

gesis

Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

German Longitudinal
Election Study



GLEES

European Election Candidate Study 2014

Comparative Dataset

ZA5718, Version 2.0.0

Study Description

The German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES) is a long-term project funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) which started with the 2009 federal election and is continued with the federal election 2013. GLES is the largest and most ambitious election study held so far in Germany. GLES 2013 was directed by five principal investigators: Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger (University of Mannheim), Prof. Dr. Sigrid Roßteutscher (University of Frankfurt), Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (University of Mannheim), Prof. Dr. Bernhard Weißels (WZB Berlin Social Science Center) and Prof. Dr. Christof Wolf (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Science) in close cooperation with the German Society for Electoral Studies (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Wahlforschung). Since 2015, Prof. Dr. Harald Schoen (University of Mannheim) has been an additional principal investigator.

The following pages document the preparation of the comparative dataset of the European Election Candidate Study 2014 (EECS 2014), version 2.0.0. For each country, the study was administered by country teams. Hence, this documentation provides a description of each study. Additionally to information on the coding of the variables this documentation also provides information on the core questionnaire employed by all participating countries as well as deviations from this core questionnaire. This version contains the British, Danish, German, Portuguese, and Swedish candidate studies. Other countries might be added if comparable data is available.

The comparative dataset was compiled at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center in close cooperation with the respective country teams. Moreover, the WZB team is involved in the European Election Study Association as well as the Comparative Candidate Survey. They also conducted the 2009 European Election Candidate Survey (ZA5048). Hence, there is significant continuity in terms of questionnaire design. At the same time, similarities enable research projects linking this dataset with other components of the 2014 European Elections Study as well as comparisons of electoral candidates on different political levels.

To get an overview of the use of our data, we kindly request users of GLES data to inform us about publications that utilize this data. In case of limited access to your publication (e.g. conference papers), we would highly appreciate if you could send us an electronic (PDF file, gles@gesis.org) or a print copy of your publication (GESIS, GLES, Post Box 122155, 68072 Mannheim, Germany; E-Mail: gles@gesis.org).

How to cite the dataset:

Roßteutscher, Sigrid; Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger; Schoen, Harald; Weißels, Bernhard; Wolf, Christof; Elmelund-Præstekær, Christian; Freire, André; Giebler, Heiko; Melcher, Reinhold; Öhberg, Patrik; Rüdiger, Wolfgang; Wagner, Aiko (2017): European Election Candidate Study 2014 (EECS 2014). Comparative Dataset. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5718 Data file Version 2.0.0, doi: 10.4232/1.12722.

Contact: Heiko Giebler, WZB Berlin Social Science Center (heiko.giebler@wzb.eu)

Table of Contents

Release note: Changes to ZA5718, Version 1.0.0	3
Study Descriptions	4
General Notes	8
Missing-Values	8
Modification of values/scales	8
Variables.....	8
Inclusion criterion	8
List of Variables.....	9
Administrative Variables	15
Variables from the EECS 2014 Core Questionnaire	18
Appendix	47
A1 Party Coding Scheme	47
A3 National Elections	48
E3/E4 Country Codes (present in the dataset)	49
E9 Religious Beliefs (present in the dataset)	49

Release note: Changes in comparison to ZA5718, Version 1.0.0

General remarks:

Basically, this update became necessary due to the inclusion of two additional countries – Portugal and the United Kingdom. There have been no changes to the general structure of the dataset, coding, or other matters with two exceptions (see below).

Errata:

The missing values for the Swedish Election Candidate Study 2014 have been corrected for the following variables: a6, b4, b9, c4-c9, d1a-d1i, e1-e3, e4a, e4b, and e5-e10. All cases with missing value -97 (not applicable) have been recoded to missing value -99 (no answer).

The variable country has been recoded to contain the included countries in an alphabetical order. Thus, Portugal is assigned to code 3 and Sweden to code 4 (former code 3).

Study Descriptions

	Denmark	Germany	Portugal
Study Title	Danish European Candidate Study (2014)	European Election Candidate Study 2014	European Candidate Survey 2014 - Portugal
Principal Investigators	Christian Elmelund-Præstekær	Bernhard Weißels and Heiko Giebler	André Freire
Authoring Entity	Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark	WZB Berlin Social Science Center	Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology, Lisbon University Institute
Funding Agency (if available)		German Research Foundation (DFG)	Portuguese Science Foundation (FCT), National Electoral Commission (CNE), Portuguese Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Portuguese Parliament
Description	<p>The universe comprises all parliamentary candidates for the 2014 European Parliament Election from the following eight Danish parties: Danish People's Party, Social Democratic Party, Liberals, Socialist People's Party, Conservative People's Party, People's Movement against the EU, Radical Party, and the New Alliance/Liberal Alliance. The survey was conducted as a web survey. Shortly after the election, invitation emails were sent including a direct link to the online survey. Two reminders were sent to those who had not responded after the first invitation emails were sent.</p>	<p>The universe comprises all parliamentary candidates for the 2014 European Parliament Election from the following eight German parties: Christian Democratic Union, Social Democratic Party of Germany, Alliance'90/Greens, The Left, Alternative for Germany, Christian Social Union, Free Democratic Party, and the Pirate Party. The survey was conducted with a postal questionnaire and a web survey. We had mailing addresses of all running candidates from the eight parties mentioned before. Out of those 564 candidates we managed to collect 446 valid email addresses.</p>	<p>The universe comprises all parliamentary candidates for the 2014 European Parliament Election from the following six Portuguese parties: Socialist Party, Social Democratic Center-Popular Party, Social Democratic Party, Portuguese Communist Party, The Earth Party Movement, and the Left Bloc. The survey was conducted with a postal questionnaire. If no valid mail address was available, we used a questionnaire which was sent via email. Several reminders were sent to the candidates who did not reply (4 to 5 by mail and 10 to 15 by email).</p>

	Denmark	Germany	Portugal
Description (continued)	Out of the 100 running candidates we managed to collect 96 valid email addresses and we got 52 answers.	Invitations to participate in the study were sent out together with a questionnaire by mail. We also invited candidates via email. Two reminders were sent out as well.	The universe comprises 105 candidates and all candidates were contacted.
Date of Data Collection	June 4 to July 8, 2014	March 18 to June 15, 2015	January, 2015 to April, 2016 ¹
Data Collector	Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark	WZB Berlin Social Science Center	Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology, Lisbon University Institute
Mode of Data Collection	Self-completion	Self-completion	Self-completion
Number of Candidates Contacted	96	564	105
Number of Respondents in the Comparative Dataset	40	207	29
Validated Response Rate	42 %	37 %	28 %

¹ No exact date available.

	Sweden	United Kingdom
Study Title	European Parliament Candidate Survey 2014 Sweden	UK European Election Candidate Survey 2014
Principal Investigators	Patrik Öhberg	Wolfgang Rüdig
Authoring Entity	Swedish National Data Service, University of Gothenburg	University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
Funding Agency (if available)	Vetenskapsrådet	University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
Description	<p>The universe comprises all parliamentary candidates for the 2014 European Parliament Election from the following ten Swedish parties: Social Democratic Labour Party, Green Ecology Party, Moderate Coalition Party, Liberal People's Party, Sweden Democrats, Centre Party, Left Party, Christian Democrats, Feminist initiative, and the Pirate Party.</p> <p>Out of 315 candidates we had email addresses of 314 candidates.</p>	<p>The universe comprises all parliamentary candidates for the 2014 European Parliament Election from the following twenty-five British parties: United Kingdom Independence Party, Labour Party, Conservative Party, Green Party, Scottish Green Party, Liberal Democrats, Scottish National Party, An Independence From Europe, British National Party, English Democrats, Plaid Cymru, Ulster Unionist Party, Christian Peoples Alliance, NO2EU, National Health Action Party, Yorkshire First, NI21 – Aspire To Better, The Peace Party, Pirate Party UK, Communities United Party, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, National Liberal Party, The Roman Party, YOURvoice, and the Liberty Great Britain.</p>

	Sweden	United Kingdom
Description (continued)		The survey was conducted with a postal questionnaire and a web survey. Invitations to participate in the study were sent out together with a questionnaire by mail to all 747 candidates from the United Kingdom. A reminder with a second printed copy of the questionnaire was sent out as well. A total of 9 mailed questionnaires were returned undelivered and 10 candidates responded indicating their refusal to take part.
Date of Data Collection	June 16 to September 20, 2014	June 16 to December 21, 2014
Data Collector	Department of Political Science, Gothenburg University	University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
Mode of Data Collection	Self-completion	Self-completion
Number of Candidates Contacted	314	747 (only 738 valid postal addresses)
Number of Respondents in the Comparative Dataset	125	124
Validated Response Rate	40 %	17 %

General Notes

Missing-Values

The following missing codes are applied in the comparative dataset:

(-99) no answer

(-97) not applicable

(-94) not in sampling frame

(-92) error in data

Code '-94' was assigned if a question was not asked in a country and if the question wording or scale used differed from the ones provided in the core questionnaire. Code '-92' was assigned for different reasons including but not limited to ticking more than one box if only one answer was asked or providing information which did not match official records (like candidacy).

Modification of values/scales

For some of the questions/variables, there are differences between the country studies with regards to the range of the variables/scales. Germany, e.g. applied 11-point scales for the left-right variables/questions ranging from 1 to 11 as opposed to from 0 to 10. However, as long as the number of scale points (and the intervals between them) were identical to the requirements in the EECS 2014 core questionnaire (like in the example of the German case), we recoded the respective variables according to these requirements.

Variables

The dataset only contains numeric variables resulting from the questions asked in the EECS 2014 core questionnaire and additional administrative variables. In some instances, deviations in regard to scaling or filters made it impossible to integrate variables into the comparative frame. However, if deemed of crucial importance we still include the variables but in a separate variable which uses the country abbreviation in its name for easy identification.

Inclusion criterion

Only respondents with valid answers for at least 75% of the variables are included in the dataset.

List of Variables

Variable	Label
<i>Administrative Variables</i>	
study	Study number (ZA-No.)
version	GESIS Archive Version
doi	Digital Object Identifier
year	Survey year
field	Field period
glescomp	GLES component
survey	Survey wave
country	Country identifier
idno	Respondent's identification number
mandate	Elected representative
<i>Part A: Political Background and Activities</i>	
a1	Party stood for in this election
a2	Member of party: year
a3aa	Candidacy national parliament: last election
a3ab	Candidacy national parliament: second last election
a3ac	Candidacy national parliament: third last election
a3ba	Candidacy European Parliament 2009
a3bb	Candidacy European Parliament 2004
a3bc	Candidacy European Parliament 1999
a3aauk	Candidacy national parliament: last election (United Kingdom)
a3abuk	Candidacy national parliament: second last election (United Kingdom)
a3acuk	Candidacy national parliament: third last election (United Kingdom)
a3bauk	Candidacy European Parliament 2009 (United Kingdom)
a3bbuk	Candidacy European Parliament 2004 (United Kingdom)
a3bcuk	Candidacy European Parliament 1999 (United Kingdom)
a4aa	Membership: trade union
a4ab	Membership: business association
a4ac	Membership: religious association
a4ad	Membership: environmental association
a4ae	Membership: human and civil rights association
a4af	Membership: sports club
a4ag	Membership: other

Part A: Political Background and Activities (continued)

a4ba	Endorsement during campaign: trade union
a4bb	Endorsement during campaign: business association
a4bc	Endorsement during campaign: religious association
a4bd	Endorsement during campaign: environmental association
a4be	Endorsement during campaign: human and civil rights association
a4bf	Endorsement during campaign: sports club
a4bg	Endorsement during campaign: other
a5a	Political experience: worked as unpaid party/campaign volunteer
a5b	Political experience: worked as paid party/campaign worker or MP employee
a5c	Political experience: held local or regional party office
a5d	Political experience: held national party office
a5e	Political experience: been elected or appointed as mayor
a5f	Political experience: been member of local government
a5g	Political experience: been member of local parliament
a5h	Political experience: been member of regional government
a5i	Political experience: been member of regional parliament
a5j	Political experience: been member of national parliament
a5k	Political experience: been member of European Parliament
a6	Party activity: hours per week

Part B: Campaigning

b1a	Nomination: contested
b1b	Nomination: how contested?
b2	Nomination: influence
b3a	Campaign: start organizing campaign
b3b	Campaign: start campaigning full-time
b4	Campaign: hours per week
b5	Campaign: budget
b6a	Campaign: budget - party funds
b6b	Campaign: budget - donations
b6c	Campaign: budget - private funds
b7a	Campaign: door-knocking, canvassing
b7b	Campaign: distributing party campaign material
b7c	Campaign: calling up voters on the phone
b7d	Campaign: visiting businesses and social organisations
b7e	Campaign: meetings with party elites/members and/or party groups
b7f	Campaign: media activities (interviews, press releases)

Part B: Campaigning (continued)

b7g	Campaign: public speeches and rallies
b7h	Campaign: personal campaign posters
b7i	Campaign: direct mailing
b7j	Campaign: personal newspaper adds
b7k	Campaign: personal spots in radio, TV, movie houses
b7l	Campaign: personal flyers or other campaign material (give-aways)
b7m	Campaign: personal website
b7n	Campaign: mailing list to inform supporters and voters about my campaign
b7o	Campaign: own blog
b7p	Campaign: Facebook
b7q	Campaign: SMS
b7r	Campaign: Twitter
b7s	Campaign: other
b8	Campaign team: professional consultants
b9	Campaign: primary aim
b10a	Campaign, topics: issues specific to your personal campaign
b10b	Campaign, topics: providing services and practical help to people
b10c	Campaign, topics: advocating the policy demands of the voters
b10d	Campaign, topics: taking care of the socio-economic well-being of your country
b10e	Campaign, topics: openness to the voters & communicating with them extensively
b10f	Campaign, topics: your personal characteristics and circumstances
b10g	Campaign, topics: particular items on the party platform
b11	Campaign: assessement of chances of winning - beginning
b12	Campaign: assessement of chances of winning - end

Part C: Issues and Policies

c2a	Dealing with most important problem: level
c2b	Dealing with second most important problem: level
c3a	Political statements: immigrants should adapt to the customs of [country]
c3b	Political statements: governments should abstain from intervening in the economy
c3c	Political statements: stronger measures to protect the environment
c3d	Political statements: same-sex marriages should be prohibited by law
c3e	Political statements: preferential treatment for women (jobs/promotions)

Part C: Issues and Policies (continued)

c3f	Political statements: people who break the law should be given stiffer sentences
c3g	Political statements: social security (prime goal of government)
c3h	Political statements: government should reduce differences in income levels
c3i	Political statements: immigrants are good for [country's] economy
c3j	Political statements: women should be free to decide on matters of abortion
c3k	Political statements: restrict privacy rights to combat crime
c4	EU integration: ego
c5	EU integration: party
c6	EU integration: party's voters
c7	Left-right: ego
c8	Left-right: party
c9	Left-right: party's voters
c10a	Financial crisis, responsibility: governments and politicians
c10b	Financial crisis, responsibility: European Union
c10c	Financial crisis, responsibility: large banks
c10d	Financial crisis, responsibility: foreign investors/speculators
c10e	Financial crisis, responsibility: European currency - EURO
c10f	Financial crisis, responsibility: everybody in these countries
c10g	Financial crisis, responsibility: your national government
c11a	Financial crisis, solution: countries with debts should default/start anew
c11b	Financial crisis, solution: the EU should continue to support
c11c	Financial crisis, solution: austerity is the only way
c11d	Financial crisis, solution: return to national currencies
c11e	Financial crisis, solution: the EU and/or IMF should provide funds
c11f	Financial crisis, solution: [country] should give financial help

Part D: Democracy, EU and Representation

d1a	Policy areas, level: economic policy
d1b	Policy areas, level: fighting crime
d1c	Policy areas, level: security and defense
d1d	Policy areas, level: protection of the environment
d1e	Policy areas, level: monetary policy
d1f	Policy areas, level: social policy
d1g	Policy areas, level: foreign policy
d1h	Policy areas, level: taxation policy

Part D: Democracy, EU and Representation (continued)

d1i	Policy areas, level: immigration policy
d2	Satisfaction with democracy in EU
d3	EU membership evaluation
d3sw	EU membership evaluation (Sweden)
d4	Satisfaction with democracy in [country]
d5a	Focus of representation: all people in Europe
d5b	Focus of representation: all people in [country]
d5c	Focus of representation: all the people who voted for you or your party
d5d	Focus of representation: your national party
d5e	Focus of representation: your EP group
d5f	Focus of representation: a specific group in society
d6	Style of representation: party vs. voters
d7	Style of representation: own opinion vs. voters
d8	Style of representation: own opinion vs. party
d9a	Statements, democracy: concerns of European citizens
d9b	Statements, democracy: you trust the institutions of the EU
d9c	Statements, democracy: concerns of the [country's] citizens
d9d	Statements, democracy: influence of special interests on law making on EU level
d9e	Statements, democracy: binding referenda to decide on EU treaties
d10a	Statements, powers of EP: right to initiate legislation
d10b	Statements, powers of EP: equal power with the council
d10c	Statements, powers of EP: nominate and bindingly elect the Commission President
d10d	Statements, powers of EP: ability to remove individual commissioners from office
d11	Identification: European vs. national
d12	EU: enlargement
d13	EU: deepening
d14a	Statements, European identity: less differences than similarities
d14b	Statements, European identity: I feel proud to be a European
d14c	Statements, European identity: European unity threatens cultural identity
d14d	Statements, European identity: EU has strengthened democracy
d14e	Statements, European identity: EU subjects member states to too much regulation
d14f	Statements, European identity: EU has greatly harmed [country's] economy
d14g	Statements, European identity: same rights to live in [country]

Part E: Personal Background

e1	Gender
e2	Year of birth
e3	Citizenship
e3s	Citizenship, other
e4a	Country of birth: mother
e4as	Country of birth: mother, other
e4b	Country of birth: father
e4bs	Country of birth: father, other
e5	Education
e6	Family's standard of living
e7	Religious services
e8	Religiosity
e9	Denomination
e10	Marital status
e11	Number of children under care
e11a	Children under care, child 1: age
e11b	Children under care, child 2: age
e11c	Children under care, child 3: age
e11d	Children under care, child 4: age
e11e	Children under care, child 5: age
e11f	Children under care, child 6: age

Administrative Variables

Variable: study

Content: Study number (ZA-No.)

Value:

[5718] ZA5718

Variable: version

Content: GESIS Archive Version

Value:

2-0-0 (2017-01-11)

Variable: doi

Content: Digital Object Identifier

Value:

10.4232/1.12722

Variable: year

Content: Survey year

Values:

[2014]

[2015]

Variable: field

Content: Field period

Values:

2014-06-04 till 2014-07-08

2014-06-16 till 2014-09-20

2014-06-16 till 2014-12-21

2015-01 till 2016-04

2015-03-18 till 2015-06-15

Variable: glescomp

Content: GLES component

Value:

[6] Component 6: Candidate Campaign Survey

Variable: survey

Content: Survey wave

Value:

[3] European Candidate Study 2014 - Comparative Dataset

Variable: country

Content: Country identifier

Values:

[1] Denmark
[2] Germany
[3] Portugal
[4] Sweden
[5] United Kingdom

Variable: idno

Content: Respondent's identification number

Values:

[1 to 525]

The respondent identification numbers were assigned as follows:

Denmark: 1 to 40
Germany: 41 to 247
Sweden: 248 to 372
Portugal: 373 to 401
United Kingdom: 402 to 525

Variable: mandate

Content: Elected representative

Values:

[1] elected

[0] not elected

The variable mandate indicates whether a candidate was elected to the European Parliament. Data for the Swedish, Danish, and Portuguese candidates rely on self-reporting. Here, information from question B3 (previous candidacies; see below) was used to construct the variable. For the respondents of the German study official information from the federal election office was used. Data for the British candidates rely on a research paper on the European Parliament Elections 2014 from the House of Commons Library which was released on June 11, 2014.

Variables from the EECS 2014 Core Questionnaire

Variable: a1

Question: A1 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Party stood for in this election

What party did you stand for in this election?

Values:

[see Appendix for party codes and value labels]

The party codes were assigned with respect to their vote share at the European Parliament Election 2014 (from highest to lowest). Therefore, for each study, the party with the highest vote share was assigned code 1, the party with the second highest vote share code 2 etc.

Variable: a2

Question: A2 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Member of party: year

In what year did you become a member of this party?

Values:

[year, 4 digits]

(0) no membership

Variables: a3aa-a3ac; a3ba-a3bc

Question: A3 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Previous candidacies

In which elections have you stood as a candidate for the European Parliament or the [national parliament, lower house if two chambers] and have you been elected? (Tick as many as apply.)

Items:

- (Aa) National parliament [year 1]
- (Ab) National parliament [year 2]
- (Ac) National parliament [year 3]
- (Ba) European Parliament 2009
- (Bb) European Parliament 2004
- (Bc) European Parliament 1999

Values:

- (1) no candidacy
- (2) candidacy, but not elected
- (3) elected

 See Appendix for a list of the elections to the national parliaments.

Study Note – Sweden:

Note that the question in the Swedish study referred to the Elections to the European Parliament in 2004, 2009 and 2014. Therefore no information on the election in 1999 exists.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

In the British study, there were four questions concerning previous candidacies. First, respondents were asked whether they have stood as a candidate in European Elections before. Respondents who reported that they have stood as a candidate before were then asked in which European Elections. For the second question a list with seven election years from 1979 to 2009 was used. Respondents were asked to indicate all election years that apply. Subsequently, two equivalent questions were asked concerning British General Elections.

Rescaling the British data to the comparative scaling is not feasible. However, the dataset contains additional variables (a3aauk-a3bcuk) for the British candidates. The following values are used for those additional variables:

- code 1: candidacy
- code 2: no candidacy

Respondents who indicated that they have not stood as a candidate in European Elections before were assigned to code 2 (no candidacy) in all items a3aauk to a3acuk. Respondents who indicated that they have not stood as a candidate in British General Elections before were assigned to code 2 (no candidacy) in all items a3bauk to a3bcuk. Furthermore, the British cases were recoded to missing value -94 (not in sampling frame) in variables a3aa to a3bc. The same applies to the cases from the other studies regarding variable a3aauk to a3bcuk.

Variables: a4aa-a4ag; a4ba-a4bg

Question: A4 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Membership/Endorsement during campaign

Are you a member and involved in one of the organisations or associations listed below? Have you been endorsed by any of these organisations or associations which means that the organisation publically supported your candidacy?

Items:

- (A) Trade union
- (B) Business association
- (C) Religious association
- (D) Environmental association
- (E) Human and civil rights association
- (F) Sports club
- (G) Other, please specify:

Values:*Member:*

- (1) member
- (0) not member

Endorsed:

- (1) publically endorsed
- (0) not endorsed

Study Note – Sweden:

In the Swedish study only one scale was used. The scale reads the following:

*code 1: not member**code 2: member, but no public support**code 3: member and public support*

a4aa-a4ag: Respondents who reported that they are not a member of the respective organization/association (code 1) were recoded to category 0 (not member) in variables a4aa to a4ag. Respondents with codes 2 or 3 were recoded to category 1 (member).

a4ba-a4bg: Respondents with code 1 were recoded to missing value -97 (not applicable) in variables a4ba-a4bg. Respondents with code 2 were recoded to category 0 (not endorsed) in variables a4ba to a4bg. Respondents with code 3 were recoded to category 1 (publically endorsed).

Study Note – United Kingdom:

The questionnaire wording and scale differ from the EECS template. The question and scale read the following:

Are you currently an active or passive member, or are you a former member, of any of the following type of organizations?

*code 1: no, never been a member**code 2: yes, passive member**code 3: yes, active member**code 4: yes, former member*

a4aa-a4ag: Respondents with codes 1 or 4 were recoded to category 0 (not member) in variables a4aa-a4ag. Respondents with codes 2 or 3 were recoded to category 1 (member) in variables a4aa-a4ag.

a4ba-a4bg: the British cases were recoded to missing value -94 (not in sampling frame) in variables a4ba-a4bg.

Variables: a5a-a5k

Question: A5 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Political experience

Regarding your political experience, have you ever . . .

Items:

- (A) worked as unpaid party/campaign volunteer.
- (B) worked as paid party/campaign worker or MP employee.
- (C) held local or regional party office.
- (D) held national party office.
- (E) been elected or appointed as mayor.
- (F) been member of local government.
- (G) been member of local parliament.
- (H) been member of regional government.
- (I) been member of regional parliament.
- (J) been member of national parliament.
- (K) been member of European parliament.

Values:

- (1) yes
 - (0) no
-

Study Note – Germany:

a5b: In Germany, there were two separate items for “paid party/campaign worker” and “MP employee”. The items read the following:

*worked as paid party/campaign worker
employed by an MP or as a party employee*

Respondents reporting having worked as a paid party/campaign worker or MP/party employee were recoded to 1 (yes) in a5b.

a5f, a5g: As there is no distinction between local governments and local parliaments in Germany, the candidates were asked if they had ever been:

member of a town or city council or another local representative office

Variables a5f and a5g are therefore identical.

Study Note – Denmark:

The items a5f and a5h were not part of the Danish study.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

Items a5a and a5f slightly differ from the EECS template. The item in the British study read the following:

*worked as an unpaid party/campaign manager?
held a local government office?*

The items a5h and a5i were not part of the British study.

Variable: a6

Question: A6 (A. Political Background and Activities)

Content: Party activity: hours per week

Outside of the election campaign, about how many hours, if any, do you usually devote to party activities in an average week?

Values:

[hours, 3 digits]

(0) no time

Variables: b1a; b1b

Question: B1 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Nomination: contested

Was your recent nomination as a candidate for the European Parliament election contested?

Values:

(1) yes

(0) no

If yes, how contested was your nomination?

Values:

(1) very much contested

(2) moderately contested

(3) very little contested

Study Note – Germany:

b1a and b1b were asked as one question. Furthermore, the response categories slightly differ from the EECS template. The German question and response categories read the following:

Would you say that your nomination as candidate for the European Parliament was contested?

code 1: not contested

code 2: little contested

code 3: moderately contested

code 4: very contested

b1a: Respondents who reported that their nomination was not contested (code 1) were put into category 0 (no) in variable b1a. Respondents with codes 2 to 4 were recoded to category 1 (yes).

b1b: Codes 2 to 4 were used to build the scale for the variable b1b. Respondents who reported that their nomination was not contested (0 in b1a) were recoded to -97 (not applicable) in variable b1b.

Study Note – Denmark and Portugal:

There were four respondents with a valid answer in variable b1b although the question was not applicable to them. These respondents were recoded to missing value -97 (not applicable).

Variable: b2

Question: B2 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Nomination: influence

Who was most influential in deciding on your candidacy nomination? (Tick one box only.)

Values:

- (1) result of primary election
- (2) party members
- (3) party delegates
- (4) regional party leadership
- (5) national party leadership
- (6) other, please specify:

Study Note – Germany:

Note that response category 1 (result of primary election) was not applied in Germany as there are no primary elections.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

Note that response category 1 (result of primary election) was not applied in the British study. Furthermore response category 3 slightly differs from the EECS template. Response category 3 reads the following:

(3) Party conference delegates

Variables: b3a; b3b

Question: B3 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: start

How long before the European Parliament election ...

Items:

- (A) did you begin organizing your campaign?
- (B) did you start campaigning full-time?

Values:

- (1) more than 6 months before the election
- (2) 6 to 3 months before
- (3) one or two months before
- (4) less than 1 month before
- (5) never

Study Note – Germany:

The time frame specified in response category 3 differs in the German study:

(3) one to three months before

Variable: b4

Question: B4 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: hours per week

About how much time did you devote to campaigning per week during the last month before the election?

Values:

[hours, 3 digits]

(0) no time

Variable: b5

Question: B5 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: budget

How much money did you spend for your personal campaign in [local currency] (including party funds, donations, and private funds)?

Values:

[local currency, 6 digits]

(0) no money

Variables: b6a-b6c

Question: B6 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: budget – distribution

What portion of that sum came from the party, from donations, and from your own private funds (total = 100%)?

Items:

- (A) Party funds
- (B) Donations
- (C) Private funds

Values:

approx. [percentage, 3 digits] %

(0) no portion

We rescaled the variables if respondents reported absolute values instead of portions or if respondents reported portions for each item b6a, b6b, and b6c but the sum of b6a to b6c did not equal 100.

Variables: b7a-b7s

Question: B7 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: activities

Were any of the following activities part of your campaign? And if yes, how important were they?

Items:

- (A) Door-knocking, canvassing
- (B) Distributing party campaign material
- (C) Calling up voters on the phone
- (D) Visiting businesses and social organisations
- (E) Meetings with party elites/members and/or party groups
- (F) Media activities (interviews, press releases)
- (G) Public speeches and rallies
- (H) Personal campaign posters
- (I) Direct mailing
- (J) Personal newspaper adds
- (K) Personal spots in radio, TV, movie houses
- (L) Personal flyers or other campaign material (give-aways)
- (M) Personal website
- (N) Mailing list to inform supporters and voters about my campaign
- (O) Own blog
- (P) Facebook
- (Q) SMS
- (R) Twitter
- (S) Other, please specify:

Values:

(0) no, not used

Used and,

- (1) little important
- (2) somewhat important
- (3) very important
- (4) most important

Study Note – Germany:

There was no “other”/open answer category. Items b7n (Mailing list) and b7o (own Blog) slightly differ:

(N) sending of emails to voters

(O) Blog, YouTube-channels or other not mentioned online activities

Study Note – United Kingdom:

Item b7b was not part of the British study. Item b7q slightly differs:

(Q) Text messaging (e.g. SMS, WhatsApp)

Furthermore, the 5-point response scale slightly differs as well. The response scale in the British study reads the following:

code 0: no, not used at all
code 1: yes, but not at all important
code 2: yes, but not very important
code 3: yes, fairly important
code 4: yes, very important

Variable: b8

Question: B8 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign team: professional consultants

Did you employ any professional consultant in your personal campaign?

Values:

(1) yes
(0) no

Variable: b9

Question: B9 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: primary aim

What was your primary aim during the campaign? Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means 'to attract as much attention as possible for me as a candidate' and 10 means 'to attract as much as possible attention for my party'? (Tick just one box.)

Values:

(0) 0 attention for candidate
(1) 1
(2) 2
(3) 3
(4) 4
(5) 5
(6) 6
(7) 7
(8) 8
(9) 9
(10) 10 attention for party

Variables: b10a-b10g

Question: B10 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: topics

How strongly did you emphasise each of the following in your campaign? (Tick one box in each row.)

Items:

- (A) Issues specific to your personal campaign
- (B) Providing services and practical help to people
- (C) Advocating the policy demands of the voters
- (D) Taking care of the socio-economic well-being of your country
- (E) Openness to the voters and communicating with them extensively
- (F) Your personal characteristics and circumstances
- (G) Particular items on the party platform

Values:

- (1) very much
- (2) much
- (3) somewhat
- (4) not much
- (5) not at all

Study Note – United Kingdom:

Item b10d slightly differs from the EECS template. The item text reads the following:

(D) Taking care of the economic well-being of the country

Variable: b11

Question: B11 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: assesment of chances of winning – beginning

In the beginning of the campaign, how did you evaluate your chances to win the mandate?

Values:

- (1) I thought I could not win.
- (2) I thought I could hardly win.
- (3) I thought it was an open race.
- (4) I thought I could hardly lose.
- (5) I thought I could not lose.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

Note that the 5-point response scale slightly differs from the EECS template. The scale reads the following:

code 1: very unlikely
code 2: fairly unlikely
code 3: even chance
code 4: fairly likely
code 5: very likely

Variable: b12

Question: B12 (B. Campaigning)

Content: Campaign: assessment of chances of winning – end

In the last week before the election, how did you evaluate your chances to win the mandate?

Values:

- (1) I thought I could not win.
- (2) I thought I could hardly win.
- (3) I thought it was an open race.
- (4) I thought I could hardly lose.
- (5) I thought I could not lose.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

For the British study an alternative 5-point response scale was used (see study note for question B11).

Question: C1 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Most important problem

In your opinion, what are the two most important political problems facing [country] today? (Please write in.)

Items:

- (A) The most important problem is:
- (B) The second most important problem is:

Values:

[open answer]

The comparative dataset does not contain the variables for items A and B. However, the data can be delivered on request.

Variables: c2a; c2b

Question: C2 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Most important problem: level

And what do you think would be the most appropriate level to deal with the two most important problems: at the local/regional, the national, or the European level?

Items:

- (A) Most important problem
- (B) Second most important problem

Values:

- (1) local/regional level
- (2) national level
- (3) European level

Variables: c3a-c3k

Question: C3 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Political statements

People hold different views on political issues. What do you think of the following? (Tick one box in each row.)

Items:

- (A) Immigrants should be required to adapt to the customs of [country].
- (B) Governments should abstain from intervening in the economy.
- (C) Stronger measures should be taken to protect the environment.
- (D) Same-sex marriages should be prohibited by law.
- (E) Women should be given preferential treatment when applying for jobs and promotions.
- (F) People who break the law should be given stiffer sentences.
- (G) Providing a stable network of social security should be the prime goal of government.
- (H) The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels.
- (I) Immigrants are good for [country's] economy.
- (J) Women should be free to decide on matters of abortion.
- (K) Privacy rights should be restricted in order to combat crime.

Values:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) neither agree nor disagree
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Variable: c4

Question: C4 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: EU integration: ego

Some say European unification should be pushed further. Others say it already has gone too far. What is your opinion? Please indicate your views using a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means unification 'has already gone too far' and 10 means it 'should be pushed further'. What number on this scale best describes your position?

Values:

- (0) 0 has already gone too far
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 should be pushed further

Variable: c5

Question: C5 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: EU integration: party

Where would you place your party on this question?

Values:

- (0) 0 has already gone too far
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 should be pushed further

Variable: c6

Question: C6 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: EU integration: party's voters

And where do your party's voters stand on this question?

Values:

- (0) 0 has already gone too far
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 should be pushed further

Study Note – Denmark:

The question was not part of the Danish study.

Variable: c7

Question: C7 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Left-right: ego

In politics, people sometimes talk about the 'left' and the 'right'. Where would you place your own views on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means the most left and 10 means the most right?

Values:

- (0) 0 left
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 right

Variable: c8

Question: C8 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Left-right: party

Using the same scale, where would you place your party? (Tick just one box.)

Values:

- (0) 0 left
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 right

Variable: c9

Question: C9 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Left-right: party's voters

Using the same scale again, where would you place your party's voters?

Values:

- (0) 0 left
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 right

Study Note – Denmark:

The question was not part of the Danish study.

Variables: c10a-c10g

Question: C10 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Financial crisis: responsibility

Following the international financial crisis that started in 2007, the economy in many countries has experienced serious problems. How responsible for the crisis in these countries would you say each of the following is?

Items:

- (A) The governments and politicians in the countries suffering from the economic crises
- (B) The European Union
- (C) The large banks
- (D) Foreign investors/speculators
- (E) The European currency - EURO
- (F) The people/everybody in these countries
- (G) Your national government

Values:

- (1) 1 not at all responsible
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5 extremely responsible

Variables: c11a-c11f

Question: C11 (C. Issues and Policies)

Content: Financial crisis: solution

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about what could be done to fight the economic crises?

Items:

- (A) Rather than take on more debt, countries with unsustainable sovereign debts should default and start anew.
- (B) The EU should continue to support all current members of the Eurozone facing major financial crises.
- (C) Austerity is the only way to solve the Eurozone crisis.
- (D) Eurozone countries with financial difficulties should leave the EURO and return to the national currency.
- (E) The EU and/or IMF should provide funds for more investment to stimulate economic growth.
- (F) [Country] should give financial help to another EU Member State facing severe economic and financial difficulties.

Values:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) neither agree nor disagree
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Variables: d1a-d1i

Question: D1 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Decisions of policy areas: level

To what extent should each of the following policy areas be decided at the national level and to what extent at the European level? Please rate each area on the scale.

Items:

- (A) Economic policy
- (B) Fighting crime
- (C) Security and defense
- (D) Protection of the environment
- (E) Monetary policy
- (F) Social policy
- (G) Foreign policy
- (H) Taxation policy
- (I) Immigration policy

Values:

- (0) 0 exclusively at the national level
- (1) 1
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7
- (8) 8
- (9) 9
- (10) 10 exclusively at the European level

Variable: d2

Question: D2 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Satisfaction with democracy in EU

All in all, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in the European Union?

Values:

- (1) very satisfied
- (2) fairly satisfied
- (3) not very satisfied
- (4) not at all satisfied

Variable: d3

Question: D3 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: EU membership evaluation

Generally speaking, do you think that [country's] membership of the European Union is a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad? (Tick one box only.)

Values:

- (1) a good thing
- (2) a bad thing
- (3) neither good nor bad

Study Note – Sweden:

For the Swedish study an alternative 4-point scale was used:

code 1: very satisfied

code 2: fairly satisfied

code 3: not very satisfied

code 4: not at all satisfied

We did not rescale the Swedish data. However, the dataset contains an additional variable (d3sw) for the Swedish candidates. Note that the Swedish cases were recoded to missing value -94 (not in sampling frame) in variable d3. The same applies to the cases from the other studies regarding variable d3sw.

Variable: d4

Question: D4 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Satisfaction with democracy in country

On the whole are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in [country]?

Values:

- (1) very satisfied
- (2) fairly satisfied
- (3) not very satisfied
- (4) not at all satisfied

Variables: d5a-d5f

Question: D5 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Focus of representation

How important is it to you to represent the following groups of people in the European Parliament?

Items:

- (A) All people in Europe
- (B) All people in [country]
- (C) All the people who voted for you or your party
- (D) Your national party
- (E) Your EP group
- (F) A specific group in society (e.g. young or elderly people)

Values:

- (1) not at all important
- (2) somewhat important
- (3) neither, nor
- (4) rather important
- (5) very important

Variable: d6

Question: D6 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Style of representation: party vs. voters

How should a Member of the European Parliament vote in parliament if his/her voters have one opinion and his/her party takes a different opinion?

Values:

- (1) MP should vote according to his/her party's opinion.
- (0) MP should vote according to his/her voters opinion.

Variable: d7

Question: D7 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Style of representation: own opinion vs. voters

How should a Member of the European Parliament vote in parliament if his/her own opinion on an issue does not correspond with the opinion of his/her voters?

Values:

- (1) MP should vote according to his/her own opinion.
- (0) MP should vote according to his/her voters opinion.

Variable: d8

Question: D8 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Style of representation: own opinion vs. party

How should a Member of the European Parliament vote in parliament if his/her own opinion on an issue differ from the party's opinion?

Values:

- (1) MP should vote according to his/her own opinion.
- (0) MP should vote according to his/her party's opinion.

Variables: d9a-d9e

Question: D9 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Statements: democracy

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. Do you 'strongly agree', or 'strongly disagree', or somewhere in between?

Items:

- (A) The European Parliament takes into consideration the concerns of European citizens.
- (B) You trust the institutions of the European Union.
- (C) The [country's] Parliament takes into consideration the concerns of the [country's] citizens.
- (D) Special interests have too much influence on law making on the European level.
- (E) Citizens should be able to initiate a binding referendum to decide on EU treaties.

Values:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) neither agree nor disagree
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Variables: d10a-d10d

Question: D10 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Statements: powers of EP

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the powers of the European Union?
Please use the scale to indicate your position.

Items:

- (A) The European Parliament should have the right to initiate legislation.
- (B) The European Parliament should have equal power with the Council in all areas of EU legislation.
- (C) The Commission President should be nominated and bindingly elected by the European Parliament.
- (D) The European Parliament should be able to remove individual Commissioners from office.

Values:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) neither agree nor disagree
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Variable: d11

Question: D11 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Identification: European vs. national

Do you see yourself as ...

Values:

- (1) [nationality] only?
- (2) [nationality] and European?
- (3) European and [nationality]?
- (4) European only?

Study Note – United Kingdom:

There was an additional answer category for “none of these” in the British study. Respondents who chose this category were recoded to missing value -97 (not applicable).

Variable: d12

Question: D12 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: EU: enlargement

In general, do you think that enlargement of the European Union would be a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad?

Values:

- (1) a good thing
- (2) a bad thing
- (3) neither good nor bad

Variable: d13

Question: D13 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: EU: deepening

In general, do you think that deepening of the European Union would be a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad?

Values:

- (1) a good thing
- (2) a bad thing
- (3) neither good nor bad

Variables: d14a-d14g

Question: D14 (D. Democracy, EU and Representation)

Content: Statements: European identity

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements on Europe and the issue of European identity? Please use the scale to indicate your position.

Items:

- (A) The differences between European countries are far less than the similarities.
- (B) I feel proud to be a European.
- (C) European unity threatens my country's cultural identity.
- (D) The European Union has strengthened democracy.
- (E) The European Union subjects member states to too much regulation.
- (F) The European Union has greatly harmed [country's] economy.
- (G) Citizens of other EU countries should have the same rights to live in [country] as we do.

Values:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) neither agree nor disagree
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Variable: e1

Question: E1 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Gender

Are you ...

Values:

- (1) male
- (0) female

Variable: e2

Question: E2 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Year of birth

In what year were you born?

Values:

[year,4 digits]

Variables: e3, e3s

Question: E3 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Citizenship

Did you have [country] citizenship when you were born?

Values:

(1) yes

(0) no, I had the [country] citizenship when I was born.

Citizenships of other countries are given in variable e3s. Country codes can be found in Appendix.

Study Note – Denmark:

Note that all respondents reported that they had the Danish citizenship when they were born.

Variables: e4a-e4bs

Question: E4 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Country of birth: parents

Were your parents born in [country]?

Items:

(A) Mother

(B) Father

Values:

(1) yes

(0) no, he/she was born in _____

Study Note – Denmark:

All respondent reported that their parents were born in Denmark.

Variable: e5

Question: E5 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Education

What is your highest level of education?

Values:

- (1) primary
- (2) secondary
- (3) post-secondary trade/vocational school
- (4) university degree incomplete; discipline: [open answer]
- (5) university degree completed; discipline: [open answer]

Study Note – Germany:

In Germany, there were two education questions from which variable e5 was constructed. First, respondents were asked to report their highest general school-leaving qualification and then their highest vocational training/academic qualification. Three respondents had a missing value on the second question. These respondents were recoded to missing value -99 (no answer). Response categories 1 (primary) and 4 (university degree incomplete) cannot be constructed from the original questions. However, there was one respondent who replied to an open question by indicating that he/she has an incomplete university degree. This candidate was put into category 4 (university degree incomplete).

Study Note – Portugal:

For the Portuguese study an alternative 9-point response scale was used:

- code 1: *none*
- code 2: *primary school incomplete*
- code 3: *4 years complete (completed Primary - 4th grade)*
- code 4: *6 years complete (preparatory, 2nd basic cycle)*
- code 5: *9 years complete (old 5th year, actual 3rd basic cycle)*
- code 6: *12 years completed (middle course completed)*
- code 7: *polytechnic completed (middle course completed)*
- code 8: *university (graduation)*
- code 9: *other*

However, there were only cases with codes 6, 8, and 9. Respondents with code 6 were recoded to category 2 (secondary) and respondents with code 8 were recoded to category 5 (university degree completed). Furthermore, there were thirteen respondents with code 9 (other) who replied to an open question by indicating that they have a university degree. These candidates were put into category 5 (university degree completed) as well.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

For the British study an alternative 9-point response scale was used:

- code 1: *did not finish primary school*
- code 2: *finished primary school but did not go to secondary school*
- code 3: *started secondary school but left without formal qualifications*
- code 4: *GCSE/'O' Level/Standard grade*
- code 5: *A-level / Higher*
- code 6: *professional /Vocational qualification (incl. HNC, HND)*
- code 7: *started university but did not graduate*
- code 8: *graduated with university degree (e.g. BA, BSc)*
- code 9: *postgraduate degree (e.g. Masters, Doctorate)*

Note that none of the candidates indicated that she or he did not finished primary school. Respondents with codes 2 or 3 were recoded to category 1 (primary), respondents with codes 4 or 5 were recoded to category 2 (secondary), respondents with code 6 were recoded to category 3 (post-secondary trade/vocational school), respondents with code 7 were recoded to category 4 (university degree incomplete), and respondents with codes 8 or 9 were recoded to category 5 (university degree completed).

Variable: e6

Question: E6 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Family's standard of living

Taking everything into account, at about what level is your family's standard of living? If you think of a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 means a poor family, 7 a rich family, and the other numbers are for the positions in between, about where would you place your family?

Values:

- (1) 1 poor family
- (2) 2
- (3) 3
- (4) 4
- (5) 5
- (6) 6
- (7) 7 rich family

Variable: e7

Question: E7 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Religious services

About how often do you attend religious services these days? (Tick one box only.)

Values:

- (1) at least once a week
- (2) 2 or 3 times a month
- (3) once a month
- (4) a number of times a year
- (5) once a year
- (6) less often
- (7) never

Variable: e8

Question: E8 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Religiosity

Regardless of whether you belong to a particular religion, how religious would you say you are?

Values:

(0) 0 not at all religious

(1) 1

(2) 2

(3) 3

(4) 4

(5) 5

(6) 6

(7) 7

(8) 8

(9) 9

(10) 10 very religious

Variable: e9

Question: E9 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Denomination

What is your religious belief?

Values:

[see Appendix for a list of the religious beliefs codes]

Variable: e10

Question: E10 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Marital status

What is your current marital status? (Tick one box only.)

Values:

(1) married, living as married

(2) widowed

(3) divorced or separated

(4) single

Study Note – Sweden 2014:

In Sweden, there was an additional response category for “other marital status” followed by an open answer question (in case of reporting the other-category). Cases with open answers were recoded to categories 1 to 4. Three respondents gave no answer. These cases were recoded to missing values -99 (no answer).

Study Note – United Kingdom:

In the United Kingdom, there was an additional response category for “living with partner”. Candidates who chose this category were recoded to 4 (single).

Variables: e11; e11a-e11f

Question: E11 (E. Personal Background)

Content: Children under care

How many children do you have in your care younger than [national legal adult age]? Please indicate the age of up to 6 of those children (from youngest to oldest).

Items:

- (A) Child 1
- (B) Child 2
- (C) Child 3
- (D) Child 4
- (E) Child 5
- (F) Child 6

Values:

[age]

Respondents were recoded to missing value -97 (not applicable) if they indicated an age of 0 years or above 17 years. Variable e11 gives the total number of children under care.

Study Note – Portugal:

For the Portuguese study an alternative question was used. The question, items, and scale read the following:

How many children do you have in your care?

younger than 5 years old
between 5 and 15 years old

code 1: *none*
 code 2: *one*
 code 3: *two*
 code 4: *three*
 code 5: *more than three*

None of the candidates indicated that she or he has more than three children younger than 5 years old or between 5 and 15 years old. Therefore, we used the information from this question to construct variable e11 (Number of children under care). However, note that the legal adult age in Portugal is 18 years instead of 16 years. Furthermore, the Portuguese cases were recoded to missing value -94 (not in sampling frame) in variables e11a to e11f.

Study Note – United Kingdom:

For the British study an alternative question was used. The question, items, and scale read the following:

Do you have any children in your care aged...

Under five years old?
Five to eighteen years old?

code 1: *none*
 code 2: *one child*

code 3: *two children*

code 4: *three children*

code 5: *more than three*

None of the candidates indicated that she or he has more than three children younger than 5 years old or between 5 and 18 years old. Therefore, we used the information from this question to construct variable e11 (Number of children under care). However, note that the legal adult age in the United Kingdom is 18 years instead of 19 years. Furthermore, the British cases were recoded to missing value -94 (not in sampling frame) in variables e11a to e11f.

Appendix

A1 Party Coding Scheme

Denmark:

Value	Label	Party
1	Party A	Danish People's Party (DF)
2	Party B	Social Democratic Party (SD)
3	Party C	Liberals (V)
4	Party D	Socialist People's Party (SF)
5	Party E	Conservative People's Party (KF)
6	Party F	People's Movement against the EU (N)
7	Party G	Radical Party (RV)
8	Party H	New Alliance/Liberal Alliance (NY)

Germany:

Value	Label	Party
1	Party A	Christian Democratic Union (CDU)
2	Party B	Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD)
3	Party C	Alliance'90/Greens (B'90/Grüne)
4	Party D	The Left (LINKE)
5	Party E	Alternative for Germany (AfD)
6	Party F	Christian Social Union (CSU)
7	Party G	Free Democratic Party (FDP)
8	Party H	Pirate Party

Portugal:

Value	Label	Party
1	Party A	Socialist Party (PS)
2	Party B	Social Democratic Center-Popular Party (CDS-PP)
3	Party C	Social Democratic Party (PSD)
4	Party D	Portuguese Communist Party (PCP)
5	Party E	The Earth Party Movement (MPT)
6	Party F	Left Bloc (BE)

Sweden:

Value	Label	Party
1	Party A	Social Democratic Labour Party (SAP)
2	Party B	Green Ecology Party (MP)
3	Party C	Moderate Coalition Party (MSP)
4	Party D	Liberal People's Party (FP)
5	Party E	Sweden Democrats (SD)
6	Party F	Centre Party (CP)
7	Party G	Left Party (V)
8	Party H	Christian Democrats (Kd)
9	Party I	Feminist initiative (FI)
10	Party J	Pirate Party (PP)

United Kingdom:

Value	Label	Party
1	Party A	United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP)
2	Party B	Labour Party (Labour)
3	Party C	Conservative Party (Conservatives)
4	Party D	Green Party (GP)
5	Party E	Scottish Green Party (GRN)
6	Party F	Liberal Democrats (LibDems)
7	Party G	Scottish National Party (SNP)
8	Party H	An Independence From Europe
9	Party I	British National Party (BNP)
10	Party J	English Democrats (ED)
11	Party K	Plaid Cymru (PC)
12	Party L	Ulster Unionist Party (UUP)
13	Party M	Christian Peoples Alliance (CPA)
14	Party N	NO2EU
15	Party O	National Health Action Party (NHA)
16	Party P	Yorkshire First
17	Party Q	NI21 – Aspire To Better
18	Party R	The Peace Party (TPP)
19	Party S	Pirate Party UK (PPUK)
20	Party T	Communities United Party (CUP)
21	Party U	The Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB)
22	Party V	National Liberal Party (NLP)
23	Party W	The Roman Party (ROMAN)
24	Party X	YOURvoice
25	Party Y	Liberty Great Britain

A3 National Elections**Denmark:**

Variable	Election
a3aa	National Parliament 2011
a3ab	National Parliament 2007
a3ac	National Parliament 2005

Germany:

Variable	Election
a3aa	National Parliament 2013
a3ab	National Parliament 2009
a3ac	National Parliament 2005

Portugal:

Variable	Election
a3aa	National Parliament 2011
a3ab	National Parliament 2009
a3ac	National Parliament 2005

Sweden:

Variable	Election
a3aa	National Parliament 2010
a3ab	National Parliament 2006
a3ac	National Parliament 2002

United Kingdom:

Variable	Election
a3aa	National Parliament 2010
a3ab	National Parliament 2005
a3ac	National Parliament 2001

E3/E4 Country Codes (present in the dataset)

0102=Afghanistan	0317=Czech Republic	0905=Iraq	1919=Spain
0106=Angola	0318=former CSSR	0906=Ireland	2010=Turkey
0112=Austria	0401=Denmark	0908=Italy	2102=Ukraine
0206=Belgium	0503=Egypt	1001=Jamaica	2104=United Kingdom
0210=Bolivia	0602=Finland	1307=Mali	2105=United States
0213=Brazil	0603=France	1405=Netherlands	2204=Vietnam
0215=Bulgaria	0704=Germany	1607=Peru	2402=former Yugoslavia
0304=Cape Verde	0706=Greece	1609=Poland	2502=Zimbabwe
0307=Chile	0710=Guinea	1801=Romania	
0308=China (includes Hong Kong)	0803=Hungary	1802=Russia	
0314=Croatia	0902=India	1908=Senegal	
	0904=Iran	1917=South Africa	

E9 Religious Beliefs (present in the dataset)

01=Roman Catholic	17=Eastern Orthodox
02=Protestant, no denomination given	19=Eastern (Greek Rite) Catholic Churches
04=Episcopalian, Anglican, Church of England, Church of Ireland	20=Jewish
05=Baptist	30=Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam, (no denomination given)
10=Lutheran	80=Others
11=Methodist	91=Agnostics
12=Pentecostal	92=Atheist
13=Presbyterian	93=None
15=Mormons, Church of Latter Day Saints	

Links

European Elections Studies (EES): <http://eeshomepage.net/>

Comparative Candidates Survey (CCS): <http://www.comparativecandidates.org/>

German Society of Electoral Research (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Wahlforschung e. V., DGfW): <http://www.dgfw.info>

GESIS Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences: <http://www.gesis.org/gles>

German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES): <http://www.gles.eu>

University of Frankfurt: <http://www.uni-frankfurt.de>

University of Mannheim: <http://www.uni-mannheim.de>

WZB Berlin Social Science Center (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung GmbH; WZB): <http://www.wzb.eu>

Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark: http://www.sdu.dk/en/om_sdu/institutter_centre/i_statskundskab

Swedish National Data Service, University of Gothenburg: <http://snd.gu.se/en>

Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology, Lisbon University Institute: <http://cies.iscte-iul.pt>

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK: <http://www.strath.ac.uk/>

This study description was compiled by WZB Berlin Social Science Center (WZB), Heiko Giebler, Reinhold Melcher and Maurice Meyer.

Berlin, January 2017