated in the lower house elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 214. Long tenure in office of the Concertacion (four Presidents in a row)
- 215. Splits and conflicts of the ruling parties, particularly and social democrats
- 216. Bad candidate and campaign of the Concertacion, former president Eduardo Frei Ruiz Tagle.
- 217. Modernizing campaigns of the right
- 218. Impact of the financial crisis 2008

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 026. Ideological and party loyalty of the voters of the two major parties, HDZ and SDP
- 027. New party leader of the SDP, who mobilized additional volatile voters
- 028. Favorable economic trends supporting the ruling HDZ
- 029. Open support for the HDZ by the Catholic Church
- 030. Several contested issues: voting rights for the Croatian citizens living abroad questioned by the SDP, threat by the SDP to introduce tax on profits from stock market shares.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 107. Economic issues concerning taxation, social welfare and health care.
- 108. The election campaign featured negative personal attacks on political opponents: A week before Election Day, with the assistance of MPs of the opposition ODS and governing KDU-CSL, a secret report by Police Colonel Kubice was published, pointing to possible links between the then Prime Minister and CSSD Party leader, Paroubek, and organized crime. For ODS and other parties, the publishing of the secret report was a way to criticize the corrupting and 'mafia-like' style of CSSD's politics.
- 109. A day before the elections were to take place, in the editorials of three out of four major dailies, the editors in-chief recommended that voters did not vote for the Communists or Social Democrats, but that they cast their vote in favor of liberal and conservative parties.
- 110. Unexpected increase in the support of Green party between January to March 2006 from almost nothing to 7 percent.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 192. Economic crisis and country's budgetary deficit was used by the centre-right parties as a tool to strengthen their position and proclaim the need of cutting spending against often populist promises of the left in areas of social spending, tax and healthcare.
- 193. Rise of distrust to traditional, namely two largest parties (ODS and CSSD), emergence of new political subjects



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the five most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 152. Welfare policy
- 153. Immigration policy (in particular treatment of children of asylum seekers not granted asylum but being unable to return to their home)
- 154. Economic policy
- 155. Tax reliefs
- 156. Higher wages for public employees

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the elections is included here:

- 143. As Estonia had been hit very hard by the global economic and financial crisis (the economy contracted by nearly 15% in 2009; in 2010, GDP expanded by 3.1%), issues related to economic recovery and job creation dominated political debates. The key question dividing voters was how to assess the government's response to the crisis.
- 144. Edgar Savisaar, head of the biggest opposition party (the Centre Party), was mired in a major scandal after having allegedly requested and received funding for his party from Russian sources connected to the Kremlin. The allegations were officially confirmed by the Estonian Security Police. All other major parties ruled out cooperation with the Centre Party as long as Edgar Savisaar remains its leader. The scandal contributed to the polarization of the electorate along ethnic lines and intensified security concerns. The scandal broke three months before the election and was in the headlines throughout the campaign period.
- 145. High levels of unemployment, coupled with concerns about rising prices made questions related to welfare prominent in the press and in campaign manifestos. Many voters attributed price hikes to the changeover to the euro (on January 1, 2011) and critics accused the Ansip government of being overeager in pleasing Brussels (e.g. implementing ruthless budget cuts in order to comply with the convergence criteria) while neglecting the welfare of economically less-secure segments of the population.
- 146. An unusually large number of independent candidates, some of them very prominent, ran on an anti-party message contributing to a critical debate about the complacency of party elites. Independent candidates were encouraged by the success of Indrek Tarand in the 2009 European Parliament elections (Tarand received over a quarter of the nation-wide vote).
- 147. The internal turmoil in the two smallest opposition parties (the People's Union and the Greens) led to widespread perceptions of their demise, which in turn drove small party supporters to vote for bigger parties (in order to not waste their votes).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 063. Cleavage between labour movement and non-socialist parties, which was intensified by the campaign ads of the central labour federation.
- 064. Disagreements on the possibilities for increasing

- welfare services and benefits, and on the possibilities to reduce taxes
- 065. Unemployment
  - 066. Benefits of the elderly people
  - 067. The so called premier campaign: the suitability of the party leaders of the three biggest parties to serve as the prime minister.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 167. The European economic crisis and the bailouts of Portugal and Greece.
- 168. The party and candidate funding scandal after the election of 2007.
- 169. The cleavage between center and periphery.
- 170. Increased income differences, even though still modest in a global comparison, the Finnish electorate is sensitive to increased economic inequalities.
- 171. The campaigning for the position of the Prime Minister.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 021. Result of the previous presidential elections (won by Nicolas Sarkozy, UMP)
- 022. Change in Party Strategy from the UDF (embodied in the Change of name UDF MoDem): left the traditional right-wing Alliance but no agreement came to force with the left wing parties
- 023. Debate about "Social VAT" (new government appointed by the new President reasserted that an increase of VAT to decrease salary charges was possible); more salient between first and second round.
- 024. Environment (new government was created with a particularly large ministerial department for environment; sustainable growth was put to the fore)
- 025. European integration (after the no to the European constitutional treaty in May 2005, debates about how should the new treaty be designed and consequently ratified in France)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 068. Reform of the social security system in Germany (Hartz IV)
- 069. Economy and unemployment
- 070. Tax Reform (Goods and services tax)
- 071. Snap Elections
- 072. Health System (Kopfpauschale)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 104. Commercial Crisis
- 049. Social Security
- 105. Nuclear Power Phase-out
- 106. Data Protection vs. Homeland Security

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the elections is included here:

- 133. Economic Crisis
- 134. Political corruption
- 135. Social upheaval-riots
- 136. Immigration
- 137. Educational reform

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 111. Tensions between Hong Kong and Beijing: When the tensions between Hong Kong and Beijing are high, more voters tend to vote for candidates from pro-Hong Kong parties; when tensions are low, more voters tend to vote for candidates from pro-Beijing parties.
- 112. Government performance: When the government performs well, more voters tend to vote for candidates from pro-government parties; when the government performs badly, more voters tend to vote for candidates from anti-government parties.
- 113. Policy orientation or stance of parties (e.g. minimum wage legislation).
- 114. Strategic voting: When an imbalance of power favoring pro-government forces in the Legislative Council is perceived, more voters tend to vote for candidates from anti-government parties and candidates who are more vocal or radical.
- 115. Candidates' quality and constituency services.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 121. Economic Stability
- 001. Education
- 046. Environmental issues/concerns
- 122. Social Welfare
- 003. Taxes

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 079. Economic crisis.
- 080. Collapse of the three major Icelandic commercial banks
- 081. Debate about democratic reform
- 082. Holding those accountable who were responsible for the bank crisis.
- 083. Saving / helping households from going bankrupt

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 084. Economic situation
- 085. Perceived competence of government party
- 086. Different views on main government party leader
- 087. Concerns about the health service
- 088. Traditional loyalties

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors

in the election is included here:

- 016. Disengagement, security
- 017. Candidates (Sharon's illness, Amir Peretz)
- 018. Social gaps, the economy
- 019. Identity (religion, ethnicity)
- 020. Disaffection from politics and corruption

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 041. Discontent with politics (related to PM response to "missing pensions records" issue)
- 042. Compensation tax (VAT) issue
- 043. Evaluation of "Structural Reform" of Koizumi Cabinet (related to socioeconomic inequality)
- 044. Political corruption
- 001. Education

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 176. Overseeing the economic recovery (Unity; UFG).
- 177. Accusations of corruption (For a good Latvia)
- 178. Blame for economic collapse
- 179. Ethnic divide

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 006. Ideological Polarization
- 007. Loss of support of PRD candidate
- 008. Intense Media Coverage of candidates
- 009. Potential Impeachment of PRD candidate
- 010. Business Advisory Center TV add against PRD candidate

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 123. The government had to pay the consequences of the financial crisis of 2007-2009. Even though, the public finances did not suffer severe consequences, and the exchange rate peso-dollar did not suffer sudden and drastic changes, GNP dropped dramatically and unemployment spread. Therefore, the perception that the Government did not respond in the best way to solve these problems extended, causing a great discontent and frustration in the population.
- 124. The problem of crime, specially the "Drug War" - an armed conflict between rival drug cartels and government forces -, produced a lack of credibility in the Government (PAN) because the persistence of violence and murders related to this issue.
- 125. The former left candidate of the PRD, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, did not recognize his defeat in 2006, and has been campaigning across the country under two small parties (Convergencia and PT). This has created strong problems for the leftist parties in two senses. On the one hand strong rejection of López Obrador among many segments of the population and, strong divisions among the parties. This deteriorated their credibility.
- 126. General dissatisfaction with the political actors.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 128. Immigration/integration of ethnic minorities debates
- 129. Future of the European Union and position of Netherlands in EU
- 130. Conflict Minister Rita Verdonk - MP Ayaan Hirsi Ali
- 131. Contested leadership of several parties
- 132. Socio-economic issues

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 185. Economic crisis and ways to get out of the crisis
- 186. Age of retirement
- 187. Healthcare (costs and coverage)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 099. Attrition of support after three terms of government
- 100. Economic recession
- 101. Campaign funding restrictions
- 102. Law and Order
- 103. Tax Reform

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 001. Education
- 002. Care of the Elderly
- 003. Taxes
- 004. Health care
- 005. Child care

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 001. Education
- 046. Environment
- 004. Health care
- 002. Care for the Elderly
- 141. Immigration

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 204. Social inclusion and redistributions of economic growth
- 205. Social conflicts
- 206. Crime and insecurity
- 207. The role of the government in the economy and the Economic development
- 208. The legacy of Fujimori's authoritarian government

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors

in the election is included here:

172. Death of former Pres. Corazon Aquino. The death of former Corazon Aquino changed the electoral landscape. Her death led to a widespread clamor for her son Benigno "Noy" Aquino III to run for President.
173. Liberal Party Standard bearer stepping aside for Noy Aquino. Mar Roxas who was then the standard bearer of the Liberal Party was preparing for the campaign when former Pres. Corazon Aquino died. He eventually gave in to the clamor and stepped aside in favor of Noy Aquino. He was eventually offered the Vice-Presidency but lost.
174. Negative political campaigning. The negative ads that were shown during the campaign affected the chances of Sen. Manuel Villar, Jr. to win. He was in 2nd place during the campaign but fell into 3rd place after the election.
175. Use of automated counting machine. The use of the counting machines prevented the widespread cheating that happened in the previous election. The results were also announced in record time. Although there are some apprehensions in using the counting machines.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

089. Decomposition of the Left (Rywin affair)
090. Social aspect of the PiS campaign (liberal Poland vs. solidary Poland)
091. The idea of the PO-PiS coalition
092. Communist Poland vs. post-communist Poland
093. Conception of moral renewal (especially PiS and PO)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

094. PiS and its allies' style of governing
095. Opposition against PiS government
096. Social campaign (advocating higher voter turnout)
097. Mobilization of the electorate
098. Sawicka affair

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

199. Scandal: Public issue and broadcasting of a short film apparently showing president Traian Basescu hitting a child during an electoral rally in 2004. Supporters of the president accused it to be a fake.
200. Political event: The vote of non-confidence for the Emil Boc government on October 13th, 2009, after the withdrawal of the Social Democrat Party (PSD) from the government coalition. The government crisis continued until the presidential elections, with Emil Boc's cabinet acting as interim government.
201. The economic crisis
202. Scandal: Publication of a series of photos showing Mircea Geoana in a late-night visit at the house of Sorin Ovidiu Vantu, a highly controversial business man. It has been used during the final debate.
203. Issue: A severe outgrowth in the political discourse of a divisive perspective on employees in public sector vs.

employees in private sector. It is particularly significant for the case of the acting president, Traian Basescu.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

133. Economic and social situation, economic crises, social uncertainty, crises of Euro currency.
134. Corruption scandals of the governmental parties, above all - junior coalition partner Slovak National Party.
135. Floods in Eastern Slovakia.
136. Frictions with Hungary (double citizenship law for Hungarians living out of the country and the counter-law passed in the Slovak Parliament immediately afterwards).
137. Civic mobilization campaign, via Internet and social networks which mobilized mostly urban young voters to show up and cast the vote.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the elections is included here:

157. Patria scandal launched by/through the media in the beginning of the electoral campaign: - the claims of bribery of Slovenian officials by the Finnish company Patria when buying the infantry armored vehicles. The president of the 2004-2008 governmental coalition Slovenian Democratic Party (SDS) was accused to be involved in
158. A vigorous government media campaign against 'tycoons' (managers who succeeded in becoming big capitalists with the help of Slovenian bank loans, as then allowed by the law and politics) had been underway since early 2008.
159. The unsolved border dispute between Slovenia and Croatia, existing since the independence of the two countries.
160. The establishment of the new party Zares - new policy in November 2007, majority of its key members came from the decaying Liberal Democracy of Slovenia (LDS). The new leadership of the long-time leading party of the Liberal Democracy of Slovenia (LDS). Party got its first female president Katarina Kresal, the attorney without any political experiences from the past.
161. The results of the presidential elections in 2007, where the independent candidate with the support of the left-centered parties' was elected in the second round, defeated the right-centered governmental coalition candidate.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the elections is included here:

180. The personality of the ANC presidential candidate Jacob Zuma (e.g. the fact that until very recently he had faced criminal charges on both corruption and rape; had been fired as Deputy President of the country, and then conducted a come-back campaign to oust President Thabo Mbeki as party president.)
181. The recent split in the ANC and the formation of the new Congress of the People.
182. The inability of COPE to settle on a well-known national leader
183. The personality of the new leader of the Democratic Alliance, Helen Zille
184. The reinvigorated campaign efforts of the ANC to meet the new challenge from COPE.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 011. Voter punishment of former government (Roh Mu-hym government)
- 012. Timing of election
- 013. Lack of interest and low turnout
- 014. Problems of candidate nominating process (for most major parties)
- 015. Emergence of the Liberty Forward Party

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the elections is included here:

- 167. The failure of the peace talks held by the PSOE government and the Spanish terrorist group ETA, and the breakdown of the ceasefire. A former socialist councilman was assassinated two days before the election.
- 168. The dispute about the reform of the Autonomy Statutes in several Spanish regions, especially in Catalonia.
- 169. The high level of political confrontation between the PSOE government and the PP, which polarized Spanish politics, mass media, and civil society organizations.
- 170. The economic situation and the prospects of economic crisis. There was a high increase in prices of basic products during the year before the election, and unemployment began to rise.
- 171. Illegal immigration and the regularization program for undocumented immigrants launched by the PSOE government.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 219. Employment/Unemployment
- 220. Social Welfare/healthcare
- 221. Education
- 222. Pensions/Elderly care
- 223. Taxes

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 045. Issues related to illegal immigration and crime
- 046. Environmental concerns
- 047. Future role of SVP member of government Christoph Blocher
- 048. Campaign style of SVP
- 049. Social Security

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 050. Economy
- 051. Cross-Strait Relations
- 052. Political stability
- 053. Ethnic relations (Taiwanese vs. mainlanders)
- 054. Anti-corruption



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 036. After the coup, a resurgence of democratic power in rural areas of Thailand.
- 037. The demise of minor parties.
- 038. Some support for traditional parties at isolated local levels
- 039. Official ban on major political parties by the junta-led government.
- 040. Ability of dominant party (TRT) to reconstitute itself as a new party, PPP.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 194. Economy
- 195. Terrorism
- 196. Religiosity versus secularism
- 197. Sectarianism
- 198. Ethnic identity

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5019

- 104. Commercial Crisis
- 209. State of the economy
- 210. Wars (on Terror, in Iraq, in Afghanistan)
- 211. Performance of incumbent administration (George W. Bush)
- 212. Size of welfare state/economic fairness/inequality
- 213. "Social" issues (abortion, religion, race, immigration)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5019

A more detailed description of the most salient factors in the election is included here:

- 162. The high economic growth under the first government of the Broad Front (2005-2010), at an average GDP rate of 8-9% annually. The strongest growth in 70 years. In contrast to the economic crisis of 2002, the most important crisis in the country's history.
- 163. Strong social policies in favor of the lower classes.
- 164. The introduction of personal income tax affecting the middle class.
- 165. Bad performance and gross errors in electoral campaign of the main challenger, the National Party leader and former President Luis Alberto Lacalle.
- 166. The high popularity of outgoing President Vázquez and the great sympathy of the government candidate José Mujica, a former guerrilla leader of the Tupamaros.

## C5020 &gt;&gt;&gt; FAIRNESS OF THE ELECTION

Q9a. How impartial was the body that administered the election law?

- 1. VERY IMPARTIAL
- 2. MOSTLY IMPARTIAL
- 3. NOT VERY IMPARTIAL
- 4. NOT IMPARTIAL AT ALL
- 9. MISSING

-----  
C5021 >>> FORMAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST NATIONAL LEVEL RESULTS  
-----Q9b. Was there a formal complaint against the national level results?  
.....

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 9. MISSING

-----  
C5022 >>> ELECTION IRREGULARITIES REPORTED  
-----Q9c. Were there irregularities reported by international election observers?  
.....

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 6. NO INTERNATIONAL ELECTION OBSERVERS
- 9. MISSING

-----

C5023\_1 >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - MONTH  
 C5023\_2 >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - DAY  
 C5023\_3 >>> DATE ELECTION SCHEDULED - YEAR

C5024\_1 >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - MONTH  
 C5024\_2 >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - DAY  
 C5024\_3 >>> DATE ELECTION HELD - YEAR

-----

Q9d. On what date was the election originally scheduled to be held?

Q9e. On what date was the election actually held?  
.....

MONTH

- 01. JANUARY
- 02. FEBRUARY
- 03. MARCH
- 04. APRIL
- 05. MAY
- 06. JUNE
- 07. JULY
- 08. AUGUST
- 09. SEPTEMBER
- 10. OCTOBER
- 11. NOVEMBER
- 12. DECEMBER

99. MISSING

DAY

01-31. DAY OF MONTH

99. MISSING

YEAR

2006-2009. YEAR

9999. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5023\_1 C5023\_3

According to the collaborator, the elections had not been scheduled. MPs are elected for terms of up to 3 years. "The Prime Minister decides when an election is to be held and gets the approval of the Governor General. When this is done the Prime Minister can announce the intention to hold an election. The Governor General will then dissolve the House of Representatives and issue the writs for the election." (Source: Australian Electoral Commission)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5023\_1 C5023\_3

This date refers to the first round of elections. The second round was scheduled for 29 October 2006.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5023\_1 C5023\_3

This date refers to the first round of elections. The second round was scheduled for 31 October 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5024\_1 C5024\_3

This date refers to the first round of elections. The second round was held on 29 October 2006.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5024\_1 C5024\_3

This date refers to the first round of elections. The second round was held on 31 October 2010.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5023\_1 C5023\_3

These report the date of the first round of elections

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5023\_1 C5023\_3

These report the date of the first round of elections, the Second round took place Sunday, January 17, 2010

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5024\_1 C5024\_3

These report the date of the first round of elections, the Second round took place Sunday, January 17, 2010

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5024\_2

Elections were held over two days, 28-29 May 2010

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5023

According to law, the elections were supposed to be held by the date entered here (February 8, 2009), i.e., 4 years after the previous elections. However, on 24 October 2007 Danish prime minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen announced the early election to be held in 13 November 2007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5024

The current elections were held ahead of time, on 13 November 2007 instead in February 2009. Danish prime minister Anders Fogh

| Rasmussen announced the early election date on 24 October 2007.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5023-C5024

| This represents the scheduled date for the first round of the elections, the second round was scheduled 17 June 2007

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5023\_1 C5023\_2

| An exact date was not fixed. Legislative period is four years. The election day is determined by the president of the Federal Republic.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5023\_1 C3023\_3

| An exact date had not been fixed. Legislative period is 4 years. The election was originally scheduled for 2011 (after the period of the four-year term of the Parliament, starting in the aftermath of the Parliamentary election of 16th September 2007, thus no earlier than September 2011).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5023\_2

| The exact day the parliamentary election was to be held is not available. See C5023\_1 in data set for the month.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5024

| Due to political reasons the Diet session was extended beyond the original schedule, because of which the 2007 Upper House election was postponed, and thus, there is a mismatch between the date the election was scheduled and actually held.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5023-C5024

| 22 November is the first round of the presidential elections  
The second round was held on December 6 2009,

-----  
C5025 >>> ELECTION DATE IRREGULARITIES  
-----

09e. If the election was held on a different date than scheduled, please explain why?

.....

000. ELECTION WAS HELD ON THE SAME DAY AS SCHEDULED

001. ELECTION WAS NOT HELD ON THE SAME DAY AS SCHEDULED [SEE VARIABLE NOTES]

999. MISSING

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5025

| The elections were held earlier than scheduled due to the breakup of the coalition government SPÖ-ÖVP in July 2008.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5025

| The Conservative Prime Minister claimed that the minority parliament had become increasingly dysfunctional. The Governor-General granted his request to dissolve Parliament and call an election.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5025

| After the fall of Topolánek II cabinet in March 2009, a new nonpartisan government was established on the basis of agreement

August,

of parties, that early election is going to be held in autumn 2009 as a way out of political crisis. President then called the election date on October 9th - October 10th 2009. However, in the end of

a deputy elected for Czech Social Democratic Party Miroslav Melcák (who later became independent and voted regularly with Topolánek's government) put a complaint to the Constitutional Court against the decision of President of Republic as well as against the bill on shortening the current legislative term and dissolving the House of Deputies. Surprisingly, the Constitutional court decided in favour of Mr. Melcák's complaint, which provoked an extensive debate among politicians, constitutional lawyers etc. The thing was that this kind

of procedure to get to early elections was already once used, without being criticized. Nevertheless, the decision meant that the early election cannot be held, because the bill about dissolving the lower house was found to be unconstitutional. Intensive negotiations among parties immediately started, but finally CSSD blocked any other legislative options, which meant that the elections were to be held in its regular term - spring 2010.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5025

The current elections were held ahead of time, on 13 November 2007 instead in February 2009. Danish prime minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen announced the early election date on 24 October 2007. The explanation was the need to secure stable government in order to proceed with important welfare policy reforms.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5025

September 18, 2005: Due to the results of the SPD in one federal country. Gerhard Schröder, the chancellor in time, asked for a vote of confidence in the parliament, which he wanted to lose and did so. Background: The Coalition SPD/Greens reformed the social security system which led to dissatisfaction of the people, Schröder wanted an election as decision about the reforms.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5025

"The election was actually held on 4th October 2009. On 3th September 2009 Costas Karamanlis (Prime Minister of Greece since 2004) two years into his second term of office, announced an early election, due to the very difficult economic circumstances that the country was experiencing. His declared justification was that he needed to secure a mandate that would enable him to pass austerity measures. The government of New Democracy was deeply unpopular, facing numerous scandals and having been denounced for the incompetent handling of the forest fires in Greece. Therefore, his decision for early elections was also related to the fact that his administration had serious legitimacy problems. In the background of this early election, we should add the prospective election of the President of the Republic, scheduled for few months later. According to the Greek Constitution, the President is elected from the parliament for a five year term. The five year term of Karolos Papoulias presidency was ending in March 2010 and the opposition party of PASOK and its leader, George Papandreou declared that the party would not renew its support for Papoulias presidency. Therefore, an alternative explanation for going to the country is that the PM tried to avoid an unnecessarily prolonged pre-election period."

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5025

Elections were held earlier than scheduled given that Parliament was dissolved following the breakdown of the Independence and Social Democratic Alliance majority coalition in the end of January 2009 (officially dissolved on February 1).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5025

The elections were held earlier than scheduled as the composition of the Knesset made it impossible to govern. Ariel Sharon (prime minister) sought the permission of the President of Israel on 21 November 2005 to dissolve the Knesset. The president approved the request on 8 December, setting the election date on March 28 2006.

Source: Diskin and Hazan 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5025

Due to political reasons the Diet session was extended beyond the original schedule, because of which the 2007 Upper House election was postponed, and thus, there is a mismatch between the date the election was scheduled and actually held.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5025

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5025

Early election as result of cabinet crisis.

-----  
C5026 >>> ELECTION VIOLENCE  
-----

Q10a. To what extent was there violence and voter or candidate intimidation during the election campaign and the election day?

- .....
1. NO VIOLENCE AT ALL
  2. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT
  3. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF OPPOSITION GROUPS
  4. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON ALL SIDES
  5. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT
  6. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF OPPOSITION GROUPS
  7. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE OF ALL SIDES

9. MISSING

-----  
C5027 >>> GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF VIOLENCE  
-----

Q10b. If there was violence, was it geographically concentrated or national?

- .....
1. NO ELECTION VIOLENCE
  2. GEOGRAPHICALLY CONCENTRATED
  3. NATIONAL

9. MISSING

-----  
C5028 >>> POST-ELECTION VIOLENCE  
-----

Q10c. To what extent was there violence following the election?

- .....
1. NO VIOLENCE AT ALL
  2. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT
  3. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF OPPOSITION GROUPS
  4. SPORADIC VIOLENCE ON ALL SIDES
  5. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT

6. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF OPPOSITION GROUPS

7. SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE OF ALL SIDES

9. MISSING

C5029 >>> POST-ELECTION PROTEST

Q10d. To what extent was there protest following the election?

1. NO PROTEST AT ALL

2. SPORADIC PROTEST

3. SIGNIFICANT PROTEST

9. MISSING

C5030 >>> ELECTORAL ALLIANCES PERMITTED IN ELECTION

Q11.1. There are multiple types of electoral alliances/coalitions, but we are explicitly interested in those involving joint lists or candidates - i.e. those where parties compete as a unit during the election.

Is this type of electoral coalition legally allowable?

1. YES

5. NO

9. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5030

While electoral alliances are not allowed to form for the House of Representatives election (Lower House), they are permitted for Senate (Upper House) election.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5030

According to the Canada Elections Act, a political party may endorse only one candidate per district.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5030

Such alliances are not forbidden, but neither they are explicitly allowed.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5030

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5030

Parties could nominate common candidates to some posts, but no common logos were registered. Voters had to cast a vote for each party, even where they registered the same candidate.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5030

The Electoral Law does not allow political parties competing against each other to present a joint list of candidates. In the 2005 elections, the Left-PDS circumvented this restriction by adding WASG candidates on both their list and constituency seats; the WASG was not participating as party as such. The PDS named itself during the election Linkspartei. PDS or just Linkspartei.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5030

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election. Joint candidates are allowed both in Parliamentary and Presidential elections. However, the alliance has to be legally registered.

## C5031 &gt;&gt;&gt; ELECTORAL ALLIANCES IN PRACTICE

Q11.2. Is this type of electoral coalition [mentioned in Q11.1.] used in practice, even if not legally allowable?

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 9. MISSING

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5031

This response refers to senatorial elections (Upper House). Electoral alliances are prohibited for the House of Representatives election (Lower House).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5031

According to the Canada Elections Act, a political party may endorse only one candidate per district.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5031

Although electoral alliances are not legally allowable, they are occasionally used in practice, but not in the 2007 election.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5031

Such alliances are sued across constituencies (single member districts).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5031

Alliance 1: Die Linke: PDS/WASG

The Electoral Law does not allow political parties competing against each other to present a joint list of candidates. In the 2005 elections, the Left-PDS circumvented this restriction by adding WASG candidates on both their list and constituency seats; the WASG was not participating as party as such. The PDS named itself during the election Linkspartei. PDS or just Linkspartei.

## C5032 &gt;&gt;&gt; DID ANY ELECTORAL ALLIANCES FORM?

Q11.3. (If yes to Q11.1 or Q11.2) Did any electoral alliances form?

- 1. YES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
- 5. NO
- 7. NOT APPLICABLE [NO ALLIANCES PERMITTED]
- 9. MISSING



## NOTES: C5032

See below for names of alliances and party memberships.  
Dominant members are indicated by an asterisk (\*).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5032

Alliance 1: The National Party and The Liberal Party\*.

Notice that this alliance took place only for the Senate election. For the House of Representatives election both parties contested independently. Electoral alliances are not allowed for the Lower House election.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5032

Alliance 1: PT\* - PRB - PC do B

Alliance 2: PSDB\* - PFL

Alliance 3: PSOL\* - PCB - PSTU

NOTE: these alliances are only valid for the presidential elections

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5032

Alliance 1: "PT" - PT\*/PMDB/PDT/PSB/PR/PCdoB/PRB/PTN/PSC/PTC

Alliance 2: "PSDB" - PSDB\*/DEM/PPS/PTB/PMN/PTdoB

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CANADA (2008): C5032

Although no formal alliance formed, The Liberal Party agreed not to contest the district where the Green party leader was running for election and the Green Party leader agreed not to contest the Liberal leader's district.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009): C5032

Alliance 1: Concertacion por la Democracia: PDC\*, PS\*, PPD\* PRSD

Alliance 2: Coalicion por Chile: UDI\*, RN\*, Chile Primero

Alliance 3: Nueva Mayoria para Chile: Partido Ecologista de Chile, Partido Humanista

Alliance 4: Juntos Podemos Mas: Communist party\*, Christian Left.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5032

Alliance 1: HSS-HSLS

Hrvatska seljacka stranka (HSS)\*

Hrvatska socijalno liberalna stranka (HSLS)\*

In 4 electoral districts this alliance also includes the following regional parties:

Zagorska stranka (ZS) (Party of Zagorje)

Zagorska demokratska stranka (ZDS) (Democratic Party of Zagorje)

Primorsko-goranski savez (PGS) (Primorje Gorski kotar Alliance)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5032

Alliance 1: "TOP09" : TOP09 and "Mayors and independents"

Alliance 2: "Sovereignty" - "Politics 21" and "Party of Common sense"

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5032

Alliance 1: Christian Democrats\* (KD) and True Finns

Alliance 2: True Finns\* and Independence Party

Alliance 3: National Coalition (KOK)\*, Christian Democrats (KD), and True Finns

Alliance 4: Center Party (KESK) and Swedish People's Party (SFP)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5032

There are no national alliances in Finland. All alliances are at the constituency level. There were 15 alliances at the election of 2011. Only alliances that were successful in gaining seats in the Parliament are listed below. Of all elected MPs, seven represent the electoral alliances listed here.

Alliance 1: Center Party\* and Swedish People's Party;

Constituency of Varsinais-Suomi

Alliance 2: Center Party\* and Christian Democrats;

Constituency of Satakunta

Alliance 3: National Coalition\* and Christian Democrats;

Constituency of Etelä-Savo

Alliance 4: National Coalition\* and Christian Democrats;

Constituency of Pohjois-Karjala

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5032

Alliance 1: "Presidential majority" - UMP\*, New Center

Alliance 2: "Left" - PS\*, PRG, Verts

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5032

Alliance 1: Die Linke: PDS/WASG (no dominant partner)

The Electoral Law does not allow political parties competing against each other to present a joint list of candidates. In the 2005 elections, the Left-PDS circumvented this restriction by adding WASG candidates on both their list and constituency seats; the WASG was not participating as a party as such. The PDS named itself during the election Linkspartei. PDS or just Linkspartei.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5032

ALLIANCE 1: Coalition of the Radical Left (SYRIZA) which includes:

Synaspismos\*: Coalition of the Left of Movements and Ecology (European Left).

AKOA: Renovative Communist Ecologic Left. KOE: Communist Organization of Greece (ICMLPO). DEA: Internationalist Workers' Left (ISO). Kokkino (4th International). Xekinima (CWI). Rosa. KEDA: Movement for the Unity in Action of the Left || Energoi Polites: Active Citizens. Ecosocialists Greece (Ecosocialist International Network). DIKKI: Democratic Social Movement, and several independent leftist activists

Source: <http://www.syn.gr/en/profile.htm>.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5032

Alliance 1: Ihud Leumi and Mafdal \*

Alliance 2: Avoda\* and Meimad

Alliance 3: Raam and Taal \*

Alliance 4: Agudat Israel \* and Degel Hatora

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5032

Alliance 1: UNITY - New Era\*; Civic Union; Society for a Different Politics

Alliance 2: Harmony Centre - Social Democratic Party "Harmony";

Socialist Party of Latvia; Daugavpils City Party

Alliance 3: Union of Greens and Farmers - Farmers' Union of Latvia; Green Party of Latvia

Alliance 4: For a Good Latvia - People's Party; Latvia's First Party/Latvian Way

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5032

Alliance 1: Alianza por el Bien de México:

=====

(Alliance for the Good of Mexico)  
PRI\*-PVEM.  
Alliance 2: Alianza por el Bien de Todos:  
(Alliance for the Good of Everyone)  
PRD\*-PT-Convergencia

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5032

Alliance 1: "Salvemos a Mexico":  
(Let's Save Mexico))  
Partido del Trabajo\*-Convergencia.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2010): C5032

Alliance 1: PvdA\* and GreenLeft  
Alliance 2: ChristenUnie and SGP  
[According to the collaborator, there is no dominant party  
in this list combination.]

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5032

Alliance 1: Alliance por el gran cambio: Alianza para el  
Progreso, Partido Humanista Peruano, Partido  
popular cristiano - PCC\*, Restauración Nacional  
Alliance 2: Alianza solidaridad Nacional: Cambio 90,  
Siempre Unidos, Solidaridad Nacional\*, Todos Por  
El Perú  
Alliance 3: Peru possible: Acción Popular, Partido Democrático  
Somos Perú, Perú Posible\*

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5032

The coalitions listed here participated in the elections to the  
the Philippine House of Representatives, the congressional  
districts.

Alliance 1: LAKAS-KAMPI: LAKAS-NUCD\* and KAMPI  
Alliance 2: Liberal Party coalition: LP\* and KKK (Struggle  
for Peace, Progress and Justice)  
Alliance 3: Nacionalista Party coalition: Nationalist Party\*,  
Kusug (Promote Progress for Cebu), PCM (People's  
Champ Movement), and Ugyon Kita Capi z (Unite Capi z)  
Alliance 4: PMP coalition: PMP\*, Navoteño (Party of the People  
of Navotas), and Magdiwang (Magdiwang Party)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5032

Alliance 1: Lewica i Demokraci: SLD\* SDPL PD UP

SLD: Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej (Left Democratic Alliance)  
SDPL: Socjaldemokracja polska (Social Democracy of Poland)  
PD: Partia demokratyczna (Democratic Party)  
UP: Unia Pracy (Labour Union)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5032

Alliance 1: CDU (Coligação Democrática Unitária)  
PCP\* (Partido Comunista Português) and PEV (Partido  
Ecológico "Os verdes")

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5032

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential  
Election, thus alliances sharing a common presidential candidate  
are listed.

Alliance 1: Social Democratic Party + Conservative Party Political  
Alliance (PSD\*+PC) Alianta Politica Partidul Social Democrat +

Partidul

Conservator (PSD\*+PC)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5032

In the 2010 election there were no regular coalitions running. However, there were two cases when candidates from one party (or grouping) placed candidates on the list of another bigger party.

1. First one - members of Civic conservative party were running on the list of Most-Híd, four of them got into the Parliament whereas 3 of those thanks to the preferential votes (each voter could give 4 preferential votes, they are counted if they exceed more than 3% of the votes for the relevant party).
2. Four members of an association "Ordinary People" ran on the list of Freedom and Solidarity on the lowest position of the list (147. - 150.). Thanks to the preferential votes all four got into the Parliament.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5032

Alliance 1: SLS\* - SMS  
Slovenian people's Party (SLS)\*  
Slovenian Youth Party (SMS)

Alliance 2: Green Party\*- Green Progress

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5032

The ANC is in a formal alliance with the Congress of South African Trade Unions, and with the South African Communist Party. But COSATU and SACP members stand for legislative office on the ANC list, as ANC members.

## C5033 &gt;&gt;&gt; REQUIREMENTS FOR JOINT PARTY LISTS

Q12. If joint lists are possible, are they subject to different regulations than single-party lists? For example higher thresholds, different numbers of candidates that may appear on the list, etc.

1. YES, JOINT PARTY LISTS MUST SATISFY HIGHER THRESHOLDS
2. YES, JOINT PARTY LISTS MAY PRESENT DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF CANDIDATES
3. YES, JOINT PARTY LISTS ARE SUBJECT TO OTHER REGULATIONS THAT ARE DIFFERENT FROM THE REGULATIONS GOVERNING INDEPENDENT PARTIES
5. NO, JOINT PARTIES ARE GOVERNED BY THE SAME RULES AS OTHER PARTIES
7. NOT APPLICABLE; NO JOINT PARTY LISTS ARE ALLOWED
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5033

Please also refer to notes for variables C5030-C5032.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006 &amp; 2010): C5033

This applies to lower house elections. C5033 for Brazil is coded 2, because joint party lists may present different number of candidates:

When district magnitude  $\geq 20$ :  
YES, when there is no joint list a political party can present up to 1,5 candidates for each seat; when there is joint list a political party can present up to 2 candidates for each seat.

When district magnitude <20:

YES, when there is no joint list a political party can present up to 2 candidates for each seat; when there is joint list a political party can present up to 2,5 candidates for each seat.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5033

Note that in the French electoral system there are no electoral lists, so this question refers to multiple parties endorsing 'joint' candidates. In practice, candidates may declare to voters as many endorsements as they wish; yet, for party funding (which is almost the only regulation on parties in France), candidates can declare only one endorsement even if they receive money from more than one party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5033

Number of candidates may be higher than the number on the list of separate parties (depends on previous election results).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5033

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, where joint candidates are not subject to different regulations. For the last Parliamentary Elections in November 2008, in the case of alliances 3% was added to the normal 5% threshold for the second party and 1% for each additional party in the alliance. However, the requested threshold for alliances could not exceed 10%.

#### C5034 >>> THE POSSIBILITY OF APPARENTEMENT

Q13a. Is there apparentement or linking of lists?

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 9. MISSING

#### C5035 >>> TYPES OF APPARENTEMENT AGREEMENTS

Q13b. If apparentement is possible, what lists can participate in such agreements?

- 1. LISTS OF THE SAME PARTY IN THE SAME CONSTITUENCY
- 2. LISTS OF THE SAME PARTY FROM DIFFERENT CONSTITUENCIES
- 3. LISTS OF DIFFERENT PARTIES IN THE SAME CONSTITUENCY
- 7. NOT APPLICABLE; NO APPARENTEMENT
- 9. MISSING

NOTES: C5035

Please also refer to notes for variable C5034.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5035

In the Macro report, the collaborator mentions that in Sweden, lists of the same party in the same constituency, or lists of different parties in the same constituency can participate in apparentement.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5035

See note for C5034.

-----  
C5036 >>> MULTI-PARTY ENDORSEMENTS  
-----

Q14a. Can candidates run with the endorsement of more than one party?  
.....

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 9. MISSING

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5036

Not applicable to the Croatian ballot: the ballot paper shows the names and acronyms of parties which compete for votes in an electoral district, but no candidate names. In addition, there is the name of a "bearer of the list", i.e. a person (usually the president of the respective party) who symbolizes the party list but who is not necessarily candidate in the electoral district. Joint party lists are possible and they also have only one "bearer of the list".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5036

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5036

According to Polish electoral law, subject of electoral competition are Electoral Committees of parties, not parties as such. Electoral committee can be formed by individual parties, or coalition of parties. A candidate can be endorsed by ONLY ONE electoral committee. However, list of candidates of an electoral committee can contain candidates supported by (only one) political party different than party which formed electoral committee. Usually it means that candidate from smaller party is a guest on the candidate list of electoral committee of a bigger party. In this case, Official Electoral Announcement (posters which one can find in the polling stations) contains information that candidate is supported by different party than party of his/her electoral committee. However, on the voting ballot one can find only name of an electoral committee.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5036

Candidates cannot run with the endorsement of more than one party, unless the parties run in a joint list with a common label - pre-electoral coalition - and with several candidates, from the corresponding political parties that integrate the coalition.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5036

The only exception is the case of parties that formally registered an electoral alliance and have joint candidates.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5036

This is variable by states. Candidates can be endorsed by more than one party. Multiple party endorsement are generally rare but do occur in states with active third parties. Theoretically parties could withdraw candidates to optimize joint performance. However, this is rare to non-existent in practice due to the weakness of third parties.

-----  
C5037 >>> MULTI-PARTY ENDORSEMENTS ON BALLOT  
-----

Q14b. If candidates can run with the endorsement of more than one party, is this reflected on the ballot?  
.....

1. NO
2. NO PARTY ENDORSEMENTS ARE INDICATED ON THE BALLOT PAPER
3. YES, CANDIDATE'S NAME APPEARS ONCE, TOGETHER WITH THE NAMES OF ALL SUPPORTING PARTIES
4. YES, CANDIDATE'S NAME APPEARS AS MANY TIMES AS THERE ARE DIFFERENT PARTIES ENDORSING HIM/HER, EACH TIME WITH THE NAME OF THE ENDORSING PARTY
5. YES, OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. NOT APPLICABLE
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5037

Please also refer to notes for variable C5036.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5037

see note for C5036

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5037

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5037

On voting ballots one can find only names of an electoral committees endorsing supporting particular candidates. See also note for D5036.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5037

This is variable by states, and nearly all of the above options appear. See also note for C5036

-----  
C5038\_1 >>> VOTES CAST - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
C5038\_2 >>> VOTES CAST - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
C5038\_3 >>> VOTES CAST - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
C5038\_4 >>> VOTES CAST - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
-----

Q16a. How many votes do voters cast or can cast?

In systems where voters rank order the candidates, if there are 10 candidates (for example), the response to this question should be 10.  
.....

- 01-90. NUMBER OF VOTES
91. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
97. NOT APPLICABLE
99. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5038\_1

For lower house elections, Australia employs the Alternative Vote system (see note C5065). In this system, voters are required to list their preferences for as many candidates as there are on the ballot. Thus, the total number of votes varies across electoral districts.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5038\_3

For upper house elections, Australia employs a single-transferable-vote form of proportional representation. In this system each voter indicates the order of preference among all the candidates in competing in her district, or alternatively, she can indicate support for a party ticket (which determines the order of preference of candidates within the party).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5038\_1

The Austrian electoral system is a proportional representation system with three segments or tiers. These correspond to the regional districts tier, the Land level tier (or state level) and the federal (or national) level tier. Counting and allocation of seats passes through each of these levels. However, voters cast a single vote. In this vote, they can express preferences for specific candidates, particularly, a Lander level candidate and/or for a regional level candidate. However, since voters cast a single vote only, this system is different from systems with multiple tiers where voters vote separately in different tiers. Hence, the system is coded as consisting of a single tier in variables C5038-C5047. See also ES note for C5038.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5038\_3

Members of the Brazilian Senate (Senado Federal) are elected for 8-years term. One-third and two-thirds of the Senate are renewed alternately every 4 years. In 2002, two-thirds of the senate was renewed, and therefore voters had two votes in the upper house election - each electoral district gave two senators. By contrast, in 2006 only a third of the senate was renewed, giving voters a single vote in these upper house elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5038\_3

Members of the Brazilian Senate (Senado Federal) are elected for 8-years term. One-third and two-thirds of the Senate are renewed alternately every 4 years. In 2006, one-third of the Senate was renewed, and therefore voters had a single vote in the upper house election. In 2010, two-thirds of the Senate were renewed, giving voters two votes in these upper house elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5038\_1

General voters cast one vote. However Serbian minority voters can cast up to three votes for individual candidates (no cumulation allowed) in their national constituency (three seats).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5038\_1

The unicameral Danish parliament, the Folketing, has 179 members, 175 from Denmark proper and two each from the Faroe Islands and Greenland. The members from these two parts of the realm are elected according to separate rules. Voters cast a single vote which affects seat distribution in two segments. The first segment refers to the 135 seats elected in 10 primary districts. An additional 40 seats are allocated in the secondary, nationwide, district, and 4 seats are allocated to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5038\_2

The secondary segment refers to 40 seats allocated in the nationwide district. However voters cast only a single vote at the constituency level, that is voters do not directly cast a vote for this tier. Hence, this variable is coded "7. Not-applicable."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5038\_1

"There are 12 multi-member constituencies with district magnitude ranging from 6 to 13 seats. There is a 5% threshold. Seats are allocated in three rounds. In the first round, seats are awarded to candidates who garner the same or more votes than the simple quota in their electoral districts. In the second round, seats are allocated in a traditional PR method. That is, party lists are awarded seats based on their share of the vote in the district, and candidates within the list receive seats in the order of how many preferential votes they received. In the third round of counting, all remaining mandates are distributed between the national candidate lists with at least 5% of the national vote." From <http://www.electinguide.org/country.php?ID=69>.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5038\_1 C5038\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5038\_1 C5038\_2

In the case of the Bundestag elections, each voter has 2 votes, one in each segment: 1 ("first vote") for an individual candidate in one of the primary constituencies, and 1 ("second vote") for the party-list established, for each of the Länder, by each political party.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5038\_1

Hong Kong has a unicameral legislature. The legislative council of the HKSAR has 60 members. Half of the legislative council is returned by geographic constituency (popular) elections; the other half is returned by functional constituency elections. Data on Hong Kong electoral institutions refer to the geographical constituency elections only.

Eligible individuals can register as an elector in both Geographical Constituency and Function Constituency. But, because of the restrictive franchise of the latter, there is less than 8% of the electors in the Geographical Constituency are eligible and registered in the Functional Constituency. In geographical constituency elections, each elector can cast 1 vote. In functional constituency (FC) elections, electors normally have 1 vote. But there are complications as the electors of some functional constituencies are not "individuals", but corporations or organizations of which their owners and/or directors are entitled to vote.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5038\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5038\_2

There is one secondary district where 9 (out of 63) so called "supplementary" seats are allocated to party lists receiving at least 5% of the valid vote. However, voters cast only a single vote, and these supplementary seats are allocated only to parties that surpass the national 5% threshold, voters do not directly cast a vote for this tier. Hence, this variable was coded 7. Non-applicable.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5038\_1-C5038\_4

Japan has a bicameral Parliament (Kokkai, or National Diet). The House of Representatives (Shugi-in) has 480 seats which are elected in two electoral segments for a four-year term. The

first segment consists of 300 seats elected from roughly equal-sized single member districts. The second segment is comprised of 180 seats allocated on the basis of proportional representation in 11 regional multi-member districts. The upper house (House of Councilors) has 242 members who are elected in two electoral segments, for 6 years term, where half of the members (121) stand for re-election every three years. The first segment consists of 47 prefecture-level districts where 73 representatives in each election are chosen by simple majority. Successful candidates are decided in the order of the number of valid votes obtained on the basis of the comparative plurality. The second segment is represented by a single nation-wide district based on proportional representation (D'Hondt method), where 48 representatives are elected in a single electoral half-cycle.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5038\_1-C5038\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5038\_1-C5038\_2

Mexican voters cast a single vote in a single member district plurality election. However, this also counts for the allocation of the proportional representation seats disputed in the larger regional multi-member districts (five circumscriptions). Thus, voters are not allowed to split their vote, in fact, the same vote is subject to a double counting that produces two-seat relevant vote totals. The first vote total determines who wins the plurality in the single-member district (300 seats). The second serves to allocate seats in the multi-member districts (200 seats). The PR seats are allocated according to the aggregate distribution of votes of multi-member districts, which excludes non valid votes, votes for parties that obtained less than 2% and votes for non-registered candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5038\_3- C5038\_4

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5038\_3- C5038\_4

For senatorial (Upper House) elections, voters cast a single vote in 3-seat multi-member districts (which correspond to the country's 31 states plus the Federal District). The first two seats are awarded to the plurality winner and the third seat is given to the first runner-up. This vote also counts for the allocation of proportional representation seats disputed in one national district. Thus, each vote is subject to a double counting that produces two-seat relevant vote totals. The first vote total determines who wins the in the multi-member districts (96 seats), and the second serves to allocate through proportional representation the resting 32 seats. For the allocation of the PR seats the national distribution of votes excludes non valid votes, votes for parties that obtained less than 2% and votes for non-registered candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5038\_1 C5038\_2

Voters in New Zealand have two votes, one for each of the two segments/tiers: a party vote (C5038\_1) and the electorate vote (C5038\_2).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5038\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5038\_2

There is one secondary district where 19 seats (one seat from each constituency) are proportionally allocated to party lists receiving at least 4% of the total vote. However since voters cast only a single vote, and these seats are allocated at the national level, rather than at the constituency level, voters do not directly cast a vote for this tier. Hence, this variable was coded 7. Not-applicable.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5038\_1-C5038\_2

The Congress of the Philippines has two chambers or houses: the House of Representatives (Kapulungan Mga Kinatawan) and the Senate (Senado).

The House of Representatives is elected on the basis of two electoral segments. In the first segment, 229 representatives are elected in single-member districts, to a three-year term. In addition, up to 20% of the total number of representatives is elected through the party-list system in a single nation-wide electoral district (second segment). After the 2010 elections, there are 56 representatives elected on party-list basis. Party-lists are to be proposed by indigenous, but non-religious, minority groups. A maximum of three seats is awarded to each party. Each elector casts two votes: one for the district representative and the other for the party of his choice.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5038\_3

The Philippines Senate (Senado) has 24 members, serving six-years terms. Concurrently with presidential elections, half of the Senate (12 members) is renewed each three years, in a single nation-wide constituency. Senators are elected according to the simple majority, and each voters can cast up to 12 votes. Hence, vote percentages and national totals are not meaningful figures.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5038\_3

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5038\_3

In Senate election voters have as many votes as there are candidates to be elected in a district (between 1 and 4).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5038

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5038\_1

"For the election of National Assembly deputies 8 electoral units (constituencies) are formed. Each unit is divided into 11 electoral districts. In each electoral unit eleven deputies are elected. In each electoral district one deputy is elected.

For the election of deputies of the Italian and Hungarian national communities special electoral units are formed on the territory where these communities live; one for the Italian and one for the Hungarian national communities." (source: macro report).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5038\_1-C5038\_2

Korea employs a mixed-member majoritarian system that combines 245 single-member districts (SMD) with 54 proportional representation (PR) seats, elected from a single nation-wide district. Each voter casts two votes, one for an individual candidate in the SMD segment, and one for a closed party list in the PR segment.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5038\_1

The Congreso de los Diputados contains 350 elected seats. There are 50 multi-member (2 seats minimum per province, the rest allotted according to population) constituencies corresponding to the country's provinces. There are in addition 2 single-member constituencies (North African enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla) from [www.ipu.org](http://www.ipu.org)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5038\_3

The Senate contains 208 directly elected seats and 56 indirectly elected seats. This section refers to the directly elected section. There are 52 multi-member constituencies corresponding to the country's provinces, plus Ceuta and Melilla. The provinces elect 4 Senators each. In the case of insular provinces, major islands elect 3 Senators each while small islands elect 1 Senator each. The autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla elect 2 Senators each.  
from www.ipu.org

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5038\_1

The Swedish Riksdagen has 349 members, where 310 members are elected from 29 multi-member (2 to 34 seats) constituencies. In addition, there is one multi-member constituency for 39 "at large" seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5038\_2

There is a second tier, that is, one multi-member constituency for 39 "at large" seats. However since voters cast only a single vote, and these seats are allocated at the national level, rather than at the constituency level, voters do not directly cast a vote for this tier. This variable was hence coded "7. Not-applicable."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5038\_1

In Switzerland voters have as many votes as the number of seats in their district (between 1 and 34 depending on the cantons). Voters can choose one of the parties on the party lists, or they can create their own list by filling an empty list on the ballot with the candidates they prefer. Moreover, they can modify the party (e.g. add candidates from other parties instead of a candidates of the list [panachage]), delete candidates or vote twice for a same candidate (cumulation).

If a voter casts fewer votes than seats in the district, the remaining votes go to the party indicated on the list. If no party is indicated, the remaining votes are lost. Since all candidates belong to a party, if a voters cast a single vote for a candidate, that vote automatically counts for that candidate's party list.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5038\_3

In 20 cantons of Switzerland voters have two votes, while in the six so-called half-cantons (BL, BS, OW, NW, AI, AR) voters have one vote. The number of votes is equal to the number of seats elected in a particular canton (or half canton).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5038\_1 to C5038\_4

Under the 2007 Constitution, a new electoral system was adopted, reintroducing a modified version of a previous form of electoral system (the one preceding the 1997 constitution). There are 400 single-seat districts were combined into larger districts: 4 single-seat, 63 with 2 seats, and 90 with 3 seats. These constituencies use the Block Vote (BV) system which allows voters to cast as many ballots as there are seats in a district. Voters are not permitted to cast all their votes for a single candidate but can split their votes between candidates nominated by different parties, for a total of 400 seats. Parallel to this tier, 80 seats are distributed according to PR list, in 8 regional constituencies of roughly equivalent proportions, without a threshold. Each party submits a list with 10 candidates who are listed once, and who can also contest constituency seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5038\_1

This indicator refers to the Block Vote (BV) segment: this system allows voters to cast as many ballots as there are seats in a district and these values vary by district in Thailand. Given the dependence of how many votes can be cast on district magnitude (and that this varies as well across districts), we could not provide a single value for this indicator. There are respectively, 4 constituencies with a single seat (1 vote), 63 constituencies with 2 seats (2 votes) and the last 90 constituencies with 3 seats (3 votes), for a total of 400 seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5038\_2

This indicator refers to the 80 PR (closed party-list system) seats allotted in 8 regional constituencies (10 seats each). Voters are allowed to vote for only one party list. The party lists are submitted to the Election Commission before the deadline for submission of candidacies to the constituency based elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5038\_3

The Wuthisapha, or Senate, is constituted of 76 directly elected and 74 indirectly elected members. The 76 members directly elected are done upon the basis of election in each Changwat, one elected senator for each Changwat (there are 76 Changwat, or provinces) (Section 111 of the 2007 Constitution). There are no reserved seats for women, ethnic minorities or other categories. The remaining 74 senators are appointed from candidates nominated by organizations from various sectors: academia(15), government (14), the private sector (15), the professional sector(15), and miscellaneous (15) (Section 114, Constitution 2007).

```
-----
C5039_1 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_2 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_3 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5039_4 >>> VOTING PROCEDURE - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
-----
```

Q16b. Do they vote for candidates (not party lists) or party lists?

Definition: Party bloc voting is used in multi-member districts where voters cast a single party-centered vote for their party of choice; the party with the most votes wins all of the district seats.

- .....
1. CANDIDATES
  2. PARTY LISTS
  3. PARTY BLOC VOTING
  4. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  7. NOT APPLICABLE
  9. MISSING

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5039\_1

The Austrian electoral system is a proportional representation system with three segments or tiers. These correspond to the regional districts tier, the Land level tier (or state level) and the federal (or national) level tier. Counting and

allocation of seats passes through each of these levels. However, voters cast a single vote. In this vote, they can express preferences for specific candidates, particularly, a Lander level candidate and/or for a regional level candidate. See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5039\_1  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5039\_1

Each political party presents a list of candidates. Voters can vote for a candidate or they can vote for a party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5039\_1  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5039\_1

Finland uses an open list system where the votes for candidates per party list in each constituency form the basis for seat allocation. Each voter must choose a candidate; it is not possible to vote for a party as such. The method for seat allocation is PR/d'Hondt. (From the macro Report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5039\_1

In geographical constituency elections, each voter can cast 1 vote for a list that includes the names of one or more candidates (up to the maximum number of Legco members returned by that geographical constituency). The same political party (group) may put up more than one list in a constituency, and candidates on a list may belong to different political party (group).  
See also note for C5038\_1.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5039\_1

Voters can choose to endorse a party, a candidate on a party list, or an independent candidate. Parties can choose to have either an open or a party ranked list of candidates. If the list is open votes that are cast on the party (the voter has not given a personal vote) are distributed between the candidates based on the number of personal votes. If the list is party ranked a vote cast on the party will be given to the candidate listed first on the list until he or she has received enough votes to be elected and so on.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5039\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C5039\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5039\_4 / C5039\_4

To be precise, voters can choose to vote for either a single candidate or a party of their choice. A vote for an individual candidate is taken to mean a vote for the party to which the candidate belongs.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5039\_1-C5039\_2  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5039\_1-C5039\_2

In Mexico each voters' vote is counted twice; once for the single member district contest, and a second time for the regional PR contest (see ES note C5038\_1-2 for details). Accordingly, the voting procedure is coded as voting for candidates and for a party list for each respective contest.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5039\_3-C5039\_4  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5039\_3-C5039\_4

In Mexico each voters' choice for senator is counted twice; once for the 3-seat multi-member districts contest, and a second time for the regional PR contest (see ES note C5038\_3-4 for details). Accordingly, the voting procedure is coded as voting for candidates and for a party list for each respective contest.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5039\_1

A vote is always one for a list and for a candidate at the same time (matrix). A majority of voters cast their vote on the first candidate on the list

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5039\_1 C5039\_2

In the first segment (Electorate Vote), voters vote for candidates. In the second segment (Party Vote), voters for closed party lists.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5039\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5039\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5039

See notes for C5038\_1-C5038\_3.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5039

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5039\_1

Slovak voters can vote for party lists of political subjects and every voter has got 4 preferential votes, they are counted if they reach 3% of all votes for the party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5039\_1

"Multi-member constituencies: blocked party lists and the d'Hondt system of proportional representation - each voter chooses one list of those made available in the constituency (province)".  
from: <http://www.nsd.uib.no>

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5039\_3

For the directly elected Senators: simple majority vote. Lists are compiled at provincial level.  
from: <http://www.nsd.uib.no>

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5039\_2

See note for C5038\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5039\_1-C5039\_2

Korean voters have two votes - one vote in the 245 single member constituencies and one on a single nation-wide proportional district.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5039\_1

Swiss voters can cast their vote in many different ways. Among others they can a) simply vote for a party list, b) endorse specific candidates from the party list, c) add candidates from other parties instead of a candidates of the list [panachage]),

d) delete candidates or vote twice for a same candidate (cumulation).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5039\_3

Cantonal law governs election to the Council of States. However, candidates are generally chosen by absolute majority vote. One exception is the canton of Jura that uses a PR system to elect its two seats.

C5040\_1 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5040\_2 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

C5040\_3 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5040\_4 >>> VOTING ROUNDS - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

Q16c. How many rounds of voting are there?

01-90. NUMBER OF ROUNDS

97. NOT APPLICABLE

99. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5040

See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5040\_1

The electoral law of 15 March 1994 Constitution (Art. 64 - 72) stipulates that Belarus has a majority/plurality electoral systems composed of 2 rounds.

Parlines describes that "In the first round, voting is considered valid if over 50 per cent of eligible voters take part in the polls. Candidates who receive over 50 per cent of votes are declared elected. If none of the candidates obtains 50 per cent of votes, a run-off election between the two leading candidates is held within two weeks. Run-off elections are considered valid if more than 25 per cent of eligible voters take part. The candidate securing a simple majority of votes wins the seat. If the second round of voting is held for only one candidate, the candidate needs to obtain the support of over half of the voters taking part in the election.)"

Source: [http://www.ipu.org/parline/reports/2027\\_B.htm](http://www.ipu.org/parline/reports/2027_B.htm)

However in the course of the election of 2008, all 110 deputies were elected in the first round of voting (more than 50 % of voters took part, and each from 110 elected candidates received more than 50 % of votes). Thus, the second round was not necessary in any electoral district.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5040\_1

General Croatian voters cast votes for party lists. However, in the 12th electoral district for national minorities voters vote for individual candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5040\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5040\_1

In geographical constituency elections, there is only one round of voting.

See also note for C5038\_1.



ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5040\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5040\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5040\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5040\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5040

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5040\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5040\_3

Although cantonal law governs election to the Council of States, most cantons employ a two-round majoritarian system, where an absolute majority is required in the first round. For the 2007 elections 29 of the 41 members were elected in the first round.

C5041\_1 >>> PARTY LISTS - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5041\_2 >>> PARTY LISTS - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

C5041\_3 >>> PARTY LISTS - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5041\_4 >>> PARTY LISTS - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

Q16d. If there are lists, are they closed, open, flexible, or is there party bloc voting?

1. CLOSED (Order of candidates elected is determined by the party and voters are unable to express preference for a particular candidate)
2. OPEN (Voters can indicate their preferred party and their favored candidate within that party)
3. FLEXIBLE (Voters can allocate votes to candidates either within a single party list or across different party lists as they see fit)
7. NOT APPLICABLE
9. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5041

See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5041\_1

Voters cast a vote for a party, however, they may select two candidates on the party list. If any candidate receives more than 7% of those (preferential) votes cast for the whole party, s/he skips all candidates and the seat is allocated to him/her.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2010): C5041\_1

In 2006 there has been an increase in the number of preference votes voters cast from 2 to 4. In clear, this means that Voters cast a vote for a party, however, they may select

4 candidates within a party list. A candidate who receives over 5 per cent of the preferential votes at the regional level will be placed at the top of the party list. In cases where several candidates receive over 5 per cent of preferential votes, they will be placed on the list in descending order based on the total number of preferential votes they receive (from IPU.org).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5041\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5041\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5041\_1

Voters may change the ranking of candidates on the list, or reject candidates by crossing their names out.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5041\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5041\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5041\_2 / C5041\_4

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5041\_2 / C5041\_4

Party lists used in the second segment (tier) for the Lower and Upper Chambers are closed, as the order of the candidates on the list is defined by the political parties.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5041\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5041\_2

There are no party lists, but the system is in many respects analogous to open lists. (From the Macro Report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5041

See notes for C5038\_1-C5038\_3.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5041

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5041\_1

Slovak voters can indicate their preferred party and their favored candidate within that party. Every voter has got 4 preferential votes, they are counted if they reach 3% of all votes for the party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5041\_3

For the Senate one votes for any individual candidates, but in the ballot (where all candidates are listed, so that one marks up to three names) candidates are identified as members of a particular party. But they are not party lists, because the list includes all candidates from all parties.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5041\_2

See note for C5038\_2

C5042\_1 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5042\_2 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5042\_3 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5042\_4 >>> TRANSFERABLE VOTES - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

## Q17. Are the votes transferable?

Definition: In systems with preferential voting, a voter can express a list of preferences. For example, votes can be cast by putting a '1' in the column next to the voter's preferred candidate, a '2' beside their second favorite candidate and so on. Votes are counted according to the first preferences and any candidates who have achieved the predetermined quota are elected. To decide which of the remaining candidates are elected the votes are transferred from candidates who have more than the necessary number to achieve the quota and from the candidate with the least number of votes. An example of this is the election in Ireland in 2002.

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 7. NOT APPLICABLE
- 9. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5042

See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5042\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5042\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5042\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5042\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5042\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5042

See note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5042\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

C5043\_1 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5043\_2 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5043\_3 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5043\_4 >>> CUMULATED VOTES - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

Q18. If more than one vote can be cast, can they be cumulated?  
 Definition: Cumulative voting refers to systems in which voters are allowed to cast more than one vote for a single candidate.

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 7. NOT APPLICABLE
- 9. MISSING

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5043

See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5043\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5043\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5043\_2

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5043\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5042

See notes for C5038\_1-C5038\_3.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5043

See note for C5038,

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5043\_2

See note for C5038\_2

C5044\_1 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5044\_2 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

C5044\_3 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5044\_4 >>> COMPULSORY VOTING - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

Q19. Is voting compulsory?

Definition: Voting is compulsory if the law states that all those who have the right to vote are obliged to exercise that right.

1. YES; STRICTLY ENFORCED SANCTIONS
2. YES; WEAKLY ENFORCED SANCTIONS
3. YES; WITHOUT SANCTION FOR VIOLATION
5. NO

7. NOT APPLICABLE

9. MISSING

NOTES: C5044

Source for this variable: CSES Macro Report Question 19.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5044

See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5044

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5044

"Voting is mandatory for those aged 18-70 unless they are illiterate. Voting is optional for the illiterate, those over 70, and those aged 16-18. Those who do not vote must 'justify' themselves to the Electoral Tribunal." (Bustani 2001, p. 306, n. 2).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5044\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

=====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5044\_1

Voting is compulsory for the Senate only (indirect elections by departmental electoral colleges).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5044\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5044\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5044\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5044\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5044

See note for C5038.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5044\_2

See note for C5038\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5044\_1

Voting is compulsory in one canton (Schaffhausen).  
Those who abstain without a justifiable reason are subject to a small fine.

-----  
C5045\_1 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5045\_2 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)

C5045\_3 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)

C5045\_4 >>> IS THERE PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
-----

21a. Are there legally mandated thresholds that a party must exceed before it is eligible to receive seats?

.....

1. YES

5. NO

7. NOT APPLICABLE

9. MISSING

## NOTES: C5045

In some plurality systems, a threshold is established for a declaration of "official party status" rather than for the acquisition of seats in the legislature. Usually, these thresholds are a certain number of seats, rather than a percentage of the popular vote. For countries in which this is the case, this variable was coded "97. NOT APPLICABLE".

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5045\_1

The Austrian electoral system is a proportional representation system with three segments or tiers. These correspond to the federal level tier, the Land level tier (or state level) and the regional districts tier. Counting and allocation of seats passes through each of these levels, and as a consequence is a three step process. An electoral threshold exists within them. In first place, in each Lander a Hare quota is calculated and used to distribute seats across the regional district level. Followed by this seats are allocated at the Land level tier but only

those parties that obtained one seat at the regional district level or 4% of the nationwide valid vote are qualified to receive seats. Finally, at the national level seats are distributed following the D'Hondt system and seats that have been already allocated are discounted.  
See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5045  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5045

There is a threshold (quota hare - calculated from percent of total votes) for the Federal Chamber of Deputies

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5045

There is no formal threshold at the level of the ten multi-member constituencies. On the level of the secondary national district (see note C5038\_2 for details), there are three thresholds - of which only one has to apply:  
1. Winning a seat directly in any of the ten multi-member constituencies;  
2. Obtaining in two of the three electoral provinces a number of votes corresponding - at least - to the provincial votes/seat ratio (using in the calculation of these ratios the number of seats in the multi-member constituencies in the electoral provinces in question, excluding the provinces' compensatory seats); or  
3. Two percent of the valid, national vote. This rule is much more influential than the other two, so this is entered as the value in C5042\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5045\_1

"There are 12 multi-member constituencies with district magnitude ranging from 6 to 13 seats. There is a 5% threshold. Seats are allocated in three rounds. In the first round, seats are awarded to candidates who garner the same or more votes than the simple quota in their electoral districts. In the second round, seats are allocated in a traditional PR method. That is, party lists are awarded seats based on their share of the vote in the district, and candidates within the list receive seats in the order of how many preferential votes they received. In the third round of counting, all remaining mandates are distributed between the national candidate lists with at least 5% of the national vote." Source:  
<http://www.electinguide.org/country.php?ID=69>.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5045

It should be noted that the parties that receive at least three percent of all valid votes cast are entitled to participate in the so-called first round of proportional allocation of 260 seats at the national level. The remaining 40 seats are awarded to the party that obtained the nation-wide plurality of votes (thus PASOK for the election of 2009), regardless of its obtained percentage or the difference with the second party.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5045\_2  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5045\_2

While there is no formal threshold at the primary district level, in the secondary national district (see note C5038\_2 for details) only party lists receiving at least 5% of the national vote are entitled to receive one of the 9 seats to be allocated.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5045\_2

The threshold applies to the nation-wide proportional district: 3% of the total valid votes for party lists, or at least 5 primary district seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5045\_2 / C5045\_4  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5045\_2 / C5045\_4

If a party does not obtain more than 2% of the vote in the plurality election it cannot receive any seats from the proportional representation lists. However, if a candidate of such party wins in any of the plurality seats, she would receive the seat and be declared as "independent".

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5045\_2  
 ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5045\_2

While there is no formal threshold at primary district level, in the secondary national district (see note C5038\_2 for details) only party lists receiving at least 4% of the total vote are entitled to receive one of the 19 to be allocated.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5045\_2

In the second segment, i.e., for a sectorial representative via closed party-list system, there is a 2% election threshold and 3-seat cap.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5045

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5045

The Turkish electoral system employs list proportional representation with a 10% threshold of percent valid votes. However, independent candidates are exempt from the 10% threshold.

-----  
 C5046\_1 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5046\_2 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5046\_3 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)  
 C5046\_4 >>> PARTY THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)  
 -----

21b. If YES in Question 21a, what is the threshold?

- .....
- 00. THERE IS NO THRESHOLD
  - 0.1-95. A PARTY MUST RECEIVE THIS PERCENT (0.1% TO 95%) OF THE POPULAR VOTE IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR SEATS
  - 96. OTHER THRESHOLD [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  - 97. NOT APPLICABLE
  - 99. MISSING

NOTES: C5046

See also notes for C5045.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5046\_1

Strictly speaking the threshold is 4% of valid votes or one seat of the 43 regional constituencies.  
 See also ES note for C5038.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5046\_1

=====

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5046\_1

"to win representation, a party (or apparentement) must exceed the Hare quota (total valid votes divided by number of seats) in a constituency. Each party is entitled to as many seats as the number of times its vote reaches the quota; unallocated seats are apportioned according to the d'Hondt formula" (Nicolau 2008, p. 170)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5046\_1

The threshold is 5% for a single party. It is higher for coalitions:

10% for coalition of 2 parties,  
15% for coalition of 3 parties,  
20% for coalition of 4 parties, etc.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5046

See note for C5045.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5046\_1

see note for C5045\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005 and 2009): C5046\_2

Germany has a double threshold: Parties with more than 5% of the valid votes ('second vote') nationally or who have won three party of the 299 constituency seats receive a proportional seat share of the 598 regular seat total based on their national vote share."

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5046\_1

The threshold is 3% of valid votes for parties to be entitled to participate in the so-called first round of proportional allocation of 260 seats at the national level.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5046\_2

To win representation in the remaining 40 seats, a party must obtain the nation-wide plurality of votes (thus PASOK for the election of 2009), regardless of its obtained percentage or the difference with the second party. Thus the threshold is nation-wide plurality of votes. See note C5047\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C5046\_2

See note for C5045\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ISRAEL (2006): C5046\_1

The legal threshold was raised for the 2006 election from 1.5% 2%. source: (Diskin and Hazan 2007)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5046\_3

In the single-member districts of the lower house contest, as well as for the prefecture-level districts of the upper house, a candidate needs to obtain votes at least equal to one-sixth of the quotient obtained by dividing the total of valid ballots cast by the number of seats to be filled from the constituency concerned. For all single member district of the lower house contest this equals obtaining at least 1/6 (16.7 percent) of the total valid votes. Instead the multi-member prefecture-level districts of the upper house contest have variable district magnitude with minimum of 1 and maximum 5. In this case, this quotient varies from 16.6% to 3.33% of the valid votes.



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5046\_1

The Saeima elections are held in five constituencies: Riga, Vidzeme, Latgale, Zemgale and Kurzeme. Saeima elections are also held in those foreign countries where a substantial number of Latvia citizens reside. Thus, the Riga constituency also includes the electorate residing outside of Latvia. Four months before election day the Central Election Commission determines the number of Saeima seats for each of the five constituencies, based on the Population Register statistics. Only those list of candidates which have received at least 5% of the total number of votes cast in all five election constituencies will be elected to the Saeima.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5046\_1

The threshold is 0.67 percent of the electoral quota, or one seat. This has been rounded to 0.7 in the data.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5046\_2

The threshold is: 5% of the party vote or winning of one or more electorates in the electorate vote tier.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5046\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5046\_2

See note for C5045\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5046\_1

5% of national vote or 7 elected MPs in two or more electoral districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5046\_2

In the second segment, i.e., for a sectoral representative via closed party-list system, there is a 2% election threshold and 3-seat cap.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5046\_1

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5046\_1

Votes are first counted at the district level, the results then go to the National Election Committee to determine which parties and coalitions have cleared, respectively, the 5% and 8% threshold.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5046\_1 C5046\_2

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The new electoral legislation (Law no. 35/2008) established a two-tier seat allocation for both Chambers of the Parliament. However, the voter casts only one vote for each of the Chambers. The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed.

On the first tier, seats are allocated to candidates receiving a majority of 50%+1 of the votes cast within the representation district. This district-level candidate threshold is cumulated to a national-level party one: either (a) 5% for individual parties, 8% for two-party electoral alliances, 9% for three-party electoral alliances, 10% for 4+ parties alliances; or (b) gaining simultaneously 6 districts for the Chamber of Deputies and 3 for

the Senate.

On the second tier, the remaining seats are allocated according to a complicated algorithm (for details, see Marian and King 2010) to other candidates based on candidate results at district level and party results at constituency level. At this level the same threshold (alternatives (a) or (b) above) remains in place.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5046\_1

The threshold is 5% for a single party. It is higher for coalitions:

7% for coalition of 2 or 3 political subjects/parties,  
10% for coalition of 4 or more political subjects/parties.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5046\_2

See note C5045\_2.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5046\_1

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5046\_3

Parties must receive a minimum of 3 % of valid vote at the district level.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5046\_1

The Swedish electoral system includes barriers to exclude small parties. To take part in the distribution of seats in the Riksdag elections, a political party must gain at least 4 percent of all votes cast in the country. A party gaining fewer votes may, however, take part in the distribution of permanent constituency seats in the constituency where it has gained at least 12 percent of the votes cast in that constituency. [...] The requirement (threshold) for election on the basis of total number of personal votes cast for the candidate is at least 8 percent of the total number of votes cast for the party in a constituency in Riksdag elections." (Source: Valmyndigheten, <http://www.val.se/>).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5046\_2

The remaining seats are allotted by the system of full proportional representation based on the votes obtained nationwide; to be awarded a seat in this national tier, a party must obtain at least 4 per cent of the votes cast throughout the country.

```
-----
C5047_1 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - LOWER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_2 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - LOWER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_3 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - UPPER - 1ST SEGMENT (TIER)
C5047_4 >>> UNIT FOR THE THRESHOLD - UPPER - 2ND SEGMENT (TIER)
-----
```

21c. If YES in Question 21a, what is the unit for the threshold mentioned in Question 21b?

- .....
1. PERCENT OF TOTAL VOTES
  2. PERCENT OF VALID VOTES
  3. PERCENT OF THE TOTAL ELECTORATE
  4. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  7. NOT APPLICABLE
  9. MISSING

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5047\_1

Strictly speaking the threshold is 4% of valid votes or one seat from one of the 43 regional constituencies.  
See also ES note for C5038.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5047\_1

The threshold consists of 5% of valid votes in the respective electoral district.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5047

See note for C5045.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5047\_1

see note for C5045\_1.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5047\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5047\_2

Germany has a double threshold: Parties with more than 5% of the valid party votes ('second vote') nationally or who have won three of the 299 constituency seats receive a proportional seat share of the 598 regular seat total based on their national vote share.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5047\_2

To win representation in the remaining 40 seats, a party must obtain the nation-wide plurality of votes (thus PASOK for the election of 2009), regardless of its obtained percentage or the difference with the second party. Thus the threshold is nation-wide plurality of votes. See note C5046\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5047\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5047\_2

See note for C5045\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5047\_2

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5047\_2

See note for C5045\_2.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5047\_1

5% of national vote or 7 elected MPs in two or more electoral districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5047\_2

The threshold for the party list representation is 2% of the total votes cast for the party list.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5047\_1 C5047\_2

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

Chamber of Deputies: The electoral legislation states two alternative

national-level party thresholds (both tiers): either (a) 5% for individual parties, 8% for two-party electoral alliances, 9% for three-party electoral alliances, 10% for 4+ parties alliances; or (b) gaining simultaneously 6 districts for the Chamber of Deputies and 3 for the Senate.

On the first tier, seats are allocated only to candidates

receiving a majority of 50%+1 of the votes cast within the representation district.

Senate: The electoral legislation states two alternative national-level party thresholds (both tiers): either (a) 5% for individual parties, 8% for two-party electoral alliances, 9% for three-party electoral alliances, 10% for 4+ parties alliances; or (b) gaining simultaneously 6 districts for the Chamber of Deputies and 3 for the Senate.

On the first tier, seats are allocated only to candidates receiving a majority of 50%+1 of the votes cast within the representation district.

## II. DATA FROM PUBLIC SOURCES

C5050\_1 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T  
C5050\_2 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T-1  
C5050\_3 >>> FREEDOM HOUSE RATING - TIME T-2

These variables report Freedom House's rating of freedom in a country at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2). Each country and territory is assigned a numerical rating, on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 indicates the highest degree of freedom and 7 the least amount of freedom. CSES reports average of the "Political Rights" and "Civil Liberties" scores.

1.0-7.0 FREEDOM SCORE

9. MISSING

NOTES: C5050

Source: Freedom House's annual publications "Freedom in the World" (<http://www.freedomhouse.org/images/File/FIW%20All%20Scores,%20Countries,%201973-2010.xls> and <http://www.freedomhouse.org/images/File/FIW%20All%20Scores,Territories,%201973-2010.xls>. Downloaded on October 13, 2010).

Until 2003, countries whose combined average ratings for Political Rights and for Civil Liberties fell between 1.0 and 2.5 were designated "Free"; between 3.0 and 5.5 "Partly Free", and between 5.5 and 7.0 "Not Free". Beginning with the ratings for 2003, countries whose combined average ratings fall between 3.0 and 5.0 are "Partly Free", and those between 5.5 and 7.0 are "Not Free".

More information about Freedom House's methodology available at: <http://freedomhouse.org/>

C5051\_1 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T  
C5051\_2 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T-1  
C5051\_3 >>> DEMOCRACY-AUTOCRACY - POLITY IV RATING - TIME T-2

These variables report POLITY IV ratings of institutionalized democracy versus autocracy in a country, at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

CSES reports the original variable POLITY - Combined Polity Score. The variable is constructed by subtracting the autocracy score from the democracy score; the resulting scale ranges from +10

(strongly democratic) to -10 (strongly autocratic).

- .....
- 10. DEMOCRATIC
  - 09.
  - 08.
  - 07.
  - 06.
  - 05.
  - 04.
  - 03.
  - 02.
  - 01.
  - 00.
  - 01.
  - 02.
  - 03.
  - 04.
  - 05.
  - 06.
  - 07.
  - 08.
  - 09.
  - 10. AUTOCRATIC
  - 66. INTERRUPTION PERIODS
  - 77. INTERREGUM PERIODS
  - 88. TRANSITION PERIODS
  - 99. MISSING

NOTES: C5051

Source: POLITY IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2007, Monty G. Marshall and Keith Jaggers, George Mason University and Colorado State University (<http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>).

The Polity IV Dataset Users' Manual (downloaded on November 25, 2010 (<http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4manualv2009.pdf>)).

The Polity IV annual time-series dataset (<http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4v2009.xls>).

-----  
C5052 >>> AGE OF THE CURRENT REGIME  
-----

The number of years since the most recent regime change (defined by a three-point change in the POLITY score over a period of three years or less) or the end of transition period defined by the lack of stable political institutions (denoted by a standardized authority score) [Variable "Durable" from Polity IV Project Dataset Users' Manual].

- 001-500. AGE OF THE REGIME (YEARS)
- 999. MISSING

NOTES: C5051

Source: POLITY IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2007, Monty G. Marshall and Keith Jaggers, George Mason University and Colorado State University (<http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>).

The Polity IV Dataset Users' Manual (Downloaded on November 25, 2010)

(<http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4manualv2009.pdf>).

The Polity IV annual time-series dataset

(<http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4v2009.xls>).

C5054 >>> REGIME: TYPE OF EXECUTIVE

Classification of political regimes in which democracies are distinguished by the type of executive (0 Dictatorship, 1 Parliamentary Democracy, 2 Mixed Democracy, 3 Presidential Democracy).

The following decision rule is applied (see Cheibub, 2007):

A. The system is parliamentary either (i) if there is no independently (indirectly or directly) elected president or (ii) if there is an independently (indirectly or directly) elected president but the government is not responsible to the president.

B. The system is mixed either if there is an independently (indirectly or directly) elected president and government is responsible to the president.

C. The system is presidential if government is not responsible to the elected legislature.

NOTE: Responsibility refers to whether the survival of the executive depends directly on legislature (i.e. vote of confidence).

1. PARLIAMENTARY REGIME
2. MIXED REGIME
3. PRESIDENTIAL REGIME

9. MISSING

NOTES: C5054

Source: Publicly Available Sources.

Decision rule comes from:

Cheibub, Jose Antonio. 2007. "Presidentialism, Parliamentarian, and Democracy". New York. Cambridge University Press.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5054

Austrian executive power is coded as a mixed or semi-presidential regime given that the president can dissolve the National Council. Article 29 of the Constitution states: "(1) The Federal President can dissolve the National Council, but he may avail himself of this prerogative only once for the same reason". However, notice that in practice the system works mostly as a parliamentary system (Müller, 2005).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5054

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5054

Brazil's legislature cannot cast a no confidence vote against the government.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5054

Article 94 of the Croatian constitution provides for a directly elected President. However, the legislature has the power to vote no-confidence in the government, as described in article 115 of the constitution.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5054

The president is elected by the Parliament for a term of five years. The government is accountable to the parliament both collectively and individually.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5054

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5054

Classifying the Finnish executive power is subject to some controversy. Here it is coded as a mixed or semi-presidential system. Some key features of the Finnish system that distinguish it from a traditional parliamentary system are that by constitution a) the president is popularly elected by direct vote for a fixed term of six years, and for no more than two consecutive terms of office; b) the president can, on recommendation of the prime minister, dissolve the legislature; c) the president can veto legislature, though parliament can override the presidential veto with a simple majority; and d) the president may issue decrees that have force of law. More details can be found in Fish & Kroenig, 2009. That said, some scholars argue that Finland -especially after constitutional reforms in the 1990's- works in practice as a parliamentary system. See Raunio, 2009 for an example.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5054

The president is elected by the Parliament for a term of five years. According to article 84 of the Greek Constitution, the government must enjoy the confidence of parliament.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5054

Note that Hong Kong is not a sovereign state, but a Special Administrative Region (SAR) in China. The Central Government authorizes the HKSAR to exercise a high degree of autonomy and enjoy executive, legislative and independent judicial power. Therefore, the HKSAR Government is kind of local government. The Chief Executive (CE) is the President of the Executive Council of Hong Kong and head of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. The Chief Executive is elected by an 800-member Election Committee. The elected CE must then be appointed by the Central People's Government. Regarding the relationship between the CE and Legislative Council, the type of executive may be regarded as some form of a presidential system, because the CE and the Legco members are returned by different elections. According to the Article 52, the CE must resign in case of refusal to sign a bill passed by a two-thirds majority of the Legislative Council.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5054

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5054

Iceland has a popularly elected president who can, among other things, dissolve parliament, exercise emergency powers and submit bill to parliament. Article 15 of the constitution stipulates that "the president appoints Ministers and discharges them. He determines their number and assignments." Regardless, the position is considered mostly ceremonial and symbolic. Further, it is common for presidential election to go uncontested. Although according to the ACLP project's coding rules Iceland is considered semi-presidential, the coding for this country differs across different data sources. (e.g. DPI considers it parliamentary, and Matt Golder codes it semi-presidential).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5054

=====

Latvian president is elected indirectly, in the Latvian Saeima. On 31 May 2007, the government candidate Valdis Zatlers defeated Aivars Endziņš.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5054

The Philippines is a republic with a presidential form of government wherein power is equally divided among its three branches: executive, legislative, and judicial. The Executive branch is composed of the President and the Vice President who are elected by direct popular vote and serve a term of six years. The Constitution grants the President authority to appoint his Cabinet. (source: <http://www.gov.ph/about/gov/>).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5054

With its directly elected president, Romania is a semi-presidential system.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5054

"It is generally accepted that Slovenia has a parliamentary system in which the focus of political decision-making lies with the parliament and the government. As in most other Central and East European countries in transition, in Slovenia the formal powers of parliament remain very strong, but, unlike the pure parliamentarism that certain countries opted for, the Slovene arrangements belong more to a group that could be characterized as parliamentarism with a directly (popularly) elected (or semi-presidential) president. The role of the president is relatively small, and is to act as the head of state, whose function or powers are mainly of a representative, initiative, and protocol nature." Source (Cerar 1999).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5054

Despite having a president as both head of state and government South Africa is considered a parliamentary democracy. The president is elected by the national assembly (hence not directly elected), and the government responsible to the assembly.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5054

Since 1992, the constitution provides for the direct election of a president. Yet, the executive Yuan is responsible to the legislative Yuan provided that the legislative Yuan is in session, its members have the right to interpellate the President of the Executive Yuan, and Ministers and chairmen of the Commissions of the said Yuan (Article 57 of the Constitution). However, the legislature cannot vote no-confidence in the government and can be dissolved by the president.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5054

Thailand is a constitutional monarchy with a Prime Minister as head of government and the King as head of state. The King holds a number of powers over the legislative branch. The King appoints ministers on the recommendation of the Prime Minister. The King issues royal decrees that have the force of law. The King also as Veto powers which the legislature can overturn with a two-thirds majority.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5054

The political system in Turkey is parliamentary with an indirectly elected president holding largely ceremonial powers. As of 2014, the president will be directly elected.



-----  
C5055 >>> NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST LOWER HOUSE ELECTION  
-----

Indicates the number of months between the current election and the previous national lower chamber election (if current election renews the national lower chamber), or the most recent national lower chamber election (if current election does not renew the national lower chamber).

.....

1-200. NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST LOWER HOUSE ELECTION

999. MISSING

## NOTES: C5055

If previous national lower chamber election was held in more than one round (i.e. run-off election), the entry refers to the number of months since the first round.

Source: Publicly Available Sources.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5055

Previous Parliamentary elections were held on 8 February 2005. The current elections were held ahead of time, on 13 November 2007 instead in February 2009. Danish prime minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen announced the early election date on 24 October 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5055

Regular Riigikogu elections shall be held on the first Sunday of March of the fourth year following the preceding Riigikogu election year.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5055

The elections for Parliament (Saeima) in Latvia are held every four years on the first Saturday in October. The previous, 9th Saeima elections were held on Saturday, October 7, 2006. The next elections were held early, on the ground of the results of the National Referendum on dissolution of the 10th Saeima (held on 23 July 2011). The 11th Saeima elections took place on 17 September 2011.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5055

Previous Parliamentary elections were held on September 23, 2001.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5055

Previous Parliamentary elections were held on September 25, 2005.

-----  
C5056 >>> NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION  
-----

Indicates the number of months between the current and previous presidential election. This variable does not signify that the election chose either the nominal or effective head of government.

.....

1-200. NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

997. NOT APPLICABLE

## 999. MISSING

## NOTES: C5056

If previous presidential election was held in more than one round (i.e. run-off election), the entry refers to the number of months since the first round.

Source: Publicly Available Sources.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009) C5056

This figure represents the number of months between the first round of presidential elections in 2005, and the first round of presidential elections in 2009.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5056

Latvian president is elected indirectly, in the Latvian Saeima. Hence, this variable is coded "997. NOT APPLICABLE". The incumbent president, Valdis Zatlers, was elected on 31 May 2007.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5056

Previous Presidential elections were held on October 9, 2000.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5056

Previous Presidential elections were held on October 9, 2005.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5056

This entry refers to the number of months between the current parliamentary election and the most recent presidential election.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5056

This entry refers to the number of months between the current parliamentary election and the most recent presidential election (the second round date is taken into account here - April 4, 2009).

## C5057 &gt;&gt;&gt; PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS ELECTORAL FORMULA

This variable indicates what electoral formula was used to elect the president.

The definition of this variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>).

PLURALITY - the candidate that obtains the most votes wins.

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY RULE - A candidate must win over 50% of the vote to win. If no candidate wins this many votes, then there is a runoff between the top two candidates.

QUALIFIED MAJORITY RULE - Each qualified majority system specifies a particular percentage of the vote that a candidate must win in order to be elected in the first round. If two or more candidates overcome these thresholds, then the one with the highest number of votes wins. The qualified majority systems vary in terms of the electoral procedure that applies when these thresholds are not met.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE - The candidate that wins a plurality of the electoral college votes wins.

SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE - Requires voters to rank single candidates in order of the most to least preferred. Votes are transferred until candidates obtain the Droop quota. The candidates that obtains this quota first is elected.

1. PLURALITY
2. ABSOLUTE MAJORITY RULE
3. QUALIFIED MAJORITY RULE
4. ELECTORAL COLLEGE
5. SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE
7. NOT APPLICABLE
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5057

Source: Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5057

The President and Vice President are not elected directly by the voters. Voters cast their vote for President and Vice-President by selecting a pair of candidates listed on a single Presidential/Vice Presidential ticket. This vote selects slates of electors to serve in the Electoral College. In forty-eight of the fifty states and the District of Columbia, the list of electors that gets a majority of all votes wins the state and all the electors are from the winning ticket. Maine and Nebraska allow the possibility for the state electors to be split.

C5058 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA IN ALL ELECTORAL SEGMENTS (TIERS)

This is a variable indicating whether the country uses (i) a majoritarian formula in all of its electoral segments (tiers), (ii) a proportional formula in all of its electoral segments (tiers), or (iii) a mixed formula.

The definition of this variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>).

MAJORITY systems require successful candidates to win either a plurality or majority of the vote. As a result, they are considered majoritarian.

PROPORTIONAL systems can be divided into two types: those that use party lists and those like the single transferable vote that do not. Those systems employing lists can themselves be divided into two further categories: quota systems (with allocation of remainders) and highest average systems.

MIXED systems use a mixture of majoritarian and proportional electoral rules. A country can be classified as having a mixed system whether it uses one or more electoral segments (tiers); in practice, most mixed systems have more than one segment (tier). Mixed electoral systems can be divided into those in which the two electoral formulas are dependent and those in which they are independent.

1. MAJORITY
2. PROPORTIONAL
3. MIXED
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5058

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5058

The Austrian electoral system is a proportional representation system with three segments or tiers. These correspond to the federal level tier, the Land level tier (or state level) and the regional districts tier. Counting and allocation of seats passes through each of these levels. However, voters cast a single vote in which they can express preferences for specific candidates, particularly, a Lander level candidate and/or for a regional level candidate.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009) C5058

Political parties and coalitions of two or more parties submit lists of up to two candidates in Chamber districts and Senate constituencies (binomial system). Voters choose one candidate in one list. The list with the largest number of votes wins two seats if it obtains more than twice as many votes as the list in second place; otherwise, the top two lists receive one seat each. Within each list, seats are won by candidates with the largest number of votes.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5058

The Danish electoral system is proportional, with a small exception: four out 179 seats, two each from the Faroe Islands and Greenland, are elected on separate rules.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5058

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5058

There is one small exception. In addition to the 14 multi-member districts there is one constituency (province of Aland) that selects one seat by simple majority rule.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5058

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5058

Mixed: 299 members are elected under the majority (first-past-the post) system and the remaining seats are filled through the proportional representation system using the party list.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5058

Greece uses the Hagenbach-Bischoff system of "reinforced" proportional representation, with voting for party lists and, within each list, preferential vote.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5058

This concerns the election of 30 representative in geographical constituencies.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5058

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5058

The Icelandic Althingi (Parliament) has 63 members, where 53 members are elected from 6 multi-member (8 to 10 seats) constituencies. In addition, there is one multi-member constituency with 9 "supplementary" seats that are allocated to parties in order to give them a number of seats in proportion to its national vote. However, only party lists that obtained at least 5% of the national vote are entitled to receive these seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5058

See note C5038\_1-C5038\_4.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5058

According to the inter-parliamentary union (IPU parlines) Romania has a mixed member proportional system.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5058

The electoral system in Slovenia employs proportional representation using the simple quotient and the preferential system with a threshold of a 4 per cent for 88 members (simple majority preferential vote for the two Deputies representing the Italian and Hungarian communities). (source: Parlins).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5059

Parties present two lists for the 400 National Assembly seats: 200 nominations on a 'national list' and a further 200 candidates representing the nine provinces in the Assembly. Despite the two lists, voters have a single vote. There are 9 multi-member (4 to 43 seats) constituencies corresponding to the provinces.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5058

Korea employs a mixed-member majoritarian system that combines 245 single-member districts (SMD) with 54 proportional representation (PR) seats, elected from a single nation-wide district. Each voter casts two votes, one for an individual candidate in the SMD segment, and one for a closed party list in the PR segment.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5058

The electoral system in Spain employs proportional representation in 50 multi-member constituencies corresponding to the country's provinces; However, there are 2 single-member constituencies (North African enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla) that use a majoritarian formula.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5058

The electoral law in the 2008 legislative election is mixed-member majoritarian (MMM) system, and the total number of seats is 113. Among them, 73 seats are elected based on the single-member districts (SMD), 34 seats based on the proportional representation (PR) in a nationwide district, and 6 seats for the aboriginals.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5058

The Lower Chamber (Cámara de Representantes; House of Representatives) of the Uruguayan General Assembly consists of 99 members. Seats are assigned among parties in a single nationwide district, based on a proportional (d'Hondt) system. The system uses closed lists and Double Simultaneous Vote (DSV) in regional districts. DVS is the system by which the voter votes synchronously in a logical order: first by a party ("lema" or label or motto) and then a list of candidates ("lista" or list).

C5059 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL SEGMENTS (TIERS)

This variable indicates the number of electoral segments (tiers)

in each country.

#### 0-5. NUMBER OF ELECTORAL SEGMENTS (TIERS)

#### 9. MISSING

NOTES: C5059

This variable primarily concerns the Lower House election. However, if a particular study is focused on the Upper House, or presidential election, it may report results for these elections, respectively.

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5059

See ES note C5058.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5059

"There are 12 multi-member constituencies with district magnitude ranging from 6 to 13 seats. There is a 5% threshold. Seats are allocated in three rounds (2 tiers). In the first round seats are awarded to candidates who garner the same or more votes than the simple quota in their electoral districts. In the second round, seats are allocated in a traditional PR method. That is, party lists are awarded seats based on their share of the vote in the district, and candidates within the list receive seats in the order of how many preferential votes they received. In the third round of counting, all remaining mandates are distributed between the national candidate lists with at least 5% of the national vote." From <http://www.electinguide.org/country.php?ID=69>.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5059

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5059

2 tiers: 299 members are elected under the majority (first-past-the post) system and the remaining seats are filled through the proportional representation system using the party list. However in the German case. If there are more constituency seats won by a party in a state than a party's seat share would be based on the party vote distribution, constituency winners remain in parliament as so-called additional members (Überhangmandate). The 2005 German election produced 16 overhang seats, that is 2.7 percent of seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5059

Of the 300 members of parliament, 248 are elected in 56 constituencies comprised of 48 multi- and 8 single-seat constituencies, 20 and 12 parliamentarians (state deputies) are elected from closed party lists on a top-down basis, proportionally to the number of votes each party receives nationwide. The remaining 40 seats are awarded to the winning party as a 'premium'. The 40 'bonus' seats are intended to enhance the stability of government through the formation of a single party majority government (from OSCE report).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5059

Legislative Council (Legco) in Hong Kong is composed of 60 members, 30 of which are returned by geographical constituency elections. The remaining 30 are elected by functional constituency elections, i.e., not by public at large, hence the system is coded as a single electoral segment.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5059

The Oireachtas/Parliament has two chambers. The Dail Eireann/House of Representatives has 166 members, elected for a five-year term by proportional representation (single transferable vote) in multi-seat constituencies. The Seanad Eireann/Senate has 60 members, 11 members nominated, 6 members selected by the universities and 43 members elected from five vocational panels, all in short time after the parliamentary elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5059

There are two segments/tiers. Each voter casts two votes - a 'party vote', and an 'electorate vote'. The latter refers to 70 constituencies where each returns one representative according to the plurality principle (63 single-member general electoral districts and 7 single-member Maori electoral districts). The remaining 52 seats are decided on the basis of 'party vote' cast for closed party lists. To qualify for seats in the Parliament, a party has to win at least 5% of the 'party vote', or at least a single 'electorate' seat.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5059

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5059

The Norwegian Storting has 169 seats, where 150 members are elected from 19 multimember constituencies. In addition, another 19 "members at large" seats (one for each multimember constituency) are distributed proportionally among the parties after the election to party lists receiving at least 4% of the national popular vote.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5059

The Congress of the Philippines has two chambers or houses: the House of Representatives (Kapulungan Mga Kinatawan) and the Senate (Senado).

The House of Representatives is elected on the basis of two electoral segments. In the first segment, 229 representatives are elected in single-member districts, to a three-year term. In addition, up to 20% of the total number of representatives is elected through the party-list system in a single nationwide electoral district (second segment). After the 2010 elections, there are 56 representatives elected on party-list basis. Party-lists are to be proposed by indigenous, but non-religious, minority groups. A maximum of three seats is awarded to each party. Each elector casts two votes: one for the district representative and the other for the party of his choice.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5059

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The new electoral legislation (Law no. 35/2008) established a two-tier seat allocation for both Chambers of the Parliament. However, the voter casts only one vote for each of the Chambers. The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5059

The Swedish Riksdagen has 349 members, where 310 members are elected from 29 multi-member (2 to 34 seats) constituencies. In addition, there is one multi-member constituency for 39 "at large" seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5059

See note for C5058.

## C5060 &gt;&gt;&gt; LINKED ELECTORAL SEGMENTS (TIERS)

This variable indicates whether countries with multiple segments (tiers) have linked (connected) or unlinked (unconnected) segments (tiers). Linkage occurs whenever (i) unused votes from one electoral segment (tier) are used at another level or (ii) the allocation of seats in one segment (tier) is conditional on the seats received in another segment (tier).

The definition of this variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>).

- 1. YES
- 5. NO
- 6. SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES
- 7. NOT APPLICABLE
- 9. MISSING

## NOTES: C5060

This variable primarily concerns the Lower House election. However, if a particular study is focused on the Upper House, or presidential election, it may report results for these elections, respectively.

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5060

The Austrian electoral system is a (non-mixed) proportional representation system with three segments or tiers. These correspond to the federal level tier, the Land level tier (or state level) and the regional districts tier. Counting and allocation of seats passes through each of these levels, and as a consequence is a three step process. In first place in each Lander a Hare quota is calculated and used to distribute seats across the regional districts. That is, parties are allocated seats from each regional district depending on how often they exceeded the Land level specified quota. Followed by this seats are allocated at the Land level tier also following the Land level quota. Finally, at the national level seats are distributed following the D'Hondt system. Seats that have been already allocated in the first and second tier are deducted from the number of seats each parties obtains at the national level. Only those parties that obtain more than 4% of the national valid votes or one seat from the regional constituencies qualify to receive seats from the Lander and National seat distribution. Given this last element the electoral system is coded as linked.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5060

In Japan's mixed electoral system, seats of both tiers are allocated separately; each party is allocated its proportionate share of the PR seats plus the SMD seats won by its candidates. However, it is important to notice that candidates may run in both the SMD districts as well as in the party list of the PR contest. These so-called "duplicate" candidates are restricted to run only in SMD constituency located within their PR bloc.



While this feature might create some implicit interdependence between the segments, Japan's system is coded as un-linked since the allocation of seats of each segment is done independently, without considering the marginal results of the other segment.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5060

The two tiers are linked, with the party vote tier acting as a compensatory mechanism, assigning total seats on the basis of the party vote using the Sainte Lague formula.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5060

South Africa's electoral system is not mixed, but composed of two linked tiers that use proportional representation. Parties present two lists to fill the National Assembly's seats: 200 nominations on a 'national list' and a 200 candidates representing the nine provinces in the Assembly. Despite the two lists, voters have a single vote. The tiers are linked since successful candidates on a party's national list depend on its proportion of the national vote; successful candidates on its provincial lists depend on the proportion of the national vote in each province.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5060

In Korea's mixed electoral system seats of both tiers are allocated separately; each party is allocated its proportionate share of the PR seats plus the SMD seats won by its candidates. Thus, it's segments are classified as not being linked.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5060

There is one multi-member constituency for distribution of 39 "at large" seats, that is nationally. "When the permanent seats have been distributed between the parties within each constituency, the permanent seats for the parties in all constituencies (a total of 310 seats) are aggregated. Thereafter, a new distribution of seats is conducted, based on the grand total of votes in the country. This time, 349 seats are distributed, taking the whole of Sweden as one single constituency. (Source: Valmyndigheten, <http://www.val.se/>).

### C5061 >>> DEPENDENT FORMULAE IN MIXED SYSTEMS

This indicates whether the two electoral formulas used in a mixed system are dependent or independent. A dependent mixed system is one in which the application of one formula is dependent on the outcome produced by the other formula. An independent mixed system is one in which the two electoral formulas are implemented independently of each other.

The definition of this variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>).

1. INDEPENDENT
2. INDEPENDENT/DEPENDENT
3. DEPENDENT
7. NOT APPLICABLE
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5061

This variable primarily concerns the Lower House election. However, if a particular study is focused on the Upper House, or presidential election, it may report results for these elections, respectively.  
Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5061  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5061

Mexico's mixed electoral system is classified as dependent because the marginal distribution of votes of the lower level segment determines how many seats each party obtains in the higher level segment. We want to emphasize, however, that since there are no other rules in effect that provide for an interactive effect between the tiers, some also consider Mexico's two tier to be independent (Mixed Member Majoritarian).

#### C5062 >>> SUBTYPES OF MIXED ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

Sub-types of mixed electoral systems.

COEXISTENCE: This is a system in which some districts use a majoritarian formula, while others employ a proportional formula in a single electoral segment (tier). Coexistence systems are independent mixed systems.

SUPERPOSITION: This is a system in which a majoritarian and proportional formula are applied in independent electoral districts.

FUSION: This is a system in which majoritarian and proportional formulas are used in an independent manner within a single district.

CORRECTION: This is a system in which seats distributed by proportional representation in one set of districts are used to correct the distortions created by the majoritarian formula in another. Correction systems are a dependent form of mixed system.

CONDITIONAL: This is a system in which the actual use or not of one electoral formula depends on the outcome produced by the other. Conditional systems are a dependent form of mixed system.

The definition of this variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>).

1. COEXISTENCE
2. SUPERPOSITION
3. FUSION
4. CORRECTION
5. CONDITIONAL
6. [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
7. NOT APPLICABLE
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5062

This variable primarily concerns the Lower House election. However, if a particular study is focused on the Upper House, or presidential election, it may report results for these elections, respectively.  
Source: Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5062

See note for C5059.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5062

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The new electoral legislation (Law no. 35/2008) established a two-tier seat allocation for both Chambers of the Parliament. However, the voter casts only one vote for each of the Chambers. The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5062

The electoral law in the 2008 legislative election is mixed-member majoritarian (MMM) system, and the total number of seats is 113. Among them, 73 seats are elected based on the single-member districts (SMD), 34 seats based on the proportional representational (PR) in a nationwide district, and 6 seats for the aboriginals.

C5063 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - LOWEST SEGMENT (TIER) -  
LOWER HOUSE

Number of electoral districts or constituencies in the first or lowest electoral segment (tier) for the lower house of the legislature.

001-900. NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5063

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5063

The Austrian electoral system consists of three overlapping tiers. The first tier is made of 43 regional electoral districts, the second tier of 9 Land or state level electoral districts and the third tier of one nation-wide electoral district. The number of seats allotted to each Land ahead of an election depends on its census number of resident citizens plus registered Austrian expatriates. The Hare electoral quota used for seat allocation both in the first and second tier is calculated at the level of the second tier. In each Land the electoral quota is calculated from the number of allotted seats divided by the number of valid votes cast. The electoral quota thus varies by Land and the same quota is applied to the first tier seat allocation in the Land's regional electoral districts. Seats allocated (and votes used up) in the first tier are subtracted from the number of seats (and votes) available for subsequent second tier allocation. The number of seats available for third tier allocation is 183 minus the number of seats distributed during first and second tier allocation. The same rule determines the number of remaining votes available for third tier allocation. Participation in second and third tier

seat allocation is restricted to parties that have gained at least one first tier seat or a minimum of 4% of valid votes nation-wide. Seat allocation in the third tier is through the D'Hondt divisor rule.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5063

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5063

In both upper and lower house elections, the country is divided into 27 multi-member constituencies corresponding to the country's 26 states and the Federal District.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009) C5063

There are 60 electoral districts at the lower house for 120 seats, and 19 electoral districts at the upper house for 18 seats (the 36 senators are elected for a period of 8 years and half are reelected every 4 years).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (2009) C5063

The D'Hondt formula is also applied at the upper house level.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5063\_1

There are a total of 12 electoral districts. 10 districts each electing 14 representatives from party lists or independent list. The two distinctive features of the Croatian electoral law concern voting in special electoral districts: 11th district for the so-called Diaspora voters (Croatian citizens who are not resident in Croatia) and 12th district for representatives of national minorities:

In the 11th district there were 404 950 registered voters (2007) who permanently live outside Croatia. Voters cast votes for party lists registered in this electoral district. There is a specific rule for determining the number of seats allocated in this electoral district: the number of valid votes is divided by the average number of necessary to win a seat in the electoral districts 1-10.

In the 12th district voters who are registered as members of national minorities can cast votes for individual candidates. For this purpose there are separate sub-districts for respective national minorities or groups of minorities. The Serbian minority elects three representatives and voters can cast up to three votes for individual candidates. One representative is elected by members of the following national minorities who cast one vote for the individual candidates: Italian - Hungarian - Czech and Slovak - Austrian, Bulgarian, German, Polish, Roma, Romanian, Ruthenian, Russian, Turkish, Ukrainian, Valachian and Jewish - Albanian, Bosniak, Montenegrin, Macedonian and Slovenian. Voters registered as members of national minorities can forgo their right to vote in the 12th electoral district and register to vote in the respective general electoral district with other Croatian citizens.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5063

In the first tier, there are 10 multi-member districts, electing 135 representatives in total. The number of multi-member constituencies was reduced from 17 to ten after the Electoral District Reform in 2007.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2007): C5063

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5063

There are altogether 15 constituencies and 200 MPs. The number of MPs per constituency is decided before each election based on the number of inhabitants in each constituency. In the

Parliamentary election of 2011 the number of MPs varied between 6 (in the constituencies of Etelä-Savo and Pohjois-Karjala) and 35 (Uusimaa). Of the 200 MPs, 199 are elected in mainland Finland. Moreover, the constituency of the autonomous Åland Islands has 1 MP according to the Election Act., elected on the basis of the simple majority rule. (From the Macro Report.)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5063

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5063

There are 299 single-member constituencies.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5063

"Of the 300 members of parliament, 248 are elected in 56 constituencies comprised of 48 multi- and 8 single-seat constituencies, and 12 parliamentarians ("state deputies") are elected from closed party lists on a top-down basis, proportionally to the number of votes each party receives nationwide. The remaining 40 seats are awarded to the winning party as 'premium'. The 40 'bonus' seats are intended to enhance the stability of government through the formation of a single party majority government." From <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/greece/41001>.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5063

Thirty members of the legislative council of the HKSAR are elected directly, on the basis of five geographic electoral constituencies.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007, 2009): C5063

In the first tier, there are 6 multi-member districts, electing 54 (out of 63) representatives in total.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5063

Each of the 43 constituencies elects between 3 and 5 candidates, and the total number of elected representatives is 166. Note that in 2002 election, there were 42 constituencies.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5063

The Saeima elections are held in five constituencies: Riga, Vidzeme, Latgale, Zemgale and Kurzeme. Saeima elections are also held in those foreign countries where a substantial number of Latvia citizens reside. Thus, the Riga constituency also includes the electorate residing outside of Latvia.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5063

The 70 electorates are made up from 63 general and 7 Maori electorates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5063

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5063

In the first tier, there are 19 multi-member districts, electing 150 representatives in total.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PERU (2011): C5063

Peru is composed of 24 departments, but for the purpose of the province of Callao also has department status.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5063

The House of Representatives is elected on the basis of two electoral segments. In the first segment, 229 representatives

| are elected in single-member districts.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5063

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5063

| There are 41 multi-member (7-19 seats) district constituencies.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5063

| There are 22 constituencies (eighteen in mainland Portugal corresponding to each district, one for each autonomous regions, Azores, and Madeira, one for Portuguese living in Europe and one for those living in the rest of the world.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5063

| The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

| The number represents the empirical result, based on the 2009 elections, 245 seats were attributed at the first allocation. the number of seats distributed at this tier varies from election to election.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5063

| There are 8 electoral units each divided into 11 single-seat constituencies (88 seats in all). There are special constituencies for two members, respectively representing the Hungarian and Italian minorities.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5063

| In the first tier, there are 29 multi-member districts, electing 310 representatives in total.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5063

| In Switzerland the 26 electoral districts correspond to the country's 20 cantons and 6 half-cantons. The number of seats per constituency varies according to population.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5063

| A total of 157 seats, of which 4 single-seat, 63 with 2 seats, and 90 with 3 seats.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5063

| There are 85 multi-member constituencies corresponding to the country's provinces, with the exception of the largest cities who are split into 2 or 3 districts. The allocation of seats is done in 2 steps. First, all votes are aggregated nationwide to determine which parties exceed the 10% threshold. Seats are then distributed in each constituency proportionally using the d'Hondt method.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5063

| See note for C5058.

-----  
C5064 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - LOWEST SEGMENT (TIER) -  
LOWER HOUSE  
-----

Average district magnitude in the first or lowest electoral segment (tier). This is calculated as the total number of seats allocated in the lowest segment (tier) divided by the total number

of districts in that segment (tier).

001.00-900.00 NUMBER OF SEATS ELECTED PER DISTRICT

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5064

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5064

The number is the empirical average district magnitude calculated from the total number of seats allocated in the 43 first tier districts in the 2008 election. Average district magnitude varies over time based on electoral result.

For more details see ES note for C5063.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5064

This figure was calculated excluding the 2 districts reserved for minorities and citizens living abroad.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5064

"Direct party-list voting with proportional distribution of seats in three rounds of counting according to a simple electoral quotient. The distribution of leftover "compensation mandates" (26 seats) takes place on the basis of a modified 'Hondt method.' from <http://www.nsd.ui.b.no>.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5064

Each of the 43 constituencies elects between 3 and 5 candidates, and the total number of elected representatives is 166.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5064

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The number represents the empirical result, based on the seat allocation after the 2009 election.

The number of distributed seats within each tier varies from election to election, depending on electoral result.

For more details see ES note for C5062. In the 2009 election 245 seats were attributed at the first allocation in 245 districts.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5064

This figure excludes the 2 seats/constituencies reserved for the Hungarian and Italian minorities.

C5065 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - LOWEST SEGMENT (TIER) -  
LOWER HOUSE

The precise electoral formula used in the first or lowest electoral segment (tier) of the lower house.

10. PLURALITY

11. PLURALITY - SINGLE MEMBER DISTRICTS

12. PLURALITY - MULTI MEMBER DISTRICTS

20. MAJORITY

21. MAJORITY - RUN-OFF

22. MAJORITY - ALTERNATIVE

30. PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

31. PR - D'HONDT

32. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - DROOP

33. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - HARE

34. PR - MODIFIED STE-LAGUE

98. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5065

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5065

According to Parline: "Voters are required to express a preference among all the candidates contesting the same seat. A candidate is elected if he/she gains an absolute majority or 50% + 1 vote. If none of the candidates in a division obtains an absolute majority of the first preference votes, a second round of counting is held. At this point, the candidate with the least number of votes is eliminated and the votes which he/she obtained in the first round are redistributed among the remaining candidates on the basis of the electors' second choices. This procedure is repeated until such time as one of the candidates obtains an absolute majority."

For details: [http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2015\\_B.htm](http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2015_B.htm)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5065

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5065

"to win representation, a party (or apparentement) must exceed the Hare quota (total valid votes divided by number of seats) in a constituency. Each party is entitled to as many seats as the number of times its vote reaches the quota; unallocated seats are apportioned according to the d'Hondt formula" (Nicola 2008, p. 170).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5065

In the lowest segment, seats are allocated to parties within each multi-member constituency separately, by the d'Hondt formula on the basis of all votes cast for the parties in the multi-member constituency in question.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5065

If the candidate obtains the absolute majority at the first round and 25% of registered electors, he/she is elected. If not, the relative majority at the second round is enough to be elected. To be eligible at the second ballot, the candidate must have obtained more than 12.5% of registered voters at the first ballot.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5065

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5065

Constituency candidates with a relative majority (first vote) in one of the 299 constituencies win a seat.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GREECE (2009): C5065



the 248 seats are allocated proportionally using the Hare quota (also called a method of the largest remainder) (from OCSE report).

The distribution of remainder seats is complex in Greece. "Any remaining unallocated seats were subsequently filled in two stages. First, the party with the largest vote total at the national level obtained all unallocated seats in constituencies where it polled the largest number of votes. Then, the remaining seats were distributed on a nationwide basis among parties (but not coalitions) by the Hare method, disregarding fractions; if there remained unallocated seats following this apportionment, these were awarded as well to the party with the largest vote total in the entire country. Finally, the twelve nationwide seats were allocated according to the largest average method, also known as the D'Hondt rule." From <http://electionresources.org/gr/>.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5065

"The electoral system in Ireland is a proportional representation single transferable vote system (PRSTV). Voters put a '1' beside their most preferred candidate, a '2' beside their second most preferred candidate, and so on. Voters can express as many preferences as there are candidates running in their constituency. On the first count, candidates are declared elected if they attract enough first preference votes to pass a specified threshold, which is defined separately for each constituency according to the formula:  $[\text{total valid votes} / (\text{total number of seats} + 1) + 1]$ . If a candidate is declared elected on the first count, the second preferences of the candidate's surplus votes (i.e., votes over and above the threshold) are then distributed among the other candidates. If this redistribution does not push any of the remaining candidates over the threshold, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is eliminated, then the second preferences of the eliminated candidate's votes are redistributed. This process of redistribution of surpluses and elimination of candidates continues until all the seats in a given constituency are filled." (For details, see Gallagher et al., 2003, Appendix 4).

Owing to the quota formula:  $[\text{total valid votes} / (\text{total number of seats} + 1) + 1]$ , the STV system in Ireland works similarly as the party-list proportional representation which uses the largest-remainder method with droop quota. Consequently, C5065 of IRL\_2007 is coded as 32.

Please be careful that because Ireland uses STV instead of PR, there are non-trivial differences between the electoral system of Ireland and the other countries with the PR, for example, "residual" votes go to the next preferred candidates in the STV but in the PR to the next listed/ranked candidates, even though both systems employ "droop" quota for the seats allocation.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LATVIA (2010): C5065

Although coded as modified Ste-Lague, Latvia uses Ste-Lague.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5065

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5065

Modified St. Lague formula was used in 2001 election only.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5065

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

To obtain a seat, candidates must get 50% +1 of the votes cast. The remaining seats are allocated according to a complicated

=====

algorithm (for details, see Marian and King 2010) to other candidates based on candidate results at district level and party results at constituency level. At this level the same threshold as discussed in C5047 remains in place.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5065

Slovakia employs PR with the Hagenbach-Bischoff method. However, the entry in the data is coded with response 31 PR - D'Hondt. The reason is that the Hagenbach-Bischoff method is considered a variant of the D'Hondt method. Further, both systems return identical results.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5065

Seats are distributed on a proportional basis. Remaining seats are distributed at the national level using the d'Hondt method, with Deputies being selected from those lists which have the highest remainders.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5065

The conversion of votes into seats depends on the nationwide district. The Droop quota is used to allocate seats. Surplus seats are apportioned using the largest remainder method.  
from: <http://www.eisa.org.za/WEP/sousystem.htm>

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5065

Seats are distributed on a proportional basis. "Multi-member constituencies: blocked party lists and the d'Hondt system of proportional representation - each voter chooses one list of those made available in the constituency (province)"  
from: <http://www.nsd.uib.no>

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5065

Modified St-Laguë method. "The permanent constituency seats are distributed on the basis of the total number of votes gained by the political parties in each constituency. Comparative numbers are calculated for the parties that will take part in the distribution of seats. The first comparative number is obtained by dividing the parties' respective total number of votes by 1.4. The party which receives the highest comparative number is awarded the first seat in the constituency. That party is then allocated a new comparative number, obtained by dividing the party's votes by 3. The other parties keep their comparative numbers until they are awarded a seat. When a party obtains its second seat, its votes are divided by 5 to calculate the next comparative number. For the third seat by 7 etc. This method of calculation is referred to as the 'adjusted odd-number method'." (Source: Valmyndigheten, <http://www.val.se/>).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWITZERLAND (2007): C5065

Switzerland employs PR with the Hagenbach-Bischoff method in 21 of the 26 cantons. In the remaining 5 cantons (3 cantons and 2 half cantons) a single majority system is employed. However, the entry in the data is coded with response 31 PR - D'Hondt. The reason is that the Hagenbach-Bischoff method is considered a variant of the D'Hondt method. Further, both systems return identical results.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5065

The Block Vote (BV) used in this electoral tier is considered plurality (sometimes referred to plurality at large). The voting is done via a series of check boxes (where there are multiple winners) and votes are tallied in a way that is similar to a plurality election.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5065

The Lower Chamber (Cámara de Representantes; House of Representatives) of the Uruguayan General Assembly consists of 99 members. Seats are assigned among parties in a single nationwide district, based on a proportional (d'Hondt) system. The system uses closed lists and Double Simultaneous Vote (DSV) in regional districts.

DVS is the system by which the voter votes synchronously in a logical order: first by a party ("lema" or label or motto) and then a list of candidates ("lista" or list). For more details see notes for C5001 and C5003.

C5066 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - SECOND SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE

Number of electoral districts or constituencies in the second electoral segment (tier) for the lower house of the legislature.

001-900. NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

997. NOT APPLICABLE

999. MISSING

## NOTES: C5066

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5066

The Austrian electoral system has three segments or tiers. These correspond to the federal level tier, the Land or state level tier (9 districts) and the regional tier (43 districts). For more details see ES note for C5063.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5066

The secondary segment refers to 40 seats allocated in the single nationwide district.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5066

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5066

There are 16 electoral districts corresponding to the Länder, that also elect 299 members in total. This is different from Module 1, where the applied code indicated one district in the second electoral segment.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2007): C5066

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ICELAND (2009): C5066

In addition to the 54 seats in 6 electoral districts, there is 1 other multi-member constituency that proportionally allocates 9 "supplementary" seats to the parties that obtained 5% or more of the national vote. For this tier the remaining seats are also allotted by the d'Hondt method.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5066

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2009): C5066

In addition to the 150 seats in 19 electoral districts, there is 1 other multi-member constituency for the 19 "members at large" seats. For this tier, the remaining seats are also allotted by the modified Saint-Lague method.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5066

The House of Representatives is elected on the basis of two electoral segments. In the first segment, 229 representatives are elected in single-member districts. In addition, up to 20% of the total number of representatives is elected through the party-list system in a single nation-wide electoral district (second tier). After the 2010 elections, there are 56 representatives elected on party-list basis.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5066

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed. The number represents the empirical result, based on the seat allocation after the 2009 election.

The number of distributed seats within each tier varies from election to election, depending on electoral result.

For more details see ES note for C5062.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5066

In addition to the 310 seats in 29 electoral districts, there is 1 other multi-member constituency for 39 "at large" seats. For this tier, the remaining seats are allotted by the system of full proportional representation based on the votes obtained nationwide, following the "adjusted odd-number method" see note for variable C5065. (Source: Valmyndigheten, <http://www.val.se/>).

C5067 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - SECOND SEGMENT (TIER) -  
LOWER HOUSE

Average district magnitude in the second electoral segment (tier). This is calculated as the total number of seats allocated in the second segment (tier) divided by the total number of districts in that segment (tier).

001.00-900.00 NUMBER OF SEATS ELECTED PER DISTRICT

997. NOT APPLICABLE

999. MISSING

## NOTES: C5067

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5067

The number is the average district magnitude calculated from the number of seats allocated in the 9 second tier districts in the 2008 election. The average district magnitude varies over time, depending on the electoral results.

For more details see ES note for C5063.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5067

These are compensation seats.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5067

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not. Without overhang seats, this value is 18.875. However with the 16 overhang seats, it rises to 19.68

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5067

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not. Without overhang seats, this value is 18.875. However with the 24 overhang seats, it rises to 20.1875.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5067

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not. Without overhang seats, this value is 50. However with the 2 overhang seats, it rises to 52.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5067

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed. For the 2008 parliamentary election, 71 seats were allocated at the second tier.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5067

See ES note for C5075.

-----  
C5068 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - SECOND SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE  
-----

The precise electoral formula used in the second electoral segment (tier) of the lower house.

- .....
- 10. PLURALITY
  - 11. PLURALITY - SINGLE MEMBER DISTRICTS
  - 12. PLURALITY - MULTI MEMBER DISTRICTS
  - 20. MAJORITY
  - 21. MAJORITY - RUN-OFF
  - 22. MAJORITY - ALTERNATIVE
  - 30. PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION
  - 31. PR - D'HONDT
  - 32. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - DROOP
  - 33. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - HARE
  - 34. PR - MODIFIED STE-LAGUE
  - 97. NOT APPLICABLE
  - 98. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]
  - 99. MISSING

NOTES: C5068

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5068

The compensatory seats are allocated to parties which have qualified for participation in this allocation in strict proportionality to the number of votes obtained by these parties. The calculation is done on the basis of the so-called pure Hare quota; seats not allocated by the full quota are allocated on the basis of largest remainders.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5068

"Direct party-list voting with proportional distribution of seats in three rounds of counting according to a simple electoral quotient. The distribution of leftover "compensation mandates" (26 seats) takes place on the basis of a modified d'Hondt method." from <http://www.nsd.ui.b.no>.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5068

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5068

Electoral formula: Until the 2005 election: Hare-Niemeyer, equal to the Hare quota and largest remainder (d'Hondt method until 1987). In 2008, Germany changed the electoral formula and is now using the Sainte-Laguë Formula.

"Party seats are distributed on the state level based on each party's vote distribution (not: vote shares) among the 16 states. Constituency seats already won in a state are subtracted from each party's seat total in this state. The remaining party seats are filled by the (closed) party lists for each state (second segment) according to the ranking of the candidates. If there are more constituency seats won by a party in a state than a party's seat share would be based on the party vote distribution, constituency winners remain in parliament as so-called additional members (Überhangmandate). While regular MP seats can be filled by alternates (in the case of death or resignation of the MP), additional members are not replaced during an electoral term." (Source: <http://aceproject.org/>). There were 16 additional seats in 2005, and 24 additional seats in 2009 (<http://www.wahlrecht.de/ueberhang/ueberhist.html>).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5068

"The parties, organizations and coalitions receiving at least two percent of the total votes cast for the party-list system shall be entitled to one seat each, provided that those garnering more than two percent of the votes shall be entitled to additional seats in proportion to their total number of votes." (Section 11 (B) and Section 12 of Republic Act (RA) 941 or the Party-list System Act). Party-list groups are only allowed a maximum of three seats.

There are two formulae in determining the number of allocated seats for each qualified party. The first formula is used to compute the number of seats to which the first party (top vote getter) is entitled to.

Proportion of the first party =

(Total votes for the first party-list)

/ (total number of votes for the party-list system).

If the proportion of votes received by the top party without rounding it off is equal to at least six percent of the total valid votes cast for all party list groups, then the top party is entitled to two additional seats for a total of three seats overall. If the proportion of votes without rounding off is equal to or greater than four percent, but less than six percent, then the first party shall have one additional seats for a total of two seats. If the proportion is less than four percent, then the first party is not entitled to any additional seat.

Formula for solving additional seats that other qualified parties are entitled to: (Additional seats for concerned party)

= [ (Number. of votes of concerned party)/(Number of votes of first party)] x (Number of additional seats allocated to the first party).

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5068

The conversion of votes into seats depends on the nationwide district. The Droop quota is used to allocate seats. Surplus seats are apportioned using the largest remainder method. from: <http://www.eisa.org.za/WEP/sousystem.htm>

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5068

For this tier, seats are allotted by the system of full proportional representation based on the votes obtained nationwide, following the "adjusted odd-number method" see note for variable C5065. (Source: Valmyndigheten, <http://www.val.se/>).

### C5069 >>> NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS - THIRD SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE

Number of electoral districts or constituencies in the third electoral segment (tier) for the lower house of the legislature.

This variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>). Original variable name: DISTRICTS3.

001-900. NUMBER OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

997. NOT APPLICABLE

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5069

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5069

The Austrian electoral system has three segments or tiers. These correspond to the federal level tier, the Land or state level tier (9 districts) and the regional tier (43 districts). For more details see ES note for C5063.

### C5070 >>> AVERAGE DISTRICT MAGNITUDE - THIRD SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE

Average district magnitude in the third electoral segment (tier). This is calculated as the total number of seats allocated in the second segment (tier) divided by the total number of districts in that segment (tier).

This variable is taken from Matt Golder's database about Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946-2000 (<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>). Original variable name: AVEMAG3.

001.00-900.00 NUMBER OF SEATS ELECTED PER DISTRICT

997. NOT APPLICABLE

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5070

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5070

The number is the district magnitude calculated from the number of seats allocated in the single third tier district in the 2008 election.

District magnitude varies over time based on electoral result. For more details see ES note for C5063.

---

C5071 >>> ELECTORAL FORMULA - THIRD SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE

---

The precise electoral formula used in the third electoral segment (tier) of the lower house.

10. PLURALITY

11. PLURALITY - SINGLE MEMBER DISTRICTS

12. PLURALITY - MULTI MEMBER DISTRICTS

20. MAJORITY

21. MAJORITY - RUN-OFF

22. MAJORITY - ALTERNATIVE

30. PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

31. PR - D'HONDT

32. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - DROOP

33. PR - LARGEST REMAINDER - HARE

34. PR - MODIFIED STE-LAGUE

97. NOT APPLICABLE

98. OTHER [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5071

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

---

C5072 >>> NUMBER OF SEATS ABOVE THE FIRST SEGMENT (TIER) - LOWER HOUSE

---

The number of seats allocated in electoral districts or constituencies above the first or lowest segment (tier). This variable may include seats allocated in several different upper segments (tiers).

000-900. NUMBER OF SEATS

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5072



=====

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5072

The number is based on the seat allocation after the 2008 election.  
The number of distributed seats within each tier varies from election to election, depending on the electoral result.  
For more details see ES note for C5063.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5072

These are compensation seats.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5072

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5072

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5072

This value changes depending on whether overhang seats are allotted or not.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5072

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed. In the present case 245 out of the 316 seats were attributed after the first round of counting, and 71 after the second. (these figures exclude the 18 minority seats)

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5072

These are compensation seats.

-----  
C5073 >>> PERCENTAGE OF SEATS ABOVE THE FIRST SEGMENT (TIER) -  
LOWER HOUSE  
-----

Percentage of seats allocated in electoral districts above the lowest segment (tier).

.....

000.00-100.00 PERCENTAGE OF SEATS

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5073

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5073

The number (111/183=60.66) is based on the seat allocation after the 2008 election.

The number of seats distributed within each tier varies from election to election, depending on electoral result. For more details see ES note for C5063.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - DENMARK (2007): C5073

The percentage is based on the 175 Parliament members from Denmark strictu sensu. The remaining four members from the Faroe Islands and Greenland are not taken into account here.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ESTONIA (2011): C5073

These are compensation seats.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5073

The percentage of upper tier seats is 50% of the total in theory. However given that overhang seats were allotted in 2005 this means that there were more than 50% of the seats allotted at this tier.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5073

The percentage of upper tier seats is 50% of the total in theory. However given that overhang seats were allotted in 2009 this means that there were more than 50% of the seats allotted

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5073

The percentage of upper tier seats is 41.66% of the total in theory. However given that (2) overhang seats were allotted in 2008, this means that there were 42.62% of the seats allotted at this tier.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5073

The CSES survey was conducted for the 2009 Presidential Election, the following figures are for the last parliamentary elections in November 2008 (house and senate).

The division of seats between tiers is variable and depends on the actual result of voting. In extreme theoretical circumstances, it is possible for one tier not to receive seats at all. Overhang seats are allowed. In the present case 245 out of the 316 seats were attributed after the first round of counting, and 71 after the second. (these figures exclude the 18 minority seats)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5073

These are compensation seats.

#### C5074 >>> FUSED VOTE

This indicates whether a fused vote was used for presidential and legislative elections. A fused vote is when a citizen casts a single ballot for the elections of more than one political office. This particular variable captures when the single ballot is for the presidency and the legislature. Citizens are unable to divide their votes among the candidates or lists of different parties. Split-ticket voting is expressly prohibited.

1. YES
5. NO

7. NOT APPLICABLE - PARLIAMENTARY REGIME

## 9. MISSING

NOTES: C50747

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5074

Voters have a single vote. However, each ballot contains a presidential ticket, a closed list for Senate, and a closed list for the Lower Chamber. Each ballot must necessarily contain lists of a single party. Electors cast votes necessarily (for President and two chambers) for the same party. Hence, the elections results are basically identical for all three institutions - both houses of the Parliament, and for the President (first round).

-----  
C5075 >>> SIZE OF THE LOWER HOUSE  
-----

Total number of seats in the lower house of the legislature during the election year.

001-900. SEATS IN THE LOWER HOUSE

999. MISSING.

NOTES: C5075

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5075

There are 10 districts each electing 14 representatives from party lists or independent list. In addition to these 140 seats, 8 seats are attributed to national minorities through a 12th district, of which 3 go to the national Serbian minority and 5 go to other minorities. The 11th district is formed of the Croatian nationals residing outside Croatia. Representatives from this constituency are elected on the basis of a non-fixed quota. That is, the number of representatives is not fixed in advance for this constituency. The number is attached to the amount of valid votes in the 10 national constituencies: more votes in the national constituencies lead to the election of less Diaspora MPs.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5075

There are 577 single-member constituencies: 555 for metropolitan France, 17 for overseas departments and "collectivités territoriales", and 5 for overseas territories.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5075

The Bundestag contains 598 seats in theory. However 16 overhang seats increase the number of seats to 614 in 2005.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5075

The Bundestag contains 598 seats in theory. However 24 overhang seats increase the number of seats to 622 in 2009.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2008): C5075

Legislative Council (Legco) in Hong Kong is composed of 60

members, 30 of which are returned by geographical constituency elections and another 30 by functional constituency elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NEW ZEALAND (2008): C5075

Normally, the parliament has 120 members, however this can sometimes increase due to an 'overhang', when a party gains more electorate seats than those that are won on the basis of its party vote. After the 2008 elections, the Parliament had 122 members, reflecting a two-seat 'overhang' for the Maori party.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5075

The Congress of the Philippines has two chambers or houses: the House of Representatives (Kapulungan Mga Kinatawan) and the Senate (Senado).

The House of Representatives is elected on the basis of two electoral segments. In the first segment, 229 representatives are elected in single-member districts. In addition, up to 20% of the total number of representatives is elected through the party-list system in a single nation-wide electoral district (second segment). After the 2010 elections, there are 56 representatives elected on party-list basis. Thus, in total after the 2010 elections there were 285 representatives in the House of Representatives.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2009): C5075

"The Assembly of the Republic shall have not less than one hundred and eighty, and not more than two hundred and thirty, Deputies, as provided in the electoral law." (The Portuguese Constitution, Article 148.)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5075

For the 2008 parliamentary elections, the Chamber of Deputies elected 334 members (316 elected from districts, plus 18 again allocated to otherwise unrepresented national minorities)

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5075

In the 113 seats contained in the lower house, 6 seats are reserved for aborigines,

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - URUGUAY (2009): C5075

The Lower Chamber (Cámara de Representantes; House of Representatives) of the Uruguayan General Assembly consists of 99 members. Seats are assigned among parties in a single nationwide district, based on a proportional (d'Hondt) system.

```
-----
C5080_1 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5080_2 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5080_3 >>> GDP GROWTH - ANNUAL % (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
-----
```

These variables report World Bank estimate of the annual GDP growth, at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Definition: Annual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2000 U.S. dollars. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.

00.00-90.00 % ANNUAL GROWTH

99. MISSING

NOTES: C5080

Source: World Development Indicators 2009 database  
(<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>).

Note that CSES uses the most recent WB indicators available at the time of data processing. However, since WB may change some of its data retroactively, differences may occur between the CSES entries and the WB indicators at later time points. "Historical data in the World Development Indicators (WDI) database often changes with each edition. We advise clients to use our most current data set since it provides not only data for the latest year available, but also revisions to previously published data. In most cases, revisions are due to estimates becoming more robust over time given better collection methods and more recent surveys." Source: The World Bank web-site <http://data.worldbank.org/about/faq/data-publications> (retrieved on Nov 10, 2010).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5080

The source of these data is the CIA world fact book.

-----  
C5081\_1 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T  
C5081\_2 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1  
C5081\_3 >>> GDP PER CAPITA, PPP (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2  
-----

These variables report World Bank estimate of the GDP per capita, at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Definition: GDP is gross domestic product at purchaser prices divided by midyear population. It is the sum of the gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. PPP GDP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as a U.S. dollar has in the United States. Data are in constant 2005 international dollars.

00000.00-89999.00 GDP PER CAPITA

99999. MISSING

NOTES: C5081

Source: World Development Indicators 2009 database  
(<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>).

See also notes for C5080.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5081

The source of these data is the CIA world fact book. Note, data

| are in 2008 US dollars.

```
-----
C5082_1 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T
C5082_2 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1
C5082_3 >>> INFLATION, GDP DEFLATOR (ANNUAL %) (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2
-----
```

These variables report World Bank estimate of Inflation at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Definition: Inflation as measured by the annual growth rate of the GDP implicit deflator shows the rate of price change in the economy as a whole. The GDP implicit deflator is the ratio of GDP in current local currency to GDP in constant local currency.

.....

-100.00-10000.00 INFLATION (ANNUAL %)

99999. MISSING

NOTES: C5082

Source: World Development Indicators 2009 database  
(<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>).

See also notes for C5080.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5082

The source of these data (2008) is the CIA world fact book.  
For 2007 and 2006, data are from the IMF world economic outlook.

```
-----
C5083_1 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T
C5083_2 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T-1
C5083_3 >>> HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX (UNPD) - TIME T-2
-----
```

These variables report UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Definition: The human development index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life; access to knowledge; and a decent standard of living. These basic dimensions are measured by life expectancy at birth, adult literacy and combined gross enrolment in primary, secondary and tertiary level education, and gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in Purchasing Power Parity US dollars (PPP US\$), respectively.

.....

00.00-99.00 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5083

Source: Human Development Report 2010 (Downloaded on December 9, 2010, from: <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/49806.html>).

Note that as of 2010 HDI figures are different from the previous

reports, due to the revision of the HDI methodology. Hence, figures for all the countries included in this CSES release are updated accordingly. For more details about the change in the HDI methodology, see <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/faq/>.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5083\_3

In the 2010 HDI Report, data for the year 2004 are not available.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5083\_3

In the 2010 HDI Report, data for the year 2004 are not available.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5083\_2 & C5083\_3

In the 2010 HDI Report, data for years 2004 and 2003 are not available.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NORWAY (2005): C5083\_2 & C5083\_3

In the 2010 HDI Report, data for years 2004 and 2003 are not available.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SWEDEN (2006): C5083\_3

In the 2010 HDI Report, data for the year 2004 are not available.

-----  
 C5084\_1 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T  
 C5084\_2 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1  
 C5084\_3 >>> POPULATION, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2  
 -----

These variables report World Bank estimate of the total population size, at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Definition: Total population is based on the de facto definition of population, which counts all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship--except for refugees not permanently settled in the country of asylum, who are generally considered part of the population of their country of origin.

1000-1,000,000,000. POPULATION SIZE

999999995904. MISSING

#### NOTES: C5084

Source: World Development Indicators 2009 database (<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>).

See also notes for C5080.

Due to a data entry error, the missing data value for this variable, which is used only in variable C5084\_1 and only for two election studies (Finland 2011 and Slovakia 2010), is "999999995904" rather than the customary "999999999999".

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2011): C5084\_1

Population data was not available for this country-year as of the original Full Release of CSES Module 3.

The data has since become available, however, and the value is: 5,388,272

This was discovered too late to be recoded in the re-release, however, and so the value still appears as missing.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVAKIA (2010): C5084\_1

Population data was not available for this country-year as of the original Full Release of CSES Module 3.

The data has since become available, however, and the value is: 5,391,428

This was discovered too late to be recoded in the re-release, however, and so the value still appears as missing.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5084

Data is from Taiwan's Council for Economic Planning and Development (CEPD) Figures for 2008 are from projected estimates, medium variant.

-----  
 C5085\_1 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T  
 C5085\_2 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-1  
 C5085\_3 >>> UNEMPLOYMENT, TOTAL (WORLD BANK) - TIME T-2  
 -----

These variables report World Bank estimate of the unemployment rate (% of total labor force), at three time periods: the election year (time T), one year before election (T-1), and two years before election (T-2).

Unemployment is the share of the labor force without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment may differ by country.

00.00-100.00 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (% OF TOTAL LABOR FORCE)

999. MISSING

#### NOTES: C5085

Source: World Development Indicators 2009 database (<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>).

See also notes for C5080.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5085\_1-C5085\_3

Unemployment estimates are not available from the World Bank for these years in Belarus. In this case, figures reported are from the International Labor Organization (ILO), and represent unemployment rates for men aged 16 to 59 years and women aged 16 to 54 years, in December of each given years.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5085

These data are from the World Labour Organization and represent persons aged 10 years and over.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5085

The source of these data is the CIA world fact book.



## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5085

These data are from the International Labor Organization.  
The figures represent total, yearly unemployment rates, for  
persons aged 15 years and over.

## C5090 &gt;&gt;&gt; CONSTITUTIONAL FEDERAL STRUCTURE

Is the country federal?

Federations are "compound polities, combining strong constituent units and strong general government, each possessing powers delegated to it by the people through a constitution and each empowered to deal directly with the citizens in the exercise of the legislative, administrative and taxing powers, and each directly elected by the citizens." (page 12, Watts, 2008).

1. YES [SEE ELECTION STUDY NOTES]

5. NO

9. MISSING

NOTES: C5090

Source: Ronald L. Watts, (2008). "Comparing Federal Systems". Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2006): C5090

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2010): C5090

Brazil's constitutional structure is Federal (Watts, 2008) with 26 federated units and one federal capital district.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5090

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5090

Germany is a Federation according to Watts (2008). The federation consists of 16 Laenders.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5090

The Provinces of the Philippines are the primary political and administrative divisions of the Philippines. There are 80 provinces at present, further subdivided into component cities and municipalities. The National Capital Region, as well as independent cities, are autonomous from any provincial government. Each province is administered by an elected governor who oversees various local government entities. The provinces are grouped into 17 regions based on geographical, cultural, and ethnological characteristics.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5090

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2007): C5090

Article 3 of the Polish Constitution states that "The Republic of Poland shall be a unitary State." The basic unit of local government is the commune (Gmina).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5090

South Africa's constitutional structure is Federal (Watts, 2008) with 9 provinces.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5090

Although de facto, the Republic of China is functioning as a unitary state, it is also de jure, a federated unit of the People's Republic of China.

## C5091 &gt;&gt;&gt; NUMBER OF LEGISLATIVE CHAMBERS

Number of legislative chambers:

1. ONE LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER; UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE
2. TWO LEGISLATIVE CHAMBERS; BICAMERAL LEGISLATURE
9. MISSING

NOTES: C5091

Note that some of the countries have indirectly elected Upper Chambers.

Source: Macro Report and Publicly Available Sources

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRALIA (2007): C5091

The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia has two chambers. The house of representatives has 150 members, elected for a three-year term in single-seat constituencies with a system of alternative vote. The senate consists of 76 Senators, twelve from each of the six states and two from each of the federal territories. The senate is elected for 6 years term. One half is renewed every 3 years, except for the 4 senators representing the federal territories, who are elected for a maximum of 3 years.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - AUSTRIA (2008): C5091

Austria has a bicameral system with two chambers: the Nationalrat (or National Council) and the Bundesrat (or Federal Council). However, only the Nationalrat is elected popularly. This house has 183 members elected for five-year terms in multimember constituencies with a proportional representation. The Bundesrat consists of 62 members. These are elected indirectly by the parties according to the number of seats they hold in the provincial assemblies.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5091

The National Assembly (Natsionalnoe Sobranie) is a bicameral legislature with a directly elected House of representatives and an upper house, the Council of Republic, is made up of (indirectly) elected representatives and presidential appointees (from Fish and Kroenig 2009, p. 65)

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CROATIA (2007): C5091

The Croatian Parliament (Hrvatski sabor) is unicameral.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CZECH REPUBLIC (2006): C5091

The Parliament České republiky (Parliament of the Czech Republic) has two chambers. Poslanecká snemovna (Chamber of Representatives) has 200 members, elected for a four year term by proportional representation. The Senát (Senat) has 81 members elected for a six-year term in single-seat constituencies, in which one-third is renewed every two years.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5091

By article 24 of the Constitution of 4 October 1958 the National Assembly and the Senate together constitute the French Parliament. The National Assembly consists of 577 deputies elected directly for five years. Members of the Senate (Senat) are elected indirectly by popularly chosen departmental electoral colleges, for nine-year terms.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2005): C5091

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - GERMANY (2009): C5091

The Bundesrat is not a second chamber formally since it is indirectly elected, but it is functionally because of its policy implications. Hence, Germany is treated as a two-chamber system. Individual elections in the 16 Länder (States) determine the composition of each Land assembly (Landtag). Each Landtag elects a Land government which then sends its members as delegates to the Bundesrat

"The Länder shall participate through the Bundesrat in the legislation and administration of the Federation and in matters concerning the European Union." (The Basic Law, Article 50).

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - IRELAND (2007): C5091

The Seanad Éireann/Senate, the upper house of the Oireachtas (Irish parliament), is indirectly elected. It has 60 members, 11 members nominated, 6 members selected by the universities and 43 members elected from five vocational panels, all in short time after the parliamentary elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2007): C5091

Japan has a bicameral Parliament (Kokkai, or National Diet). There are 480 seats in the House of Representatives (Shugi-in), elected in two electoral segments for a four-year term. The upper chamber (House of Councillors) has 242 members who are elected in two electoral segments, for 6 years term, where half of the members (121) stand for re-election every three years.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5091

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5091

The Congreso de la Unión (Congress of the Union) has two chambers. The Cámara de Diputados (Chamber of Deputies - The Lower Chamber) has 500 members, elected for a three year term, 300 members elected in single-seat constituencies and 200 members elected by proportional representation in multi-seat constituencies. The Cámara de Senadores (Chamber of Senators - The Upper Chamber) has 128 members, elected for a six year term, 96 of them in three seat constituencies and 32 by proportional representation. In the constituencies two seats are awarded to the plurality winner and one to the first runner-up.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - NETHERLANDS (2006): C5091

The 75 members of the Senate (Eerste Kamer) of the Dutch Parliament (the States General) are elected by the members of the twelve Provincial Councils, for a 4-years term.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2005): C5091

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - POLAND (2009): C5091

Poland has a bicameral parliament consisting of a 460-member lower house (Sejm) and a 100-member Senate (Senat). Both Houses are directly elected by popular vote.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SLOVENIA (2008): C5091

The parliament is composed of two chambers: the Drzavni Svet / National Council, and the Drzavni Zbor / National Assembly. The Drzavni Svet is composed of 40 indirectly elected members for 5 years.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH AFRICA (2009): C5091

The South African Parliament is composed of two chambers. Only one chamber, the National Assembly (lower house) is directly elected. The upper chamber, the National Council of provinces, is indirectly elected.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SOUTH KOREA (2008): C5091

The Kuk Hoe (National Assembly) is a unicameral parliament, consisting of 299 members, elected for a four year term, 243 members in single-seat constituencies and 56 members by proportional representation.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - SPAIN (2008): C5091

Las Cortes Generales (The General Courts) have two chambers. The Congress of Deputies (Congreso de los Diputados) has 350 members. The Senate (Senado) has 264 senators.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5091

National Assembly or Rathasapha is bicameral. It consists of the Senate or Wuthisapha (150 seats; 76 members elected by popular vote representing 76 provinces, 74 appointed by judges and independent government bodies; all serve six-year terms) and the House of Representatives or Sapha Phuthaen Ratsadon (480 seats; 400 members elected from 157 multi-seat constituencies and 80 elected on proportional party-list basis of 10 per eight zones or groupings of provinces; all serve four-year terms). Prior to 2007 all members of the legislature were elected: the new constitution grants the King power to appoint members of the Senate on the recommendation of a special commission.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - UNITED STATES (2008): C5091

The United States Senate is the upper house of the bicameral legislature of the United States. Together with the United States House of Representatives it makes up the United States Congress. Approximately one third of the Senate is renewed every two years. Senators serve terms of six years each; the terms are staggered so that approximately one-third of the seats are up for election every two years.

#### C5092 >>> ELECTORAL RESULTS DATA AVAILABLE

Are electoral results data available?

- 1. YES
- 3. INCOMPLETE
- 5. NO
- 9. MISSING

NOTES: C5092

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5092  
ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5092

This entry is calculated using the marginal vote distribution of the single member districts. Recall that the proportional representation vote distribution is calculated using the outcome of the single member districts (for further details see ES note C5038\_1-C5038\_2). Additionally, for the 2006 contest there were two pre-electoral coalitions (see ES note C5032) whose results are aggregated in the official electoral results, and thus are calculated as a single entity, but in reality include 2 and 3 parties each.

-----  
C5093 >>> EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES  
-----

Effective number of electoral parties (ENEP).

Formula:  $ENPP = 1 / (\sum [V_i^2])$   
where  $V_i$  represents the vote share of party  $i$ , and all parties ( $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ ) receiving votes are included in the calculation.

Definition based on Laakso, M. and R. Taagepera (1979).  
'"Effective" Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe', Comparative Political Studies 12: 3-27.

.....

00.00-150.00 EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES

999. MISSING

NOTES: C5093

The electoral data employed to calculate this index comes from lower house elections, unless the study is focused on upper house election exclusively.  
For countries with mixed electoral systems (see C5058) the electoral returns come from the segment containing the most seats. If there are an equal amount of seats in each segment the results come from the proportional representation segment.

Source of electoral data: Multiple.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5093

The large differences between the effective number of political parties and the corrected measure stems from the very large number of independent candidates gaining a seat.  
The residual category "other" in Belarus encompasses more than 86 percent of the vote, and is entirely composed of independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5093-C5096

Electoral returns in France contain more than one "other" category. The broader categories "regionalist", "Divers", "other left wing" "other right wing" and "others" were treated as single parties where appropriate and not amalgamated in a broader "other" category.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2006): C5093

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2009): C5093

This entry is calculated using the marginal vote distribution of the single member districts. Recall that the proportional representation vote distribution is calculated using the outcome

of the single member districts (for further details see ES note C5038\_1-C5038\_2). Additionally, for the 2006 contest there were two pre-electoral coalitions (see ES note C5032) whose results are aggregated in the official electoral results, and thus are calculated as a single entity, but in reality include 2 and 3 parties each.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5093

These figures are based on the May 10, 2010 Philippine House of Representatives election results for representatives from congressional districts.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5093

These figures are based on the 2008 parliamentary elections.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5093

These figures are calculated using the constituency level returns from the 2008 legislative (Yuan) elections. Source: Central Election Commission.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5093

Effective number of political parties was calculated using vote shares from the PR list tier.

#### ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5093

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. This figure takes into account the BDP as a political party.

### C5094 >>> CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES

Corrected effective number of electoral parties (CENEP).

Corrected Effective Number of Electoral Parties corrects for the "other" category using the least component method of bounds suggested by Taagepera (1997). The method requires calculating the ENEP (C5093) two times. One is treating the "other" category as a single party and the second is calculating the ENEP as if every vote in the "other" category belonged to a different party. The CENEP is the mean of both measures.

Definition based on: Taagepera, R. (1997). 'Effective Number of Parties for incomplete Data', Electoral Studies 16: 145-151.

00.00-150.00 CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF ELECTORAL PARTIES

999. MISSING

#### NOTES: C5094

The electoral data employed to calculate this index comes from lower house elections, unless the study is focused on upper house election exclusively. For countries with mixed electoral systems (see C5058) the electoral returns come from the segment containing the most seats. If there are an equal amount of seats in each segment the results come from the proportional representation segment.

| Source of electoral data: Multiple.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5094

The large differences between the effective number of political parties and the corrected measure stems from the very large number of independent candidates gaining a seat.

The residual category "other" in Belarus encompasses more than 86 percent of the vote and is entirely composed of independent candidates.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5093-C5096

Electoral returns in France contain more than one "other" category. The broader categories "regionalist", "Divers", "other left wing" "other right wing" and "others" were treated as single parties where appropriate and not amalgamated in a broader "other" category.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5094

These figures are based on the May 10, 2010 Philippine House of Representatives election results for representatives from congressional districts.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5094

These figures are based on the 2008 parliamentary elections.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5094

These figures are calculated using the constituency level returns from the 2008 legislative (Yuan) elections.  
Source: Central Election Commission.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - THAILAND (2007): C5094

Effective number of political parties was calculated using vote shares from the PR list tier.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5094

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. This figure does not take into account the BDP as a political party.

-----  
C5095 >>> EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES  
-----

Effective number of parliamentary parties (ENPP).

Formula:  $ENPP = 1 / (\sum S_i^2)$   
where  $S_i$  represents the seat share of party  $i$ , and all parties ( $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ ) receiving votes are included in the calculation.

Definition based on Laakso, M. and R. Taagepera (1979).  
'"Effective" Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe', Comparative Political Studies 12: 3-27.

00.00-150.00 EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES

999. MISSING

| NOTES: C5095

The electoral data employed to calculate this index comes from lower house elections, unless the study is focused on upper house election exclusively.

Source of electoral data: Multiple.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5095

the large differences between the effective number of political parties and the corrected measure stems from the very large number of independent candidates gaining a seat. The residual category "other" in Belarus encompasses more than 86 percent of the vote, and is entirely composed of independent candidates.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5093-C5096

Electoral returns in France contain more than one "other" category. The broader categories "regionalist", "Divers", "other left wing" "other right wing" and "others" were treated as single parties where appropriate and not amalgamated in a broader "other" category.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5095

These figures are based on the May 10, 2010 Philippine House of Representatives election results for representatives from congressional districts.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5095

These figures are based on the 2008 parliamentary elections.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5095

These figures are calculated using the constituency level returns from the 2008 legislative (Yuan) elections. Source: Central Election Commission.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5095

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. This figure takes into account the BDP as a political party.

C5096 >>> CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY PARTIES

Effective number of parliamentary parties (CENPP).

Corrected Effective Number of Parliamentary Parties corrects for the "other" category using the least component method of bounds suggested by Taagepera (1997). The method requires calculating the ENPP two times. One is treating the "other" category as a single party and the second is calculating the ENPP as if every seat in the "other" category belonged to a different party. The CENPP is the mean of both measures.

Definition based on: Taagepera, R. (1997). 'Effective Number of Parties for incomplete Data', Electoral Studies 16: 145-151.

00.000-150.000 CORRECTED EFFECTIVE NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY  
PARTIES  
999. MISSING



## NOTES: C5096

The electoral data employed to calculate this index comes from lower house elections, unless the study is focused on upper house election exclusively.

Source of electoral data: Multiple.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2008): C5096

The large differences between the effective number of political parties and the corrected measure stems from the very large number of independent candidates gaining a seat. The residual category "other" in Belarus encompasses more than 86 percent of the vote, and is entirely composed of independent candidates.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2007): C5093-C5096

Electoral returns in France contain more than one "other" category. The broader categories "regionalist", "Divers", "other left wing" "other right wing" and "others" were treated as single parties where appropriate and not amalgamated in a broader "other" category.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2010): C5096

These figures are based on the May 10, 2010 Philippine House of Representatives election results for representatives from congressional districts.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - ROMANIA (2009): C5096

These figures are based on the 2008 parliamentary elections.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2008): C5096

These figures are calculated using the constituency level returns from the 2008 legislative (Yuan) elections.  
Source: Central Election Commission.

## ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TURKEY (2011): C5096

The Peace and Democracy party (BDP) did not participate in the elections as a political party, but fielded its candidates as independents. This figure does not take into account the BDP as a political party.

//END OF FILE