demscore

Thematic Datasets

Codebook

Political Parties and Elections

March 2026

Copyright © Demscore
All rights reserved

Based on Demscore
Version 7.0

Funders: Demscore is funded by the Swedish Research Council, University of Gothenburg, Stockholm University, Uppsala University, and Umeå University. For more information, please visit: `https://demscore.se`

For data enquiries: contact@demscore.se

Summary of Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **43**
- 1.1 Release Notes v7 . . . 43
- 1.2 New in Demscore version 7 . . . 43
- 1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 44
- 1.4 Methodology . . . 44
- 1.5 Citations . . . 44
- 1.6 Missing Data . . . 44
- 1.7 Download ID . . . 45
- 1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 45
- 1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 45
- 1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 45

2 H-DATA **46**
- 2.1 H-DATA Historical Cabinets . . . 46
  - 2.1.1 Cabinet . . . 46
  - 2.1.2 Parties . . . 47
- 2.2 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset . . . 53
  - 2.2.1 Political Background . . . 54
  - 2.2.2 Position . . . 55
- 2.3 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789) . . . 56
  - 2.3.1 Leadership Variables . . . 56

3 QOG **59**
- 3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset . . . 59
  - 3.1.1 V-Party Dataset . . . 59
- 3.2 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series . . . 60
  - 3.2.1 Media . . . 61
  - 3.2.2 Political Parties and Elections . . . 62
  - 3.2.3 Political System . . . 146
  - 3.2.4 Religion . . . 151
  - 3.2.5 Quality of Government . . . 152
  - 3.2.6 Gender Equality . . . 154
  - 3.2.7 Conflict and Military Service . . . 154

4 REPDEM **156**
- 4.1 REPDEM Basic . . . 156
  - 4.1.1 Cabinet Information . . . 157
- 4.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe . . . 246
  - 4.2.1 Information on the Cabinets . . . 247

5 V-DEM **413**
- 5.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 . . . 413
  - 5.1.1 Identifier Variables in the V-Dem Datasets . . . 414
  - 5.1.2 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices . . . 414
  - 5.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Elections . . . 416
  - 5.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties . . . 449
  - 5.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 460

5.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 469
5.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society . . . 472
5.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - The Media . . . 473
5.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion . . . 475
5.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space . . . 479
5.1.11 Historical V-Dem - Elections . . . 480
5.1.12 Historical V-Dem - Political Parties . . . 487
5.1.13 Historical V-Dem - The Legislature . . . 491
5.1.14 Historical V-Dem - Historical V-Dem Modified . . . 492
5.1.15 Historical V-Dem - Overlap Period Discrepancies . . . 503
5.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Regimes of the World (RoW) . . . 504
5.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Executive Bases of Power . . . 506
5.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Party Institutionalization . . . 507
5.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Consensual Democracy Dimensions 508
5.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Coordinated Information Operations . . . 509
5.1.21 Digital Society Survey - Digital Media Freedom . . . 511
5.1.22 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages . . . 513
5.1.23 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Ordinal Versions of Indices . . . 516
5.1.24 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy 518
5.1.25 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Political Institutions and Political Events . . . 518
5.1.26 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Polity5 . . . 519
5.1.27 Varieties of Indoctrination . . . 521
5.1.28 Party Systems . . . 522
5.2 V-Dem V-Party v2 . . . 533
5.2.1 Identifier Variables . . . 534
5.2.2 Indices . . . 537
5.2.3 Party Basics . . . 538
5.2.4 Party Identity . . . 542
5.2.5 Party Organisation . . . 550
5.2.6 Populism . . . 554
5.2.7 Liberal-Traditional Scaling . . . 557

6 Bibliography **559**

Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **43**

1.1 Release Notes v7 . . . 43
1.2 New in Demscore version 7 . . . 43
1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 44
1.4 Methodology . . . 44
1.5 Citations . . . 44
1.6 Missing Data . . . 44
1.7 Download ID . . . 45
1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 45
1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 45
1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 45

2 H-DATA **46**

2.1 H-DATA Historical Cabinets . . . 46
2.1.1 Cabinet . . . 46
2.1.1.1 Number of Parties (cab_num_parties) . . . 46
2.1.1.2 Government Type (govtype) . . . 47
2.1.1.3 Prime Minister Party (pm_party) . . . 47
2.1.2 Parties . . . 47
2.1.2.1 Party Name (cab_party_1) . . . 47
2.1.2.2 Party Name (cab_party_2) . . . 48
2.1.2.3 Party Name (cab_party_3) . . . 48
2.1.2.4 Party Name (cab_party_4) . . . 48
2.1.2.5 Party Name (cab_party_5) . . . 48
2.1.2.6 Party Name (cab_party_6) . . . 48
2.1.2.7 Party Name (cab_party_7) . . . 49
2.1.2.8 Party Name (cab_party_8) . . . 49
2.1.2.9 Party Name (cab_party_9) . . . 49
2.1.2.10 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_1) . . . 49
2.1.2.11 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_2) . . . 50
2.1.2.12 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_3) . . . 50
2.1.2.13 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_4) . . . 50
2.1.2.14 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_5) . . . 50
2.1.2.15 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_6) . . . 50
2.1.2.16 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_7) . . . 51
2.1.2.17 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_8) . . . 51
2.1.2.18 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_9) . . . 51
2.1.2.19 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_1) . . . 51
2.1.2.20 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_2) . . . 51
2.1.2.21 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_3) . . . 52
2.1.2.22 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_4) . . . 52
2.1.2.23 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_5) . . . 52
2.1.2.24 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_6) . . . 52
2.1.2.25 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_7) . . . 53
2.1.2.26 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_8) . . . 53
2.1.2.27 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_9) . . . 53
2.2 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset . . . 53

2.2.1 Political Background . . . 54
2.2.1.1 Politics: Party (party) . . . 54
2.2.1.2 Politics: Party Name (party_name) . . . 54
2.2.1.3 Politics: Party Lead (party_lead) . . . 54
2.2.1.4 Politics: Interest organizations (org_connections) . . . 55
2.2.2 Position . . . 55
2.2.2.1 Reason out (reason_out) . . . 55
2.3 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789) . . . 56
2.3.1 Leadership Variables . . . 56
2.3.1.1 Partisan (partisan) . . . 57
2.3.1.2 Party name (partyname) . . . 57
2.3.1.3 Appointment in practice (multiple selection) (appointmentinpracticemultipl) . . . 57
2.3.1.4 Appointment in practice (single selection) (appointmentinpracticesingle) . . . 58

3 QOG **59**
3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset . . . 59
3.1.1 V-Party Dataset . . . 59
3.1.1.1 Environmental parties: share of seats (vparty_envseat) . . . 60
3.1.1.2 Environmental parties: share of votes (vparty_envvote) . . . 60
3.2 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series . . . 60
3.2.1 Media . . . 61
3.2.1.1 Practice: candidates/pol. parties have fair access to state-owned media outlets (aii_q23) . . . 61
3.2.2 Political Parties and Elections . . . 62
3.2.2.1 Law: political parties are required to disclose public donations (Gov. funds) (aii_q48) . . . 62
3.2.2.2 Practice: pol. parties disclose public donations and these are available to the public (aii_q49) . . . 62
3.2.2.3 Law: political parties are required to disclose private donations (aii_q50) . . . 63
3.2.2.4 Practice: pol. parties disclose private donations and it is available to the public (aii_q51) . . . 64
3.2.2.5 Whether an election was postponed (br_elecpost) . . . 65
3.2.2.6 Whether an election was held during the year (br_elecyear) . . . 65
3.2.2.7 Does the country have proportional voting (br_pvote) . . . 65
3.2.2.8 Full suffrage (br_suff) . . . 65
3.2.2.9 Free and Fair Elections (bti_ffe) . . . 66
3.2.2.10 Contestation (standardized version) (cam_contest) . . . 66
3.2.2.11 Inclusiveness (standardized version) (cam_inclusive) . . . 66
3.2.2.12 Electoral Self-Determination (ciri_elecsd) . . . 67
3.2.2.13 Number of changes in government per year (cpds_chg) . . . 67
3.2.2.14 Effective number of parties on the seats level (cpds_enps) . . . 68
3.2.2.15 Effective number of parties on the votes level (cpds_enpv) . . . 68
3.2.2.16 Electoral fractionalization of the party system (Rae index) (cpds_frel) 68
3.2.2.17 Legislative fractionalization of the party system (Rae index) (cpds_frleg) . . . 68
3.2.2.18 Cabinet composition (Schmidt index) (cpds_govlr) . . . 69

3.2.2.19 Government support (seat share of all parties in government) (cpds_govsup) . . . 69
3.2.2.20 Share of seats in parliament: agrarian (cpds_la) . . . 70
3.2.2.21 Share of seats in parliament: electoral alliance (cpds_lall) . . . 70
3.2.2.22 Share of seats in parliament: communist (cpds_lcom) . . . 70
3.2.2.23 Share of seats in parliament: conservative (cpds_lcon) . . . 70
3.2.2.24 Share of seats in parliament: ethnic (cpds_le) . . . 71
3.2.2.25 Share of seats in parliament: feminist (cpds_lfe) . . . 71
3.2.2.26 Share of seats in parliament: green (cpds_lg) . . . 71
3.2.2.27 Share of seats in parliament: liberal (cpds_ll) . . . 71
3.2.2.28 Share of seats in parliament: left-socialist (cpds_lls) . . . 72
3.2.2.29 Share of seats in parliament: monarchist (cpds_lmo) . . . 72
3.2.2.30 Share of seats in parliament: non-labelled (cpds_lnl) . . . 72
3.2.2.31 Share of seats in parliament: other (cpds_lo) . . . 72
3.2.2.32 Share of seats in parliament: protest (cpds_lp) . . . 73
3.2.2.33 Share of seats in parliament: post-communist (cpds_lpc) . . . 73
3.2.2.34 Share of seats in parliament: pensioners (cpds_lpen) . . . 73
3.2.2.35 Share of seats in parliament: personalist (cpds_lper) . . . 73
3.2.2.36 Share of seats in parliament: right (cpds_lr) . . . 74
3.2.2.37 Share of seats in parliament: regionalist (cpds_lreg) . . . 74
3.2.2.38 Share of seats in parliament: religious (cpds_lrel) . . . 74
3.2.2.39 Share of seats in parliament: social democratic (cpds_ls) . . . 74
3.2.2.40 Type of Government (cpds_tg) . . . 75
3.2.2.41 Share of votes: agrarian (cpds_va) . . . 76
3.2.2.42 Share of votes: electoral alliance (cpds_vall) . . . 76
3.2.2.43 Share of votes: communist (cpds_vcom) . . . 76
3.2.2.44 Share of votes: conservative (cpds_vcon) . . . 76
3.2.2.45 Share of votes: ethnic (cpds_ve) . . . 77
3.2.2.46 Share of votes: feminist (cpds_vfe) . . . 77
3.2.2.47 Share of votes: green (cpds_vg) . . . 77
3.2.2.48 Share of votes: liberal (cpds_vl) . . . 77
3.2.2.49 Share of votes: left-socialist (cpds_vls) . . . 78
3.2.2.50 Share of votes: monarchist (cpds_vmo) . . . 78
3.2.2.51 Share of votes: non-labelled (cpds_vnl) . . . 78
3.2.2.52 Share of votes: other (cpds_vo) . . . 78
3.2.2.53 Share of votes: protest (cpds_vp) . . . 79
3.2.2.54 Share of votes: post-communist (cpds_vpcom) . . . 79
3.2.2.55 Share of votes: pensioners (cpds_vpen) . . . 79
3.2.2.56 Share of votes: personalist (cpds_vper) . . . 79
3.2.2.57 Share of votes: right (cpds_vr) . . . 80
3.2.2.58 Share of votes: regionalist (cpds_vreg) . . . 80
3.2.2.59 Share of votes: religious (cpds_vrel) . . . 80
3.2.2.60 Share of votes: social democratic (cpds_vs) . . . 80
3.2.2.61 Voter turnout in election (cpds_vt) . . . 81
3.2.2.62 Electoral Volatility - Parties above 1percent (dev_altv1) . . . 81
3.2.2.63 Electoral Volatility - Parties below 1percent (dev_othv1) . . . 81
3.2.2.64 Electoral Volatility - Parties entering/exiting party system (dev_regv1) 82
3.2.2.65 Electoral Volatility - Total (dev_tv1) . . . 82

3.2.2.66 Trust in Parliament (ess_trparl) . . . 82
3.2.2.67 Trust in Political Parties (ess_trpart) . . . 83
3.2.2.68 Trust in Politicians (ess_trpolit) . . . 83
3.2.2.69 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties above 1percent (evep_altv) . 83
3.2.2.70 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Class Bloc (EP) (evep_classbloc) . . . 84
3.2.2.71 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Demarcation Bloc (EP) (evep_dembloc) . . . 84
3.2.2.72 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties below 1percent (evep_othv) . 84
3.2.2.73 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties entering/exiting party system (evep_regv) . . . 85
3.2.2.74 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Total (evep_tv) . . . 85
3.2.2.75 Electoral Process (fh_ep) . . . 85
3.2.2.76 Average District Magnitude (gol_adm) . . . 86
3.2.2.77 Districts (gol_dist) . . . 86
3.2.2.78 Effective Number of Electoral Parties (gol_enep) . . . 86
3.2.2.79 Effective Number of Electoral Parties 1 (gol_enep1) . . . 86
3.2.2.80 Effective Number of Electoral Parties (Others) (gol_enepo) . . . 87
3.2.2.81 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties (gol_enpp) 87
3.2.2.82 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties, other corrected (gol_enpp1) . . . 87
3.2.2.83 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties (Others) (gol_enppo) . . . 87
3.2.2.84 Effective Number of Presidential Candidates (gol_enpres) . . . 88
3.2.2.85 Electoral System Type-3 classes (gol_est) . . . 88
3.2.2.86 Electoral System Type-12 classes (gol_est_spec) . . . 88
3.2.2.87 Institution (gol_inst) . . . 89
3.2.2.88 Mixed Type (gol_mix) . . . 90
3.2.2.89 Multi-Tier Type (gol_mt) . . . 91
3.2.2.90 Number of Seats (gol_nos) . . . 91
3.2.2.91 Presidential Electoral System Type (gol_pest) . . . 91
3.2.2.92 Electoral Formula used in an Electoral Tier (gol_pr) . . . 92
3.2.2.93 Presidential Election (gol_preel) . . . 93
3.2.2.94 Upper Seats (gol_upseat) . . . 94
3.2.2.95 Upper Tier (gol_uptier) . . . 94
3.2.2.96 Proportional Representation (gtm_pr) . . . 94
3.2.2.97 Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (lower) (h_alignl1) . . . 95
3.2.2.98 Alignment Lower/Upper Legislative Chamber (h_alignl1l2) . . . 95
3.2.2.99 Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (upper) (h_alignl2) . . . 95
3.2.2.100 Legislative Fractionalization (lower) (h_lflo) . . . 96
3.2.2.101 Legislative Fractionalization (upper) (h_lfup) . . . 96
3.2.2.102 Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in Fractions) (ht_partsz) . . . 96
3.2.2.103 Banning of Anti-System Parties (iaep_basp) . . . 96
3.2.2.104 Banned Parties (iaep_bp) . . . 97
3.2.2.105 Some other executive have the power to call elections (iaep_callo) . 97
3.2.2.106 Ethnicity Based Banning of Parties (iaep_ebbp) . . . 98
3.2.2.107 Election of the Executive (iaep_ee) . . . 98
3.2.2.108 Executive Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_enlc) . . . 99
3.2.2.109 Electoral System (iaep_es) . . . 100

3.2.2.110 Electoral System for the Executive (iaep_ese) 100
3.2.2.111 Independence of Selection of Executive (iaep_ise) 101
3.2.2.112 National Elections for an Executive (iaep_nee) 101
3.2.2.113 National Elections for the Legislature (iaep_nel) 102
3.2.2.114 No Parties Allowed (iaep_npa) 103
3.2.2.115 National Referendums (iaep_nr) 103
3.2.2.116 Parties with More than 5 Percent (iaep_pm5p) 104
3.2.2.117 Party Nomination of Executive Candidates (iaep_pnec) 104
3.2.2.118 Party Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_pnlc) 105
3.2.2.119 Petition Signatures Establish Executive Candidates (iaep_pseec) . . 105
3.2.2.120 Petition Signatures Establish Legislature Candidates (iaep_pselc) . . 106
3.2.2.121 Party Vote Establish Executive Candidates (iaep_pveec) 106
3.2.2.122 Party Vote Establish Legislature Candidates (iaep_pvelc) 107
3.2.2.123 Self-Nomination of Executive Candidates (iaep_snec) 107
3.2.2.124 Self-Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_snlc) 108
3.2.2.125 Electoral System Family (ideaesd_esf) 108
3.2.2.126 Electoral System for the National Legislature (ideaesd_esnl) 109
3.2.2.127 Electoral System for the President (ideaesd_esp) 112
3.2.2.128 Legislative Size (Directly Elected) (ideaesd_lsde) 114
3.2.2.129 Legislative Size (Voting Members) (ideaesd_lsvm) 114
3.2.2.130 Number of Tiers (ideaesd_tiers) 114
3.2.2.131 EU Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_eucv) . . . 115
3.2.2.132 EU Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_euvt) 115
3.2.2.133 Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_legcv) 115
3.2.2.134 Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_legvt) 115
3.2.2.135 Presidential Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_prescv) 116
3.2.2.136 Presidential Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_presvt) 116
3.2.2.137 Number of Seats (Lower and Single Houses) (ipu_l_s) 116
3.2.2.138 Number of Seats (Upper House) (ipu_u_s) 116
3.2.2.139 Party Control over Ballot (lower/only house) (jw_avgballot) 117
3.2.2.140 Party Control over Ballot (upper house) (jw_avgballot2) 117
3.2.2.141 Sharing of Votes among Candidates (lower/only house) (jw_avgpool) 118
3.2.2.142 Sharing of Votes among Candidates (upper house) (jw_avgpool2) . . 118
3.2.2.143 Candidate or Party-specific Voting (lower/only house) (jw_avgvote) 118
3.2.2.144 Candidate or Party-specific Voting (upper house) (jw_avgvote2) . . 119
3.2.2.145 Dominant or Populous Tier (jw_domr) 119
3.2.2.146 Year of Election (lower/only house) (jw_election) 120
3.2.2.147 Year of Election (upper house) (jw_election2) 120
3.2.2.148 Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (lower/only house) (jw_indy)120
3.2.2.149 Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (upper house) (jw_indy2) 121
3.2.2.150 Number of Coded Legislators (lower/only house) (jw_legsize) 121
3.2.2.151 Number of Coded Legislators (upper house) (jw_legsize2) 121
3.2.2.152 District Magnitude of Average Legislator (lower/only house) (jw_mcand) 121
3.2.2.153 District Magnitude of Average Legislator (upper house) (jw_mcand2) 122
3.2.2.154 Average District Magnitude (lower/only house) (jw_mdist) 122
3.2.2.155 Average District Magnitude (upper house) (jw_mdist2) 122
3.2.2.156 Party Control over Ballot - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdballot)123

3.2.2.157 Party Control over Ballot - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdballot2) . 123
3.2.2.158 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdpool) . . . 123
3.2.2.159 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdpool2) . . . 124
3.2.2.160 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdvote) . . . 124
3.2.2.161 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdvote2) . . . 125
3.2.2.162 Runoff Elections (jw_multiround) . . . 125
3.2.2.163 Multi Tier (lower/only house) (jw_multitier) . . . 125
3.2.2.164 Multi Tier (upper house) (jw_multitier2) . . . 125
3.2.2.165 Tiers allocated in Parallel (jw_parallel) . . . 126
3.2.2.166 Personalistic Tier (jw_persr) . . . 126
3.2.2.167 Proportion Coded Legislators (lower/only house) (jw_propcoded) . . 126
3.2.2.168 Proportion Coded Legislators (upper house) (jw_propcoded2) 127
3.2.2.169 Seats from Multi-Member Districts (lower/only house) (jw_propmmd) 127
3.2.2.170 Seats from Multi-Member Districts (upper house) (jw_propmmd2) . 127
3.2.2.171 Seats from a National District (lower/only house) (jw_propn) 127
3.2.2.172 Seats from a National District (upper house) (jw_propn2) 128
3.2.2.173 Seats from Single-Member Districts (lower/only house) (jw_propsmd) 128
3.2.2.174 Seats from Single-Member Districts (upper house) (jw_propsmd2) . 128
3.2.2.175 Rank Vote (lower/only house) (jw_rank) . . . 128
3.2.2.176 Rank Vote (upper house) (jw_rank2) . . . 129
3.2.2.177 Party Control over Ballot - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdballot) 129
3.2.2.178 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdpool) . . . 129
3.2.2.179 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdvote) . . . 130
3.2.2.180 Tiervote (lower/only house) (jw_tiervote) . . . 130
3.2.2.181 Tiervote (upper house) (jw_tiervote2) . . . 130
3.2.2.182 First Multiparty Election (nelda_fme) . . . 131
3.2.2.183 Media Bias before Election (nelda_mbbe) . . . 131
3.2.2.184 Was More Than One Party Legal (nelda_mtop) . . . 132
3.2.2.185 Number of Elections, Total (nelda_noe) . . . 132
3.2.2.186 Number of Elections, Constituent Assembly (nelda_noea) 132
3.2.2.187 Number of Elections, Executive (nelda_noee) . . . 133
3.2.2.188 Number of Elections, Legislative (nelda_noel) . . . 133
3.2.2.189 Was Opposition Allowed (nelda_oa) . . . 133
3.2.2.190 Riots and Protests after Election (nelda_rpae) . . . 134
3.2.2.191 Violence and Civilian Deaths before Election (nelda_vcdbe) 134
3.2.2.192 Cummulative Party System Innovation (psi_cpsi1) . . . 135
3.2.2.193 Cummulative Party System Innovation of a second election in a year (psi_cpsi2) . . . 135
3.2.2.194 Exact date of the election (psi_edate1) . . . 136
3.2.2.195 Exact date of the second election in a year (psi_edate2) 136
3.2.2.196 Party System Innovation (overall vote share of new parties in given election) (psi_psi1) . . . 136
3.2.2.197 Party System Innovation of a second election in a year (psi_psi2) . . 136
3.2.2.198 Robust Democracy: Electoral Process (sgi_qdep) . . . 137

3.2.2.199 Competition (van_comp) . . . 137
3.2.2.200 Participation (van_part) . . . 138
3.2.2.201 Number of years the leader in office continuously (wgov_leadexp) . . 138
3.2.2.202 Number of cabinet ministers (wgov_min) . . . 138
3.2.2.203 Average age in cabinet ministers (wgov_minage) . . . 139
3.2.2.204 Average tenure for cabinet ministers (wgov_minten) . . . 139
3.2.2.205 Adjusted retention rate for cabinet ministers (wgov_mret) . . . 139
3.2.2.206 Total mumber of government positions (inc. unoccupied and multiple positions) (wgov_tot) . . . 139
3.2.2.207 Average age in government positions (wgov_totage) . . . 140
3.2.2.208 Average tenure for people in government positions (wgov_totten) . . 140
3.2.2.209 Adjusted retention rate for people in government positions (wgov_tret) 140
3.2.2.210 Confidence: The Political Parties (wvs_confpp) . . . 140
3.2.2.211 Age Representation Index (30 or under) (yri_agi30) . . . 141
3.2.2.212 Age Representation Index (35 or under) (yri_agi35) . . . 141
3.2.2.213 Age Representation Index (40 or under) (yri_agi40) . . . 141
3.2.2.214 Age Representation Index (41 to 60) (yri_agi4160) . . . 142
3.2.2.215 Age Representation Index (61 or over) (yri_agi61) . . . 142
3.2.2.216 Female Representation in Parliament (under 30 years) (yri_fem30) . 142
3.2.2.217 Female Representation in Parliament (under 35 years) (yri_fem35) . 142
3.2.2.218 Female Representation in Parliament (under 40 years) (yri_fem40) . 143
3.2.2.219 Female Representation in Parliament (41 to 60 years) (yri_fem4160) 143
3.2.2.220 Female Representation in Parliament (over 61 years) (yri_fem61) . . 143
3.2.2.221 Mean age of MPs (yri_meanage) . . . 143
3.2.2.222 Median age of MPs (yri_medianage) . . . 144
3.2.2.223 Percent MPs aged 30 or under (yri_mp30) . . . 144
3.2.2.224 Percent MPs aged 35 or under (yri_mp35) . . . 144
3.2.2.225 Percent MPs aged 40 or under (yri_mp40) . . . 144
3.2.2.226 Percent MPs aged 41 to 60 (yri_mp4160) . . . 145
3.2.2.227 Percent MPs aged 61 or over (yri_mp61) . . . 145
3.2.2.228 Party Control over Ballot - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdballot2) . . 145
3.2.2.229 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdpool2) . . . 145
3.2.2.230 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdvote2) 146
3.2.3 Political System . . . 146
3.2.3.1 Typology of political institutions (br_elect) . . . 146
3.2.3.2 Party System (bti_ps) . . . 147
3.2.3.3 Democracy (chga_demo) . . . 147
3.2.3.4 Political Pluralism and Participation (fh_ppp) . . . 148
3.2.3.5 Political Rights (fh_pr) . . . 148
3.2.3.6 Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3) . . . 148
3.2.3.7 Official State Party (iaep_osp) . . . 149
3.2.3.8 Single Party System (jw_oneparty) . . . 149
3.2.3.9 Regimes of the world with ambiguous cases (vdem_regimeamb) . . . 149
3.2.4 Religion . . . 151
3.2.4.1 Government Restrictions on Religious Practices (ciri_relfre) . . . 151
3.2.4.2 Religion Based Banning of Parties (iaep_rbbp) . . . 152
3.2.5 Quality of Government . . . 152

3.2.5.1 Corruption Perception: Political Parties (gcb_ppa) . . . 152
3.2.5.2 Election vote buying (vdem_elvotbuy) . . . 152
3.2.5.3 Electoral Accountability Sub-index (bgi_eas) . . . 153
3.2.6 Gender Equality . . . 154
3.2.6.1 Type of Gender Quota (qar_typ) . . . 154
3.2.7 Conflict and Military Service . . . 154
3.2.7.1 Battle-related deaths (number of people) (wdi_brdeath) . . . 154

4 REPDEM **156**
4.1 REPDEM Basic . . . 156
4.1.1 Cabinet Information . . . 157
4.1.1.1 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) fractionalization: lower chamber (bp_fract) . . . 157
4.1.1.2 Coalition (cab_coalition) . . . 157
4.1.1.3 Cabinet composition (cab_composition1) . . . 157
4.1.1.4 Cabinet composition (cab_composition2) . . . 157
4.1.1.5 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected) . . . 157
4.1.1.6 Cabinet duration (cab_duration_days) . . . 158
4.1.1.7 Maximum possible cabinet duration (cab_duration_max) . . . 158
4.1.1.8 Relative cabinet duration (cab_duration_relative) . . . 158
4.1.1.9 Effective number of cabinet parties: lower chamber (cab_enpp) . . . 158
4.1.1.10 Formal minority cabinet (cab_formal_minority) . . . 159
4.1.1.11 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE (cab_gravity) . . . 159
4.1.1.12 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit) . . . 159
4.1.1.13 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_gravity_prosser) . . . 159
4.1.1.14 Cabinet ID (cab_id) . . . 160
4.1.1.15 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat) (cab_majority) . . . 160
4.1.1.16 Minimal winning coalition (cab_mwc) . . . 160
4.1.1.17 Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (cab_mwcc) . . . 160
4.1.1.18 MWCC including single-party cabinets (cab_mwccs) . . . 160
4.1.1.19 Cabinet (cab_name) . . . 161
4.1.1.20 Number of cabinet parties (cab_num_parties) . . . 161
4.1.1.21 Cabinet party 1 (cab_party1) . . . 161
4.1.1.22 Cabinet party 2 (cab_party2) . . . 161
4.1.1.23 Cabinet party 3 (cab_party3) . . . 162
4.1.1.24 Cabinet party 4 (cab_party4) . . . 162
4.1.1.25 Cabinet party 5 (cab_party5) . . . 162
4.1.1.26 Cabinet party 6 (cab_party6) . . . 162
4.1.1.27 Cabinet party 7 (cab_party7) . . . 162
4.1.1.28 Cabinet party 8 (cab_party8) . . . 163
4.1.1.29 Cabinet polarization, RILE (cab_polar) . . . 163
4.1.1.30 Cabinet polarization, RILE, logit scaled (cab_polar_logit) . . . 163
4.1.1.31 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_polar_prosser) . . . 163
4.1.1.32 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_polar_prosser_logit) . . . 163
4.1.1.33 Cabinet preference range, RILE (cab_prefrange) . . . 164
4.1.1.34 Cabinet preference range, RILE, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit) . . . 164

4.1.1.35 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_prefrange_prosser) . . . 164
4.1.1.36 Cabinet seat share (cab_seatshare) . . . 164
4.1.1.37 Cabinet strength: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower) . . . 165
4.1.1.38 Cabinet strength including formal support parties: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower_supported) . . . 165
4.1.1.39 Cabinet strength at date out: lower chamber (cab_strength_out) . . . 165
4.1.1.40 Cabinet strength: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper) . . . 165
4.1.1.41 Cabinet strength at date out: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper_out) . . . 165
4.1.1.42 Surplus majority cabinet (cab_surplus) . . . 166
4.1.1.43 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar) . . . 166
4.1.1.44 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_logit) . . . 166
4.1.1.45 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_prosser) . . . 166
4.1.1.46 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_prosser_logit) . . . 167
4.1.1.47 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber, alternative operationalization (con_alt_share) . . . 167
4.1.1.48 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber (con_share) . . . 167
4.1.1.49 Date in (date_in) . . . 167
4.1.1.50 Date in (String) (date_in_str) . . . 167
4.1.1.51 Date out (date_out) . . . 168
4.1.1.52 Date out (string) (date_out_str) . . . 168
4.1.1.53 First policy dimension (label) (dim_first_label) . . . 168
4.1.1.54 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median) . . . 168
4.1.1.55 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber, 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd) . . . 169
4.1.1.56 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_bp) . . . 169
4.1.1.57 Second policy dimension (label) (dim_second_label) . . . 169
4.1.1.58 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median) . . . 169
4.1.1.59 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber, 2nd party (dim_second_median_2nd) . . . 169
4.1.1.60 Third policy dimension (label) (dim_third_label) . . . 170
4.1.1.61 Party of the median legislator: third policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_third_median) . . . 170
4.1.1.62 Election date (elecdate) . . . 170
4.1.1.63 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (enpp) . . . 170
4.1.1.64 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (Other minor parties and independents excluded) (enpp_no_others) . . . 171
4.1.1.65 Decade by date of formation (form_decade) . . . 171
4.1.1.66 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration) . . . 171
4.1.1.67 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration_alt) 171
4.1.1.68 Final vote of investiture: abstentions (form_invest_abs) . . . 171
4.1.1.69 Final vote of investiture: contra (form_invest_con) . . . 172
4.1.1.70 Final vote of investiture: pro (form_invest_pro) . . . 172
4.1.1.71 Government type (govtype) . . . 172

4.1.1.72 Bicameralism (inst_bicam) . . . 172
4.1.1.73 Comments on institutional features (inst_comment) . . . 173
4.1.1.74 Constructive vote of no-confidence (inst_convote) . . . 173
4.1.1.75 PM powers (inst_pmpower) . . . 173
4.1.1.76 Positive parliamentarism (inst_posparl) . . . 173
4.1.1.77 Semi-presidentialism (inst_semipres) . . . 174
4.1.1.78 Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems (invest_bicameral) . . . 174
4.1.1.79 Comments on investiture vote (invest_comment) . . . 174
4.1.1.80 Existence of investiture vote (invest_exist) . . . 174
4.1.1.81 Government in office after investiture object (invest_inoffice) . . . 174
4.1.1.82 Object of investiture vote (invest_object) . . . 175
4.1.1.83 Object of investiture vote: first object (invest_object1) . . . 175
4.1.1.84 Object of investiture vote: second object (invest_object2) . . . 175
4.1.1.85 Allowed number of investiture votes/rounds (invest_rounds_max) . 176
4.1.1.86 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule1) . . . 176
4.1.1.87 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule2) . . . 176
4.1.1.88 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule3) . . . 176
4.1.1.89 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule4) . . . 177
4.1.1.90 Timing of investiture vote (invest_timing) . . . 177
4.1.1.91 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_bp) . . . 177
4.1.1.92 Largest party in parliament in cabinet (largest_party_incab) . . . 177
4.1.1.93 Seat share of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_share) . . . 178
4.1.1.94 Minority situation in parliament (minority_sit) . . . 178
4.1.1.95 Type of new government (newgov_type) . . . 178
4.1.1.96 Number of cabinet members (num_ministers) . . . 178
4.1.1.97 Number of ministries (num_ministries) . . . 179
4.1.1.98 Number of parties in parliament (num_parties) . . . 179
4.1.1.99 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_prosser) . . . 179
4.1.1.100 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (parl_polar_prosser_logit) . . . 179
4.1.1.101 Parliamentary polarization, RILE, logit scaled (parl_polar_rile) . . 180
4.1.1.102 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_rile_logit) . . . 180
4.1.1.103 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE (parl_prefrange) 180
4.1.1.104 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit) . . . 180
4.1.1.105 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale (parl_prefrange_prosser) . . . 181
4.1.1.106 Formal cabinet decision rule (pmpower_formcab) . . . 181
4.1.1.107 Type of actual decision rule 1 (pmpower_formcab_rule1) . . . 181
4.1.1.108 Type of actual decision rule 2 (pmpower_formcab_rule2) . . . 181
4.1.1.109 Ministers' parliamentary accountability (pmpower_minaccount) . . . 182
4.1.1.110 PM right to appoint ministers (pmpower_minappoint) . . . 182
4.1.1.111 Type of actual appointment right (pmpower_minappoint_rule) . . . 182
4.1.1.112 PM right to dismiss ministers (pmpower_mindismiss) . . . 182
4.1.1.113 Type of actual dismissal right (pmpower_mindismiss_rule) . . . 183

4.1.1.114 PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting (pmpower_pmagenda) 183
4.1.1.115 PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries (pmpower_pmjurisdiction) . . . 183
4.1.1.116 Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs (pmpower_pmoffice) . . . 183
4.1.1.117 Description of structure 1 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule1) . . . 184
4.1.1.118 Description of structure 2 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule2) . . . 184
4.1.1.119 Description of structure 3 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule3) . . . 184
4.1.1.120 Description of structure 4 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule4) . . . 184
4.1.1.121 PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers (pmpower_pmsteering) . . . 185
4.1.1.122 Post-electoral cabinet (post_election_cab) . . . 185
4.1.1.123 Presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm) . . . 185
4.1.1.124 Restrictions on presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm_restr) . . . 185
4.1.1.125 Comments on presidential powers (pres_comment) . . . 186
4.1.1.126 Presidential decree powers (pres_decree) . . . 186
4.1.1.127 Presidential decree powers: explanation (pres_decree_expl) . . . 186
4.1.1.128 Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative (pres_dismiss) . . . 186
4.1.1.129 No name (pres_dissolve_parl) . . . 187
4.1.1.130 Presidential right of initiative (legislation) (pres_init) . . . 187
4.1.1.131 Popularly elected president (pres_pop) . . . 187
4.1.1.132 Presidential power of referenda (pres_refer) . . . 187
4.1.1.133 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule1) . . . 188
4.1.1.134 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule2) . . . 188
4.1.1.135 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule3) . . . 188
4.1.1.136 Presidential power to select the PM (pres_select_pm) . . . 188
4.1.1.137 Presidential veto powers (pres_veto) . . . 189
4.1.1.138 Presidential veto powers: explanation (pres_veto_expl) . . . 189
4.1.1.139 Proximity to election: lower chamber (prox_election) . . . 189
4.1.1.140 Proximity to election: upper chamber (prox_election_upper) . . . 189
4.1.1.141 Seat share of radical left/right parties: lower chamber (rad_share) . 190
4.1.1.142 Party seats lower chamber: Party 1 (seats_party1) . . . 190
4.1.1.143 Party seats lower chamber: Party 10 (seats_party10) . . . 190
4.1.1.144 Party seats lower chamber: Party 11 (seats_party11) . . . 190
4.1.1.145 Party seats lower chamber: Party 12 (seats_party12) . . . 191
4.1.1.146 Party seats lower chamber: Party 13 (seats_party13) . . . 191
4.1.1.147 Party seats lower chamber: Party 14 (seats_party14) . . . 191
4.1.1.148 Party seats lower chamber: Party 15 (seats_party15) . . . 191
4.1.1.149 Party seats lower chamber: Party 16 (seats_party16) . . . 191
4.1.1.150 Party seats lower chamber: Party 17 (seats_party17) . . . 192
4.1.1.151 Party seats lower chamber: Party 18 (seats_party18) . . . 192
4.1.1.152 Party seats lower chamber: Party 19 (seats_party19) . . . 192
4.1.1.153 Party seats lower chamber: Party 2 (seats_party2) . . . 192
4.1.1.154 Party seats lower chamber: Party 20 (seats_party20) . . . 192
4.1.1.155 Party seats lower chamber: Party 21 (seats_party21) . . . 193
4.1.1.156 Party seats lower chamber: Party 22 (seats_party22) . . . 193
4.1.1.157 Party seats lower chamber: Party 23 (seats_party23) . . . 193

4.1.1.158 Party seats lower chamber: Party 24 (seats_party24) 193
4.1.1.159 Party seats lower chamber: Party 25 (seats_party25) 193
4.1.1.160 Party seats lower chamber: Party 26 (seats_party26) 194
4.1.1.161 Party seats lower chamber: Party 27 (seats_party27) 194
4.1.1.162 Party seats lower chamber: Party 28 (seats_party28) 194
4.1.1.163 Party seats lower chamber: Party 29 (seats_party29) 194
4.1.1.164 Party seats lower chamber: Party 3 (seats_party3) 195
4.1.1.165 Party seats lower chamber: Party 30 (seats_party30) 195
4.1.1.166 Party seats lower chamber: Party 31 (seats_party31) 195
4.1.1.167 Party seats lower chamber: Party 32 (seats_party32) 195
4.1.1.168 Party seats lower chamber: Party 33 (seats_party33) 195
4.1.1.169 Party seats lower chamber: Party 34 (seats_party34) 196
4.1.1.170 Party seats lower chamber: Party 35 (seats_party35) 196
4.1.1.171 Party seats lower chamber: Party 36 (seats_party36) 196
4.1.1.172 Party seats lower chamber: Party 37 (seats_party37) 196
4.1.1.173 Party seats lower chamber: Party 38 (seats_party38) 196
4.1.1.174 Party seats lower chamber: Party 39 (seats_party39) 197
4.1.1.175 Party seats lower chamber: Party 4 (seats_party4) 197
4.1.1.176 Party seats lower chamber: Party 40 (seats_party40) 197
4.1.1.177 Party seats lower chamber: Party 41 (seats_party41) 197
4.1.1.178 Party seats lower chamber: Party 42 (seats_party42) 197
4.1.1.179 Party seats lower chamber: Party 43 (seats_party43) 198
4.1.1.180 Party seats lower chamber: Party 44 (seats_party44) 198
4.1.1.181 Party seats lower chamber: Party 45 (seats_party45) 198
4.1.1.182 Party seats lower chamber: Party 46 (seats_party46) 198
4.1.1.183 Party seats lower chamber: Party 47 (seats_party47) 199
4.1.1.184 Party seats lower chamber: Party 48 (seats_party48) 199
4.1.1.185 Party seats lower chamber: Party 49 (seats_party49) 199
4.1.1.186 Party seats lower chamber: Party 5 (seats_party5) 199
4.1.1.187 Party seats lower chamber: Party 50 (seats_party50) 199
4.1.1.188 Party seats lower chamber: Party 51 (seats_party51) 200
4.1.1.189 Party seats lower chamber: Party 52 (seats_party52) 200
4.1.1.190 Party seats lower chamber: Party 53 (seats_party53) 200
4.1.1.191 Party seats lower chamber: Party 54 (seats_party54) 200
4.1.1.192 Party seats lower chamber: Party 55 (seats_party55) 201
4.1.1.193 Party seats lower chamber: Party 56 (seats_party56) 201
4.1.1.194 Party seats lower chamber: Party 57 (seats_party57) 201
4.1.1.195 Party seats lower chamber: Party 58 (seats_party58) 201
4.1.1.196 Party seats lower chamber: Party 59 (seats_party59) 201
4.1.1.197 Party seats lower chamber: Party 6 (seats_party6) 202
4.1.1.198 Party seats lower chamber: Party 60 (seats_party60) 202
4.1.1.199 Party seats lower chamber: Party 61 (seats_party61) 202
4.1.1.200 Party seats lower chamber: Party 62 (seats_party62) 202
4.1.1.201 Party seats lower chamber: Party 63 (seats_party63) 203
4.1.1.202 Party seats lower chamber: Party 64 (seats_party64) 203
4.1.1.203 Party seats lower chamber: Party 65 (seats_party65) 203
4.1.1.204 Party seats lower chamber: Party 66 (seats_party66) 203
4.1.1.205 Party seats lower chamber: Party 67 (seats_party67) 203

4.1.1.206 Party seats lower chamber: Party 68 (seats_party68) 204
4.1.1.207 Party seats lower chamber: Party 7 (seats_party7) 204
4.1.1.208 Party seats lower chamber: Party 8 (seats_party8) 204
4.1.1.209 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9 (seats_party9) 204
4.1.1.210 Party seats lower chamber: Party 98 (others) (seats_party98) 204
4.1.1.211 Party seats lower chamber: Party 99 (others) (seats_party99) 205
4.1.1.212 Seat share of socialist and green parties: lower chamber (soc_green_share) 205
4.1.1.213 Seat share of socialist parties: lower chamber (soc_share) 205
4.1.1.214 Support parties (support_parties) 205
4.1.1.215 Support party 1 (support_party1) 205
4.1.1.216 Support party 2 (support_party2) 206
4.1.1.217 Support party 3 (support_party3) 206
4.1.1.218 Support party 4 (support_party4) 206
4.1.1.219 Support party 5 (support_party5) 206
4.1.1.220 Support party 6 (support_party6) 207
4.1.1.221 Support party 7 (support_party7) 207
4.1.1.222 Support party 8 (support_party8) 207
4.1.1.223 Technocrat ministry majority (techno_maj) 207
4.1.1.224 Technocrat PM (techno_pm) 207
4.1.1.225 Broad policy remit (techno_remit) 208
4.1.1.226 Description of dominant policy area (term_descr) 208
4.1.1.227 Discretionary termination (term_disc) 208
4.1.1.228 Cabinet defeat in parliament (term_disc_cabdefeat) 208
4.1.1.229 Conflict between coalition parties: Parties involved (term_disc_conflict_parties) 209
4.1.1.230 Conflict between coalition parties (personnel) (term_disc_conflict_pers) 209
4.1.1.231 Conflict between coalition parties (policy) (term_disc_conflict_pol) 209
4.1.1.232 Early parliamentary election (term_disc_earlyelec) 209
4.1.1.233 Voluntary enlargement of coalition (term_disc_enlarge) 210
4.1.1.234 Intra party conflict (term_disc_intra) 210
4.1.1.235 Intra party conflict: Type of conflict (term_disc_intra_conflict) . . 210
4.1.1.236 Intra party conflict: Party involved (term_disc_intra_party) 210
4.1.1.237 Other voluntary reason (term_disc_voluntary) 211
4.1.1.238 Economic event (term_event_econ) 211
4.1.1.239 International or national security event (term_event_intnat) 211
4.1.1.240 Non-parliamentary elections (term_event_nonparlelec) 211
4.1.1.241 Personal event (term_event_pers) 212
4.1.1.242 Popular opinion shock (term_event_popshock) 212
4.1.1.243 Ministry involved (term_ministry) 212
4.1.1.244 Other constitutional reason (term_tech_const) 212
4.1.1.245 Death of PM (term_tech_death) 212
4.1.1.246 Regular parliamentary election (term_tech_regelec) 213
4.1.1.247 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension upper chamber (upper_dim_first_median) 213
4.1.1.248 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension upper chamber (upper_dim_second_median) 213

4.1.1.249 Effective number of parliamentary parties: upper chamber (upper_enpp) . . . 213
4.1.1.250 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat: upper chamber (upper_majority) . . . 214
4.1.1.251 Party seats upper chamber: Party 1 (upper_seats_party1) . . . 214
4.1.1.252 Party seats upper chamber: Party 10 (upper_seats_party10) . . . 214
4.1.1.253 Party seats upper chamber: Party 11 (upper_seats_party11) . . . 214
4.1.1.254 Party seats upper chamber: Party 12 (upper_seats_party12) . . . 214
4.1.1.255 Party seats upper chamber: Party 13 (upper_seats_party13) . . . 215
4.1.1.256 Party seats upper chamber: Party 14 (upper_seats_party14) . . . 215
4.1.1.257 Party seats upper chamber: Party 15 (upper_seats_party15) . . . 215
4.1.1.258 Party seats upper chamber: Party 16 (upper_seats_party16) . . . 215
4.1.1.259 Party seats upper chamber: Party 17 (upper_seats_party17) . . . 215
4.1.1.260 Party seats upper chamber: Party 18 (upper_seats_party18) . . . 216
4.1.1.261 Party seats upper chamber: Party 19 (upper_seats_party19) . . . 216
4.1.1.262 Party seats upper chamber: Party 2 (upper_seats_party2) . . . 216
4.1.1.263 Party seats upper chamber: Party 20 (upper_seats_party20) . . . 216
4.1.1.264 Party seats upper chamber: Party 21 (upper_seats_party21) . . . 216
4.1.1.265 Party seats upper chamber: Party 22 (upper_seats_party22) . . . 217
4.1.1.266 Party seats upper chamber: Party 23 (upper_seats_party23) . . . 217
4.1.1.267 Party seats upper chamber: Party 24 (upper_seats_party24) . . . 217
4.1.1.268 Party seats upper chamber: Party 25 (upper_seats_party25) . . . 217
4.1.1.269 Party seats upper chamber: Party 26 (upper_seats_party26) . . . 217
4.1.1.270 Party seats upper chamber: Party 27 (upper_seats_party27) . . . 218
4.1.1.271 Party seats upper chamber: Party 29 (upper_seats_party29) . . . 218
4.1.1.272 Party seats upper chamber: Party 3 (upper_seats_party3) . . . 218
4.1.1.273 Party seats upper chamber: Party 30 (upper_seats_party30) . . . 218
4.1.1.274 Party seats upper chamber: Party 31 (upper_seats_party31) . . . 219
4.1.1.275 Party seats upper chamber: Party 32 (upper_seats_party32) . . . 219
4.1.1.276 Party seats upper chamber: Party 33 (upper_seats_party33) . . . 219
4.1.1.277 Party seats upper chamber: Party 34 (upper_seats_party34) . . . 219
4.1.1.278 Party seats upper chamber: Party 35 (upper_seats_party35) . . . 219
4.1.1.279 Party seats upper chamber: Party 36 (upper_seats_party36) . . . 220
4.1.1.280 Party seats upper chamber: Party 37 (upper_seats_party37) . . . 220
4.1.1.281 Party seats upper chamber: Party 38 (upper_seats_party38) . . . 220
4.1.1.282 Party seats upper chamber: Party 39 (upper_seats_party39) . . . 220
4.1.1.283 Party seats upper chamber: Party 4 (upper_seats_party4) . . . 220
4.1.1.284 Party seats upper chamber: Party 40 (upper_seats_party40) . . . 221
4.1.1.285 Party seats upper chamber: Party 41 (upper_seats_party41) . . . 221
4.1.1.286 Party seats upper chamber: Party 42 (upper_seats_party42) . . . 221
4.1.1.287 Party seats upper chamber: Party 44 (upper_seats_party44) . . . 221
4.1.1.288 Party seats upper chamber: Party 45 (upper_seats_party45) . . . 222
4.1.1.289 Party seats upper chamber: Party 46 (upper_seats_party46) . . . 222
4.1.1.290 Party seats upper chamber: Party 47 (upper_seats_party47) . . . 222
4.1.1.291 Party seats upper chamber: Party 48 (upper_seats_party48) . . . 222
4.1.1.292 Party seats upper chamber: Party 49 (upper_seats_party49) . . . 222
4.1.1.293 Party seats upper chamber: Party 5 (upper_seats_party5) . . . 223
4.1.1.294 Party seats upper chamber: Party 50 (upper_seats_party50) . . . 223

4.1.1.295 Party seats upper chamber: Party 51 (upper_seats_party51) 223
4.1.1.296 Party seats upper chamber: Party 52 (upper_seats_party52) 223
4.1.1.297 Party seats upper chamber: Party 53 (upper_seats_party53) 223
4.1.1.298 Party seats upper chamber: Party 54 (upper_seats_party54) 224
4.1.1.299 Party seats upper chamber: Party 55 (upper_seats_party55) 224
4.1.1.300 Party seats upper chamber: Party 56 (upper_seats_party56) 224
4.1.1.301 Party seats upper chamber: Party 57 (upper_seats_party57) 224
4.1.1.302 Party seats upper chamber: Party 58 (upper_seats_party58) 224
4.1.1.303 Party seats upper chamber: Party 59 (upper_seats_party59) 225
4.1.1.304 Party seats upper chamber: Party 6 (upper_seats_party6) 225
4.1.1.305 Party seats upper chamber: Party 60 (upper_seats_party60) 225
4.1.1.306 Party seats upper chamber: Party 61 (upper_seats_party61) 225
4.1.1.307 Party seats upper chamber: Party 62 (upper_seats_party62) 226
4.1.1.308 Party seats upper chamber: Party 63 (upper_seats_party63) 226
4.1.1.309 Party seats upper chamber: Party 64 (upper_seats_party64) 226
4.1.1.310 Party seats upper chamber: Party 65 (upper_seats_party65) 226
4.1.1.311 Party seats upper chamber: Party 66 (upper_seats_party66) 226
4.1.1.312 Party seats upper chamber: Party 67 (upper_seats_party67) 227
4.1.1.313 Party seats upper chamber: Party 68 (upper_seats_party68) 227
4.1.1.314 Party seats upper chamber: Party 69 (upper_seats_party69) 227
4.1.1.315 Party seats upper chamber: Party 7 (upper_seats_party7) 227
4.1.1.316 Party seats upper chamber: Party 8 (upper_seats_party8) 227
4.1.1.317 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9 (upper_seats_party9) 228
4.1.1.318 Total number of seats: upper chamber (upper_seats_total) 228
4.1.1.319 Year of cabinet formation (year_in) 228
4.1.1.320 Year/month of cabinet formation (year_month_in) 228
4.1.1.321 Year/month of cabinet termination (year_month_out) 228
4.1.1.322 Year out (year_out) 229
4.1.1.323 Unique id (unique_id) 229
4.1.1.324 Full duration technical termination (cab_duration_full) 229
4.1.1.325 Single party majority cabinet (cab_sp_majority) 229
4.1.1.326 Minority cabinet (cab_minority) 230
4.1.1.327 Single party minority cabinet (cab_sp_minority) 230
4.1.1.328 Minority coalition (cab_coal_minority) 230
4.1.1.329 Substantial minority cabinet (cab_sub_minority) 230
4.1.1.330 Largest party in parliament, 1st (largest_party1) 231
4.1.1.331 Largest party in parliament, 2nd (largest_party2) 231
4.1.1.332 Total number of seats: lower chamber (seats_total) 231
4.1.1.333 Cabinet seat share including formal support parties (cab_seatshare_supported) 231
4.1.1.334 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the dim_first_median_2nd_bp party of the median legislator: first policy dimension; lower chamber; 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd_bp) 231
4.1.1.335 Conflict between coalition parties (policy and/or personnel) (term_disc_conflict) 232
4.1.1.336 Party seats upper chamber: Party 69 (seats_party69) 232
4.1.1.337 Party seats lower chamber: Party 70 (seats_party70) 232
4.1.1.338 Party seats lower chamber: Party 71 (seats_party71) 232
4.1.1.339 Party seats lower chamber: Party 72 (seats_party72) 232

4.1.1.340 Party seats lower chamber: Party 73 (seats_party73) 233
4.1.1.341 Party seats lower chamber: Party 74 (seats_party74) 233
4.1.1.342 Party seats lower chamber: Party 75 (seats_party75) 233
4.1.1.343 Party seats lower chamber: Party 76 (seats_party76) 233
4.1.1.344 Party seats lower chamber: Party 77 (seats_party77) 233
4.1.1.345 Party seats lower chamber: Party 78 (seats_party78) 234
4.1.1.346 Party seats lower chamber: Party 79 (seats_party79) 234
4.1.1.347 Party seats lower chamber: Party 80 (seats_party80) 234
4.1.1.348 Party seats lower chamber: Party 81 (seats_party81) 234
4.1.1.349 Party seats lower chamber: Party 82 (seats_party82) 235
4.1.1.350 Party seats lower chamber: Party 83 (seats_party83) 235
4.1.1.351 Party seats lower chamber: Party 84 (seats_party84) 235
4.1.1.352 Party seats lower chamber: Party 85 (seats_party85) 235
4.1.1.353 Party seats lower chamber: Party 86 (seats_party86) 235
4.1.1.354 Party seats lower chamber: Party 87 (seats_party87) 236
4.1.1.355 Party seats lower chamber: Party 88 (seats_party88) 236
4.1.1.356 Party seats lower chamber: Party 89 (seats_party89) 236
4.1.1.357 Party seats lower chamber: Party 90 (seats_party90) 236
4.1.1.358 Party seats lower chamber: Party 91 (seats_party91) 237
4.1.1.359 Party seats lower chamber: Party 92 (seats_party92) 237
4.1.1.360 Party seats lower chamber: Party 93 (seats_party93) 237
4.1.1.361 Party seats lower chamber: Party 94 (seats_party94) 237
4.1.1.362 Party seats lower chamber: Party 95 (seats_party95) 237
4.1.1.363 Party seats lower chamber: Party 96 (seats_party96) 238
4.1.1.364 Party seats lower chamber: Party 97 (seats_party97) 238
4.1.1.365 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9998 (seats_party9998) 238
4.1.1.366 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9999 (seats_party9999) 238
4.1.1.367 Party seats upper chamber: Party 70 (upper_seats_party70) 239
4.1.1.368 Party seats upper chamber: Party 73 (upper_seats_party73) 239
4.1.1.369 Party seats upper chamber: Party 74 (upper_seats_party74) 239
4.1.1.370 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (upper_seats_party9998) . . 239
4.1.1.371 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (upper_seats_party9999) . . 239
4.1.1.372 Caretaker cabinet (cab_caretaker) 240
4.1.1.373 Cabinet preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_prosser_logit) 240
4.1.1.374 Cabinet preference range: lower chamber, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (cab_prefrange_ches) 240
4.1.1.375 Cabinet polarization, CHES general left- right scale (lrgen) (cab_polar_ches) 240
4.1.1.376 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_ches) 241
4.1.1.377 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_gravity_prosser_logit) 241
4.1.1.378 Cabinet centre of gravity, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (cab_gravity_ches_lrgen) 241
4.1.1.379 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_prosser_logit) 241
4.1.1.380 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (parl_prefrange_ches) 241
4.1.1.381 Parliamentary polarization, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (parl_polar_ches) 242

4.1.1.382 Party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_1st) . . . 242
4.1.1.383 Second party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_2nd) . . . 242
4.1.1.384 V-Dem: Electoral democracy index (vdem_elecdem) . . . 242
4.1.1.385 V-Dem: Liberal democracy index (vdem_libdem) . . . 243
4.1.1.386 V-Dem: Participatory democracy index (vdem_partipdem) . . . 243
4.1.1.387 V-Dem: Deliberative democracy index (vdem_delibdem) . . . 243
4.1.1.388 V-Dem: Egalitarian democracy index (vdem_egaldem) . . . 243
4.1.1.389 Party seats lower chamber: Party 100 (seats_party100) . . . 244
4.1.1.390 Party seats upper chamber: Party 75 (upper_seats_party75) . . . 244
4.1.1.391 Party seats upper chamber: Party 76 (upper_seats_party76) . . . 244
4.1.1.392 Cabinet party 1, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party1) . . . 244
4.1.1.393 Cabinet party 2, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party2) . . . 244
4.1.1.394 Cabinet party 3, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party3) . . . 245
4.1.1.395 Cabinet party 4, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party4) . . . 245
4.1.1.396 Cabinet party 5, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party5) . . . 245
4.1.1.397 Cabinet party 6, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party6) . . . 245
4.1.1.398 Cabinet party 7, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party7) . . . 246
4.1.1.399 Cabinet seat share: lower chamber for Party 8 (cab_seatshare_party8) 246
4.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe . . . 246
4.2.1 Information on the Cabinets . . . 247
4.2.1.1 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail1_duration) . . 247
4.2.1.2 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail1_parties) 247
4.2.1.3 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail1_party1) . . . 247
4.2.1.4 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 10 (barg_fail1_party10) . . . 248
4.2.1.5 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 11 (barg_fail1_party11) . . . 248
4.2.1.6 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 12 (barg_fail1_party12) . . . 248
4.2.1.7 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 13 (barg_fail1_party13) . . . 248
4.2.1.8 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 14 (barg_fail1_party14) . . . 249
4.2.1.9 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 15 (barg_fail1_party15) . . . 249
4.2.1.10 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 16 (barg_fail1_party16) . . . 249
4.2.1.11 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail1_party2) . . . 249
4.2.1.12 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail1_party3) . . . 250
4.2.1.13 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail1_party4) . . . 250
4.2.1.14 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail1_party5) . . . 250
4.2.1.15 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail1_party6) . . . 250

4.2.1.16 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail1_party7) . . . 251
4.2.1.17 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail1_party8) . . . 251
4.2.1.18 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 9 (barg_fail1_party9) . . . 251
4.2.1.19 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail2_duration) . . 251
4.2.1.20 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail2_parties) 251
4.2.1.21 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail2_party1) . . . 252
4.2.1.22 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail2_party2) . . . 252
4.2.1.23 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail2_party3) . . . 252
4.2.1.24 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail2_party4) . . . 252
4.2.1.25 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail2_party5) . . . 253
4.2.1.26 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail2_party6) . . . 253
4.2.1.27 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail2_party7) . . . 253
4.2.1.28 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail2_party8) . . . 253
4.2.1.29 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail3_duration) . . 254
4.2.1.30 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail3_parties) 254
4.2.1.31 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail3_party1) . . . 254
4.2.1.32 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail3_party2) . . . 254
4.2.1.33 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail3_party3) . . . 255
4.2.1.34 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail3_party4) . . . 255
4.2.1.35 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail3_party5) . . . 255
4.2.1.36 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail3_party6) . . . 255
4.2.1.37 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail3_party7) . . . 255
4.2.1.38 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail4_duration) . . 256
4.2.1.39 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail4_parties) 256
4.2.1.40 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail4_party1) . . . 256
4.2.1.41 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail4_party2) . . . 256
4.2.1.42 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail4_party3) . . . 257
4.2.1.43 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail4_party4) . . . 257
4.2.1.44 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail4_party5) . . . 257

4.2.1.45 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail4_party6) . . . 257
4.2.1.46 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail4_party7) . . . 258
4.2.1.47 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail5_duration) . . 258
4.2.1.48 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail5_parties) 258
4.2.1.49 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail5_party1) . . . 258
4.2.1.50 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail5_party2) . . . 259
4.2.1.51 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail5_party3) . . . 259
4.2.1.52 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail5_party4) . . . 259
4.2.1.53 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail5_party5) . . . 259
4.2.1.54 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail5_party6) . . . 260
4.2.1.55 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail5_party7) . . . 260
4.2.1.56 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail6_duration) . . 260
4.2.1.57 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail6_parties) 260
4.2.1.58 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail6_party1) . . . 260
4.2.1.59 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail6_party2) . . . 261
4.2.1.60 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail6_party3) . . . 261
4.2.1.61 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail6_party4) . . . 261
4.2.1.62 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail6_party5) . . . 261
4.2.1.63 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail6_party6) . . . 262
4.2.1.64 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail6_party7) . . . 262
4.2.1.65 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail6_party8) . . . 262
4.2.1.66 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 9 (barg_fail6_party9) . . . 262
4.2.1.67 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail7_duration) . . 263
4.2.1.68 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail7_parties) 263
4.2.1.69 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail7_party1) . . . 263
4.2.1.70 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail7_party2) . . . 263
4.2.1.71 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail7_party3) . . . 264
4.2.1.72 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail7_party4) . . . 264
4.2.1.73 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail7_party5) . . . 264

4.2.1.74 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail7_party6) . . . 264
4.2.1.75 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail7_party7) . . . 264
4.2.1.76 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail7_party8) . . . 265
4.2.1.77 Number of inconclusive bargaining rounds (barg_fail_rounds) . . . 265
4.2.1.78 Duration of successful bargaining round (barg_success_duration) . . 265
4.2.1.79 Parties involved in successful bargaining round (barg_success_parties) 265
4.2.1.80 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_success_party1) . . . 266
4.2.1.81 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_success_party2) . . . 266
4.2.1.82 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_success_party3) . . . 266
4.2.1.83 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_success_party4) . . . 266
4.2.1.84 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_success_party5) . . . 267
4.2.1.85 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_success_party6) . . . 267
4.2.1.86 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_success_party7) . . . 267
4.2.1.87 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_success_party8) . . . 267
4.2.1.88 Total bargaining duration (barg_total_duration) . . . 267
4.2.1.89 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) fractionalization: lower chamber (bp_fract) . . . 268
4.2.1.90 Coalition (cab_coalition) . . . 268
4.2.1.91 Cabinet composition (cab_composition1) . . . 268
4.2.1.92 Cabinet composition (cab_composition2) . . . 268
4.2.1.93 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected) . . . 269
4.2.1.94 Cabinet duration (cab_duration_days) . . . 269
4.2.1.95 Maximum possible cabinet duration (cab_duration_max) . . . 269
4.2.1.96 Relative cabinet duration (cab_duration_relative) . . . 269
4.2.1.97 Effective number of cabinet parties: lower chamber (cab_enpp) . . . 270
4.2.1.98 Formal minority cabinet (cab_formal_minority) . . . 270
4.2.1.99 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE (cab_gravity) . . . 270
4.2.1.100 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit) . . 270
4.2.1.101 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit_prosser) . . . 271
4.2.1.102 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_gravity_prosser) . . . 271
4.2.1.103 Cabinet ID (cab_id) . . . 271
4.2.1.104 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat) (cab_majority) . . . 271
4.2.1.105 Minimal winning coalition (cab_mwc) . . . 272
4.2.1.106 Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (cab_mwcc) . . . 272
4.2.1.107 MWCC including single-party cabinets (cab_mwccs) . . . 272
4.2.1.108 Cabinet (cab_name) . . . 272
4.2.1.109 Number of cabinet parties (cab_num_parties) . . . 273
4.2.1.110 Cabinet party 1 (cab_party1) . . . 273

4.2.1.111 Cabinet party 2 (cab_party2) . . . 273
4.2.1.112 Cabinet party 3 (cab_party3) . . . 273
4.2.1.113 Cabinet party 4 (cab_party4) . . . 274
4.2.1.114 Cabinet party 5 (cab_party5) . . . 274
4.2.1.115 Cabinet party 6 (cab_party6) . . . 274
4.2.1.116 Cabinet party 7 (cab_party7) . . . 274
4.2.1.117 Cabinet party 8 (cab_party8) . . . 274
4.2.1.118 Cabinet polarization, RILE (cab_polar) . . . 275
4.2.1.119 Cabinet polarization, RILE, logit scaled (cab_polar_logit) . . . 275
4.2.1.120 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_polar_prosser) . . . 275
4.2.1.121 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_polar_prosser_logit) . . . 275
4.2.1.122 Cabinet preference range, RILE (cab_prefrange) . . . 276
4.2.1.123 Cabinet preference range, RILE, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit) . . . 276
4.2.1.124 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit_prosser) . . . 276
4.2.1.125 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_prefrange_prosser) . . . 276
4.2.1.126 Cabinet seat share (cab_seatshare) . . . 277
4.2.1.127 Cabinet strength: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower) . . . 277
4.2.1.128 Cabinet strength including formal support parties: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower_supported) . . . 277
4.2.1.129 Cabinet strength at date out: lower chamber (cab_strength_out) . . . 277
4.2.1.130 Cabinet strength: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper) . . . 278
4.2.1.131 Cabinet strength at date out: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper_out) . . . 278
4.2.1.132 Surplus majority cabinet (cab_surplus) . . . 278
4.2.1.133 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar) . . . 278
4.2.1.134 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_logit) . . . 278
4.2.1.135 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_prosser) . . . 279
4.2.1.136 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_prosser_logit) . . . 279
4.2.1.137 Coalition agreement (coal_agree) . . . 279
4.2.1.138 Agreement public (coal_agree_public) . . . 279
4.2.1.139 Conflict management mechanisms (coal_conf) . . . 280
4.2.1.140 CMM used for most common conflicts (coal_conf_common) . . . 280
4.2.1.141 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_common_mech1) . . . 280
4.2.1.142 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_common_mech2) . . . 281
4.2.1.143 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_common_mech3) . . . 281
4.2.1.144 CMM: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_mech1) . . . 281
4.2.1.145 CMM: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_mech2) . . . 282
4.2.1.146 CMM: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_mech3) . . . 282
4.2.1.147 CMM: Mechanism 4 (coal_conf_mech4) . . . 282
4.2.1.148 CMM: Mechanism 5 (coal_conf_mech5) . . . 283
4.2.1.149 CMM: Mechanism 6 (coal_conf_mech6) . . . 283

4.2.1.150 CMM used for most serious conflicts (coal_conf_serious) 283
4.2.1.151 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_serious_mech1) 283
4.2.1.152 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_serious_mech2) 284
4.2.1.153 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_serious_mech3) 284
4.2.1.154 Coalition discipline in legisation (coal_disc_leg) 284
4.2.1.155 Coalition discipline in other parliamentary behavior (coal_disc_parl) 285
4.2.1.156 Distribution of competences: all agreements (coal_distcomp_all) . . 285
4.2.1.157 Distribution of competences (coal_distcomp_doc1) 285
4.2.1.158 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 1 (coal_distcomp_doc2) 285
4.2.1.159 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 2 (coal_distcomp_doc3) 286
4.2.1.160 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 3 (coal_distcomp_doc4) 286
4.2.1.161 Distribution of offices: all agreements (coal_distoff_all) 286
4.2.1.162 Distribution of offices: (coal_distoff_doc1) 286
4.2.1.163 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 1 (coal_distoff_doc2) 287
4.2.1.164 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 2 (coal_distoff_doc3) 287
4.2.1.165 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 3 (coal_distoff_doc4) 287
4.2.1.166 Election rule (coal_elec_rule) 287
4.2.1.167 Freedom of appointment (coal_free_appointment) 288
4.2.1.168 General rules: all agreements (coal_genrules_all) 288
4.2.1.169 General rules (coal_genrules_doc1) 288
4.2.1.170 General rules: additional agreement number 1 (coal_genrules_doc2) 288
4.2.1.171 General rules: additional agreement number 2 (coal_genrules_doc3) 288
4.2.1.172 General rules: additional agreement number 3 (coal_genrules_doc4) 289
4.2.1.173 Agreement on junior ministers (coal_junmin) 289
4.2.1.174 Agreement on non-cabinet positions (coal_noncab) 289
4.2.1.175 Policies: all agreements (coal_pol_all) 289
4.2.1.176 Policies (coal_pol_doc1) 290
4.2.1.177 Policies: additional agreement number 1 (coal_pol_doc2) 290
4.2.1.178 Policies: additional agreement number 2 (coal_pol_doc3) 290
4.2.1.179 Policies: additional agreement number 3 (coal_pol_doc4) 290
4.2.1.180 Agreement on policies (coalition agreement) (coal_policy) 291
4.2.1.181 Policy specific procedural rules: all agreements (coal_polspec_all) . 291
4.2.1.182 Policy specific procedural rules (coal_polspec_doc1) 291
4.2.1.183 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 1 (coal_polspec_doc2) 291
4.2.1.184 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 2 (coal_polspec_doc3) 291
4.2.1.185 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 3 (coal_polspec_doc4) 292
4.2.1.186 Size of agreement: all agreements (coal_size_agreement_all) 292
4.2.1.187 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc1) 292

4.2.1.188 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc2) . . . 292
4.2.1.189 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc3) . . . 293
4.2.1.190 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc4) . . . 293
4.2.1.191 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber, alternative operationalization (con_alt_share) . . . 293
4.2.1.192 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber (con_share) . . . 293
4.2.1.193 Date in (date_in) . . . 294
4.2.1.194 Date in (String) (date_in_str) . . . 294
4.2.1.195 Date out (date_out) . . . 294
4.2.1.196 Date out (string) (date_out_str) . . . 294
4.2.1.197 Deputy PM party 1 (deputy_party1) . . . 294
4.2.1.198 Deputy PM party 2 (deputy_party2) . . . 295
4.2.1.199 Deputy PM party 3 (deputy_party3) . . . 295
4.2.1.200 Deputy PM party 4 (deputy_party4) . . . 295
4.2.1.201 Portfolio Deputy PM party 1 (deputy_port1) . . . 295
4.2.1.202 Portfolio Deputy PM party 2 (deputy_port2) . . . 296
4.2.1.203 Portfolio Deputy PM party 3 (deputy_port3) . . . 296
4.2.1.204 Portfolio Deputy PM party 4 (deputy_port4) . . . 296
4.2.1.205 Portfolio Deputy PM party 5 (deputy_port5) . . . 296
4.2.1.206 Portfolio Deputy PM party 6 (deputy_port6) . . . 296
4.2.1.207 First policy dimension (label) (dim_first_label) . . . 297
4.2.1.208 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median) . . . 297
4.2.1.209 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_2nd) . . . 297
4.2.1.210 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_bp) . . . 297
4.2.1.211 Second policy dimension (label) (dim_second_label) . . . 298
4.2.1.212 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median) . . . 298
4.2.1.213 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median_2nd) . . . 298
4.2.1.214 Third policy dimension (label) (dim_third_label) . . . 298
4.2.1.215 Party of the median legislator: third policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_third_median) . . . 299
4.2.1.216 Election date (elecdate) . . . 299
4.2.1.217 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (enpp) . . . 299
4.2.1.218 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (Other minor parties and independents excluded) (enpp_no_others) . . . 299
4.2.1.219 Issues excluded from agenda (exclagenda) . . . 300
4.2.1.220 Decade by date of formation (form_decade) . . . 300
4.2.1.221 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration) . . . 300
4.2.1.222 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration_alt) 300
4.2.1.223 Final vote of investiture: abstentions (form_invest_abs) . . . 301
4.2.1.224 Final vote of investiture: contra (form_invest_con) . . . 301
4.2.1.225 Final vote of investiture: pro (form_invest_pro) . . . 301
4.2.1.226 Government type (govtype) . . . 301
4.2.1.227 Bicameralism (inst_bicam) . . . 302
4.2.1.228 Comments on institutional features (inst_comment) . . . 302

4.2.1.229 Constructive vote of no-confidence (inst_convote) 302
4.2.1.230 PM powers (inst_pmpower) 302
4.2.1.231 Positive parliamentarism (inst_posparl) 303
4.2.1.232 Semi-presidentialism (inst_semipres) 303
4.2.1.233 Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems (invest_bicameral) 303
4.2.1.234 Comments on investiture vote (invest_comment) 303
4.2.1.235 Existence of investiture vote (invest_exist) 304
4.2.1.236 Government in office after investiture object (invest_inoffice) 304
4.2.1.237 Object of investiture vote (invest_object) 304
4.2.1.238 Object of investiture vote: first object (invest_object1) 304
4.2.1.239 Object of investiture vote: second object (invest_object2) 305
4.2.1.240 Allowed number of investiture votes/rounds (invest_rounds_max) . 305
4.2.1.241 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule1) 305
4.2.1.242 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule2) 305
4.2.1.243 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule3) 306
4.2.1.244 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule4) 306
4.2.1.245 Timing of investiture vote (invest_timing) 306
4.2.1.246 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party1) 307
4.2.1.247 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party2) 307
4.2.1.248 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party3) 307
4.2.1.249 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party1) 307
4.2.1.250 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party2) 308
4.2.1.251 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party3) 308
4.2.1.252 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party1) 308
4.2.1.253 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party2) 308
4.2.1.254 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party3) 308
4.2.1.255 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party4) 309
4.2.1.256 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party1) 309
4.2.1.257 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party2) 309
4.2.1.258 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party3) 309
4.2.1.259 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party1) 310
4.2.1.260 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party2) 310
4.2.1.261 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party3) 310
4.2.1.262 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party1) 310
4.2.1.263 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party2) 311
4.2.1.264 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party3) 311
4.2.1.265 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 16 (jm_portfolio16_party1) 311
4.2.1.266 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 16 (jm_portfolio16_party2) 311
4.2.1.267 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 17 (jm_portfolio17_party1) 311
4.2.1.268 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 17 (jm_portfolio17_party2) 312
4.2.1.269 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 18 (jm_portfolio18_party1) 312
4.2.1.270 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 18 (jm_portfolio18_party2) 312
4.2.1.271 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party1) 312
4.2.1.272 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party2) 313
4.2.1.273 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party3) 313
4.2.1.274 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party1) 313
4.2.1.275 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party2) 313

4.2.1.276 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party3) 313
4.2.1.277 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 20 (jm_portfolio20_party1) 314
4.2.1.278 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 20 (jm_portfolio20_party2) 314
4.2.1.279 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 21 (jm_portfolio21_party1) 314
4.2.1.280 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 21 (jm_portfolio21_party2) 314
4.2.1.281 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party1) 315
4.2.1.282 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party2) 315
4.2.1.283 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party3) 315
4.2.1.284 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party1) 315
4.2.1.285 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party2) 315
4.2.1.286 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party3) 316
4.2.1.287 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 25 (jm_portfolio25_party1) 316
4.2.1.288 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 25 (jm_portfolio25_party2) 316
4.2.1.289 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party1) 316
4.2.1.290 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party2) 317
4.2.1.291 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party3) 317
4.2.1.292 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 27 (jm_portfolio27_party1) 317
4.2.1.293 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 27 (jm_portfolio27_party2) 317
4.2.1.294 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 28 (jm_portfolio28_party1) 317
4.2.1.295 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 29 (jm_portfolio29_party1) 318
4.2.1.296 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 29 (jm_portfolio29_party2) 318
4.2.1.297 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party1) 318
4.2.1.298 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party2) 318
4.2.1.299 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party3) 319
4.2.1.300 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party4) 319
4.2.1.301 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party5) 319
4.2.1.302 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 30 (jm_portfolio30_party1) 319
4.2.1.303 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 30 (jm_portfolio30_party2) 319
4.2.1.304 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 31 (jm_portfolio31_party1) 320
4.2.1.305 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 31 (jm_portfolio31_party2) 320
4.2.1.306 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 32 (jm_portfolio32_party1) 320
4.2.1.307 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 33 (jm_portfolio33_party1) 320
4.2.1.308 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 34 (jm_portfolio34_party1) 321
4.2.1.309 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 35 (jm_portfolio35_party1) 321
4.2.1.310 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 36 (jm_portfolio36_party1) 321
4.2.1.311 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 37 (jm_portfolio37_party1) 321
4.2.1.312 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 39 (jm_portfolio39_party1) 322
4.2.1.313 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party1) 322
4.2.1.314 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party2) 322
4.2.1.315 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party3) 322
4.2.1.316 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party4) 322
4.2.1.317 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 40 (jm_portfolio40_party1) 323
4.2.1.318 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 43 (jm_portfolio43_party1) 323
4.2.1.319 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 44 (jm_portfolio44_party1) 323
4.2.1.320 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 45 (jm_portfolio45_party1) 323
4.2.1.321 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 45 (jm_portfolio45_party2) 324
4.2.1.322 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 46 (jm_portfolio46_party1) 324
4.2.1.323 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party1) 324

4.2.1.324 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party2) 324
4.2.1.325 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party3) 324
4.2.1.326 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party4) 325
4.2.1.327 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party1) 325
4.2.1.328 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party2) 325
4.2.1.329 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party3) 325
4.2.1.330 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party4) 326
4.2.1.331 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party1) 326
4.2.1.332 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party2) 326
4.2.1.333 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party3) 326
4.2.1.334 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party1) 327
4.2.1.335 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party2) 327
4.2.1.336 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party3) 327
4.2.1.337 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party4) 327
4.2.1.338 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party5) 327
4.2.1.339 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party1) 328
4.2.1.340 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party2) 328
4.2.1.341 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party3) 328
4.2.1.342 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party4) 328
4.2.1.343 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party5) 329
4.2.1.344 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party1) 329
4.2.1.345 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party2) 329
4.2.1.346 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party3) 329
4.2.1.347 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party4) 329
4.2.1.348 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party5) 330
4.2.1.349 Party 6 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party6) 330
4.2.1.350 Information on junior ministers (junmin) 330
4.2.1.351 Largest party in parliament (largest_party) 330
4.2.1.352 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_bp) 331
4.2.1.353 Largest party in parliament in cabinet (largest_party_incab) 331
4.2.1.354 Seat share of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_share) 331
4.2.1.355 Minority situation in parliament (minority_sit) 331
4.2.1.356 Type of new government (newgov_type) 332
4.2.1.357 Number of cabinet members (num_ministers) 332
4.2.1.358 Number of ministries (num_ministries) 332
4.2.1.359 Number of parties in parliament (num_parties) 332
4.2.1.360 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_prosser) 333
4.2.1.361 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (parl_polar_prosser_logit) 333
4.2.1.362 Parliamentary polarization, RILE (parl_polar_rile) 333
4.2.1.363 Parliamentary polarization, RILE, logit scaled (parl_polar_rile_logit) 333
4.2.1.364 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE (parl_prefrange) 334
4.2.1.365 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit) 334
4.2.1.366 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit_prosser) 334

4.2.1.367 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale (parl_prefrange_prosser) . . . 334
4.2.1.368 Personal union (personalunion) . . . 335
4.2.1.369 Exception to personal union: Party 1 (personalunion_party1) . . . 335
4.2.1.370 Exception to personal union: Party 2 (personalunion_party2) . . . 335
4.2.1.371 Exception to personal union: Party 3 (personalunion_party3) . . . 335
4.2.1.372 Exception to personal union: Party 4 (personalunion_party4) . . . 336
4.2.1.373 Exception to personal union: Party 5 (personalunion_party5) . . . 336
4.2.1.374 Exception to personal union: Party 6 (personalunion_party6) . . . 336
4.2.1.375 Exception to personal union: Party 7 (personalunion_party7) . . . 336
4.2.1.376 Formal cabinet decision rule (pmpower_formcab) . . . 337
4.2.1.377 Type of actual decision rule 1 (pmpower_formcab_rule1) . . . 337
4.2.1.378 Type of actual decision rule 2 (pmpower_formcab_rule2) . . . 337
4.2.1.379 Ministers' parliamentary accountability (pmpower_minaccount) . . . 337
4.2.1.380 PM right to appoint ministers (pmpower_minappoint) . . . 338
4.2.1.381 Type of actual appointment right (pmpower_minappoint_rule) . . . 338
4.2.1.382 PM right to dismiss ministers (pmpower_mindismiss) . . . 338
4.2.1.383 Type of actual dismissal right (pmpower_mindismiss_rule) . . . 338
4.2.1.384 PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting (pmpower_pmagenda) 339
4.2.1.385 PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries (pmpower_pmjurisdiction) . . . 339
4.2.1.386 Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs (pmpower_pmoffice) . . . 339
4.2.1.387 Description of structure 1 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule1) . . . 340
4.2.1.388 Description of structure 2 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule2) . . . 340
4.2.1.389 Description of structure 3 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule3) . . . 340
4.2.1.390 Description of structure 4 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule4) . . . 340
4.2.1.391 PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers (pmpower_pmsteering) . . . 341
4.2.1.392 Party 1 holding portfolio 10 (portfolio10_party1) . . . 341
4.2.1.393 Party 1 holding portfolio 11 (portfolio11_party1) . . . 341
4.2.1.394 Party 2 holding portfolio 11 (portfolio11_party2) . . . 341
4.2.1.395 Party 1 holding portfolio 12 (portfolio12_party1) . . . 342
4.2.1.396 Party 2 holding portfolio 12 (portfolio12_party2) . . . 342
4.2.1.397 Party 1 holding portfolio 13 (portfolio13_party1) . . . 342
4.2.1.398 Party 2 holding portfolio 13 (portfolio13_party2) . . . 342
4.2.1.399 Party 1 holding portfolio 14 (portfolio14_party1) . . . 342
4.2.1.400 Party 2 holding portfolio 14 (portfolio14_party2) . . . 343
4.2.1.401 Party 1 holding portfolio 15 (portfolio15_party1) . . . 343
4.2.1.402 Party 2 holding portfolio 15 (portfolio15_party2) . . . 343
4.2.1.403 Party 1 holding portfolio 16 (portfolio16_party1) . . . 343
4.2.1.404 Party 2 holding portfolio 16 (portfolio16_party2) . . . 344
4.2.1.405 Party 1 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party1) . . . 344
4.2.1.406 Party 2 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party2) . . . 344
4.2.1.407 Party 3 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party3) . . . 344
4.2.1.408 Party 1 holding portfolio 18 (portfolio18_party1) . . . 344
4.2.1.409 Party 1 holding portfolio 19 (portfolio19_party1) . . . 345
4.2.1.410 Party 2 holding portfolio 19 (portfolio19_party2) . . . 345
4.2.1.411 Party 1 holding portfolio 1 (portfolio1_party1) . . . 345

4.2.1.412 Party 1 holding portfolio 20 (portfolio20_party1) 345
4.2.1.413 Party 2 holding portfolio 20 (portfolio20_party2) 346
4.2.1.414 Party 1 holding portfolio 21 (portfolio21_party1) 346
4.2.1.415 Party 2 holding portfolio 21 (portfolio21_party2) 346
4.2.1.416 Party 1 holding portfolio 22 (portfolio22_party1) 346
4.2.1.417 Party 2 holding portfolio 22 (portfolio22_party2) 346
4.2.1.418 Party 1 holding portfolio 23 (portfolio23_party1) 347
4.2.1.419 Party 2 holding portfolio 23 (portfolio23_party2) 347
4.2.1.420 Party 1 holding portfolio 24 (portfolio24_party1) 347
4.2.1.421 Party 2 holding portfolio 24 (portfolio24_party2) 347
4.2.1.422 Party 1 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party1) 348
4.2.1.423 Party 2 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party2) 348
4.2.1.424 Party 3 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party3) 348
4.2.1.425 Party 1 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party1) 348
4.2.1.426 Party 2 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party2) 348
4.2.1.427 Party 3 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party3) 349
4.2.1.428 Party 1 holding portfolio 27 (portfolio27_party1) 349
4.2.1.429 Party 2 holding portfolio 27 (portfolio27_party2) 349
4.2.1.430 Party 1 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party1) 349
4.2.1.431 Party 2 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party2) 350
4.2.1.432 Party 3 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party3) 350
4.2.1.433 Party 1 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party1) 350
4.2.1.434 Party 2 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party2) 350
4.2.1.435 Party 3 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party3) 350
4.2.1.436 Party 1 holding portfolio 2 (portfolio2_party1) 351
4.2.1.437 Party 2 holding portfolio 2 (portfolio2_party2) 351
4.2.1.438 Party 1 holding portfolio 30 (portfolio30_party1) 351
4.2.1.439 Party 1 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party1) 351
4.2.1.440 Party 2 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party2) 352
4.2.1.441 Party 3 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party3) 352
4.2.1.442 Party 1 holding portfolio 32 (portfolio32_party1) 352
4.2.1.443 Party 2 holding portfolio 32 (portfolio32_party2) 352
4.2.1.444 Party 1 holding portfolio 33 (portfolio33_party1) 353
4.2.1.445 Party 2 holding portfolio 33 (portfolio33_party2) 353
4.2.1.446 Party 1 holding portfolio 34 (portfolio34_party1) 353
4.2.1.447 Party 2 holding portfolio 34 (portfolio34_party2) 353
4.2.1.448 Party 1 holding portfolio 35 (portfolio35_party1) 353
4.2.1.449 Party 2 holding portfolio 35 (portfolio35_party2) 354
4.2.1.450 Party 1 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party1) 354
4.2.1.451 Party 2 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party2) 354
4.2.1.452 Party 3 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party3) 354
4.2.1.453 Party 1 holding portfolio 37 (portfolio37_party1) 355
4.2.1.454 Party 1 holding portfolio 38 (portfolio38_party1) 355
4.2.1.455 Party 2 holding portfolio 38 (portfolio38_party2) 355
4.2.1.456 Party 1 holding portfolio 39 (portfolio39_party1) 355
4.2.1.457 Party 1 holding portfolio 3 (portfolio3_party1) 355
4.2.1.458 Party 2 holding portfolio 3 (portfolio3_party2) 356
4.2.1.459 Party 1 holding portfolio 40 (portfolio40_party1) 356

4.2.1.460 Party 1 holding portfolio 41 (portfolio41_party1) 356
4.2.1.461 Party 1 holding portfolio 42 (portfolio42_party1) 356
4.2.1.462 Party 2 holding portfolio 42 (portfolio42_party2) 357
4.2.1.463 Party 1 holding portfolio 43 (portfolio43_party1) 357
4.2.1.464 Party 1 holding portfolio 44 (portfolio44_party1) 357
4.2.1.465 Party 1 holding portfolio 45 (portfolio45_party1) 357
4.2.1.466 Party 1 holding portfolio 46 (portfolio46_party1) 357
4.2.1.467 Party 1 holding portfolio 47 (portfolio47_party1) 358
4.2.1.468 Party 1 holding portfolio 48 (portfolio48_party1) 358
4.2.1.469 Party 1 holding portfolio 49 (portfolio49_party1) 358
4.2.1.470 Party 1 holding portfolio 4 (portfolio4_party1) 358
4.2.1.471 Party 2 holding portfolio 4 (portfolio4_party2) 359
4.2.1.472 Party 1 holding portfolio 50 (portfolio50_party1) 359
4.2.1.473 Party 1 holding portfolio 51 (portfolio51_party1) 359
4.2.1.474 Party 1 holding portfolio 52 (portfolio52_party1) 359
4.2.1.475 Party 1 holding portfolio 53 (portfolio53_party1) 359
4.2.1.476 Party 1 holding portfolio 54 (portfolio54_party1) 360
4.2.1.477 Party 1 holding portfolio 55 (portfolio55_party1) 360
4.2.1.478 Party 1 holding portfolio 56 (portfolio56_party1) 360
4.2.1.479 Party 1 holding portfolio 57 (portfolio57_party1) 360
4.2.1.480 Party 1 holding portfolio 58 (portfolio58_party1) 361
4.2.1.481 Party 1 holding portfolio 59 (portfolio59_party1) 361
4.2.1.482 Party 1 holding portfolio 5 (portfolio5_party1) 361
4.2.1.483 Party 2 holding portfolio 5 (portfolio5_party2) 361
4.2.1.484 Party 1 holding portfolio 60 (portfolio60_party1) 361
4.2.1.485 Party 1 holding portfolio 6 (portfolio6_party1) 362
4.2.1.486 Party 1 holding portfolio 7 (portfolio7_party1) 362
4.2.1.487 Party 1 holding portfolio 8 (portfolio8_party1) 362
4.2.1.488 Party 2 holding portfolio 8 (portfolio8_party2) 362
4.2.1.489 Party 1 holding portfolio 9 (portfolio9_party1) 363
4.2.1.490 Party 2 holding portfolio 9 (portfolio9_party2) 363
4.2.1.491 Post-electoral cabinet (post_election_cab) 363
4.2.1.492 Presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm) 363
4.2.1.493 Restrictions on presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm_restr) 364
4.2.1.494 Comments on presidential powers (pres_comment) 364
4.2.1.495 Presidential decree powers (pres_decree) 364
4.2.1.496 Presidential decree powers: explanation (pres_decree_expl) 364
4.2.1.497 Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative (pres_dismiss) 365
4.2.1.498 No codebook entry (pres_dissolve_parl) 365
4.2.1.499 Presidential right of initiative (legislation) (pres_init) 365
4.2.1.500 Popularly elected president (pres_pop) 365
4.2.1.501 Presidential power of referenda (pres_refer) 366
4.2.1.502 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule1) 366
4.2.1.503 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule2) 366
4.2.1.504 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule3) 366
4.2.1.505 Presidential power to select the PM (pres_select_pm) 367

4.2.1.506 Presidential veto powers (pres_veto) 367
4.2.1.507 Presidential veto powers: explanation (pres_veto_expl) 367
4.2.1.508 Proximity to election: lower chamber (prox_election) 368
4.2.1.509 Proximity to election: upper chamber (prox_election_upper) 368
4.2.1.510 Seat share of radical left/right parties: lower chamber (rad_share) . 368
4.2.1.511 Party seats lower chamber: Party 1 (seats_party1) 368
4.2.1.512 Party seats lower chamber: Party 10 (seats_party10) 369
4.2.1.513 Party seats lower chamber: Party 11 (seats_party11) 369
4.2.1.514 Party seats lower chamber: Party 12 (seats_party12) 369
4.2.1.515 Party seats lower chamber: Party 13 (seats_party13) 369
4.2.1.516 Party seats lower chamber: Party 14 (seats_party14) 369
4.2.1.517 Party seats lower chamber: Party 15 (seats_party15) 370
4.2.1.518 Party seats lower chamber: Party 16 (seats_party16) 370
4.2.1.519 Party seats lower chamber: Party 17 (seats_party17) 370
4.2.1.520 Party seats lower chamber: Party 18 (seats_party18) 370
4.2.1.521 Party seats lower chamber: Party 19 (seats_party19) 371
4.2.1.522 Party seats lower chamber: Party 2 (seats_party2) 371
4.2.1.523 Party seats lower chamber: Party 20 (seats_party20) 371
4.2.1.524 Party seats lower chamber: Party 21 (seats_party21) 371
4.2.1.525 Party seats lower chamber: Party 22 (seats_party22) 371
4.2.1.526 Party seats lower chamber: Party 23 (seats_party23) 372
4.2.1.527 Party seats lower chamber: Party 24 (seats_party24) 372
4.2.1.528 Party seats lower chamber: Party 25 (seats_party25) 372
4.2.1.529 Party seats lower chamber: Party 26 (seats_party26) 372
4.2.1.530 Party seats lower chamber: Party 27 (seats_party27) 373
4.2.1.531 Party seats lower chamber: Party 28 (seats_party28) 373
4.2.1.532 Party seats lower chamber: Party 29 (seats_party29) 373
4.2.1.533 Party seats lower chamber: Party 3 (seats_party3) 373
4.2.1.534 Party seats lower chamber: Party 30 (seats_party30) 373
4.2.1.535 Party seats lower chamber: Party 31 (seats_party31) 374
4.2.1.536 Party seats lower chamber: Party 32 (seats_party32) 374
4.2.1.537 Party seats lower chamber: Party 33 (seats_party33) 374
4.2.1.538 Party seats lower chamber: Party 34 (seats_party34) 374
4.2.1.539 Party seats lower chamber: Party 35 (seats_party35) 375
4.2.1.540 Party seats lower chamber: Party 36 (seats_party36) 375
4.2.1.541 Party seats lower chamber: Party 37 (seats_party37) 375
4.2.1.542 Party seats lower chamber: Party 38 (seats_party38) 375
4.2.1.543 Party seats lower chamber: Party 39 (seats_party39) 376
4.2.1.544 Party seats lower chamber: Party 4 (seats_party4) 376
4.2.1.545 Party seats lower chamber: Party 40 (seats_party40) 376
4.2.1.546 Party seats lower chamber: Party 41 (seats_party41) 376
4.2.1.547 Party seats lower chamber: Party 42 (seats_party42) 376
4.2.1.548 Party seats lower chamber: Party 43 (seats_party43) 377
4.2.1.549 Party seats lower chamber: Party 45 (seats_party45) 377
4.2.1.550 Party seats lower chamber: Party 48 (seats_party48) 377
4.2.1.551 Party seats lower chamber: Party 49 (seats_party49) 377
4.2.1.552 Party seats lower chamber: Party 5 (seats_party5) 378
4.2.1.553 Party seats lower chamber: Party 50 (seats_party50) 378

4.2.1.554 Party seats lower chamber: Party 51 (seats_party51) 378
4.2.1.555 Party seats lower chamber: Party 52 (seats_party52) 378
4.2.1.556 Party seats lower chamber: Party 53 (seats_party53) 379
4.2.1.557 Party seats lower chamber: Party 54 (seats_party54) 379
4.2.1.558 Party seats lower chamber: Party 56 (seats_party56) 379
4.2.1.559 Party seats lower chamber: Party 57 (seats_party57) 379
4.2.1.560 Party seats lower chamber: Party 58 (seats_party58) 380
4.2.1.561 Party seats lower chamber: Party 59 (seats_party59) 380
4.2.1.562 Party seats lower chamber: Party 6 (seats_party6) 380
4.2.1.563 Party seats lower chamber: Party 60 (seats_party60) 380
4.2.1.564 Party seats lower chamber: Party 61 (seats_party61) 380
4.2.1.565 Party seats lower chamber: Party 65 (seats_party65) 381
4.2.1.566 Party seats lower chamber: Party 7 (seats_party7) 381
4.2.1.567 Party seats lower chamber: Party 8 (seats_party8) 381
4.2.1.568 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9 (seats_party9) 381
4.2.1.569 Seat share of socialist and green parties: lower chamber (soc_green_share) 382
4.2.1.570 Seat share of socialist parties: lower chamber (soc_share) 382
4.2.1.571 Support parties (support_parties) 382
4.2.1.572 Support party 1 (support_party1) 382
4.2.1.573 Support party 2 (support_party2) 383
4.2.1.574 Support party 3 (support_party3) 383
4.2.1.575 Support party 4 (support_party4) 383
4.2.1.576 Support party 5 (support_party5) 383
4.2.1.577 Support party 6 (support_party6) 383
4.2.1.578 Support party 7 (support_party7) 384
4.2.1.579 Support party 8 (support_party8) 384
4.2.1.580 Technocrat ministry majority (techno_maj) 384
4.2.1.581 Technocrat PM (techno_pm) 384
4.2.1.582 Broad policy remit (techno_remit) 385
4.2.1.583 Description of dominant policy area (term_descr) 385
4.2.1.584 Discretionary termination (term_disc) 385
4.2.1.585 Cabinet defeat in parliament (term_disc_cabdefeat) 385
4.2.1.586 Conflict between coalition parties: Parties involved (term_disc_conflict_parties) 386
4.2.1.587 Conflict between coalition parties (personnel) (term_disc_conflict_pers) 386
4.2.1.588 Conflict between coalition parties (policy) (term_disc_conflict_pol) 386
4.2.1.589 Early parliamentary election (term_disc_earlyelec) 386
4.2.1.590 Voluntary enlargement of coalition (term_disc_enlarge) 387
4.2.1.591 Intra party conflict (term_disc_intra) 387
4.2.1.592 Intra party conflict: Type of conflict (term_disc_intra_conflict) . . 387
4.2.1.593 Intra party conflict: Party involved (term_disc_intra_party) 388
4.2.1.594 Other voluntary reason (term_disc_voluntary) 388
4.2.1.595 Economic event (term_event_econ) 388
4.2.1.596 International or national security event (term_event_intnat) 388
4.2.1.597 Non-parliamentary elections (term_event_nonparlelec) 388
4.2.1.598 Personal event (term_event_pers) 389
4.2.1.599 Popular opinion shock (term_event_popshock) 389

4.2.1.600 Ministry involved (term_ministry) . . . 389
4.2.1.601 Other constitutional reason (term_tech_const) . . . 389
4.2.1.602 Death of PM (term_tech_death) . . . 390
4.2.1.603 Regular parliamentary election (term_tech_regelec) . . . 390
4.2.1.604 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, upper chamber (upper_dim_first_median) . . . 390
4.2.1.605 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, upper chamber (upper_dim_second_median) . . . 390
4.2.1.606 Effective number of parliamentary parties: upper chamber (upper_enpp) . . . 391
4.2.1.607 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat: upper chamber (upper_majority) . . . 391
4.2.1.608 Party seats upper chamber: Party 1 (upper_seats_party1) . . . 391
4.2.1.609 Party seats upper chamber: Party 10 (upper_seats_party10) . . . 391
4.2.1.610 Party seats upper chamber: Party 11 (upper_seats_party11) . . . 392
4.2.1.611 Party seats upper chamber: Party 12 (upper_seats_party12) . . . 392
4.2.1.612 Party seats upper chamber: Party 13 (upper_seats_party13) . . . 392
4.2.1.613 Party seats upper chamber: Party 14 (upper_seats_party14) . . . 392
4.2.1.614 Party seats upper chamber: Party 15 (upper_seats_party15) . . . 393
4.2.1.615 Party seats upper chamber: Party 16 (upper_seats_party16) . . . 393
4.2.1.616 Party seats upper chamber: Party 17 (upper_seats_party17) . . . 393
4.2.1.617 Party seats upper chamber: Party 18 (upper_seats_party18) . . . 393
4.2.1.618 Party seats upper chamber: Party 19 (upper_seats_party19) . . . 393
4.2.1.619 Party seats upper chamber: Party 2 (upper_seats_party2) . . . 394
4.2.1.620 Party seats upper chamber: Party 20 (upper_seats_party20) . . . 394
4.2.1.621 Party seats upper chamber: Party 21 (upper_seats_party21) . . . 394
4.2.1.622 Party seats upper chamber: Party 22 (upper_seats_party22) . . . 394
4.2.1.623 Party seats upper chamber: Party 23 (upper_seats_party23) . . . 395
4.2.1.624 Party seats upper chamber: Party 24 (upper_seats_party24) . . . 395
4.2.1.625 Party seats upper chamber: Party 25 (upper_seats_party25) . . . 395
4.2.1.626 Party seats upper chamber: Party 26 (upper_seats_party26) . . . 395
4.2.1.627 Party seats upper chamber: Party 27 (upper_seats_party27) . . . 395
4.2.1.628 Party seats upper chamber: Party 29 (upper_seats_party29) . . . 396
4.2.1.629 Party seats upper chamber: Party 3 (upper_seats_party3) . . . 396
4.2.1.630 Party seats upper chamber: Party 30 (upper_seats_party30) . . . 396
4.2.1.631 Party seats upper chamber: Party 31 (upper_seats_party31) . . . 396
4.2.1.632 Party seats upper chamber: Party 32 (upper_seats_party32) . . . 397
4.2.1.633 Party seats upper chamber: Party 33 (upper_seats_party33) . . . 397
4.2.1.634 Party seats upper chamber: Party 34 (upper_seats_party34) . . . 397
4.2.1.635 Party seats upper chamber: Party 35 (upper_seats_party35) . . . 397
4.2.1.636 Party seats upper chamber: Party 36 (upper_seats_party36) . . . 397
4.2.1.637 Party seats upper chamber: Party 37 (upper_seats_party37) . . . 398
4.2.1.638 Party seats upper chamber: Party 38 (upper_seats_party38) . . . 398
4.2.1.639 Party seats upper chamber: Party 39 (upper_seats_party39) . . . 398
4.2.1.640 Party seats upper chamber: Party 4 (upper_seats_party4) . . . 398
4.2.1.641 Party seats upper chamber: Party 40 (upper_seats_party40) . . . 399
4.2.1.642 Party seats upper chamber: Party 41 (upper_seats_party41) . . . 399
4.2.1.643 Party seats upper chamber: Party 44 (upper_seats_party44) . . . 399
4.2.1.644 Party seats upper chamber: Party 45 (upper_seats_party45) . . . 399

4.2.1.645 Party seats upper chamber: Party 46 (upper_seats_party46) 400
4.2.1.646 Party seats upper chamber: Party 47 (upper_seats_party47) 400
4.2.1.647 Party seats upper chamber: Party 48 (upper_seats_party48) 400
4.2.1.648 Party seats upper chamber: Party 49 (upper_seats_party49) 400
4.2.1.649 Party seats upper chamber: Party 5 (upper_seats_party5) 401
4.2.1.650 Party seats upper chamber: Party 50 (upper_seats_party50) 401
4.2.1.651 Party seats upper chamber: Party 54 (upper_seats_party54) 401
4.2.1.652 Party seats upper chamber: Party 55 (upper_seats_party55) 401
4.2.1.653 Party seats upper chamber: Party 56 (upper_seats_party56) 401
4.2.1.654 Party seats upper chamber: Party 57 (upper_seats_party57) 402
4.2.1.655 Party seats upper chamber: Party 58 (upper_seats_party58) 402
4.2.1.656 Party seats upper chamber: Party 59 (upper_seats_party59) 402
4.2.1.657 Party seats upper chamber: Party 6 (upper_seats_party6) 402
4.2.1.658 Party seats upper chamber: Party 60 (upper_seats_party60) 403
4.2.1.659 Party seats upper chamber: Party 7 (upper_seats_party7) 403
4.2.1.660 Party seats upper chamber: Party 8 (upper_seats_party8) 403
4.2.1.661 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9 (upper_seats_party9) 403
4.2.1.662 Total number of seats: upper chamber (upper_seats_total) 403
4.2.1.663 Year of cabinet formation (year_in) 404
4.2.1.664 Year/month of cabinet formation (year_month_in) 404
4.2.1.665 Year/month of cabinet termination (year_month_out) 404
4.2.1.666 Year out (year_out) 404
4.2.1.667 Unique id (unique_id) 405
4.2.1.668 Full duration technical termination (cab_duration_full) 405
4.2.1.669 Single party majority cabinet (cab_sp_majority) 405
4.2.1.670 Minority cabinet (cab_minority) 405
4.2.1.671 Single party minority cabinet (cab_sp_minority) 406
4.2.1.672 Minority coalition (cab_coal_minority) 406
4.2.1.673 Substantial minority cabinet (cab_sub_minority) 406
4.2.1.674 Total number of seats: lower chamber (seats_total) 406
4.2.1.675 Cabinet seat share including formal support parties (cab_seatshare_supported) 407
4.2.1.676 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the dim_first_median_2nd_bp party of the median legislator: first policy dimension; lower chamber; 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd_bp) 407
4.2.1.677 Conflict between coalition parties (policy and/or personnel) (term_disc_conflict) 407
4.2.1.678 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (seats_party9998) 407
4.2.1.679 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (seats_party9999) 408
4.2.1.680 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (upper_seats_party9998) . . 408
4.2.1.681 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (upper_seats_party9999) . . 408
4.2.1.682 Cabinet party 1, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party1) . . . 408
4.2.1.683 Cabinet party 2, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party2) . . . 408
4.2.1.684 Cabinet party 3, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party3) . . . 409
4.2.1.685 Cabinet party 4, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party4) . . . 409
4.2.1.686 Cabinet party 5, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party5) . . . 409
4.2.1.687 Cabinet party 6, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party6) . . . 409
4.2.1.688 Cabinet party 7, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party7) . . . 409
4.2.1.689 Cabinet party 8, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party8) . . . 410

4.2.1.690 Cabinet party 1, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party1) 410
4.2.1.691 Cabinet party 2, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party2) 410
4.2.1.692 Cabinet party 3, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party3) 410
4.2.1.693 Cabinet party 4, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party4) 411
4.2.1.694 Cabinet party 5, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party5) 411
4.2.1.695 Cabinet party 6, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party6) 411
4.2.1.696 Cabinet party 7, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party7) 411
4.2.1.697 Cabinet party 8, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party8) 412
4.2.1.698 Cabinet ID, old standard (old_cab_id) 412
4.2.1.699 Unique ID for old cabinet ID and government composition (old_unique_id) 412

5 V-DEM **413**

5.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 413
5.1.1 Identifier Variables in the V-Dem Datasets 414
5.1.1.1 Gap index (gap_index) 414
5.1.2 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices 414
5.1.2.1 Freedom of association index (thick) (v2x_frassoc_thick) 414
5.1.2.2 Civil society participation index (v2x_cspart) 415
5.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Elections 416
5.1.3.1 Election type (v2eltype) 417
5.1.3.2 Public campaign finance (v2elpubfin) 418
5.1.3.3 Elections multiparty (v2elmulpar) 419
5.1.3.4 Election vote buying (v2elvotbuy) 419
5.1.3.5 Election other voting irregularities (v2elirreg) 420
5.1.3.6 Election government intimidation (v2elintim) 421
5.1.3.7 Election other electoral violence (v2elpeace) 422
5.1.3.8 Election boycotts (v2elboycot) 423
5.1.3.9 Election free campaign media (v2elfrcamp) 424
5.1.3.10 Election paid campaign advertisements (v2elpdcamp) 425
5.1.3.11 Election domestic election monitors (v2eldommon) 426
5.1.3.12 Election losers accept results (v2elaccept) 426
5.1.3.13 Election assume office (v2elasmoff) 427
5.1.3.14 Name of largest party (v2lpname) 428
5.1.3.15 Name of second largest party (v2slpname) 429
5.1.3.16 Name of third largest party (v2tlpname) 429
5.1.3.17 Election HOG turnover ordinal (v2elturnhog) 430
5.1.3.18 Elections HOS turnover ordinal (v2elturnhos) 431
5.1.3.19 Election executive turnover ordinal (v2eltvrexo) 432
5.1.3.20 Lower chamber electoral system (v2elloelsy) 433
5.1.3.21 Lower chamber election seats (v2elloseat) 435
5.1.3.22 Lower chamber election seats won by largest party (v2ellostlg) 436
5.1.3.23 Lower chamber election seat share won by largest party (v2ellostsl) . 436
5.1.3.24 Lower chamber election seats won by second largest party (v2ellostsm) 437
5.1.3.25 Lower chamber election seat share won by second largest party (v2ellostss) 438
5.1.3.26 Lower chamber election seats won by third largest party (v2ellosttm) 439
5.1.3.27 Lower chamber election seat share won by third largest party (v2ellostts) 439

5.1.3.28 Lower chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v2ellovtlg) 440
5.1.3.29 Lower chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v2ellovtsm) . . . 441
5.1.3.30 Lower chamber election vote share of third-largest vote-getter (v2ellovttm) . . . 442
5.1.3.31 Lower chamber election statutory threshold (v2elthresh) . . . 442
5.1.3.32 Lower chamber election turnover (v2eltvrig) . . . 443
5.1.3.33 Subnational election area less free and fair characteristics (v2elsnlfc) 444
5.1.3.34 Subnational election area more free and fair characteristics (v2elsnmrfc) 445
5.1.3.35 Lower chamber hybrid system reserved seats (v2elloreseat) . . . 446
5.1.3.36 Lower chamber upper tier electoral districts (v2elloupdis) . . . 447
5.1.3.37 Lower chamber base tier electoral districts (v2ellobadis) . . . 448
5.1.3.38 Lower chamber base or nominal tier seats (v2ellobaseat) . . . 449
5.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties . . . 449
5.1.4.1 Barriers to parties (v2psbars) . . . 450
5.1.4.2 Party Ban (v2psparban) . . . 451
5.1.4.3 Opposition parties autonomy (v2psoppaut) . . . 451
5.1.4.4 Party organizations (v2psorgs) . . . 452
5.1.4.5 Party Branches (v2psprbrch) . . . 453
5.1.4.6 Party linkages (v2psprlnks) . . . 454
5.1.4.7 Distinct party platforms (v2psplats) . . . 455
5.1.4.8 Candidate selection–National/local (v2pscnslnl) . . . 455
5.1.4.9 Legislative party cohesion (v2pscohesv) . . . 456
5.1.4.10 Party competition across regions (v2pscomprg) . . . 457
5.1.4.11 National party control (v2psnatpar) . . . 458
5.1.4.12 Subnational party control (v2pssunpar) . . . 459
5.1.4.13 Party ban target (v2psbantar) . . . 460
5.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 460
5.1.5.1 HOS appointment in practice (v2expathhs) . . . 461
5.1.5.2 HOS control over (v2exctlhs) . . . 462
5.1.5.3 HOS party (v2exparhos) . . . 463
5.1.5.4 HOG appointment in practice (v2expathhg) . . . 464
5.1.5.5 HOG control over (v2exctlhg) . . . 465
5.1.5.6 HOG party (v2expothog) . . . 466
5.1.5.7 HOG removal by other in practice (v2exrmhgnp) . . . 466
5.1.5.8 Regime interregnum (v2regint) . . . 467
5.1.5.9 Regime support groups (v2regsupgroups) . . . 468
5.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 469
5.1.6.1 Legislature opposition parties (v2lgoppart) . . . 469
5.1.6.2 Lower chamber gender quota (v2lgqugen) . . . 470
5.1.6.3 Lower chamber gender quota placement mandate (v2lgqugens) . . . 471
5.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society . . . 472
5.1.7.1 Religious organization repression (v2csrlgrep) . . . 472
5.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - The Media . . . 473
5.1.8.1 Media bias (v2mebias) . . . 474
5.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion . . . 475
5.1.9.1 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl) . . . 475
5.1.9.2 Access to public services distributed by political group (v2peapspol) 476

5.1.9.3 Access to state jobs by political group (v2peasjpol) . . . 477
5.1.9.4 Access to state business opportunities by political group (v2peasbepol) 478
5.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space . . . 479
5.1.10.1 Engagement in independent political associations (v2capolit) . . . 479
5.1.11 Historical V-Dem - Elections . . . 480
5.1.11.1 Ballot printing (v3elbalstat) . . . 480
5.1.11.2 Minority or majority government (v3elncbmaj) . . . 481
5.1.11.3 Upper chamber election turnover (v3eltvriguc) . . . 482
5.1.11.4 Upper chamber election seats (v3elupseat) . . . 483
5.1.11.5 Upper chamber election seats won by largest party (v3elupstsl) . . . 483
5.1.11.6 Upper chamber election seats won by second largest party (v3elupstsm) 484
5.1.11.7 Upper chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3elupvtlg) 485
5.1.11.8 Upper chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3elupvtsm) . . . 485
5.1.11.9 Total votes (v3ttlvote) . . . 486
5.1.12 Historical V-Dem - Political Parties . . . 487
5.1.12.1 Party identification (v3partyid) . . . 487
5.1.12.2 Party age largest (v3psagefirst) . . . 488
5.1.12.3 Party age executive (v3psagepm) . . . 489
5.1.12.4 Party age second largest (v3psagesecond) . . . 489
5.1.12.5 Party age third largest (v3psagethird) . . . 490
5.1.13 Historical V-Dem - The Legislature . . . 491
5.1.13.1 Lower chamber quota for social groups (v3lgqumin) . . . 491
5.1.14 Historical V-Dem - Historical V-Dem Modified . . . 492
5.1.14.1 Lower chamber electoral system (v3elloelsy) . . . 492
5.1.14.2 Lower chamber election seats (v3elloseat) . . . 494
5.1.14.3 Lower chamber election seats won by largest party (v3ellostlg) . . . 495
5.1.14.4 Lower chamber election seat share won by largest party (v3ellostsl) . 496
5.1.14.5 Lower chamber election seats won by second largest party (v3ellostsm) 496
5.1.14.6 Lower chamber election seat share won by second largest party (v3ellostss) . . . 497
5.1.14.7 Lower chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3ellovtlg) 498
5.1.14.8 Lower chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3ellovtsm) . . . 498
5.1.14.9 Effective number of cabinet parties (v3elncbpr) . . . 499
5.1.14.10 Lower chamber election turnover (v3eltvrig) . . . 500
5.1.14.11 Presidential election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3elvotlrg) . . 501
5.1.14.12 Presidential election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3elvotsml) . . . 501
5.1.14.13 Legislature opposition parties (v3lgoppart) . . . 502
5.1.15 Historical V-Dem - Overlap Period Discrepancies . . . 503
5.1.15.1 HOS appointment in practice (v3expathhs) . . . 503
5.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Regimes of the World (RoW) . . . 504
5.1.16.1 Regimes of the world - the RoW Measure (v2x_regime) . . . 504
5.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Executive Bases of Power . . . 506
5.1.17.1 Ruling party dimension index (v2x_ex_party) . . . 506
5.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Party Institutionalization . . . 507
5.1.18.1 Party institutionalization index (v2xps_party) . . . 507
5.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Consensual Democracy Dimensions 508

5.1.19.1 Divided party control index (v2x_divparctrl) . . . 508
5.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Coordinated Information Operations . . . 509
5.1.20.1 Party dissemination of false information domestic (v2smpardom) . . 510
5.1.20.2 Party dissemination of false information abroad (v2smparab) 510
5.1.21 Digital Society Survey - Digital Media Freedom . . . 511
5.1.21.1 Political parties cyber security capacity (v2smpolcap) . . . 512
5.1.22 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages . . . 513
5.1.22.1 Party/candidate use of social media in campaigns (v2smcamp) . . . 514
5.1.22.2 Political parties hate speech (v2smpolhate) . . . 515
5.1.23 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Ordinal Versions of Indices . . . 516
5.1.23.1 Civil society participation index ordinal (e_v2x_cspart_3c) . . . 516
5.1.23.2 Freedom of association (thick) index ordinal (e_v2x_frassoc_thick_3c) 516
5.1.23.3 Party institutionalization index ordinal (e_v2xps_party_3c) 517
5.1.24 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy 518
5.1.24.1 Lexical index (e_lexical_index) . . . 518
5.1.25 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Political Institutions and Political Events . . . 518
5.1.25.1 Parties in legislature (e_legparty) . . . 519
5.1.26 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Polity5 . . . 519
5.1.26.1 Political competition (e_polcomp) . . . 519
5.1.27 Varieties of Indoctrination . . . 521
5.1.27.1 Political influence, non state-owned media (v2medpolnonstate) . . . 521
5.1.28 Party Systems . . . 522
5.1.28.1 Opposition Parties' Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy_opposition) 522
5.1.28.2 Government Coalition Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_government) . . . 523
5.1.28.3 Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_opposition) 524
5.1.28.4 Party-System Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion) . . . 525
5.1.28.5 Opposition Parties' Religion Index (v2xpas_religion_opposition) . . 526
5.1.28.6 Government Coalition Religion Index (v2xpas_religion_government) 527
5.1.28.7 Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_opposition) 528
5.1.28.8 Government Coalition Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_government) . . . 528
5.1.28.9 Party-System Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic) . . . 529
5.1.28.10 Party-System Religion Index (v2xpas_religion) . . . 530
5.1.28.11 Government Coalition Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy_government) . . . 531
5.1.28.12 Party-System Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy) . . . 532
5.2 V-Dem V-Party v2 . . . 533
5.2.1 Identifier Variables . . . 534
5.2.1.1 Party name, English (v2paenname) . . . 534
5.2.1.2 Party name, Original (v2paorname) . . . 534
5.2.1.3 Party short name (v2pashname) . . . 535
5.2.1.4 Numeric party identifier (v2paid) . . . 535
5.2.1.5 Party Facts ID (A) (pf_party_id) . . . 535
5.2.1.6 Start and end year of gap in party coding (A) (party_gaps) . . . 535
5.2.1.7 Party Facts URL (A) (pf_url) . . . 536
5.2.1.8 Gap index (A) (gap_index) . . . 536
5.2.1.9 CHES Party Code (E) (ches_id) . . . 536

5.2.1.10 GPS Party Code (E) (gps_id) . . . 536
5.2.2 Indices . . . 537
5.2.2.1 Anti-Pluralism Index (D) (v2xpa_antiplural) . . . 537
5.2.2.2 Populism Index (D) (v2xpa_popul) . . . 537
5.2.3 Party Basics . . . 538
5.2.3.1 Seat share (v2paseatshare) . . . 538
5.2.3.2 Seat number (v2panumbseat) . . . 538
5.2.3.3 Seats total (v2patotalseat) . . . 538
5.2.3.4 Vote share (v2pavote) . . . 539
5.2.3.5 Temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2paallian) . . . 539
5.2.3.6 Name of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2panaallian) . . . 539
5.2.3.7 Vote share of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2pavallian) . . . 539
5.2.3.8 Seats of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2panoallian) . . . 540
5.2.3.9 Party continuation (v2paelcont) . . . 540
5.2.3.10 Party continuation (C) (v2paelcont_nr) . . . 540
5.2.3.11 Government support (v2pagovsup) . . . 541
5.2.3.12 Pariah Party (v2papariah) . . . 541
5.2.4 Party Identity . . . 542
5.2.4.1 Anti-elitism (v2paanteli) . . . 542
5.2.4.2 People-centrism (v2papeople) . . . 542
5.2.4.3 Political Opponents (v2paopresp) . . . 543
5.2.4.4 Political Pluralism (v2paplur) . . . 543
5.2.4.5 Minority Rights (v2paminor) . . . 544
5.2.4.6 Rejection of Political Violence (v2paviol) . . . 544
5.2.4.7 Immigration (v2paimmig) . . . 545
5.2.4.8 LGBT Social Equality (v2palgbt) . . . 545
5.2.4.9 Cultural Superiority (v2paculsup) . . . 546
5.2.4.10 Religious Principles (v2parelig) . . . 546
5.2.4.11 Gender Equality (v2pagender) . . . 547
5.2.4.12 Working Women (v2pawomlab) . . . 547
5.2.4.13 Economic Left-Right Scale (v2pariglef) . . . 548
5.2.4.14 Welfare (v2pawelf) . . . 548
5.2.4.15 Clientelism (v2paclient) . . . 549
5.2.4.16 Salience and Mobilization (v2pasalie_nr) . . . 549
5.2.5 Party Organisation . . . 550
5.2.5.1 Local Party Office (v2palocoff) . . . 550
5.2.5.2 Local Organizational Strength (v2paactcom) . . . 550
5.2.5.3 Affiliate Organizations (v2pasoctie) . . . 551
5.2.5.4 Candidate Nomination (v2panom) . . . 551
5.2.5.5 Internal Cohesion (v2padisa) . . . 552
5.2.5.6 Personalization of Party (v2paind) . . . 552
5.2.5.7 Party Resources (v2pafunds_nr) . . . 553
5.2.5.8 Party Support Group (v2pagroup_nr) . . . 553
5.2.6 Populism . . . 554
5.2.6.1 Salience of anti–establishment rhetoric (E) (ep_antielite_salience) . . . 554
5.2.6.2 Salience of reducing political corruption (E) (ep_corrupt_salience) . . . 554
5.2.6.3 Members vs. leadership party policy choices (E) (ep_members_vs_leadership) . . . 555

5.2.6.4 Position on direct vs. representative democracy (E) (ep_people_vs_elite) . . . 555
5.2.6.5 Populism type (E) (ep_type_populism) . . . 555
5.2.6.6 Populist values type (E) (ep_type_populist_values) . . . 556
5.2.6.7 Populist rhetoric (E) (ep_v8_popul_rhetoric) . . . 556
5.2.6.8 Populist saliency (E) (ep_v9_popul_saliency) . . . 557
5.2.7 Liberal-Traditional Scaling . . . 557
5.2.7.1 Position on democratic freedoms and rights (E) (ep_galtan) . . . 557
5.2.7.2 Salience of libertarian or traditional issues (E) (ep_galtan_salience) 557
5.2.7.3 Social Liberalism-Conservatism (E) (ep_v6_lib_cons) . . . 558
5.2.7.4 Social values saliency (E) (ep_v7_lib_cons_saliency) . . . 558

6 Bibliography **559**

1 Explanatory Notes

1.1 Release Notes v7

Demscore provides worldwide free access to harmonized data on Democracy, Environment, Migration, Social Policy, Conflict and Representation from several of the world's most prominent social science research institutes. The interdisciplinary nature of Demscore data facilitates large-scale comparative analyses. This is essential to advance adequate policy responses to complex societal challenges associated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and beyond, facing Sweden, Europe, and the world today.

With a firm commitment to transparency and openness, Demscore v7 enables users to gain comprehensive insights into various topics across the social sciences. The joint infrastructure ensures data integrity and quality at the highest international standards and maximizes usability in the measurement of contextual data with over 25.000 variables across nearly all countries in the world, from 1750 to the present.

This creates critical time- and cost saving advantages in data collection, management, distribution, and not the least for end-users in the scientific community. Demscore's unique approach to translating and merging data scales up to more than 410.000 variable versions available in the infrastructure, storing more than 10 billion non-missing observations.

This collaborative effort between leading Swedish universities pushes the scale of social science data to a new level and offers unprecedented possibilities for interdisciplinary research and knowledge advancement.

These are the key features of Demscore:

1. **Customized Download:** A fully normalized, joint PostgreSQL database, sophisticated programming, and a user-friendly web-based interface for users to generate custom-designed datasets and codebooks for download.
2. **Translations and Data Merges:** Demscore currently offers more than 1100 merge options between datasets.
3. **Metadata:** Demscore takes information on and organization of metadata to new heights with the inclusion of customized codebooks, a detailed methodology document, and a comprehensive handbook.
4. **Handling of Missing Data:** Demscore pioneers in developing an innovative approach to tackle missing data. Researchers can now account for missing values with increased precision, leading to more robust and reliable analyses.
5. **Merge Scores:** Demscore introduces a unique merge mechanism. This powerful tool enables researchers to combine datasets effortlessly, uncovering connections and patterns that were previously hidden in isolated data silos.
6. **Thematic Datasets:** Demscore provides researchers with curated thematic datasets, each focused on a specific topic. These datasets bring together relevant variables from across the Demscore partners, facilitating in-depth investigations and comprehensive analyses of specific domains.
7. **Interactive Web Portal:** In addition to all the above, Demscore's web portal offers interactive visualization tools, user support and additional information on all partners and data sources.

For more information, please visit `https://www.demscore.se/` or contact contact@demscore.se.

1.2 New in Demscore version 7

A detailed description of changes and additions made for version 7 compared to version 6 can be found in the Methodology Document.

1.3 The Demscore Codebook

The autogenerated Demscore Codebook lists variable entries for those variables chosen by the user along with citation guidelines and licenses per variable.

The meta data is extracted from the codebooks per dataset stored in a table in the Demscore PostgreSQL database with one row per variable for all datasets. This table includes codebook entries, variable tags, labels, and other variable information in LaTeX format used to generate an automated codebook.
Demscore maintains a single set of standard entries for metadata across all datasets, to which all project members contribute their information. Additionally, variables within different datasets may have varying sets of additional information requirements specific to each dataset. These dataset-specific entries are also included, but they are presented as variable-specific metadata beneath the standard entries.
At the outset of the harmonization process, Demscore underwent a thorough variable name cleanup. This involved tasks such as replacing spaces or dots in variable names with underscores and converting all letters to lowercase. Notably, the original tags remain preserved and stored in the PostgreSQL table. Each variable in Demscore is accessible in both short and long forms. The short form comprises the cleaned version of the original variable tag, while the long form starts with the dataset name from which it originates, followed by the cleaned variable name.

For instance, the original name of the variable *MinisterPersonalID* from the H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset is included as *ministerpersonalid* (short form) and *hdata_fomin_ministerpersonalid* (long form) in Demscore.

In addition, each dataset includes Demscore unit-identifier variables which are named according to the following naming scheme: Beginning with u_, followed by the name of the primary unit and finally the variable tag. The *year*- variable from the COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB), which is part of the primary unit u_complab_country_year has the Demscore unit identifier name *u_complab_country_year_year*.

1.4 Methodology

For details on our methodology please see the Demscore Methodology document available for download on the Demscore website.

1.5 Citations

The Demscore project does not have a formal citation of its own. Hence, when using Demscore, we suggest that you cite the respective projects and datasets. We indicate how every dataset is to be cited in the autogenerated codebook you retreive with your data download, both in the dataset description and the codebook entry for each variable. Most often it is sufficient to cite the dataset a variable originates from, but sometimes there is a variable specific citation listed in the codebook entry in addition to that. For these cases, please also add the variable specific citation to the reference list of your publication. Full references are linked in the codebook entries of the variables and listed in the codebook's bibliography. We suggest you to also cite the Demscore Methodology Document when using data retrieved through Demscore.

1.6 Missing Data

Demscore indicates different types of missingness for observations in the customized datasets:
Missing in original data = Whenever an observation in the original variable is a missing (NA, missing code such as 7777, blank cell), we preserve this missing value. When the original source has special codes for various types of missing, those are preserved.
Missing code: -11111 = Demscore code for observation is missing due to the translation/merge, i.e., missing data due to no data being included for this combination of identifiers in the end Output Unit.
Missing code: -22222 = No observation is merged/translated, but the original data contains information for these identifier combinations elsewhere. For these cases, we use a different code. The

user needs to consult the reference documents (Methodology Document Section 5.1. or the Demscore Handbook) to clarify why the translation to the identifier combinations in the end Output Unit was not possible.

Please note that an observation that is missing in its original output unit does no take the value -11111, but appears as NA/blank cell in the customized dataset.

1.7 Download ID

The download ID can be shared with other users for replication purposes. A user can type the download ID into the Demscore website and retrieve the same download selection and files as the original user. This ID is autogenerated for each download from the Demscore website and will always retrieve the same data, even if the Demscore version was updated in the meantime.

Download ID:

1.8 Unit Identifier Variables

An Output Unit is defined as an output format in which variables can be retrieved from one or more datasets through a strictly defined output grid. A unit table defining this output grid contains unit identifier columns with u_ prefixes and the table is sorted based on these unit identifier columns and has a fixed number of rows. Unit columns are based on the columns that constitute the unit of analysis in a dataset. They are added to the original dataset and marked by a unit prefix (consisting of a u_ and the dataset unit name) before the original variable name. Unit columns can contain slightly modified data, e.g., missing values are replaced by a default value. Sometimes we add additional columns to the unit table, for instance if a dataset includes both a country_id column with a numeric country code, we add the variable storing the full country name to the unit table as well for better readability.

1.9 Thematic Dataset

This dataset contains over 1,000 variables on various aspects pertaining to parties and elections. This includes variables on e.g., party programs, voter turnout, cabinet compositions, and government formation. We hope that this dataset will be a valuable resource for users that are interested in political representation and electoral aspects of democracy. Note: the number of variables can vary depending on the Output Unit that has been downloaded.

1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit

u_demscore_country_year_country: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

u_demscore_country_year_code: NA

u_demscore_country_year_year: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

2 H-DATA

The Historical Data Archive (H-DATA) is a hub of historical country-level data running as far back as the French revolution (1789) and offers unparalleled depth of data and temporality, enabling researchers to answer critical questions about the past but to also understand the origins of, and find historical parallels to, present-day problems. H-DATA works to collect, integrate, and curate historical data from Demscore's other modules. By adding this long-term historical dimension, H-DATA makes it possible for researchers to study the path dependency of political institutions where changes are incremental or rare thus making long time-series essential to understanding their causes and consequences. By extending data back into time, H-DATA helps deepen and further our understanding of the conditions of the complex global challenges that we face today. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data`

2.1 H-DATA Historical Cabinets

Dataset tag: hdata_cab

Output Unit:

Description:
Timespan: 1919-1958
Coverage: 407 cabinets in 20 European countries
The Historical Cabinets (H-CAB) dataset is an historical extension of the Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED) and covers cabinets formed during the interwar period. Update 2.0 includes 8 countries not previously covered, for a total of 20 European countries between 1919-1958 (Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom). The H-CAB dataset provides data on dates of cabinet formation and dissolution, along with data on the cabinet party composition, allowing for analysis on cabinet formation and duration.

Dataset citiation: When using this dataset, please cite the following:

Teorell, Jan, Johan Hellström, Joseph Noonan Lotta Wiechel (2025), Historical Cabinets (H-CAB) Dataset v2.0, available at `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data`.

Link to original codebook:
`https://www.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.803895.1740574544!/menu/standard/file/H-CAB%202.0_Codebook_last%20update%2020250225.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data/datasets-1.610144`

2.1.1 Cabinet

These variables contail additional information on the cabinet.

2.1.1.1 Number of Parties (cab_num_parties)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_num_parties
Original tag: cab_num_parties
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 406, Percent: 99.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28 Percent: 6.9

Description:

Number of cabinet parties.

2.1.1.2 Government Type (govtype)

Long tag: hdata_cab_govtype

Original tag: govtype

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 406, Percent: 99.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28 Percent: 6.9

Description:

Government type.
1. Minority coalition cabinet: Holds less than 50 percent plus one seat in parliament. Single-party minority cabinets are likewise coded as 'Min'.
2. Single-party majority cabinet: Holds 50percent plus one seat in parliament. Is not a coalition.
3. Minimal winning coalition: Is turned into a losing coalition by the subtraction of any of the coalition parties, i.e., if it loses a coalition party it holds less than 50 percent plus one seat.
4. Surplus majority coalition: Can lose a coalition party and still be winning, i.e. control 50 percent plus one seat or more in the parliament.
5. A non-partisan cabinet, e.g. appointed by a president to hold an election

2.1.1.3 Prime Minister Party (pm_party)

Long tag: hdata_cab_pm_party

Original tag: pm_party

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13

Description:

PM's party (short name)

2.1.2 Parties

These variables contain information about the party composition of cabinets.

2.1.2.1 Party Name (cab_party_1)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_1

Original tag: cab_party_1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13

Description:

ParlGov short name of party 1

2.1.2.2 Party Name (cab_party_2)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_2
Original tag: cab_party_2
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 2

2.1.2.3 Party Name (cab_party_3)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_3
Original tag: cab_party_3
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 3

2.1.2.4 Party Name (cab_party_4)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_4
Original tag: cab_party_4
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 406, Percent: 99.75
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 377, Percent: 1.24
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.14
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 4

2.1.2.5 Party Name (cab_party_5)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_5
Original tag: cab_party_5
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 406, Percent: 99.75
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28 Percent: 6.9
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 5

2.1.2.6 Party Name (cab_party_6)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_6
Original tag: cab_party_6
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 6

2.1.2.7 Party Name (cab_party_7)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_7
Original tag: cab_party_7
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 7

2.1.2.8 Party Name (cab_party_8)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_8
Original tag: cab_party_8
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 8

2.1.2.9 Party Name (cab_party_9)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_9
Original tag: cab_party_9
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 407, Percent: 100
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29 Percent: 7.13
Description:
ParlGov short name of party 9

2.1.2.10 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_1)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_1
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_1
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 276, Percent: 67.81
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 309, Percent: 1.02
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 1

2.1.2.11 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_2)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_2
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_2
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 206, Percent: 50.61
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 207, Percent: 0.68
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 2

2.1.2.12 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_3)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_3
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_3
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 153, Percent: 37.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 138, Percent: 0.45
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 9.8
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 3

2.1.2.13 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_4)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_4
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_4
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 98, Percent: 24.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28 Percent: 28.57
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 3

2.1.2.14 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_5)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_5
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_5
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 50, Percent: 12.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 0.14
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 14
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 6

2.1.2.15 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_6)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_6
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_6
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 3.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 5

2.1.2.16 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_7)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_7
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_7
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 7

2.1.2.17 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_8)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_8
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_8
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 8

2.1.2.18 ParlGov ID (from ParlGov Dataset) (cab_party_parlgov_id_9)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_parlgov_id_9
Original tag: cab_party_parlgov_id_9
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:
Description:
ParlGov ID for party 9

2.1.2.19 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_1)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_1
Original tag: cab_party_seats_1
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 97.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 375, Percent: 1.24
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 5.54
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 1

2.1.2.20 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_2)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_2
Original tag: cab_party_seats_2
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 310, Percent: 76.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 262, Percent: 0.86
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 48 Percent: 15.48
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 2

2.1.2.21 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_3)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_3
Original tag: cab_party_seats_3
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 241, Percent: 59.21
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 190, Percent: 0.63
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 21.16
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 3

2.1.2.22 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_4)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_4
Original tag: cab_party_seats_4
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 148, Percent: 36.36
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104, Percent: 0.34
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 29.73
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 4

2.1.2.23 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_5)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_5
Original tag: cab_party_seats_5
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 89, Percent: 21.87
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 65, Percent: 0.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24 Percent: 26.97
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 5

2.1.2.24 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_6)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_6
Original tag: cab_party_seats_6
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 7.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 0.07
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 34.38
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 6

2.1.2.25 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_7)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_7
Original tag: cab_party_seats_7
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 3.19
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 46.15
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 7

2.1.2.26 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_8)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_8
Original tag: cab_party_seats_8
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.98
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 50
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 8

2.1.2.27 Party Seats (cab_party_seats_9)

Long tag: hdata_cab_cab_party_seats_9
Original tag: cab_party_seats_9
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2023)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.49
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Party seats lower chamber Party 9

2.2 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset

Dataset tag: hdata_fomin

Output Unit: H-DATA Minister-Year, i.e., data is collected per foreign minister and the date they got into office. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one minister in combination with a date, using the columns foreignminister and date_in. The date_in column does nor exist in the original dataset but is a concatenation of the columns fminyear, fminmonth and fminday. Several other columns, such as date_out, country_name, etc. are added to the unit table in order to aggregate and later translate to other Output Units.

Description: For their article "War, Performance, and the Survival of Foreign Ministers", Hanna Bäck, Jan Teorell, Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar and Alejandro Quiroz Flores created The Foreign

Minister Dataset. The Foreign Minister Dataset consists of comparative historical data on foreign ministers' background and reasons for leaving office in the world's 13 former and current great powers from 1789 to the present. The data covers 1155 regular (non-acting) foreign ministers, as well as partial information on 173 acting foreign ministers, for the following 13 great powers: Austria (the Habsburg Empire/Austria-Hungary), Britain, China (Qing Empire/Republic/People's Republic of China), France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Prussia/Germany, the Ottoman Empire/Turkey, Russia, Spain, Sweden and the United States.

Dataset citiation: When using this dataset, please cite the following paper:

Hanna Bäck, Jan Teorell, Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar, Alejandro Quiroz Flores, War, Performance, and the Survival of Foreign Ministers, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Volume 17, Issue 2, April 2021, oraa024, `https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/oraa024`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data/datasets-1.610144`

2.2.1 Political Background

Variables providing information on the political background of the foreign minister.

2.2.1.1 Politics: Party (party)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_party

Original tag: party

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2583, Percent: 8.52

Description:

Was the FM acting as member of a party?
1. No
2. Yes

2.2.1.2 Politics: Party Name (party_name)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_party_name

Original tag: party_name

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2612, Percent: 8.61

Description:

Free text the name of the political party. In English where available, otherwise in original language. If party=1, enter 9999.

2.2.1.3 Politics: Party Lead (party_lead)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_party_lead

Original tag: party_lead

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:

Did the FM hold a leading position or special mandate on a national level within a political party?

1. No
2. Yes

2.2.1.4 Politics: Interest organizations (org_connections)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_org_connections

Original tag: org_connections

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:

Did the FM hold office within any interest organisations other than political parties (such as trade unions or business organisations) prior to appointment?

1. No
2. Yes

2.2.2 Position

These variables give information on the position of the foreign minister.

2.2.2.1 Reason out (reason_out)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_reason_out

Original tag: Reason_out

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2583, Percent: 8.52

Description:

When exiting by regular procedures (when manner_out is coded 1, otherwise this variable should be coded 9999), why did the FM leave the post as FM?

1. End of government/party leaves government:

11. End of constitutionally mandated term/elections

12. Other reason for end of government (e.g. new PM/change in party composition)

13. Party of minister leaves government

2. Forced resignation (removed by head of government or similar) primarily due to:

21. Political scandal

22. Policy disagreement between minister and premier/PM

23. Policy disagreement between minister and monarch/president

24. Policy disagreement between minister and own party/other minister

25. Personal/departmental error or low personal performance

26. Move to other post within cabinet (individual move of the FM to another post)

27. Move to another post within cabinet in the general context of a reshuffle

28. Loss of eligibility for the post

29. Other reason

3. Unforced resignation primarily due to:

31. Move to alternative (high) position outside of cabinet

32. Other reason (e.g. voluntary retirement, not due to ill health)

2.3 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789)

Dataset tag: hdata_plt

Output Unit: H-DATA Leader-Date, i.e., data is collected per leader and the day they got into power.

Description:
Timespan: 1789-2022
Coverage: 10,662 leader spells in 186 countries
The Leader Survival Dataset is the post-1789 part of the "Political Leaders through Time" (PLT) dataset, and provides data on entry and exit dates, type of leader position held, biographical background information, as well as appointment and exit reasons for 10,662 individual leaders in 186 countries (or territories) from 1789-2022. The dataset was used by Per Andersson Jan Teorell in their article "The Double-Edged Sword: How State Capacity Prolongs Autocratic Tenure but Hastens Democratization".

Dataset citation:
Gerring John, Nong Xin, Chatterton Ben, Cojocaru Lee, Dalli Cem Mert, Knutsen Carl Henrik, Kokkonen Andrej, Smith Daniel Steven, Teorell Jan, Selsky Sam, Ward Daisy, Jeon Ji Yeon. "Leader Tenure through the Ages: The Growth of Constraints." Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin, 2024.

Link to original codebook:
`https://www.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.803891.1740574267!/menu/standard/file/Codebook%20Leader%20Survival%20Data_last%20update%2020250225.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data/datasets-1.610144`

2.3.1 Leadership Variables

This set of variables describes each leader, or in some cases an interregnum between leaders. A leader is defined loosely as someone who occupies a position at or near the apex of political power in a territory. Separate observations (rows) for the same leader are required if that person's status changes along one of these dimensions: (a) Office type, (b) Office typology, or (c) Spell (dates of entry and exit). If a leader occupies the same office sequentially it is understood as the same spell and hence does not require a new observation.

2.3.1.1 Partisan (partisan)

Long tag: hdata_plt_partisan

Original tag: partisan

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9819, Percent: 92.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22871, Percent: 75.4

Description:

Question: Is the leader affiliated with a political party?
Clarification: A political party refers to an official party or faction that was wellknown to political observers at the time. Members caucused together, shared political views, and in other ways sought to advance their cause. This does not mean that there was a mass base or even elections. It is simply a political affiliation. You may assume that if there were no parties in a polity the leader is nonpartisan. Do not answer this question if it is not clear, i.e., if data is missing or ambiguous. There should be a recognized name for the party/faction.
0: No (nonpartisan)
1: Yes (partisan)
Sources: Worldstatesmen.

2.3.1.2 Party name (partyname)

Long tag: hdata_plt_partyname

Original tag: partyname

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10622, Percent: 100

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24373, Percent: 80.36

Description:

Question: What party or faction is the leader affiliated with (if any)?
[text]
Sources: Worldstatesmen.

2.3.1.3 Appointment in practice (multiple selection) (appointmentinpracticemultipl)

Long tag: hdata_plt_appointmentinpracticemultipl

Original tag: appointmentinpracticemultipl

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10622, Percent: 100

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24373, Percent: 80.36

Description:

Question: How did the leader reach office?
Clarification: If several bodies were involved in the appointment process, select each one. Response category 9 should only be selected if the head of state is directly elected, not if he or she was appointed by the legislature after an election.
0: Through the threat of or application of force, such as a coup or rebellion
1: Appointed by a foreign power or any non-domestic organization (i.e. trading company, UN Representation)
2: Appointed by the ruling party (in a one-party system)
3: Appointed by a royal council (either members of the royal family or conclave of aristocrats)
4: Through hereditary succession including those who inherit office following the death of their spouse
5: Appointed by the military
6: Appointed by the legislature
7: Appointed by the head of state

8: Appointed by the head of government
9: Directly through a popular election (regardless of the extension of the suffrage)
10: Other (including conclave of clergy, by marriage)
Sources: Various country-specific sources

2.3.1.4 Appointment in practice (single selection) (appointmentinpracticesingle)

Long tag: hdata_plt_appointmentinpracticesingle

Original tag: appointmentinpracticesingle

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10596, Percent: 99.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24316, Percent: 80.17

Description:

Question: How did the leader reach office?
Clarification: If several bodies were involved in the appointment process, select the one that exerted the most critical impact on the decision. However, in the next question we ask separately about whether the approval of the legislature was necessary. Response category 9 should only be selected if the leader was directly elected, not if he or she was appointed by the legislature after an election.
0: Through the threat of or application of force, such as a coup or rebellion
1: Appointed by a foreign power
2: Appointed by the ruling party (in a one-party system)
3: Appointed by a royal council (either members of the royal family or conclave of aristocrats)
4: Through hereditary succession
5: Appointed by the military
6: Appointed by the legislature
7: Appointed by the head of state
8: Appointed by the head of government
9: Directly through a popular election (regardless of the extension of the suffrage).
10: Other (including clerical bodies such as the College of Cardinals)
Sources: Various country-specific sources
Ordering: If you select 10, proceed to the next question [v2exothhs]. If you select 6, skip question "Leader selection by legislature in practice [v2exaphos]".

3 QOG

The **Quality of Government (QoG)** Institute was founded in 2004 by Professor Bo Rothstein and Professor Sören Holmberg. It is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. QoG is comprised of about 30 researchers who conduct and promote research on the causes, consequences and nature of Good Governance and the Quality of Government (QoG) - that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted and competent government institutions. QoG's award-winning datasets focus on concepts related to quality of government, transparency, and public administration. The main objective of QoG's research is to address the theoretical and empirical problem of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained. A second objective is to study the effects of Quality of Government on a number of policy areas, such as health, the environment, social policy, and poverty. The QoG datasets draw on a number of freely available datasources. More information on how the variables are complied for different QoG datasets can be found in the respective QoG codebooks available on their website. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government`

3.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset

Dataset tag: qog_ei

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset (QoG-EI) is a compilation of major freely available indicators measuring environmental performance of countries over time.

Dataset citation: Povitkina, Marina, Natalia Alvarado Pachon Cem Mert Dalli. 2021. The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset, version Sep21. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_ei_sept21_august2023.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/environmental-indicators-dataset`

3.1.1 V-Party Dataset

Dataset by: Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project V-Party provides expert-coded assessments of party organization and identity for most parties in most countries over 1970-2019. Using V-Dem methodology (Coppedge et al., 2020), in January 2020, 665 experts rated the policy positions and organizational capacity of political parties across elections in a given country. Specifically, as a general rule, experts coded data for all parties that reached more than 5Link to the original source:

`https://www.v-dem.net/en/data/data/v-party-dataset/`

3.1.1.1 Environmental parties: share of seats (vparty_envseat)

Long tag: qog_ei_vparty_envseat

Original tag: vparty_envseat

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187, Percent: 0.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 5.56

Description:

> The variable measures the share of seats in the lower chamber taken by the parties, for which environmental protection is relevant to gain and keep voters, as agreed on by at least half of the coders in the V-Party dataset.

The original variable from V-Party dataset - v2pasalie - measures the share of coders who answered '12: Environmental protection' to the multiple-choice question 'Which of the following issues are most relevant for the party's effort to gain and keep voters?'. We only keep parties that score 0.5 or higher on variable v2pasalie_12 and then calculate their share of seats in a given country-year using v2paseatshare variable - Seat share the party gained in the election to the lower chamber.

3.1.1.2 Environmental parties: share of votes (vparty_envvote)

Long tag: qog_ei_vparty_envvote

Original tag: vparty_envvote

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187, Percent: 0.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 5.56

Description:

> The variable measures the share of votes to the lower chamber received by the parties, for which environmental protection is relevant to gain and keep voters, as agreed on by at least half of the coders in the V-Party dataset.

The original variable from V-Party dataset - v2pasalie - reports the share of coders who answered '12: Environmental protection' to the multiple-choice question 'Which of the following issues are most relevant for the party's effort to gain and keep voters?'. We only keep parties that score 0.5 or higher on variable v2pasalie_12 and then calculate their share of votes in a given country-year using v2pavote variable - Vote share the party gained in the election to the lower chamber.

3.2 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series

Dataset tag: qog_std_ts

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The QoG Standard dataset is our largest dataset. It consists of approximately 2100 variables from more than 100 data sources related to Quality of Government. In the QoG Standard TS dataset, data from 1946 to 2024 is included and the unit of analysis is country-year (e.g.,

Sweden-1946, Sweden-1947, etc.).

Dataset citation: Teorell, Jan, Aksel Sundström, Sören Holmberg, Bo Rothstein, Natalia Alvarado Pachon, Cem Mert Dalli, Rafael Lopez Valverde, Victor Saidi Phiri Lauren Gerber. 2025. The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan24`

QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_std_jan25.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/standard-dataset`

3.2.1 Media

This category includes indicators on the freedom of the media in a given country (freedom of the press, regulation of the media) as well as the public access and confidence in the media.

3.2.1.1 Practice: candidates/pol. parties have fair access to state-owned media outlets (aii_q23)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q23

Original tag: aii_q23

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 23. In practice, candidates/political parties have equitable access to state-owned media outlets.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) candidates/political parties have equal access to and receive fair treatment in state-owned media outlets,

2) access is equal in both news reports and editorial commentary, and

3) candidates/political parties are offered the same rates for campaign advertising.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) some candidates/political parties occasionally have more access to and receive better treatment in state-owned media outlets,

2) access is occasionally unequal in either news reports or editorial commentary, or

3) occasionally a candidate/political party is offered better rates for campaign advertising.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) some candidates/political parties usually have more access to and/or receive better treatment in state-owned media outlets,

2) access is usually unequal in both news reports or editorial commentary, or

3) some candidates/political parties are usually offered better rates for campaign advertising.

3.2.2 Political Parties and Elections

This category includes variables describing various aspects of the legislature and political parties in the legislature (number of seats) as well as variables related to the election for the executive and variables on the outcomes of elections.

3.2.2.1 Law: political parties are required to disclose public donations (Gov. funds) (aii_q48)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q48

Original tag: aii_q48

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 48. In law, political parties are required to regularly disclose public donations (funds sourced from the government).

A 100 score is earned where a law requires political parties to publish all public contributions.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists.

3.2.2.2 Practice: pol. parties disclose public donations and these are available to the public (aii_q49)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q49

Original tag: aii_q49

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 49. In practice, political parties regularly disclose public donations (funds that are sourced from the government) and the disclosures are easily available to the public.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) political parties disclose public donations within a month of received, and

2) they are easily available online or at the cost of photocopy.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) political parties don't always disclose public donations or disclose them more than a month of received, or

2) disclosures are not available online or the cost of paper versions is higher than photocopying.

A 0 score is earned where political parties rarely disclose public donations.

3.2.2.3 Law: political parties are required to disclose private donations (aii_q50)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q50

Original tag: aii_q50

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 50. In law, political parties are required to regularly disclose private donations.

A 100 score is earned where the law requires political parties to publish all private contributions.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists.

3.2.2.4 Practice: pol. parties disclose private donations and it is available to the public (aii_q51)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q51

Original tag: aii_q51

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 51. In practice, political parties regularly disclose private donations and the disclosures are easily available to the public.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) political parties disclose private donations within a one month of received, and

2) they are easily available online or at the cost of photocopy.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) political parties don't always disclose private donations or disclose them more than a month of received, or

2) disclosures are not available online or the cost of paper versions is higher than photocopying.

A 0 score is earned where political parties rarely disclose private donations.

3.2.2.5 Whether an election was postponed (br_elecpost)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_elecpost

Original tag: br_elecpost

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11660, Percent: 91.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10448, Percent: 34.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1212 Percent: 10.39

Description:

Whether an election at the Parliament held that year was postponed from an earlier date (0: No, 1: Yes)

3.2.2.6 Whether an election was held during the year (br_elecyear)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_elecyear

Original tag: br_elecyear

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11660, Percent: 91.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10448, Percent: 34.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1212 Percent: 10.39

Description:

Whether an election at the Parliament was held that year (0: No, 1: Yes)

3.2.2.7 Does the country have proportional voting (br_pvote)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_pvote

Original tag: br_pvote

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10348, Percent: 81.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9230, Percent: 30.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1118 Percent: 10.8

Description:

Is the electoral system characterized by including proportional representation? (0: No 1: Yes)

3.2.2.8 Full suffrage (br_suff)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_suff

Original tag: br_suff

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11657, Percent: 91.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10446, Percent: 34.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1211 Percent: 10.39

Description:
Whether the electoral system attributes full suffrage (0: No 1: Yes)

3.2.2.9 Free and Fair Elections (bti_ffe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ffe

Original tag: bti_ffe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:
To what extent are political representatives determined by general, free and fair elections? From 1 to 10.

1. There are no elections on free and fair elections.

4. General, multi-party elections are held, conducted properly and accepted as the means of filling political posts. However, there are some constraints on the fairness of the elections with regard to registration, campaigning or media access.

7. General elections are held, but serious irregularities during the voting process and ballot count occur. The rights to vote, campaign, and run for office are restricted, and elections have de facto only limited influence over who governs.

10. National elections, if held at all, are entirely unfree and unfair.

3.2.2.10 Contestation (standardized version) (cam_contest)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cam_contest

Original tag: cam_contest

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7015, Percent: 55.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6189, Percent: 20.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 826 Percent: 11.77

Description:
Contestation standardized to be comparable across years.

3.2.2.11 Inclusiveness (standardized version) (cam_inclusive)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cam_inclusive

Original tag: cam_inclusive

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7015, Percent: 55.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6189, Percent: 20.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 826 Percent: 11.77

Description:

Inclusiveness standardized to be comparable across years.

3.2.2.12 Electoral Self-Determination (ciri_elecsd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_elecsd

Original tag: ciri_elecsd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6974, Percent: 54.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6316, Percent: 20.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 658 Percent: 9.44

Description:

The right of citizens to freely determine their own political system and leadership is known as the right to self-determination. Enjoyment of this right means that citizens have both the legal right and the ability in practice to change the laws and officials that govern them through periodic, free, and fair elections held on the basis of universal adult suffrage. To what extent do citizens have freedom of political choice and have the legal right and ability in practice to change the laws and officials that govern them?

Scoring Scheme:

The right of citizens to change their government through free and fair elections is:

(0) Not respected (neither free nor fair elections)

(1) Limited (moderately free and fair elections)

(2) Generally respected (very free and fair elections)

3.2.2.13 Number of changes in government per year (cpds_chg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_chg

Original tag: cpds_chg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1853, Percent: 14.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1853, Percent: 6.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of changes in government per year [termination of government due to (a) elections, (b) voluntary resignation of the Prime Minister, (c) resignation of Prime Minister due to health reasons, (d) dissension within government (break up of the coalition), (e) lack of parliamentary support, (f) intervention by the head of state, or (g) broadening of the coalition (inclusion of new parties).

3.2.2.14 Effective number of parties on the seats level (cpds_enps)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_enps

Original tag: cpds_enps

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Effective number of parties on the seats level according to the formula proposed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979).

3.2.2.15 Effective number of parties on the votes level (cpds_enpv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_enpv

Original tag: cpds_enpv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Effective number of parties on the votes level according to the formula proposed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979).

3.2.2.16 Electoral fractionalization of the party system (Rae index) (cpds_frel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_frel

Original tag: cpds_frel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Index of electoral fractionalization of the party system according to the formula proposed by Rae (1968). The index can take values between 1 (maximal fractionalization) and 0 (minimal fractionalization).

3.2.2.17 Legislative fractionalization of the party system (Rae index) (cpds_frleg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_frleg

Original tag: cpds_frleg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Index of legislative fractionalization of the party system according to the formula proposed by Rae (1968). The index can take values between 1 (maximal fractionalization) and 0 (minimal fractionalization).

3.2.2.18 Cabinet composition (Schmidt index) (cpds_govlr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_govlr

Original tag: cpds_govlr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1852, Percent: 14.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1852, Percent: 6.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Cabinet composition (Schmidt-Index):

1. Hegemony of right-wing (and centre) parties.
2. Dominance of right-wing (and centre) parties.
3. Balance of power between left and right.
4. Dominance of social-democratic and other left parties.
5. Hegemony of social-democratic and other left parties.

3.2.2.19 Government support (seat share of all parties in government) (cpds_govsup)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_govsup

Original tag: cpds_govsup

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1853, Percent: 14.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1853, Percent: 6.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Total government support: seat share of all parties in government. Weighted by the numbers of days in office in a given year.

3.2.2.20 Share of seats in parliament: agrarian (cpds_la)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_la

Original tag: cpds_la

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as agrarian.

3.2.2.21 Share of seats in parliament: electoral alliance (cpds_lall)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lall

Original tag: cpds_lall

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as electoral alliance.

3.2.2.22 Share of seats in parliament: communist (cpds_lcom)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lcom

Original tag: cpds_lcom

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as communist.

3.2.2.23 Share of seats in parliament: conservative (cpds_lcon)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lcon

Original tag: cpds_lcon

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as conservative.

3.2.2.24 Share of seats in parliament: ethnic (cpds_le)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_le

Original tag: cpds_le

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as ethnic.

3.2.2.25 Share of seats in parliament: feminist (cpds_lfe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lfe

Original tag: cpds_lfe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as feminist.

3.2.2.26 Share of seats in parliament: green (cpds_lg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lg

Original tag: cpds_lg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as green.

3.2.2.27 Share of seats in parliament: liberal (cpds_ll)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_ll

Original tag: cpds_ll

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as liberal.

3.2.2.28 Share of seats in parliament: left-socialist (cpds_lls)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lls

Original tag: cpds_lls

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as left-socialist.

3.2.2.29 Share of seats in parliament: monarchist (cpds_lmo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lmo

Original tag: cpds_lmo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as monarchist.

3.2.2.30 Share of seats in parliament: non-labelled (cpds_lnl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lnl

Original tag: cpds_lnl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as non-labelled.

3.2.2.31 Share of seats in parliament: other (cpds_lo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lo

Original tag: cpds_lo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as other.

3.2.2.32 Share of seats in parliament: protest (cpds_lp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lp

Original tag: cpds_lp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as protest.

3.2.2.33 Share of seats in parliament: post-communist (cpds_lpc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lpc

Original tag: cpds_lpc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as post-communist.

3.2.2.34 Share of seats in parliament: pensioners (cpds_lpen)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lpen

Original tag: cpds_lpen

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as pensioners.

3.2.2.35 Share of seats in parliament: personalist (cpds_lper)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lper

Original tag: cpds_lper

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as personalist.

3.2.2.36 Share of seats in parliament: right (cpds_lr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lr

Original tag: cpds_lr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as right.

3.2.2.37 Share of seats in parliament: regionalist (cpds_lreg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lreg

Original tag: cpds_lreg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as regionalist.

3.2.2.38 Share of seats in parliament: religious (cpds_lrel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_lrel

Original tag: cpds_lrel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as religious.

3.2.2.39 Share of seats in parliament: social democratic (cpds_ls)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_ls

Original tag: cpds_ls

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of seats in parliament for the political parties classified as social democratic.

3.2.2.40 Type of Government (cpds_tg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_tg

Original tag: cpds_tg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1851, Percent: 14.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1851, Percent: 6.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Type of government based on the following classification:

1. Single-party majority government: One party takes all government seats and has a parliamentary majority.

2. Minimal winning coalition: All participating parties are necessary to form a majority government [gt;50.0percent].

3. Surplus coalition: Coalition governments that exceed the minimal-winning criterion [gt;50.0percent].

4. Single-party minority government: The party in government does not possess a majority in Parliament [lt;50.0percent].

5. Multi-party minority government: The parties in government do not possess a majority in Parliament [lt;50.0percent].

6. Caretaker government: Governments that should simply maintain the status quo.

7. Technocratic government: Led by a technocratic prime minister, consists of a majority of technocratic ministers and is in possession of a mandate to change the status quo.

3.2.2.41 Share of votes: agrarian (cpds_va)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_va

Original tag: cpds_va

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as agrarian.

3.2.2.42 Share of votes: electoral alliance (cpds_vall)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vall

Original tag: cpds_vall

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as electoral alliance.

3.2.2.43 Share of votes: communist (cpds_vcom)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vcom

Original tag: cpds_vcom

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as communist.

3.2.2.44 Share of votes: conservative (cpds_vcon)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vcon

Original tag: cpds_vcon

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of votes of the political parties classified as conservative.

3.2.2.45 Share of votes: ethnic (cpds_ve)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_ve

Original tag: cpds_ve

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of votes of the political parties classified as ethnic.

3.2.2.46 Share of votes: feminist (cpds_vfe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vfe

Original tag: cpds_vfe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of votes of the political parties classified as feminist.

3.2.2.47 Share of votes: green (cpds_vg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vg

Original tag: cpds_vg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Share of votes of the political parties classified as green.

3.2.2.48 Share of votes: liberal (cpds_vl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vl

Original tag: cpds_vl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as liberal.

3.2.2.49 Share of votes: left-socialist (cpds_vls)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vls

Original tag: cpds_vls

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as left-socialist.

3.2.2.50 Share of votes: monarchist (cpds_vmo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vmo

Original tag: cpds_vmo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as monarchist.

3.2.2.51 Share of votes: non-labelled (cpds_vnl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vnl

Original tag: cpds_vnl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as non-labelled.

3.2.2.52 Share of votes: other (cpds_vo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vo

Original tag: cpds_vo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as other.

3.2.2.53 Share of votes: protest (cpds_vp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vp

Original tag: cpds_vp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as protest.

3.2.2.54 Share of votes: post-communist (cpds_vpcom)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vpcom

Original tag: cpds_vpcom

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as post-communist.

3.2.2.55 Share of votes: pensioners (cpds_vpen)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vpen

Original tag: cpds_vpen

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as pensioners.

3.2.2.56 Share of votes: personalist (cpds_vper)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vper

Original tag: cpds_vper

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as personalist.

3.2.2.57 Share of votes: right (cpds_vr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vr

Original tag: cpds_vr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as right.

3.2.2.58 Share of votes: regionalist (cpds_vreg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vreg

Original tag: cpds_vreg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as regionalist.

3.2.2.59 Share of votes: religious (cpds_vrel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vrel

Original tag: cpds_vrel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as religious.

3.2.2.60 Share of votes: social democratic (cpds_vs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vs

Original tag: cpds_vs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 14.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1864, Percent: 6.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of votes of the political parties classified as social democratic.

3.2.2.61 Voter turnout in election (cpds_vt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cpds_vt

Original tag: cpds_vt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Armingeon, Engler, Leeman & Weisstanner (2024), Armingeon, Engler, Leemann & Weisstanner (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 14.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1857, Percent: 6.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Voter turnout in election.

3.2.2.62 Electoral Volatility - Parties above 1percent (dev_altv1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dev_altv1

Original tag: dev_altv1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 2.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility caused by vote switching between existing parties, namely parties receiving at least 1percent of the national share in both elections under scrutiny.

3.2.2.63 Electoral Volatility - Parties below 1percent (dev_othv1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dev_othv1

Original tag: dev_othv1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 2.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility caused by vote switching between parties falling below 1percent of the national share in both the elections at time t and t+1. It is important to clarify that this category is not computed by aggregating the scores of each party falling below 1percent and

then comparing the overall sum at time t and t+1. Conversely, each party's volatility is counted separately - up to a specification of 0.1percent - and then added to the calculation of dev_othv. This choice has been made to avoid underestimation of Total Volatility but at the same time to maintain a distinction between parties above 1percent and parties below 1percent for the calculation of the two components of dev_regv and dev_altv.

3.2.2.64 Electoral Volatility - Parties entering/exiting party system (dev_regv1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dev_regv1

Original tag: dev_regv1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 2.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility caused by vote switching between parties that enter or exit from the party system. A party is considered as entering the party system where it receives at least 1percent of the national share in election at time t+1 (while it received less than 1percent in election at time t). Conversely, a party is considered as exiting the part system where it receives less than 1percent in election at time t+1 (while it received at least 1percent in election at time t).

3.2.2.65 Electoral Volatility - Total (dev_tv1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dev_tv1

Original tag: dev_tv1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 2.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 378, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Total electoral volatility in the party system, given by the sum of the previous measures: dev_regv + dev_altv + dev_othv = dev_tv.

3.2.2.66 Trust in Parliament (ess_trparl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ess_trparl

Original tag: ess_trparl

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 2.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 0.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. The Parliament.

3.2.2.67 Trust in Political Parties (ess_trpart)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ess_trpart

Original tag: ess_trpart

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 2.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 0.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. The Political Parties.

3.2.2.68 Trust in Politicians (ess_trpolit)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ess_trpolit

Original tag: ess_trpolit

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 2.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 258, Percent: 0.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. The Politicians.

3.2.2.69 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties above 1percent (evep_altv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_altv

Original tag: evep_altv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 1.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 0.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility in the European Parliament, caused by vote switching between parties that enter or exit from the party system caused by vote switching between existing parties, namely parties receiving at least 1percent of the national share in both elections under scrutiny.

3.2.2.70 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Class Bloc (EP) (evep_classbloc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_classbloc

Original tag: evep_classbloc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 145, Percent: 1.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 145, Percent: 0.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Net change in the aggregate vote share for all parties included in the Class Bloc. For the definition of the class bloc and the identification of parties included in such bloc, the author relies on Bartolini and Mair (1990) and Bartolini (1983; 2000). This includes 'those parties which are the historical product of the structuring of the working-class movement' (Bartolini and Mair 1990 [2007], 46). Full list of parties in the class bloc can be found in the original codebook.

3.2.2.71 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Demarcation Bloc (EP) (evep_dembloc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_dembloc

Original tag: evep_dembloc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 0.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 0.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Net change in the aggregate vote share for all parties included in the Demarcation Bloc. Those political parties that defend anti-EU, anti-immigration and economically protectionist policies are included in the demarcation bloc. Full list of parties in the demarcation bloc can be found in the original codebook.

3.2.2.72 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties below 1percent (evep_othv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_othv

Original tag: evep_othv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 1.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 0.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility in the European Parliament, caused by vote switching between parties falling below 1percent of the national share in both the elections at time t and t+1. It is important to clarify that this category is not computed by aggregating the scores of each party falling below 1percent and then comparing the overall sum at time t and t+1. Conversely, each party's volatility is counted separately - up to a specification of 0.1percent - and then added to the calculation of evep_othv. This choice has been made to avoid underestimation of Total Volatility but at the same time to maintain a distinction between parties above 1percent and parties below 1percent for the calculation of the two components of evep_regv and evep_altv.

3.2.2.73 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Parties entering/exiting party system (evep_regv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_regv

Original tag: evep_regv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 1.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 0.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Electoral volatility in the European Parliament, caused by vote switching between parties that enter or exit from the party system. A party is considered as entering the party system where it receives at least 1percent of the national share in election at time t+1 (while it received less than 1percent in election at time t). Conversely, a party is considered as exiting the part system where it receives less than 1percent in election at time t+1 (while it received at least 1percent in election at time t).

3.2.2.74 Electoral Volatility in the EP - Total (evep_tv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_tv

Original tag: evep_tv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 1.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 0.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Total electoral volatility in the party system, given by the sum of the previous measures: evep_regv + evep_altv + evep_othv = evep_tv.

3.2.2.75 Electoral Process (fh_ep)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_ep

Original tag: fh_ep

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Electoral Process - The variable measures to what extent the national legislative representatives and the national chief authority are elected through free and fair elections. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

3.2.2.76 Average District Magnitude (gol_adm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_adm

Original tag: gol_adm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6480, Percent: 50.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5712, Percent: 18.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.85

Description:

Average district magnitude in an electoral tier. This is calculated as the total number of seats allocated in an electoral tier divided by the total number of districts in that tier.

3.2.2.77 Districts (gol_dist)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_dist

Original tag: gol_dist

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6509, Percent: 51.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5741, Percent: 18.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.8

Description:

This is the number of electoral districts or constituencies in an electoral tier.

3.2.2.78 Effective Number of Electoral Parties (gol_enep)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enep

Original tag: gol_enep

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6091, Percent: 47.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5510, Percent: 18.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 581 Percent: 9.54

Description:

Effective number of electoral parties.

3.2.2.79 Effective Number of Electoral Parties 1 (gol_enep1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enep1

Original tag: gol_enep1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6073, Percent: 47.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5496, Percent: 18.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577 Percent: 9.5

Description:

The effective number of electoral parties once the "other" category has been "corrected" by using the least component method of bounds.

3.2.2.80 Effective Number of Electoral Parties (Others) (gol_enepo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enepo

Original tag: gol_enepo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6077, Percent: 47.8

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5496, Percent: 18.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 581 Percent: 9.56

Description:

The percentage of the vote going to parties that are collectively known as "others" in official election results.

3.2.2.81 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties (gol_enpp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enpp

Original tag: gol_enpp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6423, Percent: 50.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5807, Percent: 19.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 616 Percent: 9.59

Description:

The effective number of parliamentary (legislative) parties.

3.2.2.82 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties, other corrected (gol_enpp1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enpp1

Original tag: gol_enpp1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6332, Percent: 49.8

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5720, Percent: 18.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 612 Percent: 9.67

Description:

This is the effective number of parliamentary (legislative) parties once the "other" category has been "corrected" by using the least component method of bounds.

3.2.2.83 Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties (Others) (gol_enppo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enppo

Original tag: gol_enppo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6336, Percent: 49.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5720, Percent: 18.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 616 Percent: 9.72

Description:

The percentage of seats won by parties that are collectively known as "others" in official election results.

3.2.2.84 Effective Number of Presidential Candidates (gol_enpres)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_enpres

Original tag: gol_enpres

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3183, Percent: 25.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3066, Percent: 10.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 117 Percent: 3.68

Description:

The effective number of presidential candidates.

3.2.2.85 Electoral System Type-3 classes (gol_est)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_est

Original tag: gol_est

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6605, Percent: 51.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5837, Percent: 19.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.63

Description:

This is a categorical variable that takes on one of three values indicating the basic type of electoral system used in the elections.

1. Majoritarian
2. Proportional
3. Mixed

3.2.2.86 Electoral System Type-12 classes (gol_est_spec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_est_spec

Original tag: gol_est_spec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6611, Percent: 52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5843, Percent: 19.26

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.62

Description:
This is a categorical variable that provides a more detailed indication of the type of electoral system used in the election.

1. Single-Member-District-Plurality (SMDP)
2. Two-Round System (TRS)
3. Alternative Vote (AV)
4. Borda Count (BC)
5. Block Vote (BV)
6. Party Block Vote (PBV)
7. Limited Vote (LV)
8. Single Nontransferable Vote (SNTV)
9. List Proportional Representation (List PR)
10. Single Transferable Vote (STV)
11. Mixed Dependent (or Mixed Member Proportional)
12. Mixed Independent (or Mixed Parallel)

3.2.2.87 Institution (gol_inst)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_inst
Original tag: gol_inst
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6637, Percent: 52.2
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5867, Percent: 19.34
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 770 Percent: 11.6
Description:
This is a categorical variable indicating a country's regime type at the end of a given year. The data for this variable come from Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010), which we updated through 2011.

0. Parliamentary democracy

1. Semi-presidential democracy

2. Presidential democracy

3. Civilian dictatorship

4. Military dictatorship

5. Royal dictatorship

Not all elections that occur when a regime is classified as a dictatorship (regime = 4-6) are dictatorial. This apparent anomaly has to do with the fact that a country's regime type is coded based on its status at the end of a given year. Elections like those in Argentina 1962, Nicaragua 1983, Philippines 1965, and Thailand 1976 all preceded a democratic collapse in the same year. Although these countries are considered dictatorial at the end of these years, we code these particular elections as democratic and therefore include them in our data set. We should note that we code the 1997 elections in Kenya, the 1999 elections in Guinea Bissau, the 2005 elections in Liberia, the 2006 elections in Mauritania, and the 2008 elections in Bangladesh as democratic even though Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010) do not code these countries as democratic until the following year. The reason for this is that these elections are the primary reason cited by Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010) for their eventual recoding of these countries as democratic. As an example, Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland (2010) do not code Liberia as democratic until 2006 despite the fact that presidential elections took place in October 2005, because the winner of these elections, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, did not officially take office until January 2006. The bottom line is that there are a few observations in our data set of democratic elections where regime indicates that the country was a dictatorship by the end of the year.

3.2.2.88 Mixed Type (gol_mix)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_mix

Original tag: gol_mix

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1147, Percent: 9.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1078, Percent: 3.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69 Percent: 6.02

Description:

This is a categorical variable that indicates the precise type of mixed electoral system that is being used.

1. Coexistence

2. Superposition

3. Fusion

4. Correction

5. Conditional

3.2.2.89 Multi-Tier Type (gol_mt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_mt

Original tag: gol_mt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6365, Percent: 50.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5657, Percent: 18.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 708 Percent: 11.12

Description:

This is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether different electoral tiers are linked (1) or not (0). Electoral tiers are linked if the unused votes from one electoral tier are used to allocate seats in another electoral tier, or if the allocation of seats in one electoral tier is conditional on the seats received in a different electoral tier.

3.2.2.90 Number of Seats (gol_nos)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_nos

Original tag: gol_nos

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6582, Percent: 51.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5814, Percent: 19.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.67

Description:

This indicates the total number of seats in the lower house of the national legislature.

3.2.2.91 Presidential Electoral System Type (gol_pest)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_pest

Original tag: gol_pest

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3131, Percent: 24.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3013, Percent: 9.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 118 Percent: 3.77

Description:

This is a categorical variable that indicates the electoral formula used in the presidential election.

1. Plurality

2. Absolute Majority

3. Qualified Majority

4. Electoral College

5. Alternative Vote

3.2.2.92 Electoral Formula used in an Electoral Tier (gol_pr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_pr

Original tag: gol_pr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6593, Percent: 51.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5825, Percent: 19.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 768 Percent: 11.65

Description:

This is a categorical variable that indicates the precise electoral formula used in an electoral tier.

1. Single-Member-District-Plurality (SMDP)

2. Two Round Majority-Plurality

3. Two Round Qualified Majority

4. Two Round Majority Runoff

5. Alternative Vote (AV)

6. Borda Count (BC)

7. Modified Borda Count (mBC)

8. Block Vote (BV)

9. Party Block Vote (PBV)

10. Limited Vote (LV)

11. Single Nontransferable Vote (SNTV)

12. Hare quota

13. Hare quota with largest remainders

14. Hare quota with highest average remainders

15. Hagenbach-Bischoff quota

16. Hagenbach-Bischoff quota with largest remainders

17. Hagenbach-Bischoff quota with highest average remainders

18. Droop quota

19. Droop quota with largest remainders

20. Droop quota with highest average remainders

21. Imperiali quota

22. Imperiali quota with largest remainders

23. Imperiali quota with highest average remainders

24. Reinforced Imperiali quota

25. D'Hondt

26. Sainte-Laguë

27. Modified Sainte-Laguë

28. Single Transferable Vote.

Note: Users can find a detailed description of the difference between types in the original codebook.

3.2.2.93 Presidential Election (gol_preel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_preel

Original tag: gol_preel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6637, Percent: 52.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5867, Percent: 19.34

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 770 Percent: 11.6

Description:

This is a dichotomous variable that takes on the value 1 if the election is presidential and 0 if the election is legislative.

3.2.2.94 Upper Seats (gol_upseat)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_upseat

Original tag: gol_upseat

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6383, Percent: 50.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5622, Percent: 18.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 761 Percent: 11.92

Description:

This indicates the number of legislative seats allocated in electoral districts above the lowest electoral tier.

3.2.2.95 Upper Tier (gol_uptier)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gol_uptier

Original tag: gol_uptier

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bormann & Golder (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6134, Percent: 48.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5422, Percent: 17.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 712 Percent: 11.61

Description:

This indicates the percentage of all legislative seats allocated in electoral districts above the lowest electoral tier.

3.2.2.96 Proportional Representation (gtm_pr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtm_pr

Original tag: gtm_pr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gerring et al. (2005)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4374, Percent: 34.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3897, Percent: 12.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 477 Percent: 10.91

Description:

The centripetal theory of democratic governance emphasizes the following three features of an electoral system: (a) district magnitude (M), (b) seat allocation rules (majoritarian or proportional), and (c) candidate selection rules. The centripetal ideal type is defined by

Mgt;1, proportional seat allocation rules, and party-controlled candidate selection. This is the closed-list-PR electoral system. Other systems are ranked lower in this coding according to their deviation from this ideal type. Thus, the coding for the list-PR variable is as follows:

0. Majoritarian or Preferential-vote.

1. Mixed-member majority or Block vote.

2. Closed-list-PR.

3.2.2.97 Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (lower) (h_alignl1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_alignl1

Original tag: h_alignl1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7417, Percent: 58.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6719, Percent: 22.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 698 Percent: 9.41

Description:

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the executive and the lower legislative chamber, coded 1 when the party controlling the executive branch is either the largest party in the lower legislative chamber or is a member of a ruling coalition in that chamber.

3.2.2.98 Alignment Lower/Upper Legislative Chamber (h_alignl1l2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_alignl1l2

Original tag: h_alignl1l2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2909, Percent: 22.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2708, Percent: 8.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 201 Percent: 6.91

Description:

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the legislative chambers, coded 1 when the same party or a coalition of parties (when available) control a majority in both legislative chambers.

3.2.2.99 Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (upper) (h_alignl2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_alignl2

Original tag: h_alignl2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2909, Percent: 22.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2708, Percent: 8.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 201 Percent: 6.91

Description:

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the executive and the upper legislative chamber, coded 1 when the party controlling the executive branch is either the largest party in the upper legislative chamber or is a member of a ruling coalition in that chamber.

3.2.2.100 Legislative Fractionalization (lower) (h_lflo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_lflo

Original tag: h_lflo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9160, Percent: 72.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8187, Percent: 26.99

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 973 Percent: 10.62

Description:

Legislative fractionalization is approximately the probability that two random draws from the lower legislative chamber will be from different parties.

3.2.2.101 Legislative Fractionalization (upper) (h_lfup)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_lfup

Original tag: h_lfup

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2438, Percent: 19.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2285, Percent: 7.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 153 Percent: 6.28

Description:

Legislative fractionalization is approximately the probability that two random draws from the upper legislative chamber will be from different parties.

3.2.2.102 Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in Fractions) (ht_partsz)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ht_partsz

Original tag: ht_partsz

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Teorell & Wahman (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5543, Percent: 43.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5183, Percent: 17.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 360 Percent: 6.49

Description:

Counts the largest parties' number of seats divided by the legislative assemblies' total number of seats expressed in fractions. In countries with a two-chamber parliament, the lower house is counted.

3.2.2.103 Banning of Anti-System Parties (iaep_basp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_basp

Original tag: iaep_basp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6881, Percent: 54.12
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6577, Percent: 21.68
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.42
Description:
Does an anti-system platform determine the banning of parties?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.104 Banned Parties (iaep_bp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_bp
Original tag: iaep_bp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7083, Percent: 55.71
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6772, Percent: 22.33
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 311 Percent: 4.39
Description:
Are there banned parties?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.105 Some other executive have the power to call elections (iaep_callo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_callo
Original tag: iaep_callo
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7329, Percent: 57.65
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7003, Percent: 23.09
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 326 Percent: 4.45
Description:
Does some other executive have the power to call elections?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.106 Ethnicity Based Banning of Parties (iaep_ebbp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ebbp
Original tag: iaep_ebbp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6881, Percent: 54.12
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6577, Percent: 21.68
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.42
Description:
Does ethnic makeup determine the banning of parties?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.107 Election of the Executive (iaep_ee)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ee
Original tag: iaep_ee
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5398, Percent: 42.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5130, Percent: 16.91
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 268 Percent: 4.96
Description:
Is the executive elected by:

1. Directly elected by public vote

2. Elected through legislative action by members of the legislature

3. Chosen through party process strictly by a party

4. Indirect public vote

5. Appointed

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.108 Executive Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_enlc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_enlc
Original tag: iaep_enlc
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6368, Percent: 50.09
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6094, Percent: 20.09
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.3
Description:
Does executive nomination establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.109 Electoral System (iaep_es)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_es

Original tag: iaep_es

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5939, Percent: 46.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5710, Percent: 18.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 229 Percent: 3.86

Description:

What is the type of electoral system for legislative elections?

1. Plurality (First past the post)

2. Majority

3. Proportional representation

4. Mixed systems (combination of PR and either plurality or majority). This option includes situations in which a single chamber contains seats selected by different methods, or situations in which all of the seats in a chamber are chosen with the same method, but each chamber is selected through different methods.

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.110 Electoral System for the Executive (iaep_ese)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ese

Original tag: iaep_ese

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3124, Percent: 24.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2971, Percent: 9.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 153 Percent: 4.9

Description:

Election rules governing the determination of electoral outcomes for the executive: we record data on the electoral requirements for winning executive elections, specifically, the sorts of vote thresholds required for winners. If the executive is appointed or otherwise comes to power via non-electoral processes, we code this as missing.

1. Majority rule (50percent + 1). Where run-offs are held, "majority rule" is selected, as the intention of a run-off election is to have one candidate receive a majority of the votes.

2. Plurality

3. No official, explicit, rule governing the outcome

4. Party leader of majority party/coalition in legislature is automatically selected without additional process

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.111 Independence of Selection of Executive (iaep_ise)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_ise

Original tag: iaep_ise

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6827, Percent: 53.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6535, Percent: 21.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 292 Percent: 4.28

Description:

Is there an executive chosen independently of the legislature (like a president, for example)? If these processes that select the executive are distinct from that which selects the legislature, then the authors consider the two to be independent. The selection processes, moreover, can involve different - albeit competing or complimentary - forms of selection.

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.112 National Elections for an Executive (iaep_nee)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_nee

Original tag: iaep_nee

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7271, Percent: 57.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6945, Percent: 22.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 326 Percent: 4.48

Description:

Does the country hold national elections for an executive? We consider national elections to involve subjecting the executive to some form of popular plebiscite. This electoral process may or may not bear any relationship to the ultimate appointment of the executive. Executive council elections that select an executive are not considered national elections.

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.113 National Elections for the Legislature (iaep_nel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_nel

Original tag: iaep_nel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6841, Percent: 53.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6537, Percent: 21.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.44

Description:

Does the country hold national elections for the legislature We consider national elections to involve subjecting the members of the legislature to some form of popular plebiscite. While seats may be divided into districts, we consider national elections to occur when district-wide elections are organized at the national level.

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.114 No Parties Allowed (iaep_npa)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_npa
Original tag: iaep_npa
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6881, Percent: 54.12
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6577, Percent: 21.68
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.42
Description:

Are no parties allowed?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.115 National Referendums (iaep_nr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_nr
Original tag: iaep_nr
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6972, Percent: 54.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6660, Percent: 21.96
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 312 Percent: 4.48
Description:

Does the country hold national elections on referendum items?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.116 Parties with More than 5 Percent (iaep_pm5p)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pm5p

Original tag: iaep_pm5p

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5976, Percent: 47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5702, Percent: 18.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.59

Description:

How many parties hold at least 5percent of seats in the legislature?

1. One

2. Two

3. More than two

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.117 Party Nomination of Executive Candidates (iaep_pnec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pnec

Original tag: iaep_pnec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3436, Percent: 27.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3267, Percent: 10.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 169 Percent: 4.92

Description:

Does party nomination (party list, convention, etc.) establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.118 Party Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_pnlc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pnlc

Original tag: iaep_pnlc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6368, Percent: 50.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6094, Percent: 20.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.3

Description:

Does party nomination (party list, convention, etc.) establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.119 Petition Signatures Establish Executive Candidates (iaep_pseec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pseec

Original tag: iaep_pseec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3436, Percent: 27.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3267, Percent: 10.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 169 Percent: 4.92

Description:

Do petition signatures establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.120 Petition Signatures Establish Legislature Candidates (iaep_pselc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pselc

Original tag: iaep_pselc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6368, Percent: 50.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6094, Percent: 20.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.3

Description:

Do petition signatures establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.121 Party Vote Establish Executive Candidates (iaep_pveec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pveec

Original tag: iaep_pveec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3436, Percent: 27.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3267, Percent: 10.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 169 Percent: 4.92

Description:

Do members of party vote (primary) establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.122 Party Vote Establish Legislature Candidates (iaep_pvelc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_pvelc

Original tag: iaep_pvelc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6368, Percent: 50.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6094, Percent: 20.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.3

Description:

Do members of party vote (primary) establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.123 Self-Nomination of Executive Candidates (iaep_snec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_snec

Original tag: iaep_snec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3436, Percent: 27.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3267, Percent: 10.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 169 Percent: 4.92

Description:

Does self-nomination establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.124 Self-Nomination of Legislature Candidates (iaep_snlc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_snlc

Original tag: iaep_snlc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6368, Percent: 50.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6094, Percent: 20.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 274 Percent: 4.3

Description:

Does self-nomination establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.2.125 Electoral System Family (ideaesd_esf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_esf

Original tag: ideaesd_esf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1454, Percent: 11.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1280, Percent: 4.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 174 Percent: 11.97

Description:

Electoral System Family

1. Proportional Representation

2. Plurality/Majority

3. Plurality/Majority and Proportional Representation

4. Mixed

5. Transition

6. Other

7. Not Applicable

3.2.2.126 Electoral System for the National Legislature (ideaesd_esnl)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_esnl
Original tag: ideaesd_esnl
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1447, Percent: 11.38
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172 Percent: 11.89
Description:
Electoral System for National Legislature:

1. List Proportional Representation (List PR)

Under a List Proportional Representation (List PR) system each party or grouping presents a list of candidates for a multi-member electoral district, the voters vote for a party, and parties receive seats in proportion to their overall share of the vote. In some (closed list) systems the winning candidates are taken from the lists in order of their position on the lists. If the lists are 'open' or 'free' the voters can influence the order of the candidates by marking individual preferences.

2. Block Vote (BV)

Block Vote is a plurality/majority system used in multi-member districts. Electors have as many votes as there are candidates to be elected. The candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats. Usually voters vote for candidates rather than parties and in most systems may use as many, or as few, of their votes as they wish.

3. First Past the Post (FPTP)

First Past The Post is the simplest form of plurality/majority electoral system. The winning candidate is the one who gains more votes than any other candidate, even if this is not an absolute majority of valid votes. The system uses single-member districts and the voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

4. Two-Round System (TRS)

The Two-Round System is a plurality/majority system in which a second election is held if no candidate or party achieves a given level of votes, most commonly an absolute majority (50 per cent plus one), in the first election round. A Two-Round System may take a majority-plurality form-more than two candidates contest the second round and the one wins the highest number of votes in the second round is elected, regardless of whether they have won an absolute majority-or a majority run-off form-only the top two candidates in the first round contest the second round.

5. Mixed Member Proportional (MMP)

Mixed Member Proportional is a mixed system in which the choices expressed by the voters are used to elect representatives through two different systems-one List PR system and (usually) one plurality/majority system-where the List PR system compensates for the disproportionality in the results from the plurality/majority system.

6. Single Transferable Vote (STV)

The Single Transferable Vote is a preferential system in which the voter has one vote in a multi-member district and the candidates that surpass a specified quota of first preference votes are immediately elected. In successive counts, votes are redistributed from least successful candidates, who are eliminated, and votes surplus to the quota are redistributed from successful candidates, until sufficient candidates are declared elected. Voters normally vote for candidates rather than political parties, although a party-list option is possible.

7. Alternative Vote (AV)

The Alternative Vote is a preferential plurality/majority system used in single-member districts. Voters use numbers to mark their preferences on the ballot paper. A candidate who receives an absolute majority (50 per cent plus 1) of valid first preference votes is declared elected. If no candidate achieves an absolute majority of first preferences, the least successful

candidates are eliminated and their votes reallocated according to their second preferences until one candidate has an absolute majority. Voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

8. Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV)

Under the Single Non-Transferable Vote system voters cast a single vote in a multi-member district. The candidates with the highest vote totals are declared elected. Voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

9. Two-Round System, Party Block Vote (TRS PBV)

Party Block Vote (PBV) is a plurality/majority system using multi-member districts in which voters cast a single party-centered vote for a party of choice, and do not choose between candidates. The party with the most votes will win every seat in the electoral district.

10. Limited Vote (LV)

Limited Vote is a candidate-centred electoral system used in multi-member districts in which electors have more than one vote, but fewer votes than there are candidates to be elected. The candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats.

11. First Past The Post, Party Block Vote (FPTP PBV)

12. First Past the Post, List Proportional Representation (FPTP List PR)

13. First Past the Post, Block Vote (FPTP BV)

14. First Past the Post, Party Block Vote, List Proportional Representation (FPTP PBV List PR)

15. Parallel

A Parallel System is a mixed system in which the choices expressed by the voters are used to elect representatives through two different systems-one List PR system and (usually) one plurality/majority system-but where no account is taken of the seats allocated under the first system in calculating the results in the second system.

16. In transition

17. Modified Borda Count (Modified BC)

Borda Count (BC) - A candidate-centred preferential system used in either single- or multimember districts in which voters use numbers to mark their preferences on the ballot paper and each preference marked is then assigned a value using equal steps. These are summed and the candidate(s) with the highest total(s) is/are declared elected.

18. Two-Round System, Party Block Vote, List Proportional Representation (TRS PBV List PR)

19. No direct elections.

3.2.2.127 Electoral System for the President (ideaesd_esp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_esp

Original tag: ideaesd_esp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1438, Percent: 11.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1264, Percent: 4.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 174 Percent: 12.1

Description:
Electoral System for the President:

1. Two-Round System (TRS)

The Two-Round System is a plurality/majority system in which a second election is held if no candidate or party achieves a given level of votes, most commonly an absolute majority (50 per cent plus one), in the first election round. A Two-Round System may take a majority-plurality form-more than two candidates contest the second round and the one who wins the highest number of votes in the second round is elected, regardless of whether they have won an absolute majority-or a majority run-off form-only the top two candidates in the first round contest the second round.

2. First Past the Post (FPTP)

First Past The Post is the simplest form of plurality/majority electoral system. The winning candidate is the one who gains more votes than any other candidate, even if this is not an absolute majority of valid votes. The system uses single-member districts and the voters vote for candidates rather than political parties.

3. Supplementary Vote (SV)

Supplementary vote: Voters can rank up to three candidates, and if no candidate wins a majority in the first round of voting, second and third preferences from ballots whose first preference candidate has been eliminated are used to determine the winner.

4. Single Transferable Vote (STV)

The Single Transferable Vote is a preferential system in which the voter has one vote in a multi-member district and the candidates that surpass a specified quota of first preference votes are immediately elected. In successive counts, votes are redistributed from least successful candidates, who are eliminated, and votes surplus to the quota are redistributed from successful candidates, until sufficient candidates are declared elected. Voters normally vote for candidates rather than political parties, although a party-list option is possible.

5. In Transition

6. Other

7. Not applicable

3.2.2.128 Legislative Size (Directly Elected) (ideaesd_lsde)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_lsde

Original tag: ideaesd_lsde

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1439, Percent: 11.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1266, Percent: 4.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 173 Percent: 12.02

Description:

Legislative size, directly elected. Total number of directly elected representatives, excluding those appointed or indirectly elected.

3.2.2.129 Legislative Size (Voting Members) (ideaesd_lsvm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_lsvm

Original tag: ideaesd_lsvm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1421, Percent: 11.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1256, Percent: 4.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 165 Percent: 11.61

Description:

Legislative size, voting members. Total number of directly elected representatives, including those appointed or indirectly elected.

3.2.2.130 Number of Tiers (ideaesd_tiers)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideaesd_tiers

Original tag: ideaesd_tiers

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1441, Percent: 11.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1269, Percent: 4.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172 Percent: 11.94

Description:

Number of tiers. The tiers of an electoral system can be understood as the sets of

representatives that are elected to the same chamber by the entire electorate of a country. 99 indicates a hybrid system, where one part of the country elects representatives using one electoral system, while another distinct part of the country elects representatives using a different system.

3.2.2.131 EU Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_eucv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_eucv

Original tag: ideavt_eucv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 199, Percent: 1.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 199, Percent: 0.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

EU Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting

3.2.2.132 EU Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_euvt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_euvt

Original tag: ideavt_euvt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 199, Percent: 1.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 199, Percent: 0.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

EU Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout

3.2.2.133 Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_legcv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_legcv

Original tag: ideavt_legcv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2203, Percent: 17.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1953, Percent: 6.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 250 Percent: 11.35

Description:

Parliamentary Election: Compulsory Voting

3.2.2.134 Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_legvt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_legvt

Original tag: ideavt_legvt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2083, Percent: 16.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1873, Percent: 6.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 210 Percent: 10.08
Description:
Parliamentary Election: Voter Turnout

3.2.2.135 Presidential Election: Compulsory Voting (ideavt_prescv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_prescv
Original tag: ideavt_prescv
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 919, Percent: 7.23
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 873, Percent: 2.88
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 46 Percent: 5.01
Description:
Presidential Election: Compulsory Voting

3.2.2.136 Presidential Election: Voter Turnout (ideavt_presvt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ideavt_presvt
Original tag: ideavt_presvt
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 870, Percent: 6.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 828, Percent: 2.73
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 42 Percent: 4.83
Description:
Presidential Election: Voter Turnout

3.2.2.137 Number of Seats (Lower and Single Houses) (ipu_l_s)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ipu_l_s
Original tag: ipu_l_s
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Inter-Parliamentary Union (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5423, Percent: 42.65
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4780, Percent: 15.76
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 643 Percent: 11.86
Description:
Number of Seats (Lower and Single Houses).

3.2.2.138 Number of Seats (Upper House) (ipu_u_s)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ipu_u_s
Original tag: ipu_u_s
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Inter-Parliamentary Union (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2099, Percent: 16.51
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1936, Percent: 6.38
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163 Percent: 7.77

Description:
Number of Seats (Upper House).

3.2.2.139 Party Control over Ballot (lower/only house) (jw_avgballot)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgballot

Original tag: jw_avgballot

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2354, Percent: 18.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2094, Percent: 6.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 260 Percent: 11.05

Description:
Country-level weighted averages of Party Control over Ballot - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdballot) and Party Control over Ballot - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdballot), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of ballots for the average member sitting in the lower house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.140 Party Control over Ballot (upper house) (jw_avgballot2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgballot2

Original tag: jw_avgballot2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 3.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 1.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Country-level weighted averages of Party Control over Ballot - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdballot2) and Party Control over Ballot - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdballot2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of ballots for the average member sitting in the upper house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.141 Sharing of Votes among Candidates (lower/only house) (jw_avgpool)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgpool

Original tag: jw_avgpool

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2359, Percent: 18.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2112, Percent: 6.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 247 Percent: 10.47

Description:

Country-level weighted averages of Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdpool) and Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdpool), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of the pooling of votes for the average member sitting in the lower house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.142 Sharing of Votes among Candidates (upper house) (jw_avgpool2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgpool2

Original tag: jw_avgpool2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 3.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 1.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Country-level weighted averages of Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdpool2) and Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdpool2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of the pooling of votes for the average member sitting in the upper house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.143 Candidate or Party-specific Voting (lower/only house) (jw_avgvote)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgvote

Original tag: jw_avgvote

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2332, Percent: 18.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2085, Percent: 6.87

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 247 Percent: 10.59

Description:

Country-level weighted averages of Candidate- or Party-specific Voting - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdvote) and Candidate- or Party-specific Voting - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdvote), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of votes for the average member sitting in the lower house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.2.144 Candidate or Party-specific Voting (upper house) (jw_avgvote2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_avgvote2

Original tag: jw_avgvote2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 3.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 460, Percent: 1.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Country-level weighted averages of Candidate- or Party-specific Voting - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdvote2) and Candidate- or Party-specific Voting - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdvote2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of votes for the average member sitting in the upper house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.2.145 Dominant or Populous Tier (jw_domr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_domr

Original tag: jw_domr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2222, Percent: 17.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2003, Percent: 6.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 9.86

Description:

This variable ranks countries in increasing order of incentives to cultivate a personal vote according to their most dominant or populous tier (or tier with the greater number of legislators). The variable varies from 1 to 13, corresponding to the thirteen positions in Carey \

amp; Shugart's (1995) ranking. For example, a country with a ranking of 1 would have a tier with the lowest possible rank of personal vote incentives, and that tier would account for the

majority of the members in the assembly.

3.2.2.146 Year of Election (lower/only house) (jw_election)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_election

Original tag: jw_election

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2253, Percent: 17.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2012, Percent: 6.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 241 Percent: 10.7

Description:

Dummy variable, 1 if year of election to lower house.

3.2.2.147 Year of Election (upper house) (jw_election2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_election2

Original tag: jw_election2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 3.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 1.35

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Dummy variable, 1 if year of election to upper house.

3.2.2.148 Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (lower/only house) (jw_indy)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_indy

Original tag: jw_indy

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1975, Percent: 15.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1778, Percent: 5.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 197 Percent: 9.97

Description:

Equals 1 wherever independent candidates are legally allowed (even where the legal requirements are strict), and 0 otherwise. This complements the cases where the ballot variables above equal 1 or 2, since they are adjusted to capture de facto practice. jw_indy instead captures the de jure rules. A user could adjust the ballot variables above to be de jure if (s)he replaced values of 2 with values of 1 when jw_indy = 0. Refers to lower house elections. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.149 Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (upper house) (jw_indy2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_indy2

Original tag: jw_indy2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 3.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 1.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Same as jw_indy, but for upper house elections. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.150 Number of Coded Legislators (lower/only house) (jw_legsize)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_legsize

Original tag: jw_legsize

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2692, Percent: 21.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2409, Percent: 7.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283 Percent: 10.51

Description:

The number of legislators coded in the dataset. These may not account for the total number of legislators if there are appointed legislators that have no electoral rules to code.

3.2.2.151 Number of Coded Legislators (upper house) (jw_legsize2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_legsize2

Original tag: jw_legsize2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 4.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 1.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The number of legislators coded in the dataset. These may not account for the total number of legislators if there are appointed legislators that have no electoral rules to code.

3.2.2.152 District Magnitude of Average Legislator (lower/only house) (jw_mcand)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mcand

Original tag: jw_mcand

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2136, Percent: 16.8

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1887, Percent: 6.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 249 Percent: 11.66

Description:

In keeping with the emphasis on the incentives faced by individual legislators, this variable measures the district magnitude considering the viewpoint of the average legislator in the lower house. It is scored as a weighted average of the various district sizes, where weights are computed as the number of legislators running in the district of each magnitude divided by the total number of seats. For example: A country with 300 seats divided among one national district with 200 members and 100 single-member districts has a magnitude for the average legislator of [(200*200) + (100*1)]/300, which yields a figure of 133.67.

3.2.2.153 District Magnitude of Average Legislator (upper house) (jw_mcand2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mcand2

Original tag: jw_mcand2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 645, Percent: 5.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 645, Percent: 2.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

This is the district magnitude of the average legislator in the upper house.

3.2.2.154 Average District Magnitude (lower/only house) (jw_mdist)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mdist

Original tag: jw_mdist

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3076, Percent: 24.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2715, Percent: 8.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 361 Percent: 11.74

Description:

This is the standard magnitude of the average district in the lower house. For example: A country with 300 seats divided among one national district with 200 members and 100 single-member districts would have an average district magnitude (jw_mdist) of 2.97 (i.e., 300/101).

3.2.2.155 Average District Magnitude (upper house) (jw_mdist2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mdist2

Original tag: jw_mdist2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 4.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 1.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
This is the average district magnitude in the upper house.

3.2.2.156 Party Control over Ballot - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdballot)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdballot

Original tag: jw_mmdballot

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1607, Percent: 12.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1496, Percent: 4.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 111 Percent: 6.91

Description:
Ballot (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.157 Party Control over Ballot - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdballot2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdballot2

Original tag: jw_mmdballot2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 2.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Ballot for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.158 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdpool)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdpool

Original tag: jw_mmdpool

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1587, Percent: 12.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1489, Percent: 4.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 98 Percent: 6.18

Description:

Pool for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.159 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdpool2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdpool2

Original tag: jw_mmdpool2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 291, Percent: 2.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 291, Percent: 0.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Pool for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.160 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdvote)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdvote

Original tag: jw_mmdvote

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1560, Percent: 12.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1462, Percent: 4.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 98 Percent: 6.28

Description:

Vote for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.2.161 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdvote2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_mmdvote2

Original tag: jw_mmdvote2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 2.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Vote for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.2.162 Runoff Elections (jw_multiround)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_multiround

Original tag: jw_multiround

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2075, Percent: 16.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1868, Percent: 6.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 207 Percent: 9.98

Description:

The variable indicates whether there are run-off elections. These are usually for SMDs with absolute majority requirements. Where jw_multiround is equal to 1, voters have more than a single vote to cast, albeit votes occur on separate election days.

3.2.2.163 Multi Tier (lower/only house) (jw_multitier)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_multitier

Original tag: jw_multitier

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2405, Percent: 18.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2160, Percent: 7.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 245 Percent: 10.19

Description:

Indicates whether there are two or more tiers to the legislature.

3.2.2.164 Multi Tier (upper house) (jw_multitier2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_multitier2

Original tag: jw_multitier2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 3.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 1.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Equals 1 wherever there are multiple allocation tiers, regardless of whether they are the result of mixed member systems that incorporate different members under different rules, or systems that have upper tiers within a single electoral system to compensate for disproportionality in lower tiers.

3.2.2.165 Tiers allocated in Parallel (jw_parallel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_parallel

Original tag: jw_parallel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 244, Percent: 1.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 230, Percent: 0.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14 Percent: 5.74

Description:

Coded 1 if multiple tiers are elected in parallel fashion, 0 when they are elected in (at least some-what) compensatory fashion. Is coded only when jw_multitier = 1.

3.2.2.166 Personalistic Tier (jw_persr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_persr

Original tag: jw_persr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2252, Percent: 17.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2033, Percent: 6.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 9.72

Description:

This variable ranks countries in increasing order of incentives to cultivate a personal vote according to their more personalistic tier (or tier with the greater incentives to cultivate a personal vote). The variable varies from 1 to 13, corresponding to the thirteen positions in Carey \
amp; Shugart's (1995) ranking. For example, a country with a ranking of 13 would have a tier with the highest possible rank of incentives to cultivate a personal vote, although that tier may only account for a minority or small fraction of its members.

3.2.2.167 Proportion Coded Legislators (lower/only house) (jw_propcoded)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propcoded

Original tag: jw_propcoded

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3521, Percent: 27.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3118, Percent: 10.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 403 Percent: 11.45

Description:
Shows the proportion of total legislators (elected and non-elected) that are included in the database (i.e. those that are elected).

3.2.2.168 Proportion Coded Legislators (upper house) (jw_propcoded2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propcoded2

Original tag: jw_propcoded2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 852, Percent: 6.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 852, Percent: 2.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
This is the proportion of the total number of legislators (elected and non-elected) that are coded.

3.2.2.169 Seats from Multi-Member Districts (lower/only house) (jw_propmmd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propmmd

Original tag: jw_propmmd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2728, Percent: 21.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2431, Percent: 8.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 297 Percent: 10.89

Description:
Proportion of seats from Multi-Member District (lower/only house).

3.2.2.170 Seats from Multi-Member Districts (upper house) (jw_propmmd2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propmmd2

Original tag: jw_propmmd2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 466, Percent: 3.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 466, Percent: 1.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
This is the proportion of coded legislators elected in multi-member districts.

3.2.2.171 Seats from a National District (lower/only house) (jw_propn)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propn

Original tag: jw_propn

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3400, Percent: 26.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3018, Percent: 9.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 382 Percent: 11.24

Description:

The proportion of legislators that are elected via a national tier.

3.2.2.172 Seats from a National District (upper house) (jw_propn2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propn2

Original tag: jw_propn2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1083, Percent: 8.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1083, Percent: 3.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

This is the proportion of coded legislators that are elected via a national tier. This is often (but not always) similar to the proportion elected via multi-member districts (jw_propmmd): some electoral systems have proportional representation based on regional multimember districts as well as national tiers (e.g. Hungary).

3.2.2.173 Seats from Single-Member Districts (lower/only house) (jw_propsmd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propsmd

Original tag: jw_propsmd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2688, Percent: 21.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2405, Percent: 7.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283 Percent: 10.53

Description:

Proportion of seats from Single-Member Districts.

3.2.2.174 Seats from Single-Member Districts (upper house) (jw_propsmd2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_propsmd2

Original tag: jw_propsmd2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 409, Percent: 3.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 409, Percent: 1.35

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

This is the proportion of coded legislators elected in single-member districts (Note: In the original data for Kyrgyzstan propsmd2=60 in 1997-1999 and propsmd2=45 2000-2004. We have replaced these figures with missing values).

3.2.2.175 Rank Vote (lower/only house) (jw_rank)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_rank

Original tag: jw_rank

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1771, Percent: 13.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1587, Percent: 5.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 184 Percent: 10.39

Description:

Equals 1 in two circumstances: where voters may rank order candidates according to preference, or where citizens have multiple preference votes for multiple candidates, even if they may not specifically rank the candidates. Otherwise, jw_rank is equal to zero. Refers to lower house elections.

3.2.2.176 Rank Vote (upper house) (jw_rank2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_rank2

Original tag: jw_rank2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 3.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 1.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Same as jw_rank, but for upper house elections.

3.2.2.177 Party Control over Ballot - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdballot)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdballot

Original tag: jw_smdballot

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1072, Percent: 8.43

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 909, Percent: 3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163 Percent: 15.21

Description:

Ballot for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.178 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdpool)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdpool

Original tag: jw_smdpool

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1097, Percent: 8.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 934, Percent: 3.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163 Percent: 14.86

Description:

Pool for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.179 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdvote)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdvote

Original tag: jw_smdvote

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1097, Percent: 8.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 934, Percent: 3.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163 Percent: 14.86

Description:

Vote for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.2.180 Tiervote (lower/only house) (jw_tiervote)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_tiervote

Original tag: jw_tiervote

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2129, Percent: 16.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1917, Percent: 6.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 212 Percent: 9.96

Description:

Equals 1 when citizens are given a separate vote for deputies in each legislative tier.

3.2.2.181 Tiervote (upper house) (jw_tiervote2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_tiervote2

Original tag: jw_tiervote2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 351, Percent: 2.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 351, Percent: 1.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Equals 1 when citizens are given a separate vote for deputies in each legislative tier.

3.2.2.182 First Multiparty Election (nelda_fme)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_fme

Original tag: nelda_fme

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

This indicates when a newly independent country is having its first elections, when a country holds the first multiparty elections after a significant period of non-democratic rule, or when a country transitions from single-party elections to multiparty elections. Multiparty means that more than one party is allowed to contest the election, and that at least some of the parties are both nominally and effectively independent of the ruling actors.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3.2.2.183 Media Bias before Election (nelda_mbbe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_mbbe

Original tag: nelda_mbbe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

If there were reports by either domestic or outside actors of media bias in favor of the incumbent or ruling party, it is coded as a 'Yes'. In cases where the media is totally controlled by the government, and/or no opposition is allowed, the answer is 'Yes'. It is possible that the answer is 'No' even if the political system is tightly controlled.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

3.2.2.184 Was More Than One Party Legal (nelda_mtop)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_mtop

Original tag: nelda_mtop

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

This variable indicates whether multiple political parties were technically legal. The legalization of multiple parties need not necessarily mean the existence of a functioning opposition party, as there may be other non-legal barriers to the development of an opposition party. Similarly, a well organized opposition party may exist but may not be legal.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

3.2.2.185 Number of Elections, Total (nelda_noe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_noe

Original tag: nelda_noe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

The number of elections during the year (counting legislative, executive and constituent assembly elections).

3.2.2.186 Number of Elections, Constituent Assembly (nelda_noea)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_noea

Original tag: nelda_noea

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

Number of constituent assembly elections during the year.

3.2.2.187 Number of Elections, Executive (nelda_noee)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_noee

Original tag: nelda_noee

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

Number of executive elections during the year.

3.2.2.188 Number of Elections, Legislative (nelda_noel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_noel

Original tag: nelda_noel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

Number of legislative elections during the year.

3.2.2.189 Was Opposition Allowed (nelda_oa)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_oa

Original tag: nelda_oa

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

This variable indicates whether at least one opposition political party existed to contest the election. Some countries have multiple government parties but no opposition political party. An opposition party is one that is not in the government, meaning it is not affiliated with the incumbent party in power.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

3.2.2.190 Riots and Protests after Election (nelda_rpae)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_rpae

Original tag: nelda_rpae

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

If there are protests and riots after elections, a 'Yes' is coded. The riots and protests should at least somewhat be related to the handling or outcome of the election.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

3.2.2.191 Violence and Civilian Deaths before Election (nelda_vcdbe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_vcdbe

Original tag: nelda_vcdbe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

If there was any significant violence relating to the elections that resulted in civilian deaths, a 'Yes' is coded. These deaths should be at least plausibly related to the election, though sometimes it is difficult to be certain. Deaths related to civil war that are not intended to influence the election, and are not caused by the election, should not be counted.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

3.2.2.192 Cummulative Party System Innovation (psi_cpsi1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_cpsi1

Original tag: psi_cpsi1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 1.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Cumulative Party System Innovation: sum of the vote share received by non-founder parties in each election. A party is considered as a founder if it has received at least 1percent of the national vote share in at least one of the first two post-WWII elections (or, in the case of Greece, Portugal and Spain, the first two democratic elections). Otherwise, the party is counted as a non-founder. The rationale behind this choice is that we look at the first two post-WWII or post-authoritarian elections and make a dichotomous distinction between relevant parties that formed the system (those who received more than 1percent of the votes) and parties that emerged later or were only marginal actors (those below 1percent) at that time.

3.2.2.193 Cummulative Party System Innovation of a second election in a year (psi_cpsi2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_cpsi2

Original tag: psi_cpsi2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Cumulative Party System Innovation: sum of the vote share received by non-founder parties in each election. A party is considered as a founder if it has received at least 1percent of the national vote share in at least one of the first two post-WWII elections (or, in the case of Greece, Portugal and Spain, the first two democratic elections). Otherwise, the party is counted as a non-founder. The rationale behind this choice is that we look at the first two post-WWII or post-authoritarian elections and make a dichotomous distinction between relevant parties that formed the system (those who received more than 1percent of the votes) and parties that emerged later or were only marginal actors (those below 1percent) at that time. This variable (psi_cpsi2) refers to a second election held on the same year as an election reported on psi_cpsi1.

3.2.2.194 Exact date of the election (psi_edate1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_edate1

Original tag: psi_edate1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 1.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Exact date of the election

3.2.2.195 Exact date of the second election in a year (psi_edate2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_edate2

Original tag: psi_edate2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Exact date of a second election in a same year

3.2.2.196 Party System Innovation (overall vote share of new parties in given election) (psi_psi1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_psi1

Original tag: psi_psi1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 1.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Party System Innovation: overall vote share of new parties in a given election. It is calculated at time t with respect to time t-1 (namely, PSInn is calculated with respect to the status quo established at the previous election) and therefore each observation in each country is completely independent from the previous ones. In order to exclude marginal parties, the author has set a threshold at 1percent of the national share for a given party to be considered as part of the party system in a given election and has collected data starting from the third post-World War II or democratic election of each country, for a total of 209 new parties (see the complete list of new parties below) in 327 elections. The underlying assumption is that the party system innovation they are interested in is that occurring after the initial institutionalization of the party system. According to PSInn, a party is considered 'new' only in the first election when it enters the party system by receiving at least 1percent of the national share. Then, in the subsequent elections, it becomes 'old'.

3.2.2.197 Party System Innovation of a second election in a year (psi_psi2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_psi_psi2

Original tag: psi_psi2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele (2016)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Party System Innovation: overall vote share of new parties in a given election. It is calculated at time t with respect to time t-1 (namely, PSInn is calculated with respect to the status quo established at the previous election) and therefore each observation in each country is completely independent from the previous ones. In order to exclude marginal parties, the author has set a threshold at 1percent of the national share for a given party to be considered as part of the party system in a given election and has collected data starting from the third post-World War II or democratic election of each country, for a total of 209 new parties (see the complete list of new parties below) in 327 elections. The underlying assumption is that the party system innovation they are interested in is that occurring after the initial institutionalization of the party system. According to PSInn, a party is considered 'new' only in the first election when it enters the party system by receiving at least 1percent of the national share. Then, in the subsequent elections, it becomes 'old'. This variable (psi_psi2) refers to a second election held on the same year as an election reported on psi_psi1.

3.2.2.198 Robust Democracy: Electoral Process (sgi_qdep)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_qdep

Original tag: sgi_qdep

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Robust Democracy: Electoral Process (Candidacy Procedures, Media Access, Voting and Registration Rights, Party Financing, Popular Decision-making).

3.2.2.199 Competition (van_comp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_van_comp

Original tag: van_comp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Vanhanen (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10374, Percent: 81.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9479, Percent: 31.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 895 Percent: 8.63

Description:

The competition variable portrays the electoral success of smaller parties, that is, the percentage of votes gained by the smaller parties in parliamentary and/or presidential elections. The variable is calculated by subtracting from 100 the percentage of votes won by the largest party (the party which wins most votes) in parliamentary elections or by the party of the successful candidate in presidential elections. Depending on their importance, either parliamentary or presidential elections are used in the calculation of the variable, or both elections are used, with weights. If information on the distribution of votes is not available, or if the distribution does not portray the reality accurately, the distribution of parliamentary

seats is used instead. If parliament members are elected but political parties are not allowed to take part in elections, it is assumed that one party has taken all votes or seats. In countries where parties are not banned but yet only independent candidates participate in elections, it is assumed that the share of the largest party is not over 30 percent.

3.2.2.200 Participation (van_part)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_van_part

Original tag: van_part

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Vanhanen (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10374, Percent: 81.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9479, Percent: 31.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 895 Percent: 8.63

Description:

The political participation variable portrays the voting turnout in each election, and is calculated as the percentage of the total population who actually voted in the election. In the case of indirect elections, only votes cast in the final election are taken into account. If electors have not been elected by citizens, only the number of actual electors is taken into account, which means that the degree of participation drops to the value 0. If an election to choose electors has been held, the participation variable is calculated from the number and distribution of votes in that election. National referendums raise the variable value by five percent and state (regional) referendums by one percent for the year they are held. Referendums can add the degree of participation at maximum by 30 percent a year. The value of the combined degree of participation cannot be higher than 70 percent, even in cases where the sum of participation and referendums would be higher than 70.

3.2.2.201 Number of years the leader in office continuously (wgov_leadexp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_leadexp

Original tag: wgov_leadexp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9000, Percent: 70.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8557, Percent: 28.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.92

Description:

The number of years the person has been leader of the country in a row, continuous. Thus, it starts over if the leader is removed. The count starts at 1, when the leader first appear as leader in the dataset. Therefore, the measure is imprecise for leaders, who came to power before 1966.

3.2.2.202 Number of cabinet ministers (wgov_min)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_min

Original tag: wgov_min

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9000, Percent: 70.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8557, Percent: 28.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.92

Description:
Number of cabinet ministers. This number only include cabinet ministers.

3.2.2.203 Average age in cabinet ministers (wgov_minage)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_minage
Original tag: wgov_minage
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8384, Percent: 65.94
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7979, Percent: 26.31
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 405 Percent: 4.83
Description:
Average age for cabinet ministers (people included for wgov_min).

3.2.2.204 Average tenure for cabinet ministers (wgov_minten)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_minten
Original tag: wgov_minten
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8975, Percent: 70.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8532, Percent: 28.13
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.94
Description:
The average tenure for cabinet ministers (people included for wgov_min).

3.2.2.205 Adjusted retention rate for cabinet ministers (wgov_mret)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_mret
Original tag: wgov_mret
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8976, Percent: 70.6
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8533, Percent: 28.13
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.94
Description:
The share of cabinet ministers (people included for wgov_min), who were in office the previous year. This measure is adjusted for an expansion of the size of wgov_min, so wgov_min stays constant and the retention rate is therefore not influenced by an expansion of the cabinet.

3.2.2.206 Total mumber of government positions (inc. unoccupied and multiple positions) (wgov_tot)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_tot
Original tag: wgov_tot
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9000, Percent: 70.79
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8557, Percent: 28.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.92

Description:

Number of entries for the country in the dataset. This number includes unoccupied positions and multiple positions held by the same persons.

3.2.2.207 Average age in government positions (wgov_totage)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_totage

Original tag: wgov_totage

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8990, Percent: 70.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8547, Percent: 28.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.93

Description:

Average age for people in government positions, who were counted for wgov_tot.

3.2.2.208 Average tenure for people in government positions (wgov_totten)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_totten

Original tag: wgov_totten

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8995, Percent: 70.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8552, Percent: 28.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 443 Percent: 4.92

Description:

The average tenure for people in government positions, who were counted for wgov_tot.

3.2.2.209 Adjusted retention rate for people in government positions (wgov_tret)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wgov_tret

Original tag: wgov_tret

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Nyrup & Bramwell (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8837, Percent: 69.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8404, Percent: 27.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 433 Percent: 4.9

Description:

The share of people in government positions, who were also in office in the previous year. This measure is adjusted for an expansion of the size of wgov_tot, so n_total stays constant and the retention rate is therefore not influenced by an expansion of the cabinet.

3.2.2.210 Confidence: The Political Parties (wvs_confpp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wvs_confpp

Original tag: wvs_confpp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: EVS (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 340, Percent: 2.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 334, Percent: 1.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 1.76

Description:

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: The Political Parties

1. None at all
2. Not very much
3. Quite a lot
4. A great deal

3.2.2.211 Age Representation Index (30 or under) (yri_agi30)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_agi30

Original tag: yri_agi30

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 715, Percent: 5.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 7.13

Description:

The percentage of MPs aged 30 or under relative to the percent of citizens aged 30 or under in the population.

3.2.2.212 Age Representation Index (35 or under) (yri_agi35)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_agi35

Original tag: yri_agi35

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 715, Percent: 5.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 7.13

Description:

The percentage of MPs aged 35 or under relative to the percent of citizens aged 35 or under in the population.

3.2.2.213 Age Representation Index (40 or under) (yri_agi40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_agi40

Original tag: yri_agi40

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 715, Percent: 5.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 7.13

Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 40 or under relative to the percent of citizens aged 40 or under in the population.

3.2.2.214 Age Representation Index (41 to 60) (yri_agi4160)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_agi4160

Original tag: yri_agi4160

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 715, Percent: 5.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 7.13

Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 41 to 60 relative to the percent of citizens aged 41 to 60 in the population.

3.2.2.215 Age Representation Index (61 or over) (yri_agi61)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_agi61

Original tag: yri_agi61

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 715, Percent: 5.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51 Percent: 7.13

Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 61 or over relative to the percent of citizens aged 61 or over in the population.

3.2.2.216 Female Representation in Parliament (under 30 years) (yri_fem30)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_fem30

Original tag: yri_fem30

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16

Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 30 or under of all female MPs.

3.2.2.217 Female Representation in Parliament (under 35 years) (yri_fem35)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_fem35

Original tag: yri_fem35

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 35 or under of all female MPs.

3.2.2.218 Female Representation in Parliament (under 40 years) (yri_fem40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_fem40
Original tag: yri_fem40
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 40 or under of all female MPs.

3.2.2.219 Female Representation in Parliament (41 to 60 years) (yri_fem4160)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_fem4160
Original tag: yri_fem4160
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 41 to 60 of all female MPs.

3.2.2.220 Female Representation in Parliament (over 61 years) (yri_fem61)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_fem61
Original tag: yri_fem61
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 61 or over of all female MPs.

3.2.2.221 Mean age of MPs (yri_meanage)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_meanage
Original tag: yri_meanage
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16

Description:
The mean age of MPs in the respective country.

3.2.2.222 Median age of MPs (yri_medianage)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_medianage
Original tag: yri_medianage
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The median age of MPs in the respective country.

3.2.2.223 Percent MPs aged 30 or under (yri_mp30)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_mp30
Original tag: yri_mp30
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 30 or under.

3.2.2.224 Percent MPs aged 35 or under (yri_mp35)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_mp35
Original tag: yri_mp35
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 35 or under.

3.2.2.225 Percent MPs aged 40 or under (yri_mp40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_mp40
Original tag: yri_mp40
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16

Description:
The percentage of female MPs aged 40 or under of all female MPs.

3.2.2.226 Percent MPs aged 41 to 60 (yri_mp4160)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_mp4160
Original tag: yri_mp4160
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 41 to 60.

3.2.2.227 Percent MPs aged 61 or over (yri_mp61)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_yri_mp61
Original tag: yri_mp61
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Stockemer & Sundström (2022)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 723, Percent: 5.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 664, Percent: 2.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 8.16
Description:
The percentage of MPs aged 61 or over.

3.2.2.228 Party Control over Ballot - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdballot2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdballot2
Original tag: jw_smdballot2
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 1.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 0.43
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Ballot for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order); (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list); (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

3.2.2.229 Sharing of Votes among Candidates - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdpool2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdpool2

Original tag: jw_smdpool2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 0.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Pool for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district; (1) where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5percent or less of a legislature's membership; (2) where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

3.2.2.230 Candidate or Party-specific Voting - SMD (upper house) (jw_smdvote2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_smdvote2

Original tag: jw_smdvote2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 0.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Vote (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house. The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives): (0) where voters have only one vote for a party; (1) where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts); (2) where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

3.2.3 Political System

This category includes variables describing the rules of the political system (presidential or parliamentary system), the chief executive (years in office), regime type, stability (age of present regime), and checks and balances as well as aspects of federalism.

3.2.3.1 Typology of political institutions (br_elect)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_elect

Original tag: br_elect

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11660, Percent: 91.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10448, Percent: 34.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1212 Percent: 10.39

Description:

Alternative democracy indicator capturing degree of multi-party competition. (0: No elections 1: Single-party elections 2: Non-democratic multi-party elections 3: Democratic elections.)

3.2.3.2 Party System (bti_ps)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ps

Original tag: bti_ps

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent is there a stable and socially rooted party system able to articulate and aggregate societal interests? From 1 to 10.

1. There is no party system to articulate and aggregate societal interests.

4. The party system is unstable with shallow roots in society: high fragmentation, high voter volatility, and high polarization.

7. The party system is fairly stable and socially rooted: moderate fragmentation, moderate voter volatility, and moderate polarization.

10. The party system is stable and socially rooted: it is able to articulate and aggregate societal interest with low fragmentation, low voter volatility and low polarization.

3.2.3.3 Democracy (chga_demo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_chga_demo

Original tag: chga_demo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Cheibub et al. (2010)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8844, Percent: 69.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7908, Percent: 26.07

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 936 Percent: 10.58

Description:

A regime is considered a democracy if the executive and the legislature is directly or indirectly elected by popular vote, multiple parties are allowed, there is de facto existence of multiple parties outside of regime front, there are multiple parties within the legislature, and there has been no consolidation of incumbent advantage (e.g. unconstitutional closing of the lower house or extension of incumbent's term by postponing of subsequent elections). Transition years are coded as the regime that emerges in that year.

0. No Democracy

1. Democracy

3.2.3.4 Political Pluralism and Participation (fh_ppp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_ppp

Original tag: fh_ppp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Political Pluralism and Participation - This variable encompasses an examination of the right of the people to freely organize in political parties; the existence of an opposition with a realistic possibility to increase its support; the ability of the people to make political choices free from domination by the military, totalitarian parties or other powerful groups; and the existence of full political rights for all minorities. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

3.2.3.5 Political Rights (fh_pr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_pr

Original tag: fh_pr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9251, Percent: 72.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8125, Percent: 26.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1126 Percent: 12.17

Description:

Political Rights Rating - Political rights enable people to participate freely in the political process, including the right to vote freely for distinct alternatives in legitimate elections, compete for public office, join political parties and organizations, and elect representatives who have a decisive impact on public policies and are accountable to the electorate. The specific list of rights considered varies over the years. Countries are graded between 1 (most free) and 7 (least free).

3.2.3.6 Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_polcon3

Original tag: h_polcon3

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9975, Percent: 78.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9006, Percent: 29.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 969 Percent: 9.71

Description:

This index measures the feasibility of policy change, i.e. the extent to which a change in the prefer-ences of any one political actor may lead to a change in government policy. The index is

composed from the following information: the number of independent branches of government with veto power over policy change, counting the executive and the presence of an effective lower and upper house in the legislature (more branches leading to more constraint); the extent of party alignment across branches of government, measured as the extent to which the same party or coalition of parties control each branch (decreasing the level of constraint); and the extent of preference heterogeneity within each legislative branch, measured as legislative fractionalization in the relevant house (increasing constraint for aligned executives, decreasing it for opposed executives). The index scores are derived from a simple spatial model and theoretically ranges from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating more political constraint and thus less feasibility of policy change. Note that the coding reflects information as of January 1 in any given year. Henisz (2002) uses this index to demonstrate that political environments that limit the feasibility of policy change are an important determinant of investment in infrastructure.

3.2.3.7 Official State Party (iaep_osp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_osp

Original tag: iaep_osp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7041, Percent: 55.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6721, Percent: 22.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 320 Percent: 4.54

Description:

Is there an official state party?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.3.8 Single Party System (jw_oneparty)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_jw_oneparty

Original tag: jw_oneparty

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Johnson & Wallack (2012)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3460, Percent: 27.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3053, Percent: 10.07

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 407 Percent: 11.76

Description:

Dummy variable, 1 if single-party system.

3.2.3.9 Regimes of the world with ambiguous cases (vdem_regimeamb)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_regimeamb

Original tag: vdem_regimeamb

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10907, Percent: 85.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10547, Percent: 34.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 360 Percent: 3.3

Description:

Answer to the question: 'How can the political regime overall be classified considering the competitiveness of access to power (polyarchy) as well as liberal principles?'

0. Closed autocracy: No multiparty elections for the chief executive or the legislature.

1. Closed autocracy upper bound: Same as closed autocracy, but the confidence intervals of the multiparty election indicators overlap the level of electoral autocracies.

2. Electoral autocracy lower bound: Same as electoral autocracy, but the confidence intervals

of one or both of the multiparty election indicators overlap the level of closed autocracies.

3. Electoral autocracy: De-jure multiparty elections for the chief executive and the legislature, but failing to achieve that elections are free and fair, or de-facto multiparty, or a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites of polyarchy as measured by V-Dem's Electoral Democracy Index.

4. Electoral autocracy upper bound: Same as electoral autocracy, but the upper bounds of

the confidence intervals of the indicators for free and fair and multiparty elections and the Electoral Democracy Index overlap the level of electoral democracies.

5. Electoral democracy lower bound: Same as electoral democracy, but the lower bounds of

the confidence intervals of the indicators for free and fair, or multiparty or the Electoral Democracy Index overlap the level of electoral autocracies.

6. Electoral democracy: Free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral Democracy Index, but either access to justice, or transparent law enforcement, or liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive not satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component Index.

7. Electoral democracy upper bound: Same as electoral democracy, but the confidence intervals of the indicators for access to justice, and transparent law enforcement, and the liberal component index overlap the level of liberal democracies.

8. Liberal democracy lower bound: Same as liberal democracy, but the confidence intervals of the indicators for access to justice, and transparent law enforcement, and the liberal component index reaches the level of electoral democracies.

9. Liberal democracy: De-facto free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral

Democracy Index are guaranteed as well as access to justice, transparent law enforcement and the liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component

Index.

3.2.4 Religion

This category includes variables regarding numbers of followers of specific religions and the status of religion in the constitution.

3.2.4.1 Government Restrictions on Religious Practices (ciri_relfre)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_relfre

Original tag: ciri_relfre

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7491, Percent: 58.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6571, Percent: 21.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 920 Percent: 12.28

Description:

This variable indicates the extent to which the freedom of citizens to exercise and practice their religious beliefs is subject to actual government restrictions. Citizens of whatever religious belief should be able to worship free from government interference. Additionally, citizens should be able to hold no religion at all.

Citizens should be able to freely practice their religion and proselytize (attempt to convert) other citizens to their religion as long as such attempts are done in a non-coercive, peaceful manner.

Members of the clergy should be able to advocate partisan political views freely, oppose government laws, support political candidates, and otherwise freely participate in politics without fear of government prosecution.

Some important questions to consider include: Does the government respect rights to religious expression, including the freedom to publish religious documents in foreign languages? Does religious belief affect membership in a ruling party or a career in government? Does the government prohibit promotion of one religion over another, or discriminate on the grounds of religion or belief? Does the government restrict the teaching or practice of any faith? Does the government discriminate against minority religious groups?

Scoring Scheme:

Government restrictions on religious practices are:

(0) Severe and Widespread

(1) Moderate

(2) Practically Absent

3.2.4.2 Religion Based Banning of Parties (iaep_rbbp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_iaep_rbbp

Original tag: iaep_rbbp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wig et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6881, Percent: 54.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6577, Percent: 21.68

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 304 Percent: 4.42

Description:

Does religious affiliation determine the banning of parties?

0. No

1. Yes

Source: IAEP (Wig et al., 2015)

3.2.5 Quality of Government

This category includes variables that are the core features of QoG (impartiality, bureaucratic quality and corruption) as well as measures that are broader (rule of law and transparency).

3.2.5.1 Corruption Perception: Political Parties (gcb_ppa)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gcb_ppa

Original tag: gcb_ppa

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Transparency International (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 508, Percent: 4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 501, Percent: 1.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 1.38

Description:

To what extent do you perceive the following categories in this country to be affected by corruption? Political parties. 1 (Not at all corrupt) - 5 (Extremely corrupt).

3.2.5.2 Election vote buying (vdem_elvotbuy)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_elvotbuy

Original tag: vdem_elvotbuy

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9340, Percent: 73.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9055, Percent: 29.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 285 Percent: 3.05

Description:

Election vote buying

Question: In this national election, was there evidence of vote and/or turnout buying?

Clarification: Vote and turnout buying refers to the distribution of money or gifts to individuals, families, or small groups in order to influence their decision to vote/not vote or whom to vote for. It does not include legislation targeted at specific constituencies, i.e., 'porkbarrel' legislation.

Responses:

0: Yes. There was systematic, widespread, and almost nationwide vote/turnout buying by

almost all parties and candidates.

1: Yes, some. There were non-systematic but rather common vote-buying efforts, even if only

in some parts of the country or by one or a few parties.

2: Restricted. Money and/or personal gifts were distributed by parties or candidates but these

offerings were more about meeting an 'entry-ticket' expectation and less about actual vote

choice or turnout, even if a smaller number of individuals may also be persuaded.

3: Almost none. There was limited use of money and personal gifts, or these attempts were

limited to a few small areas of the country. In all, they probably affected less than a few

percent of voters.

4: None. There was no evidence of vote/turnout buying.

3.2.5.3 Electoral Accountability Sub-index (bgi_eas)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bgi_eas

Original tag: bgi_eas

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3152, Percent: 24.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3074, Percent: 10.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 2.47

Description:

Electoral (vertical) accountability refers the range of actions and mechanisms that citizens can use to hold governments accountable. This includes organization in political parties and participation in free and fair elections

3.2.6 Gender Equality

This category includes variables related to the differences of access and opportunities between women and men by country, such as access to education, overall employment and employment by specific sectors, and indexes that shine a light on the general differences in treatment between men and women.

3.2.6.1 Type of Gender Quota (qar_typ)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_qar_typ

Original tag: qar_typ

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hughes et al. (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1033, Percent: 8.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1003, Percent: 3.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Type of gender quota. 'seats' denotes a national quota that reserves a certain percentage of seats in the legislature for women. 'candidate' denotes a national gender quota that requires all parties to field a certain percentage of female candidates or nominees. 'both' denotes hybrid quotas that use a mix of both types.

Coded only for country-years where a quota was present.

3.2.7 Conflict and Military Service

This category includes variables concerning armed conflict, including civil war and terrorism, govern- ment revenue and spending related to violent conflict (military expenditure, arms imports, military personnel).

3.2.7.1 Battle-related deaths (number of people) (wdi_brdeath)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_brdeath

Original tag: wdi_brdeath

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1185, Percent: 9.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1123, Percent: 3.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 5.23

Description:

Battle-related deaths are deaths in battle-related conflicts between warring parties in the conflict dyad (two conflict units that are parties to a conflict). Typically, battle-related deaths occur in warfare involving the armed forces of the warring parties. This includes traditional battlefield fighting, guerrilla activities, and all kinds of bombardments of military units, cities, and villages, etc. The targets are usually the military itself and its installations or state institutions and state representatives, but there is often substantial collateral damage in the form of civilians being killed in crossfire, in indiscriminate bombings, etc. All deaths--military as well as civilian--incurred in such situations, are counted as battle-related deaths.

4 REPDEM

The **Representative Democracy Data Archive (REPDEM)** presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe. As a world-leading database for research on the competition for government in Europe, the archive contains unique data on governments, parliaments, political parties, length of government formation periods, bargain rounds, as well as procedures and mechanism for intra-coalition governance, etc. The latest updates were made in the research infrastructure project Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED). PAGED builds on REPDEM's previous international and comparative projects on European parliamentary democracy. More information is available on the project's website: `http://repdem.org`

4.1 REPDEM Basic

Dataset tag: repdem_basic

Output Unit: Repdem Cabinet-Date, i.e., data is collected per cabinet and date. The unit for this dataset is a cabinet and the day a cabinet started. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a cabinet in combination with a date, using the columns cab_name and date_in. The unit can also be expressed using the columns cab_id and date_in.

Description: Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED) – Basic dataset, is a research infrastructure project that aims to build a state-of-the-art database for comparative coalition research on political institutions, political parties, parliaments and governments.

This comparative dataset builds on previous datasets (Andersson et al 2020, Bergman et al 2019, Bergman et al 2021, Bergman et al 2024, Hellström et al 2021, Strøm et al 2008), and has been updated in-house to cover additional years, additional countries (vetted by county experts), and additional variables. The dataset provides detailed information on important aspects of government formation and government termination in 33 parliamentary democracies from 1943 (or their democratic transitions) up to late-2025.

Dataset citation:
Hellström, Johan, Torbjörn Bergman, Jonas Lindahl, and Elsa Karlsson Gustafsson (2026). The Representative Democracy Data Archive (REPDEM) – Basic dataset, Version 2026.02. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, a national research infrastructure (grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council). Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Comments:
For party abbreviations see party codebook: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5185/party-codebook-repdem-3.pdf`
Notes on coding principles: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5187/notes-on-coding-principles.pdf`

Link to original codebook
`https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5184/repdem-basic-data-set-codebook.pdf`

License: REPDEM presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe.
Repdem offers a range of datasets available for free (without even a demand for registration).

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://repdem.org/index.php/current-dataset/`

4.1.1 Cabinet Information

These variables provide information on the Cabinet composition.

4.1.1.1 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) fractionalization: lower chamber (bp_fract)

Long tag: repdem_basic_bp_fract
Original tag: bp_fract
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Same calculation as enpp, but using Banzhaf index values instead of party seat shares as weights.

4.1.1.2 Coalition (cab_coalition)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_coalition
Original tag: cab_coalition
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34
Description:
Coalition government
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.3 Cabinet composition (cab_composition1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_composition1
Original tag: cab_composition1
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Party abbreviations (see party codebook). List of cabinet parties, beginning with the party of the PM.

4.1.1.4 Cabinet composition (cab_composition2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_composition2
Original tag: cab_composition2
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Party Ids (see party codebook). List of cabinet parties, beginning with the party of the PM.

4.1.1.5 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_connected

Original tag: cab_connected

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 989, Percent: 82.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1790, Percent: 5.9

Description:

Ideologically "connected cabinet" (i.e., the parties are next to one another) on economic left-right placement of political parties.
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.6 Cabinet duration (cab_duration_days)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_duration_days

Original tag: cab_duration_days

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1110, Percent: 92.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Measured in days. Defined as the time period between cabinet's first and last day in office.

4.1.1.7 Maximum possible cabinet duration (cab_duration_max)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_duration_max

Original tag: cab_duration_max

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1918, Percent: 6.32

Description:

Measured in days. Defined as: remainder of the parliamentary term when cabinet assumes office until
(a) next constitutionally mandated parliamentary elections
(b) next constitutionally mandated presidential elections if it is required or customary for governments to resign at that time

4.1.1.8 Relative cabinet duration (cab_duration_relative)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_duration_relative

Original tag: cab_duration_relative

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1109, Percent: 92.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Defined as the share (proportion) of potential duration the cabinet was in office.

4.1.1.9 Effective number of cabinet parties: lower chamber (cab_enpp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_enpp

Original tag: cab_enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1116, Percent: 93.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Effective number of cabinet parties(lower chamber)

4.1.1.10 Formal minority cabinet (cab_formal_minority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_formal_minority

Original tag: cab_formal_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:

Formal minority
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.11 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE (cab_gravity)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_gravity

Original tag: cab_gravity

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

The Manifesto Project's RILE scale has been used to estimate party positions. For the calculation of the measure, consult the notes on coding principles.

4.1.1.12 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_gravity_logit

Original tag: cab_gravity_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

Same as cab_gravity, but with logit-scaled (Lowe et al. 2011) party positions.

4.1.1.13 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_gravity_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_gravity_prosser

Original tag: cab_gravity_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

Prosser's (2014) suggested categories for estimating party positions from the Manifesto Project data has been used.

4.1.1.14 Cabinet ID (cab_id)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_id

Original tag: cab_id

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Cabinet code. First two digits: country Second two digits: cabinet number.

4.1.1.15 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat) (cab_majority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_majority

Original tag: cab_majority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:

Majority government
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.16 Minimal winning coalition (cab_mwc)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_mwc

Original tag: cab_mwc

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:

MWC
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.17 Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (cab_mwcc)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_mwcc

Original tag: cab_mwcc

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 859, Percent: 71.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1513, Percent: 4.99

Description:

Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (MWCC).
0: no
1: yes
A cabinet is a MWCC if (i) it is connected, and (ii) it cannot remain winning AND connected by dropping a party.

4.1.1.18 MWCC including single-party cabinets (cab_mwccs)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_mwccs

Original tag: cab_mwccs

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1008, Percent: 84.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1796, Percent: 5.92

Description:

MWCC including single-party cabinets
0: no
1: yes
Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet including single-party majority governments.

4.1.1.19 Cabinet (cab_name)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_name

Original tag: cab_name

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Cabinet name (name of the PM consecutively numbered with Roman figures).

4.1.1.20 Number of cabinet parties (cab_num_parties)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_num_parties

Original tag: cab_num_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Number of cabinet parties

4.1.1.21 Cabinet party 1 (cab_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party1

Original tag: cab_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1126, Percent: 94.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.22 Cabinet party 2 (cab_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party2

Original tag: cab_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 783, Percent: 65.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1278, Percent: 4.21

Description:

Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.23 Cabinet party 3 (cab_party3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party3
Original tag: cab_party3
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 490, Percent: 41.04
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 668, Percent: 2.2
Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.24 Cabinet party 4 (cab_party4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party4
Original tag: cab_party4
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 21.78
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 337, Percent: 1.11
Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.25 Cabinet party 5 (cab_party5)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party5
Original tag: cab_party5
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 119, Percent: 9.97
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 136, Percent: 0.45
Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.26 Cabinet party 6 (cab_party6)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party6
Original tag: cab_party6
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 4.36
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.2
Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.27 Cabinet party 7 (cab_party7)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party7
Original tag: cab_party7
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 26.32

Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.28 Cabinet party 8 (cab_party8)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_party8

Original tag: cab_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 62.5

Description:
Party-IDs see party codebook

4.1.1.29 Cabinet polarization, RILE (cab_polar)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_polar

Original tag: cab_polar

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.1.1.30 Cabinet polarization, RILE, logit scaled (cab_polar_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_polar_logit

Original tag: cab_polar_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.1.1.31 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_polar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_polar_prosser

Original tag: cab_polar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.1.1.32 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_polar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_polar_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_polar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.1.1.33 Cabinet preference range, RILE (cab_prefrange)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_prefrange

Original tag: cab_prefrange

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 944, Percent: 79.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1745, Percent: 5.75

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the cabinet on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.1.1.34 Cabinet preference range, RILE, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_prefrange_logit

Original tag: cab_prefrange_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the cabinet based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.1.1.35 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_prefrange_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_prefrange_prosser

Original tag: cab_prefrange_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

As cab_prefrange, but using the categories suggested by Prosser (2014) for constructing the left-right scale

4.1.1.36 Cabinet seat share (cab_seatshare)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare

Original tag: cab_seatshare

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Cabinet seat share (0-1)

4.1.1.37 Cabinet strength: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_strength_lower

Original tag: cab_strength_lower

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties combined.

4.1.1.38 Cabinet strength including formal support parties: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower_supported)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_strength_lower_supported

Original tag: cab_strength_lower_supported

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties and all formal support parties.

4.1.1.39 Cabinet strength at date out: lower chamber (cab_strength_out)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_strength_out

Original tag: cab_strength_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 857, Percent: 71.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1425, Percent: 4.7

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties at termination of the cabinet.

4.1.1.40 Cabinet strength: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_strength_upper

Original tag: cab_strength_upper

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 416, Percent: 34.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 570, Percent: 1.88

Description:

Cabinet strength (upper chamber)

4.1.1.41 Cabinet strength at date out: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper_out)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_strength_upper_out

Original tag: cab_strength_upper_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 219, Percent: 18.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share (upper chamber) of all cabinet parties at termination of the cabinet.

4.1.1.42 Surplus majority cabinet (cab_surplus)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_surplus

Original tag: cab_surplus

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:

Surplus government
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.43 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_wpolar

Original tag: cab_wpolar

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

As cab_polar, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.1.1.44 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_wpolar_logit

Original tag: cab_wpolar_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

As cab_wpolar, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.1.1.45 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_wpolar_prosser

Original tag: cab_wpolar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

As cab_polar_prosser, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.1.1.46 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_wpolar_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_wpolar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

As cab_wpolar_prosser, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.1.1.47 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber, alternative operationalization (con_alt_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_con_alt_share

Original tag: con_alt_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the Christian democratic (50) or conservative (60) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.1.1.48 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber (con_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_con_share

Original tag: con_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the liberal (40) or conservative (60) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.1.1.49 Date in (date_in)

Long tag: repdem_basic_date_in

Original tag: date_in

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

First day in cabinet life according to official criteria defined as:
(a) date that PM/cabinet was appointed by head of state
(b) date of investiture vote in parliament
(c) date of general election

4.1.1.50 Date in (String) (date_in_str)

Long tag: repdem_basic_date_in_str

Original tag: date_in_str

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
In date as character string

4.1.1.51 Date out (date_out)

Long tag: repdem_basic_date_out
Original tag: date_out
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Last day in cabinet life defined as:
(a) day of cabinet resignation
(b) day of general election

4.1.1.52 Date out (string) (date_out_str)

Long tag: repdem_basic_date_out_str
Original tag: date_out_str
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Out date as character string

4.1.1.53 First policy dimension (label) (dim_first_label)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_first_label
Original tag: dim_first_label
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
First policy dimension (label)

4.1.1.54 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_first_median
Original tag: dim_first_median
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 826, Percent: 69.18
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1469, Percent: 4.84
Description:
Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.1.1.55 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber, 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_first_median_2nd

Original tag: dim_first_median_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others', only coded if a second median party exists

4.1.1.56 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_bp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_first_median_bp

Original tag: dim_first_median_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 823, Percent: 68.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1465, Percent: 4.83

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.1.1.57 Second policy dimension (label) (dim_second_label)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_second_label

Original tag: dim_second_label

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Second policy dimension (label)

4.1.1.58 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_second_median

Original tag: dim_second_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 826, Percent: 69.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1469, Percent: 4.84

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.1.1.59 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber, 2nd party (dim_second_median_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_second_median_2nd

Original tag: dim_second_median_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 14.29

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others', only coded if a second median party exists

4.1.1.60 Third policy dimension (label) (dim_third_label)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_third_label

Original tag: dim_third_label

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Third policy dimension (label)

4.1.1.61 Party of the median legislator: third policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_third_median)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_third_median

Original tag: dim_third_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 62, Percent: 5.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 0.33

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.1.1.62 Election date (elecdate)

Long tag: repdem_basic_elecdate

Original tag: elecdate

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Date of most recent parliamentary election:
(a) two-round elections: date of second round
(b) elections held over several days: date of last day

4.1.1.63 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (enpp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_enpp

Original tag: enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

All legislators subsumed under 'others' treated as one single party (minimum fragmentation)

4.1.1.64 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (Other minor parties and independents excluded) (enpp_no_others)

Long tag: repdem_basic_enpp_no_others

Original tag: enpp_no_others

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

All legislators subsumed under 'others' have been excluded from the calculation of the measure.

4.1.1.65 Decade by date of formation (form_decade)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_decade

Original tag: form_decade

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1139, Percent: 95.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1927, Percent: 6.35

Description:

90: 1990s
100: 2000s
110: 2010s
120: 2020s

4.1.1.66 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_duration

Original tag: form_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1917, Percent: 6.32

Description:

Measured in days. Time period between 'Date out' of previous cabinet and 'Date in' of current cabinet.

4.1.1.67 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration_alt)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_duration_alt

Original tag: form_duration_alt

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1917, Percent: 6.32

Description:

Measured in days. Number of days since the election OR the 'Date out' of previous cabinet if it is terminated between elections. Thus, this alternative measurement ignores/doesn't count the time between 'Date out' of previous cabinet and the election date.

4.1.1.68 Final vote of investiture: abstentions (form_invest_abs)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_invest_abs

Original tag: form_invest_abs

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 496, Percent: 41.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 892, Percent: 2.94

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of abstentions.

4.1.1.69 Final vote of investiture: contra (form_invest_con)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_invest_con

Original tag: form_invest_con

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 512, Percent: 42.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 3.02

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of contra votes.

4.1.1.70 Final vote of investiture: pro (form_invest_pro)

Long tag: repdem_basic_form_invest_pro

Original tag: form_invest_pro

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 512, Percent: 42.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 3.02

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of pro votes.

4.1.1.71 Government type (govtype)

Long tag: repdem_basic_govtype

Original tag: govtype

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

1: Min Minority cabinet: Holds less than 50 percent plus one seat in parliament. Single-party minority cabinets are likewise coded as 'Min'.

2: Maj Single-party majority cabinet: Holds 50percent plus one seat in parliament. Is not a coalition.

3: Mwc Minimal winning coalition: Is turned into a losing coalition by the subtraction of any of the coalition parties, i.e., if it loses a coalition party it holds less than 50 percent plus one seat.

4: Sur Surplus majority coalition: Can lose a coalition party and still be winning, i.e. control 50 percent plus one seat or more in the parliament

5: Non A non-partisan cabinet, e.g. appointed by a president to hold an election

4.1.1.72 Bicameralism (inst_bicam)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_bicam

Original tag: inst_bicam

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1133, Percent: 94.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Bicameralism:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.73 Comments on institutional features (inst_comment)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_comment

Original tag: inst_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

No codebook entry

4.1.1.74 Constructive vote of no-confidence (inst_convote)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_convote

Original tag: inst_convote

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1133, Percent: 94.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Constructive vote of no-confidence:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.75 PM powers (inst_pmpower)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_pmpower

Original tag: inst_pmpower

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM powers. Ranges from 1 to 8, with an increasing number indicating an increasingly more powerful PM.

4.1.1.76 Positive parliamentarism (inst_posparl)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_posparl

Original tag: inst_posparl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1133, Percent: 94.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Positive parliamentarism:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.77 Semi-presidentialism (inst_semipres)

Long tag: repdem_basic_inst_semipres

Original tag: inst_semipres

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1065, Percent: 89.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1855, Percent: 6.12

Description:

Semi-presidentialism:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.78 Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems (invest_bicameral)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_bicameral

Original tag: invest_bicameral

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 685, Percent: 57.37

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1107, Percent: 3.65

Description:

Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems:
1: Only in first/lower chamber
2: In both chambers

4.1.1.79 Comments on investiture vote (invest_comment)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_comment

Original tag: invest_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Comments

4.1.1.80 Existence of investiture vote (invest_exist)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_exist

Original tag: invest_exist

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1126, Percent: 94.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1922, Percent: 6.34

Description:

Existence of investiture vote:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.81 Government in office after investiture object (invest_inoffice)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_inoffice

Original tag: invest_inoffice

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 317, Percent: 26.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 548, Percent: 1.81

Description:

Government in office after investiture object. In the case of multiple objects of investiture, indicates after which object the government can effectively act (e.g., has control over armed forces):
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.1.1.82 Object of investiture vote (invest_object)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_object

Original tag: invest_object

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Object of investiture vote. Lists all objects that need to pass an investiture vote, separated by commas:
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.1.1.83 Object of investiture vote: first object (invest_object1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_object1

Original tag: invest_object1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 625, Percent: 52.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1044, Percent: 3.44

Description:

Object of investiture vote: first object:
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.1.1.84 Object of investiture vote: second object (invest_object2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_object2

Original tag: invest_object2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 106, Percent: 0.35

Description:

Object of investiture vote: second object:
1: Only PM

2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.1.1.85 Allowed number of investiture votes/rounds (invest_rounds_max)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_rounds_max

Original tag: invest_rounds_max

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 26.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537, Percent: 1.77

Description:

Only relevant if there is a maximum number of votes/rounds.

4.1.1.86 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_rule1

Original tag: invest_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1012, Percent: 84.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1677, Percent: 5.53

Description:

Decision rule for first investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.1.1.87 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_rule2

Original tag: invest_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 296, Percent: 24.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 487, Percent: 1.61

Description:

Decision rule for second investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.1.1.88 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_rule3

Original tag: invest_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 13.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 294, Percent: 0.97

Description:
Decision rule for third investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.1.1.89 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_rule4

Original tag: invest_rule4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 1.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 0.16

Description:
Decision rule for forth investiture vote/round
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.1.1.90 Timing of investiture vote (invest_timing)

Long tag: repdem_basic_invest_timing

Original tag: invest_timing

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 693, Percent: 58.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1117, Percent: 3.68

Description:
Timing of investiture vote:
1: Before taking office
2: After taking office
3: Both before and after taking office When investiture votes must be held with respect to the government taking office.

4.1.1.91 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_bp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_largest_party_bp

Original tag: largest_party_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:
Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament (lower chamber)

4.1.1.92 Largest party in parliament in cabinet (largest_party_incab)

Long tag: repdem_basic_largest_party_incab

Original tag: largest_party_incab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Largest party in parliament in cabinet
0: No
1: Yes

4.1.1.93 Seat share of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_largest_party_share

Original tag: largest_party_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Seat share of largest party in parliament (lower chamber)

4.1.1.94 Minority situation in parliament (minority_sit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_minority_sit

Original tag: minority_sit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Minority situation in parliament i.e., no single party holds 50percent plus one seat or more of the parliamentary seats.
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.95 Type of new government (newgov_type)

Long tag: repdem_basic_newgov_type

Original tag: newgov_type

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1139, Percent: 95.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1927, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Records if a new cabinet is the result of an election, replacement of one or several cabinet parties without a preceding election, of if there has only been a change of PM without a preceding election. This variable does not apply to non-partisan cabinets.
1: Election
2: Replacement
3: PM change, but same party composition as previous cabinet
4: other
5: non-partisan

4.1.1.96 Number of cabinet members (num_ministers)

Long tag: repdem_basic_num_ministers

Original tag: num_ministers

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1128, Percent: 94.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Number of Ministers

4.1.1.97 Number of ministries (num_ministries)

Long tag: repdem_basic_num_ministries

Original tag: num_ministries

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Number of Ministries

4.1.1.98 Number of parties in parliament (num_parties)

Long tag: repdem_basic_num_parties

Original tag: num_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Number of parties in parliament. All parties, excluding 'others'.

4.1.1.99 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_polar_prosser

Original tag: parl_polar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1057, Percent: 88.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1834, Percent: 6.05

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.1.1.100 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (parl_polar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_polar_prosser_logit

Original tag: parl_polar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1057, Percent: 88.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1834, Percent: 6.05

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.1.1.101 Parliamentary polarization, RILE, logit scaled (parl_polar_rile)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_polar_rile

Original tag: parl_polar_rile

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1057, Percent: 88.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1834, Percent: 6.05

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.1.1.102 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_rile_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_polar_rile_logit

Original tag: parl_polar_rile_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1057, Percent: 88.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1834, Percent: 6.05

Description:
Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.1.1.103 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE (parl_prefrange)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_prefrange

Original tag: parl_prefrange

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1056, Percent: 88.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1833, Percent: 6.04

Description:
The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in parliament on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.1.1.104 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_prefrange_logit

Original tag: parl_prefrange_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1056, Percent: 88.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1833, Percent: 6.04

Description:
Same as parl_prefrange, but using logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011).

4.1.1.105 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale (parl_prefrange_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_prefrange_prosser

Original tag: parl_prefrange_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1056, Percent: 88.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1833, Percent: 6.04

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in parliament on the general-left right dimension in the Manifesto Project data based on the categories suggested by Prosser (2014)

4.1.1.106 Formal cabinet decision rule (pmpower_formcab)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_formcab

Original tag: pmpower_formcab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Formal cabinet decision rule:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.107 Type of actual decision rule 1 (pmpower_formcab_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_formcab_rule1

Original tag: pmpower_formcab_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1079, Percent: 90.37

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1859, Percent: 6.13

Description:

Type of actual decision rule 1:
1: unanimity
2: majority
3: consensus defined by PM (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)
4: consensus defined by head of state (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)

4.1.1.108 Type of actual decision rule 2 (pmpower_formcab_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_formcab_rule2

Original tag: pmpower_formcab_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 0.16

Description:

Type of actual decision rule 2:
1: unanimity
2: majority
3: consensus defined by PM (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)

4: consensus defined by head of state (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)

4.1.1.109 Ministers' parliamentary accountability (pmpower_minaccount)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_minaccount

Original tag: pmpower_minaccount

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Ministers' parliamentary accountability:
0: direct
1: via PM only
2: via vote of no confidence against full cabinet only

4.1.1.110 PM right to appoint ministers (pmpower_minappoint)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_minappoint

Original tag: pmpower_minappoint

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM right to appoint ministers:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.111 Type of actual appointment right (pmpower_minappoint_rule)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_minappoint_rule

Original tag: pmpower_minappoint_rule

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1090, Percent: 91.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

Type of actual appointment right:
1: yes, PM alone
2: yes, through formal act carried out by head of state
3: no, head of state has discretionary powers
4: other

4.1.1.112 PM right to dismiss ministers (pmpower_mindismiss)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_mindismiss

Original tag: pmpower_mindismiss

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM right to dismiss ministers:

0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.113 Type of actual dismissal right (pmpower_mindismiss_rule)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_mindismiss_rule

Original tag: pmpower_mindismiss_rule

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1024, Percent: 85.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1848, Percent: 6.09

Description:

Type of actual dismissal right:
1: yes, PM alone
2: yes, through formal act carried out by head of state
3: no, head of state has discretionary powers
4: other

4.1.1.114 PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting (pmpower_pmagenda)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmagenda

Original tag: pmpower_pmagenda

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.115 PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries (pmpower_pmjurisdiction)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmjurisdiction

Original tag: pmpower_pmjurisdiction

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.116 Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs (pmpower_pmoffice)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmoffice

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1091, Percent: 91.37

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1844, Percent: 6.08

Description:
Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.117 Description of structure 1 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmoffice_rule1

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 802, Percent: 67.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1358, Percent: 4.48

Description:
Description of structure 1:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.1.1.118 Description of structure 2 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmoffice_rule2

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 426, Percent: 35.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 682, Percent: 2.25

Description:
Description of structure 2:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.1.1.119 Description of structure 3 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmoffice_rule3

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 152, Percent: 12.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 266, Percent: 0.88

Description:
Description of structure 3:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.1.1.120 Description of structure 4 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmoffice_rule4

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 0.16

Description:

Description of structure 4:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.1.1.121 PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers (pmpower_pmsteering)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pmpower_pmsteering

Original tag: pmpower_pmsteering

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1124, Percent: 94.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1926, Percent: 6.35

Description:

PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.122 Post-electoral cabinet (post_election_cab)

Long tag: repdem_basic_post_election_cab

Original tag: post_election_cab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Post-electoral cabinet
0: No
1: Yes

4.1.1.123 Presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_appoint_pm

Original tag: pres_appoint_pm

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 476, Percent: 39.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 739, Percent: 2.44

Description:

Presidential power to appoint PM:
0: No appointment power
1: Free choice
2: Constitution gives open room for interpretation
3: Constitution gives clear instruction

4.1.1.124 Restrictions on presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm_restr)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_appoint_pm_restr

Original tag: pres_appoint_pm_restr

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Clarification on what constitutional restrictions apply if a president has limited appointment power.

4.1.1.125 Comments on presidential powers (pres_comment)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_comment

Original tag: pres_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Comments on presidential powers

4.1.1.126 Presidential decree powers (pres_decree)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_decree

Original tag: pres_decree

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

Presidential decree powers:
0: No decree power
1: Decree power
2: Decrees need to be countersigned by PM

4.1.1.127 Presidential decree powers: explanation (pres_decree_expl)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_decree_expl

Original tag: pres_decree_expl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Provides further detail on any decree powers held by the president, if any.

4.1.1.128 Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative (pres_dismiss)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_dismiss

Original tag: pres_dismiss

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative:

0: No dissolution at own initiative
1: Free choice (at own initiative)
2: In case of parliamentary (in)activity

4.1.1.129 No name (pres_dissolve_parl)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_dissolve_parl

Original tag: pres_dissolve_parl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

No codebook entry

4.1.1.130 Presidential right of initiative (legislation) (pres_init)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_init

Original tag: pres_init

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

Presidential right of initiative (legislation):
0: No (President cannot initiate legislation)
1: Yes (President can initiate legislation)

4.1.1.131 Popularly elected president (pres_pop)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_pop

Original tag: pres_pop

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1133, Percent: 94.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1928, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Popularly elected president:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.132 Presidential power of referenda (pres_refer)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_refer

Original tag: pres_refer

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Presidential power of referenda. All relevant referenda powers are listed, separated by commas:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government

3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.1.1.133 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_refer_rule1

Original tag: pres_refer_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 236, Percent: 19.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 405, Percent: 1.34

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, first right:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.1.1.134 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_refer_rule2

Original tag: pres_refer_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 85, Percent: 7.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 0.47

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, second right
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.1.1.135 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_refer_rule3

Original tag: pres_refer_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 0.07

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, third right:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.1.1.136 Presidential power to select the PM (pres_select_pm)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_select_pm

Original tag: pres_select_pm

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

Presidential power to select the PM:
0: No power or only formal powers
1: Selecting power

4.1.1.137 Presidential veto powers (pres_veto)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_veto

Original tag: pres_veto

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 666, Percent: 2.2

Description:

Presidential veto powers:
0: No veto power
1: Veto can be overruled by supermajority
2: Veto can be overruled by majority of the new parliament after new elections
3: Veto can be overruled by absolute majority
4: Veto can be overruled by simple majority
5: Veto of president leads to a referendum

4.1.1.138 Presidential veto powers: explanation (pres_veto_expl)

Long tag: repdem_basic_pres_veto_expl

Original tag: pres_veto_expl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Provides further detail on any veto powers held by the president, if any.

4.1.1.139 Proximity to election: lower chamber (prox_election)

Long tag: repdem_basic_prox_election

Original tag: prox_election

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1108, Percent: 92.8

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1877, Percent: 6.19

Description:

Proximity to election: lower chamber
1 (FE): Cabinets formed immediately following an election and ended by the next election.
2 (F): Cabinets formed immediately following an election.
3 (N): Cabinets neither formed immediately following an election nor ended by the next election.
4 (E): Cabinets ended by an election.

4.1.1.140 Proximity to election: upper chamber (prox_election_upper)

Long tag: repdem_basic_prox_election_upper

Original tag: prox_election_upper

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 177, Percent: 14.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 217, Percent: 0.72

Description:

Proximity to election: upper chamber
1 (FE): Cabinets immediately following an election and ended by the next election.
2 (F): Cabinets immediately following an election.
3 (N): Cabinets neither immediately following an election nor ended by the next election.
4 (E): Cabinets ended by an election.

4.1.1.141 Seat share of radical left/right parties: lower chamber (rad_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_rad_share

Original tag: rad_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the socialist or other left parties (20) or nationalist and radical right parties (70) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.1.1.142 Party seats lower chamber: Party 1 (seats_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party1

Original tag: seats_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 600, Percent: 50.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1034, Percent: 3.41

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 1

4.1.1.143 Party seats lower chamber: Party 10 (seats_party10)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party10

Original tag: seats_party10

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 363, Percent: 30.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 553, Percent: 1.82

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 10

4.1.1.144 Party seats lower chamber: Party 11 (seats_party11)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party11

Original tag: seats_party11

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 26.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 506, Percent: 1.67

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 11

4.1.1.145 Party seats lower chamber: Party 12 (seats_party12)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party12
Original tag: seats_party12
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 442, Percent: 37.02
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 733, Percent: 2.42
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 12

4.1.1.146 Party seats lower chamber: Party 13 (seats_party13)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party13
Original tag: seats_party13
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 21.36
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 401, Percent: 1.32
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 13

4.1.1.147 Party seats lower chamber: Party 14 (seats_party14)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party14
Original tag: seats_party14
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 16.16
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 303, Percent: 1
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 14

4.1.1.148 Party seats lower chamber: Party 15 (seats_party15)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party15
Original tag: seats_party15
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 217, Percent: 18.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331, Percent: 1.09
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 15

4.1.1.149 Party seats lower chamber: Party 16 (seats_party16)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party16
Original tag: seats_party16
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 16.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 312, Percent: 1.03
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 16

4.1.1.150 Party seats lower chamber: Party 17 (seats_party17)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party17
Original tag: seats_party17
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 241, Percent: 20.18
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 326, Percent: 1.07
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 17

4.1.1.151 Party seats lower chamber: Party 18 (seats_party18)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party18
Original tag: seats_party18
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 130, Percent: 10.89
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 152, Percent: 0.5
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 18

4.1.1.152 Party seats lower chamber: Party 19 (seats_party19)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party19
Original tag: seats_party19
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 16.16
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 261, Percent: 0.86
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 19

4.1.1.153 Party seats lower chamber: Party 2 (seats_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party2
Original tag: seats_party2
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 677, Percent: 2.23
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 2

4.1.1.154 Party seats lower chamber: Party 20 (seats_party20)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party20
Original tag: seats_party20
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 174, Percent: 14.57
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 208, Percent: 0.69
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 20

4.1.1.155 Party seats lower chamber: Party 21 (seats_party21)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party21
Original tag: seats_party21
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 119, Percent: 9.97
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 132, Percent: 0.44
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 21

4.1.1.156 Party seats lower chamber: Party 22 (seats_party22)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party22
Original tag: seats_party22
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 129, Percent: 10.8
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 145, Percent: 0.48
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 22

4.1.1.157 Party seats lower chamber: Party 23 (seats_party23)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party23
Original tag: seats_party23
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 87, Percent: 7.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 94, Percent: 0.31
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 23

4.1.1.158 Party seats lower chamber: Party 24 (seats_party24)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party24
Original tag: seats_party24
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 152, Percent: 12.73
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 172, Percent: 0.57
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 24

4.1.1.159 Party seats lower chamber: Party 25 (seats_party25)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party25
Original tag: seats_party25
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 101, Percent: 8.46
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 102, Percent: 0.34
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 25

4.1.1.160 Party seats lower chamber: Party 26 (seats_party26)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party26
Original tag: seats_party26
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 3.77
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 40, Percent: 0.13
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 11.11
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 26

4.1.1.161 Party seats lower chamber: Party 27 (seats_party27)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party27
Original tag: seats_party27
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 53, Percent: 4.44
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 0.17
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.89
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 27

4.1.1.162 Party seats lower chamber: Party 28 (seats_party28)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party28
Original tag: seats_party28
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 2.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 0.13
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 28

4.1.1.163 Party seats lower chamber: Party 29 (seats_party29)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party29
Original tag: seats_party29
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 85, Percent: 7.12
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 83, Percent: 0.27
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 2.35
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 29

4.1.1.164 Party seats lower chamber: Party 3 (seats_party3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party3
Original tag: seats_party3
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 516, Percent: 43.22
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 937, Percent: 3.09
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 3

4.1.1.165 Party seats lower chamber: Party 30 (seats_party30)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party30
Original tag: seats_party30
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 4.36
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 48, Percent: 0.16
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 7.69
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 30

4.1.1.166 Party seats lower chamber: Party 31 (seats_party31)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party31
Original tag: seats_party31
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 2.68
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 0.12
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 31

4.1.1.167 Party seats lower chamber: Party 32 (seats_party32)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party32
Original tag: seats_party32
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 2.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 0.12
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 32

4.1.1.168 Party seats lower chamber: Party 33 (seats_party33)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party33
Original tag: seats_party33
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 62, Percent: 5.19
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59, Percent: 0.19
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 4.84

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 33

4.1.1.169 Party seats lower chamber: Party 34 (seats_party34)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party34
Original tag: seats_party34
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 50, Percent: 4.19
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 58, Percent: 0.19
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 34

4.1.1.170 Party seats lower chamber: Party 35 (seats_party35)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party35
Original tag: seats_party35
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 2.6
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 0.12
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 35

4.1.1.171 Party seats lower chamber: Party 36 (seats_party36)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party36
Original tag: seats_party36
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 2.26
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 0.11
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 36

4.1.1.172 Party seats lower chamber: Party 37 (seats_party37)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party37
Original tag: seats_party37
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 56, Percent: 4.69
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 0.15
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 19.64
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 37

4.1.1.173 Party seats lower chamber: Party 38 (seats_party38)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party38
Original tag: seats_party38
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 38

4.1.1.174 Party seats lower chamber: Party 39 (seats_party39)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party39
Original tag: seats_party39
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 46, Percent: 3.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 15.22
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 39

4.1.1.175 Party seats lower chamber: Party 4 (seats_party4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party4
Original tag: seats_party4
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 362, Percent: 30.32
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 728, Percent: 2.4
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 4

4.1.1.176 Party seats lower chamber: Party 40 (seats_party40)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party40
Original tag: seats_party40
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 5.88
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 40

4.1.1.177 Party seats lower chamber: Party 41 (seats_party41)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party41
Original tag: seats_party41
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 41

4.1.1.178 Party seats lower chamber: Party 42 (seats_party42)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party42
Original tag: seats_party42
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 42

4.1.1.179 Party seats lower chamber: Party 43 (seats_party43)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party43
Original tag: seats_party43
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 16.67
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 43

4.1.1.180 Party seats lower chamber: Party 44 (seats_party44)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party44
Original tag: seats_party44
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 0.09
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9 Percent: 25.71
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 44

4.1.1.181 Party seats lower chamber: Party 45 (seats_party45)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party45
Original tag: seats_party45
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 22.73
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 45

4.1.1.182 Party seats lower chamber: Party 46 (seats_party46)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party46
Original tag: seats_party46
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 2.43

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 24.14
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 46

4.1.1.183 Party seats lower chamber: Party 47 (seats_party47)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party47
Original tag: seats_party47
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 41.67
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 47

4.1.1.184 Party seats lower chamber: Party 48 (seats_party48)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party48
Original tag: seats_party48
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 2.35
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 0.08
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 10.71
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 48

4.1.1.185 Party seats lower chamber: Party 49 (seats_party49)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party49
Original tag: seats_party49
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 0.07
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 49

4.1.1.186 Party seats lower chamber: Party 5 (seats_party5)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party5
Original tag: seats_party5
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 512, Percent: 42.88
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 966, Percent: 3.18
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 5

4.1.1.187 Party seats lower chamber: Party 50 (seats_party50)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party50

Original tag: seats_party50
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 50

4.1.1.188 Party seats lower chamber: Party 51 (seats_party51)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party51
Original tag: seats_party51
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 14.29
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 51

4.1.1.189 Party seats lower chamber: Party 52 (seats_party52)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party52
Original tag: seats_party52
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 52

4.1.1.190 Party seats lower chamber: Party 53 (seats_party53)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party53
Original tag: seats_party53
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 15.79
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 53

4.1.1.191 Party seats lower chamber: Party 54 (seats_party54)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party54
Original tag: seats_party54
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 54

4.1.1.192 Party seats lower chamber: Party 55 (seats_party55)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party55
Original tag: seats_party55
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 55

4.1.1.193 Party seats lower chamber: Party 56 (seats_party56)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party56
Original tag: seats_party56
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 12.5
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 56

4.1.1.194 Party seats lower chamber: Party 57 (seats_party57)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party57
Original tag: seats_party57
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 41.67
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 57

4.1.1.195 Party seats lower chamber: Party 58 (seats_party58)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party58
Original tag: seats_party58
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 58

4.1.1.196 Party seats lower chamber: Party 59 (seats_party59)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party59
Original tag: seats_party59
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 1.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 43.75
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 59

4.1.1.197 Party seats lower chamber: Party 6 (seats_party6)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party6
Original tag: seats_party6
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 401, Percent: 33.58
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 798, Percent: 2.63
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 6

4.1.1.198 Party seats lower chamber: Party 60 (seats_party60)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party60
Original tag: seats_party60
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 18.18
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 60

4.1.1.199 Party seats lower chamber: Party 61 (seats_party61)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party61
Original tag: seats_party61
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 23.53
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 61

4.1.1.200 Party seats lower chamber: Party 62 (seats_party62)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party62
Original tag: seats_party62
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 25
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 62

4.1.1.201 Party seats lower chamber: Party 63 (seats_party63)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party63
Original tag: seats_party63
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 63

4.1.1.202 Party seats lower chamber: Party 64 (seats_party64)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party64
Original tag: seats_party64
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 64

4.1.1.203 Party seats lower chamber: Party 65 (seats_party65)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party65
Original tag: seats_party65
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 65

4.1.1.204 Party seats lower chamber: Party 66 (seats_party66)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party66
Original tag: seats_party66
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 66

4.1.1.205 Party seats lower chamber: Party 67 (seats_party67)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party67
Original tag: seats_party67
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 0.08
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 67

4.1.1.206 Party seats lower chamber: Party 68 (seats_party68)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party68
Original tag: seats_party68
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 68

4.1.1.207 Party seats lower chamber: Party 7 (seats_party7)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party7
Original tag: seats_party7
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 47.24
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 948, Percent: 3.13
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 7

4.1.1.208 Party seats lower chamber: Party 8 (seats_party8)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party8
Original tag: seats_party8
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 360, Percent: 30.15
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 642, Percent: 2.12
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 8

4.1.1.209 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9 (seats_party9)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party9
Original tag: seats_party9
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 421, Percent: 35.26
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 758, Percent: 2.5
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 9

4.1.1.210 Party seats lower chamber: Party 98 (others) (seats_party98)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party98
Original tag: seats_party98
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 98 (others)

4.1.1.211 Party seats lower chamber: Party 99 (others) (seats_party99)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party99

Original tag: seats_party99

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 99 (others)

4.1.1.212 Seat share of socialist and green parties: lower chamber (soc_green_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_soc_green_share

Original tag: soc_green_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:
Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the ecologist parties (10), socialist or other left parties (20), or social democratic parties (30) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.1.1.213 Seat share of socialist parties: lower chamber (soc_share)

Long tag: repdem_basic_soc_share

Original tag: soc_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 95.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:
Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the socialist or other left parties (20) or social democratic parties (30) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.1.1.214 Support parties (support_parties)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_parties

Original tag: support_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:
See party codebooks. Only includes formal support parties, i.e., those that have a formal written agreement with the government guaranteeing, at minimum, support in issues of confidence and supply

4.1.1.215 Support party 1 (support_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party1
Original tag: support_party1
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 179, Percent: 14.99
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 289, Percent: 0.95
Description:
Support party 1

4.1.1.216 Support party 2 (support_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party2
Original tag: support_party2
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 74, Percent: 6.2
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 0.44
Description:
Support party 2

4.1.1.217 Support party 3 (support_party3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party3
Original tag: support_party3
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 41, Percent: 3.43
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 60, Percent: 0.2
Description:
Support party 3

4.1.1.218 Support party 4 (support_party4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party4
Original tag: support_party4
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23, Percent: 0.08
Description:
Support party 4

4.1.1.219 Support party 5 (support_party5)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party5
Original tag: support_party5
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Support party 5

4.1.1.220 Support party 6 (support_party6)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party6
Original tag: support_party6
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Support party 6

4.1.1.221 Support party 7 (support_party7)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party7
Original tag: support_party7
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Support party 7

4.1.1.222 Support party 8 (support_party8)

Long tag: repdem_basic_support_party8
Original tag: support_party8
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Support party 8

4.1.1.223 Technocrat ministry majority (techno_maj)

Long tag: repdem_basic_techno_maj
Original tag: techno_maj
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Technocrat ministry majority
0: No
1: Yes

4.1.1.224 Technocrat PM (techno_pm)

Long tag: repdem_basic_techno_pm
Original tag: techno_pm
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Technocrat PM
0: No
1: Yes

4.1.1.225 Broad policy remit (techno_remit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_techno_remit
Original tag: techno_remit
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Broad policy remit
0: No
1: Yes
A cabinet without a broad policy remit is considered a caretaker cabinet.

4.1.1.226 Description of dominant policy area (term_descr)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_descr
Original tag: term_descr
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
No codebook entry

4.1.1.227 Discretionary termination (term_disc)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc
Original tag: term_disc
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Discretionary termination:
0: No
1: Yes

4.1.1.228 Cabinet defeat in parliament (term_disc_cabdefeat)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_cabdefeat
Original tag: term_disc_cabdefeat
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:
Cabinet defeat in parliament:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.229 Conflict between coalition parties: Parties involved (term_disc_conflict_parties)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_conflict_parties
Original tag: term_disc_conflict_parties
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Party IDs see party codebooks

4.1.1.230 Conflict between coalition parties (personnel) (term_disc_conflict_pers)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_conflict_pers
Original tag: term_disc_conflict_pers
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Conflict between coalition parties (personnel):
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.231 Conflict between coalition parties (policy) (term_disc_conflict_pol)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_conflict_pol
Original tag: term_disc_conflict_pol
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Conflict between coalition parties (policy):
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.232 Early parliamentary election (term_disc_earlyelec)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_earlyelec
Original tag: term_disc_earlyelec
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Early parliamentary election:
0: no

1: yes

4.1.1.233 Voluntary enlargement of coalition (term_disc_enlarge)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_enlarge

Original tag: term_disc_enlarge

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Voluntary enlargement of coalition:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.234 Intra party conflict (term_disc_intra)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_intra

Original tag: term_disc_intra

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1110, Percent: 92.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Intra party conflict:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.235 Intra party conflict: Type of conflict (term_disc_intra_conflict)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_intra_conflict

Original tag: term_disc_intra_conflict

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Intra party conflict, Type of conflict:
L – Conflict in national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) (NB: This is conflict contained in the leadership.)
NL – Conflict between united national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) and non-leaders (party activists, party congress delegates, backbench MPs, regional leaders, etc.)
LNL – Conflict in national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) including grass-roots mobilization (i.e. conflict is not confined to the top level)

4.1.1.236 Intra party conflict: Party involved (term_disc_intra_party)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_intra_party

Original tag: term_disc_intra_party

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Party IDs see party codebooks

4.1.1.237 Other voluntary reason (term_disc_voluntary)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_voluntary

Original tag: term_disc_voluntary

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Other voluntary reason:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.238 Economic event (term_event_econ)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_event_econ

Original tag: term_event_econ

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Economic event:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.239 International or national security event (term_event_intnat)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_event_intnat

Original tag: term_event_intnat

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

International or national security event:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.240 Non-parliamentary elections (term_event_nonparlelec)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_event_nonparlelec

Original tag: term_event_nonparlelec

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Non-parliamentary elections:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.241 Personal event (term_event_pers)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_event_pers

Original tag: term_event_pers

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Personal event:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.242 Popular opinion shock (term_event_popshock)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_event_popshock

Original tag: term_event_popshock

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Popular opinion shock:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.243 Ministry involved (term_ministry)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_ministry

Original tag: term_ministry

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

No codebook entry

4.1.1.244 Other constitutional reason (term_tech_const)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_tech_const

Original tag: term_tech_const

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Other constitutional reason:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.245 Death of PM (term_tech_death)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_tech_death

Original tag: term_tech_death

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Death of PM:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.246 Regular parliamentary election (term_tech_regelec)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_tech_regelec

Original tag: term_tech_regelec

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2

Description:

Regular parliamentary election:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.247 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension upper chamber (upper_dim_first_median)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_dim_first_median

Original tag: upper_dim_first_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 151, Percent: 12.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 210, Percent: 0.69

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.1.1.248 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension upper chamber (upper_dim_second_median)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_dim_second_median

Original tag: upper_dim_second_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 151, Percent: 12.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 210, Percent: 0.69

Description:

Party IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'.

4.1.1.249 Effective number of parliamentary parties: upper chamber (upper_enpp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_enpp

Original tag: upper_enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 203, Percent: 17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Description:

Effective number of parliamentary parties in upper chamber. All legislators subsumed under 'others' treated as one single party (minimum fragmentation).

4.1.1.250 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat: upper chamber (upper_majority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_majority

Original tag: upper_majority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 302, Percent: 25.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 396, Percent: 1.31

Description:

Cabinet majority (50percent + 1 seat) in upper chamber
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.251 Party seats upper chamber: Party 1 (upper_seats_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party1

Original tag: upper_seats_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 116, Percent: 9.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 168, Percent: 0.55

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 1

4.1.1.252 Party seats upper chamber: Party 10 (upper_seats_party10)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party10

Original tag: upper_seats_party10

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 46, Percent: 0.15

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 10

4.1.1.253 Party seats upper chamber: Party 11 (upper_seats_party11)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party11

Original tag: upper_seats_party11

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 78, Percent: 6.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 110, Percent: 0.36

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 11

4.1.1.254 Party seats upper chamber: Party 12 (upper_seats_party12)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party12

Original tag: upper_seats_party12

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 88, Percent: 7.37
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 117, Percent: 0.39
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 12

4.1.1.255 Party seats upper chamber: Party 13 (upper_seats_party13)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party13
Original tag: upper_seats_party13
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 48, Percent: 4.02
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 13

4.1.1.256 Party seats upper chamber: Party 14 (upper_seats_party14)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party14
Original tag: upper_seats_party14
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 2.43
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 14

4.1.1.257 Party seats upper chamber: Party 15 (upper_seats_party15)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party15
Original tag: upper_seats_party15
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 48, Percent: 4.02
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 15

4.1.1.258 Party seats upper chamber: Party 16 (upper_seats_party16)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party16
Original tag: upper_seats_party16
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 83, Percent: 6.95
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 124, Percent: 0.41
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 16

4.1.1.259 Party seats upper chamber: Party 17 (upper_seats_party17)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party17
Original tag: upper_seats_party17
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 109, Percent: 9.13
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 135, Percent: 0.45
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 17

4.1.1.260 Party seats upper chamber: Party 18 (upper_seats_party18)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party18
Original tag: upper_seats_party18
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 3.18
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 53, Percent: 0.17
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 18

4.1.1.261 Party seats upper chamber: Party 19 (upper_seats_party19)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party19
Original tag: upper_seats_party19
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 7.04
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 88, Percent: 0.29
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 19

4.1.1.262 Party seats upper chamber: Party 2 (upper_seats_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party2
Original tag: upper_seats_party2
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 1.68
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23, Percent: 0.08
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 2

4.1.1.263 Party seats upper chamber: Party 20 (upper_seats_party20)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party20
Original tag: upper_seats_party20
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 7.79
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 139, Percent: 0.46
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 20

4.1.1.264 Party seats upper chamber: Party 21 (upper_seats_party21)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party21
Original tag: upper_seats_party21

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 0.12
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 21

4.1.1.265 Party seats upper chamber: Party 22 (upper_seats_party22)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party22
Original tag: upper_seats_party22
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 5.61
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 80, Percent: 0.26
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 22

4.1.1.266 Party seats upper chamber: Party 23 (upper_seats_party23)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party23
Original tag: upper_seats_party23
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 46, Percent: 3.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 0.15
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 23

4.1.1.267 Party seats upper chamber: Party 24 (upper_seats_party24)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party24
Original tag: upper_seats_party24
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 80, Percent: 6.7
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 88, Percent: 0.29
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 24

4.1.1.268 Party seats upper chamber: Party 25 (upper_seats_party25)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party25
Original tag: upper_seats_party25
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 25

4.1.1.269 Party seats upper chamber: Party 26 (upper_seats_party26)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party26
Original tag: upper_seats_party26
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 26

4.1.1.270 Party seats upper chamber: Party 27 (upper_seats_party27)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party27
Original tag: upper_seats_party27
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 2.26
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 0.09
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 27

4.1.1.271 Party seats upper chamber: Party 29 (upper_seats_party29)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party29
Original tag: upper_seats_party29
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 1.51
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 29

4.1.1.272 Party seats upper chamber: Party 3 (upper_seats_party3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party3
Original tag: upper_seats_party3
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 111, Percent: 9.3
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 146, Percent: 0.48
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 3

4.1.1.273 Party seats upper chamber: Party 30 (upper_seats_party30)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party30
Original tag: upper_seats_party30
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 10

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 30

4.1.1.274 Party seats upper chamber: Party 31 (upper_seats_party31)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party31
Original tag: upper_seats_party31
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 31

4.1.1.275 Party seats upper chamber: Party 32 (upper_seats_party32)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party32
Original tag: upper_seats_party32
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 32

4.1.1.276 Party seats upper chamber: Party 33 (upper_seats_party33)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party33
Original tag: upper_seats_party33
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 0.09
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 33

4.1.1.277 Party seats upper chamber: Party 34 (upper_seats_party34)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party34
Original tag: upper_seats_party34
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 34

4.1.1.278 Party seats upper chamber: Party 35 (upper_seats_party35)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party35
Original tag: upper_seats_party35
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 35

4.1.1.279 Party seats upper chamber: Party 36 (upper_seats_party36)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party36
Original tag: upper_seats_party36
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 36

4.1.1.280 Party seats upper chamber: Party 37 (upper_seats_party37)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party37
Original tag: upper_seats_party37
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 36.36
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 37

4.1.1.281 Party seats upper chamber: Party 38 (upper_seats_party38)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party38
Original tag: upper_seats_party38
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 38

4.1.1.282 Party seats upper chamber: Party 39 (upper_seats_party39)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party39
Original tag: upper_seats_party39
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 40
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 39

4.1.1.283 Party seats upper chamber: Party 4 (upper_seats_party4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party4
Original tag: upper_seats_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 5.61
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 106, Percent: 0.35
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 4

4.1.1.284 Party seats upper chamber: Party 40 (upper_seats_party40)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party40
Original tag: upper_seats_party40
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 66.67
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 40

4.1.1.285 Party seats upper chamber: Party 41 (upper_seats_party41)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party41
Original tag: upper_seats_party41
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 41

4.1.1.286 Party seats upper chamber: Party 42 (upper_seats_party42)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party42
Original tag: upper_seats_party42
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 42

4.1.1.287 Party seats upper chamber: Party 44 (upper_seats_party44)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party44
Original tag: upper_seats_party44
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 44

4.1.1.288 Party seats upper chamber: Party 45 (upper_seats_party45)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party45
Original tag: upper_seats_party45
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 45

4.1.1.289 Party seats upper chamber: Party 46 (upper_seats_party46)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party46
Original tag: upper_seats_party46
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 46

4.1.1.290 Party seats upper chamber: Party 47 (upper_seats_party47)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party47
Original tag: upper_seats_party47
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 47

4.1.1.291 Party seats upper chamber: Party 48 (upper_seats_party48)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party48
Original tag: upper_seats_party48
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 48

4.1.1.292 Party seats upper chamber: Party 49 (upper_seats_party49)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party49
Original tag: upper_seats_party49
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 49

4.1.1.293 Party seats upper chamber: Party 5 (upper_seats_party5)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party5
Original tag: upper_seats_party5
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 60, Percent: 5.03
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 108, Percent: 0.36
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 5

4.1.1.294 Party seats upper chamber: Party 50 (upper_seats_party50)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party50
Original tag: upper_seats_party50
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 50

4.1.1.295 Party seats upper chamber: Party 51 (upper_seats_party51)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party51
Original tag: upper_seats_party51
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 51

4.1.1.296 Party seats upper chamber: Party 52 (upper_seats_party52)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party52
Original tag: upper_seats_party52
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 52

4.1.1.297 Party seats upper chamber: Party 53 (upper_seats_party53)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party53
Original tag: upper_seats_party53
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 53

4.1.1.298 Party seats upper chamber: Party 54 (upper_seats_party54)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party54
Original tag: upper_seats_party54
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 0.05
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 54

4.1.1.299 Party seats upper chamber: Party 55 (upper_seats_party55)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party55
Original tag: upper_seats_party55
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 55

4.1.1.300 Party seats upper chamber: Party 56 (upper_seats_party56)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party56
Original tag: upper_seats_party56
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 56

4.1.1.301 Party seats upper chamber: Party 57 (upper_seats_party57)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party57
Original tag: upper_seats_party57
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 57

4.1.1.302 Party seats upper chamber: Party 58 (upper_seats_party58)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party58
Original tag: upper_seats_party58
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 58

4.1.1.303 Party seats upper chamber: Party 59 (upper_seats_party59)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party59
Original tag: upper_seats_party59
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 28.57
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 59

4.1.1.304 Party seats upper chamber: Party 6 (upper_seats_party6)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party6
Original tag: upper_seats_party6
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 2.68
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 6

4.1.1.305 Party seats upper chamber: Party 60 (upper_seats_party60)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party60
Original tag: upper_seats_party60
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 60

4.1.1.306 Party seats upper chamber: Party 61 (upper_seats_party61)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party61
Original tag: upper_seats_party61
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 61

4.1.1.307 Party seats upper chamber: Party 62 (upper_seats_party62)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party62
Original tag: upper_seats_party62
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 62

4.1.1.308 Party seats upper chamber: Party 63 (upper_seats_party63)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party63
Original tag: upper_seats_party63
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 63

4.1.1.309 Party seats upper chamber: Party 64 (upper_seats_party64)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party64
Original tag: upper_seats_party64
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 64

4.1.1.310 Party seats upper chamber: Party 65 (upper_seats_party65)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party65
Original tag: upper_seats_party65
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 65

4.1.1.311 Party seats upper chamber: Party 66 (upper_seats_party66)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party66
Original tag: upper_seats_party66
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 66

4.1.1.312 Party seats upper chamber: Party 67 (upper_seats_party67)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party67
Original tag: upper_seats_party67
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 67

4.1.1.313 Party seats upper chamber: Party 68 (upper_seats_party68)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party68
Original tag: upper_seats_party68
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 68

4.1.1.314 Party seats upper chamber: Party 69 (upper_seats_party69)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party69
Original tag: upper_seats_party69
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 0.06
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 69

4.1.1.315 Party seats upper chamber: Party 7 (upper_seats_party7)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party7
Original tag: upper_seats_party7
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 143, Percent: 11.98
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 0.65
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 7

4.1.1.316 Party seats upper chamber: Party 8 (upper_seats_party8)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party8
Original tag: upper_seats_party8
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 33, Percent: 2.76
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 0.1
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 6.06
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 8

4.1.1.317 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9 (upper_seats_party9)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party9
Original tag: upper_seats_party9
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 87, Percent: 7.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104, Percent: 0.34
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 9

4.1.1.318 Total number of seats: upper chamber (upper_seats_total)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_total
Original tag: upper_seats_total
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 303, Percent: 25.38
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 398, Percent: 1.31
Description:
Total number of seats (upper chamber)

4.1.1.319 Year of cabinet formation (year_in)

Long tag: repdem_basic_year_in
Original tag: year_in
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Year of cabinet formation

4.1.1.320 Year/month of cabinet formation (year_month_in)

Long tag: repdem_basic_year_month_in
Original tag: year_month_in
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Year/month of cabinet formation

4.1.1.321 Year/month of cabinet termination (year_month_out)

Long tag: repdem_basic_year_month_out

Original tag: year_month_out
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Year/month of cabinet termination

4.1.1.322 Year out (year_out)

Long tag: repdem_basic_year_out
Original tag: year_out
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
Year of cabinet termination

4.1.1.323 Unique id (unique_id)

Long tag: repdem_basic_unique_id
Original tag: unique_id
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36
Description:
Variable identifying unique combinations of cab_id and an alphanumerically sorted version of cab_composition2 or potential_government.

4.1.1.324 Full duration technical termination (cab_duration_full)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_duration_full
Original tag: cab_duration_full
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1110, Percent: 92.96
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1881, Percent: 6.2
Description:
0: no
1: yes

Takes the value 1 if the cabinet terminates due to technical reasons and its relative duration is greater than 90percent

4.1.1.325 Single party majority cabinet (cab_sp_majority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_sp_majority
Original tag: cab_sp_majority
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.326 Minority cabinet (cab_minority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_minority
Original tag: cab_minority
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34
Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.327 Single party minority cabinet (cab_sp_minority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_sp_minority
Original tag: cab_sp_minority
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34
Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.328 Minority coalition (cab_coal_minority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_coal_minority
Original tag: cab_coal_minority
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34
Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.329 Substantial minority cabinet (cab_sub_minority)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_sub_minority
Original tag: cab_sub_minority
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34
Description:
0: no
1: yes

Any minority cabinet that does not reach majority status with seats added from formal support parties.

4.1.1.330 Largest party in parliament, 1st (largest_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_largest_party1

Original tag: largest_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Largest party in terms of seats. See party codebooks.

4.1.1.331 Largest party in parliament, 2nd (largest_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_largest_party2

Original tag: largest_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

See party codebooks.

4.1.1.332 Total number of seats: lower chamber (seats_total)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_total

Original tag: seats_total

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1111, Percent: 93.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1923, Percent: 6.34

Description:

Total number of seats: lower chamber

4.1.1.333 Cabinet seat share including formal support parties (cab_seatshare_supported)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_supported

Original tag: cab_seatshare_supported

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1136, Percent: 95.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

To be announced

4.1.1.334 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the dim_first_median_2nd_bp party of the median legislator: first policy dimension; lower chamber; 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd_bp)

Long tag: repdem_basic_dim_first_median_2nd_bp

Original tag: dim_first_median_2nd_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:
To be announced

4.1.1.335 Conflict between coalition parties (policy and/or personnel) (term_disc_conflict)

Long tag: repdem_basic_term_disc_conflict
Original tag: term_disc_conflict
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1108, Percent: 92.8
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1877, Percent: 6.19
Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.336 Party seats upper chamber: Party 69 (seats_party69)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party69
Original tag: seats_party69
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 69

4.1.1.337 Party seats lower chamber: Party 70 (seats_party70)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party70
Original tag: seats_party70
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 62, Percent: 5.19
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 0.28
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 70

4.1.1.338 Party seats lower chamber: Party 71 (seats_party71)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party71
Original tag: seats_party71
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 71

4.1.1.339 Party seats lower chamber: Party 72 (seats_party72)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party72
Original tag: seats_party72
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 71

4.1.1.340 Party seats lower chamber: Party 73 (seats_party73)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party73
Original tag: seats_party73
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 73

4.1.1.341 Party seats lower chamber: Party 74 (seats_party74)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party74
Original tag: seats_party74
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 14.29
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 74

4.1.1.342 Party seats lower chamber: Party 75 (seats_party75)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party75
Original tag: seats_party75
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 75

4.1.1.343 Party seats lower chamber: Party 76 (seats_party76)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party76
Original tag: seats_party76
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 76

4.1.1.344 Party seats lower chamber: Party 77 (seats_party77)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party77
Original tag: seats_party77
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 77

4.1.1.345 Party seats lower chamber: Party 78 (seats_party78)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party78
Original tag: seats_party78
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 78

4.1.1.346 Party seats lower chamber: Party 79 (seats_party79)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party79
Original tag: seats_party79
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 79

4.1.1.347 Party seats lower chamber: Party 80 (seats_party80)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party80
Original tag: seats_party80
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 80

4.1.1.348 Party seats lower chamber: Party 81 (seats_party81)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party81
Original tag: seats_party81
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 81

4.1.1.349 Party seats lower chamber: Party 82 (seats_party82)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party82
Original tag: seats_party82
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 82

4.1.1.350 Party seats lower chamber: Party 83 (seats_party83)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party83
Original tag: seats_party83
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 83

4.1.1.351 Party seats lower chamber: Party 84 (seats_party84)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party84
Original tag: seats_party84
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 84

4.1.1.352 Party seats lower chamber: Party 85 (seats_party85)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party85
Original tag: seats_party85
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 85

4.1.1.353 Party seats lower chamber: Party 86 (seats_party86)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party86
Original tag: seats_party86
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 86

4.1.1.354 Party seats lower chamber: Party 87 (seats_party87)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party87
Original tag: seats_party87
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 25
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 87

4.1.1.355 Party seats lower chamber: Party 88 (seats_party88)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party88
Original tag: seats_party88
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 88

4.1.1.356 Party seats lower chamber: Party 89 (seats_party89)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party89
Original tag: seats_party89
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 89

4.1.1.357 Party seats lower chamber: Party 90 (seats_party90)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party90
Original tag: seats_party90
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 90

4.1.1.358 Party seats lower chamber: Party 91 (seats_party91)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party91
Original tag: seats_party91
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 91

4.1.1.359 Party seats lower chamber: Party 92 (seats_party92)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party92
Original tag: seats_party92
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 92

4.1.1.360 Party seats lower chamber: Party 93 (seats_party93)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party93
Original tag: seats_party93
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 93

4.1.1.361 Party seats lower chamber: Party 94 (seats_party94)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party94
Original tag: seats_party94
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 94

4.1.1.362 Party seats lower chamber: Party 95 (seats_party95)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party95

Original tag: seats_party95
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 50
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 95

4.1.1.363 Party seats lower chamber: Party 96 (seats_party96)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party96
Original tag: seats_party96
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 96

4.1.1.364 Party seats lower chamber: Party 97 (seats_party97)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party97
Original tag: seats_party97
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100
Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 97

4.1.1.365 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9998 (seats_party9998)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party9998
Original tag: seats_party9998
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 3.1
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75, Percent: 0.25
Description:
To be announced

4.1.1.366 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9999 (seats_party9999)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party9999
Original tag: seats_party9999
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 47.99
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Description:
To be announced

4.1.1.367 Party seats upper chamber: Party 70 (upper_seats_party70)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party70
Original tag: upper_seats_party70
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 53, Percent: 4.44
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 70

4.1.1.368 Party seats upper chamber: Party 73 (upper_seats_party73)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party73
Original tag: upper_seats_party73
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 73

4.1.1.369 Party seats upper chamber: Party 74 (upper_seats_party74)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party74
Original tag: upper_seats_party74
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 16.67
Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 74

4.1.1.370 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (upper_seats_party9998)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party9998
Original tag: upper_seats_party9998
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 58, Percent: 4.86
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23
Description:
To be announced

4.1.1.371 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (upper_seats_party9999)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party9999
Original tag: upper_seats_party9999
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 135, Percent: 11.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 0.59

Description:

To be announced

4.1.1.372 Caretaker cabinet (cab_caretaker)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_caretaker

Original tag: cab_caretaker

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1141, Percent: 95.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1930, Percent: 6.36

Description:

Caretaker cabinet
0: no
1: yes

4.1.1.373 Cabinet preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_prefrange_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_prefrange_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

Same as cab_prefrange_logit, but using the categories suggested by Prosser (2014) for constructing the left-right scale

4.1.1.374 Cabinet preference range: lower chamber, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (cab_prefrange_ches)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_prefrange_ches

Original tag: cab_prefrange_ches

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 224, Percent: 18.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 384, Percent: 1.27

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the cabinet based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey's general left-right scale (lrgen).

4.1.1.375 Cabinet polarization, CHES general left- right scale (lrgen) (cab_polar_ches)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_polar_ches

Original tag: cab_polar_ches

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 224, Percent: 18.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 384, Percent: 1.27

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in the cabinet, based on the Chapel

Hill Expert Survey's general left-right scale (lrgen).

4.1.1.376 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_ches)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_wpolar_ches

Original tag: cab_wpolar_ches

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 224, Percent: 18.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 384, Percent: 1.27

Description:

As cab_polar_ches, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.1.1.377 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_gravity_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_gravity_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_gravity_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 946, Percent: 79.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1746, Percent: 5.76

Description:

Same as cab_gravity_prosser, but with logit-scaled (Lowe et al. 2011) party positions.

4.1.1.378 Cabinet centre of gravity, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (cab_gravity_ches_lrgen)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_gravity_ches_lrgen

Original tag: cab_gravity_ches_lrgen

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 224, Percent: 18.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 384, Percent: 1.27

Description:

Same as cab_gravity, but with the Chapel Hill Expert Surveys general left-right (lrgen) scale used to estimate party positions

4.1.1.379 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_prefrange_prosser_logit

Original tag: parl_prefrange_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1056, Percent: 88.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1833, Percent: 6.04

Description:

Same as parl_prefrange_logit, but using the categories suggested by Prosser (2014) for constructing the left-right scale

4.1.1.380 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (parl_prefrange_ches)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_prefrange_ches

Original tag: parl_prefrange_ches

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 340, Percent: 28.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the parliament based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey's general left-right scale (lrgen).

4.1.1.381 Parliamentary polarization, CHES general left-right scale (lrgen) (parl_polar_ches)

Long tag: repdem_basic_parl_polar_ches

Original tag: parl_polar_ches

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 341, Percent: 28.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in parliament, based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey's general left-right scale (lrgen).

4.1.1.382 Party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_1st)

Long tag: repdem_basic_median_party_economic_1st

Original tag: median_party_economic_1st

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 795, Percent: 66.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1411, Percent: 4.65

Description:

The median legislator party on the economic left-right policy dimension

4.1.1.383 Second party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_basic_median_party_economic_2nd

Original tag: median_party_economic_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Description:

The second median legislator party on the economic left-right policy dimension, if there is a tie between two parties (i.e., when there are two median legislators).

4.1.1.384 V-Dem: Electoral democracy index (vdem_elecdem)

Long tag: repdem_basic_vdem_elecdem

Original tag: vdem_elecdem

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1113, Percent: 93.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1916, Percent: 6.32

Description:

V-Dem's electoral democracy index (v2x_polyarchy) from the year the cabinet took office. Ranges from 0 (low) to 1 (high).

4.1.1.385 V-Dem: Liberal democracy index (vdem_libdem)

Long tag: repdem_basic_vdem_libdem

Original tag: vdem_libdem

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1113, Percent: 93.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1916, Percent: 6.32

Description:

V-Dem's liberal democracy index (v2x_libdem) from the year the cabinet took office. Ranges from 0 (low) to 1 (high).

4.1.1.386 V-Dem: Participatory democracy index (vdem_partipdem)

Long tag: repdem_basic_vdem_partipdem

Original tag: vdem_partipdem

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1113, Percent: 93.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1916, Percent: 6.32

Description:

V-Dem's participatory democracy index (v2x_partipdem) from the year the cabinet took office. Ranges from 0 (low) to 1 (high).

4.1.1.387 V-Dem: Deliberative democracy index (vdem_delibdem)

Long tag: repdem_basic_vdem_delibdem

Original tag: vdem_delibdem

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1113, Percent: 93.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1916, Percent: 6.32

Description:

V-Dem's deliberative democracy index (v2x_delibdem) from the year the cabinet took office. Ranges from 0 (low) to 1 (high).

4.1.1.388 V-Dem: Egalitarian democracy index (vdem_egaldem)

Long tag: repdem_basic_vdem_egaldem

Original tag: vdem_egaldem

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1113, Percent: 93.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1916, Percent: 6.32

Description:

V-Dem's egalitarian democracy index (v2x_egaldem), ranging from 0 (low) to 1 (high).

4.1.1.389 Party seats lower chamber: Party 100 (seats_party100)

Long tag: repdem_basic_seats_party100

Original tag: seats_party100

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 25

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 100

4.1.1.390 Party seats upper chamber: Party 75 (upper_seats_party75)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party75

Original tag: upper_seats_party75

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 75

4.1.1.391 Party seats upper chamber: Party 76 (upper_seats_party76)

Long tag: repdem_basic_upper_seats_party76

Original tag: upper_seats_party76

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 76

4.1.1.392 Cabinet party 1, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party1)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party1

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1102, Percent: 92.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1908, Percent: 6.29

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 1, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party1'.

4.1.1.393 Cabinet party 2, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party2)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party2
Original tag: cab_seatshare_party2
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 778, Percent: 65.16
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1278, Percent: 4.21
Description:
The seat share in the cabinet for party 2, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party2'.

4.1.1.394 Cabinet party 3, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party3)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party3
Original tag: cab_seatshare_party3
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 40.2
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 660, Percent: 2.18
Description:
The seat share in the cabinet for party 3, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party3'.

4.1.1.395 Cabinet party 4, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party4)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party4
Original tag: cab_seatshare_party4
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 256, Percent: 21.44
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 336, Percent: 1.11
Description:
The seat share in the cabinet for party 4, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party4'.

4.1.1.396 Cabinet party 5, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party5)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party5
Original tag: cab_seatshare_party5
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 117, Percent: 9.8
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 0.44
Description:
The seat share in the cabinet for party 5, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party5'.

4.1.1.397 Cabinet party 6, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party6)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party6
Original tag: cab_seatshare_party6
Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 4.36
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.2
Description:
The seat share in the cabinet for party 6, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party6'.

4.1.1.398 Cabinet party 7, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party7)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party7

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 26.32

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 7, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party7'.

4.1.1.399 Cabinet seat share: lower chamber for Party 8 (cab_seatshare_party8)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_seatshare_party8

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 60

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 8, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party8'.

4.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe

Dataset tag: repdem_wecee

Output Unit: Repdem Cabinet-Date, i.e., data is collected per cabinet and date. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a cabinet in combination with a date, using the columns cab_name and date_in. The unit can also be expressed using the columns cab_id and date_in.

Description: This dataset contains data on governments, parliaments, political parties, and political institutions for Western Europe until 2019 and data for Central and Eastern Europe until 2021.

It includes data collected by experts on coalition politics in their respective countries using standardised coding instructions and interview guidelines. Specifically, the data were gathered from official documents (government, administration, and parliament) and party documents (election manifestos, coalition agreements), by conducting semi-structured interviews with (former) staff and cabinet members as well as a systemic analysis of media reports.

Dataset citation:
Hellström, Johan, Torbjörn Bergman, Jonas Lindahl, Hanna Bäck, Gabriella Ilonszki, Wolfgang C. Müller, and Kaare Strøm (2025) Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED) – Coalition Governance in Central Eastern and Western Europe Dataset, Version 2024.12. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

And

Bergman, Torbjörn, Hanna Bäck, and Johan Hellström (eds.). (2021). Coalition Governance in Western Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

And

Bergman, Torbjörn, Gabriella Ilonszki, and Johan Hellström (eds.) (2024). Coalition Politics in Central Eastern Europe: Governing in Times of Crisis. London: Routledge.

Comments:
For party abbreviations see party codebook: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4266/party-codebook-wecee-4.pdf`
Notes on coding principles: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4291/paged-notes-on-coding-principles-2.pdf`

Link to original codebook
`https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4606/data-set-codebook-wecee-2.pdf`

License: REPDEM presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe.
Repdem offers a range of datasets available for free (without even a demand for registration).

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://repdem.org/index.php/current-dataset/`

4.2.1 Information on the Cabinets

These variables provide general information on each cabinet such as duration, cabinet composition and majoritiy relations.

4.2.1.1 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail1_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_duration

Original tag: barg_fail_rounds

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 108, Percent: 9.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 177, Percent: 0.58

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.2 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail1_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_parties

Original tag: barg_fail1_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.3 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail1_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party1

Original tag: barg_fail1_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 177, Percent: 14.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.4 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 10 (barg_fail1_party10)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party10

Original tag: barg_fail1_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.5 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 11 (barg_fail1_party11)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party11

Original tag: barg_fail1_party10

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.6 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 12 (barg_fail1_party12)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party12

Original tag: barg_fail1_party11

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.7 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 13 (barg_fail1_party13)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party13

Original tag: barg_fail1_party12

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.8 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 14 (barg_fail1_party14)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party14

Original tag: barg_fail1_party13

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.9 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 15 (barg_fail1_party15)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party15

Original tag: barg_fail1_party14

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.10 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 16 (barg_fail1_party16)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party16

Original tag: barg_fail1_party15

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.11 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail1_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party2

Original tag: barg_fail1_party16

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 167, Percent: 13.99

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 266, Percent: 0.88

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.12 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail1_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party3

Original tag: barg_fail1_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 135, Percent: 11.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 0.64

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.13 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail1_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party4

Original tag: barg_fail1_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 8.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 150, Percent: 0.49

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.14 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail1_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party5

Original tag: barg_fail1_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 56, Percent: 4.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 79, Percent: 0.26

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.15 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail1_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party6

Original tag: barg_fail1_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.16 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail1_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party7

Original tag: barg_fail1_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 42, Percent: 0.14

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.17 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail1_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party8

Original tag: barg_fail1_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.18 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 9 (barg_fail1_party9)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail1_party9

Original tag: barg_fail1_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 0.05

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.19 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail2_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_duration

Original tag: barg_fail1_party9

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 3.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 63, Percent: 0.21

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.20 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail2_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_parties

Original tag: barg_fail2_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.21 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail2_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party1

Original tag: barg_fail2_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 90, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131, Percent: 0.43

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.22 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail2_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party2

Original tag: barg_fail2_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 87, Percent: 7.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 124, Percent: 0.41

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.23 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail2_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party3

Original tag: barg_fail2_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 74, Percent: 6.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 86, Percent: 0.28

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.24 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail2_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party4

Original tag: barg_fail2_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 4.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 0.22

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.25 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail2_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party5

Original tag: barg_fail2_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.26 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail2_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party6

Original tag: barg_fail2_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.27 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail2_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party7

Original tag: barg_fail2_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.28 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail2_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail2_party8

Original tag: barg_fail2_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.29 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail3_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_duration

Original tag: barg_fail2_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23, Percent: 0.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 8

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.30 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail3_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_parties

Original tag: barg_fail3_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.31 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail3_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party1

Original tag: barg_fail3_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59, Percent: 0.19

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.32 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail3_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party2

Original tag: barg_fail3_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 3.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54, Percent: 0.18

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.33 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail3_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party3

Original tag: barg_fail3_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 3.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 0.14

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.34 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail3_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party4

Original tag: barg_fail3_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 0.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.35 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail3_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party5

Original tag: barg_fail3_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.36 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail3_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party6

Original tag: barg_fail3_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.37 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail3_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail3_party7

Original tag: barg_fail3_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.38 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail4_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_duration

Original tag: barg_fail3_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 30.77

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.39 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail4_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_parties

Original tag: barg_fail4_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.40 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail4_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party1

Original tag: barg_fail4_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.41 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail4_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party2

Original tag: barg_fail4_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.42 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail4_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party3

Original tag: barg_fail4_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 0.08

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.43 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail4_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party4

Original tag: barg_fail4_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 1.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 12.5

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.44 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail4_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party5

Original tag: barg_fail4_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.45 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail4_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party6

Original tag: barg_fail4_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.46 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail4_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail4_party7

Original tag: barg_fail4_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.47 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail5_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_duration

Original tag: barg_fail4_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.48 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail5_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_parties

Original tag: barg_fail5_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.49 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail5_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party1

Original tag: barg_fail5_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.50 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail5_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party2

Original tag: barg_fail5_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.51 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail5_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party3

Original tag: barg_fail5_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.52 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail5_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party4

Original tag: barg_fail5_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 12.5

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.53 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail5_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party5

Original tag: barg_fail5_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.54 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail5_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party6

Original tag: barg_fail5_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.55 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail5_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail5_party7

Original tag: barg_fail5_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.56 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail6_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_duration

Original tag: barg_fail5_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.57 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail6_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_parties

Original tag: barg_fail6_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.58 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail6_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party1

Original tag: barg_fail6_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.59 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail6_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party2

Original tag: barg_fail6_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.60 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail6_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party3

Original tag: barg_fail6_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.61 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail6_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party4

Original tag: barg_fail6_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.62 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail6_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party5

Original tag: barg_fail6_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.63 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail6_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party6

Original tag: barg_fail6_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.64 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail6_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party7

Original tag: barg_fail6_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.65 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail6_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party8

Original tag: barg_fail6_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.66 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 9 (barg_fail6_party9)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail6_party9

Original tag: barg_fail6_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.67 Duration of unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail7_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_duration

Original tag: barg_fail6_party9

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.68 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round (barg_fail7_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_parties

Original tag: barg_fail7_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.69 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_fail7_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party1

Original tag: barg_fail7_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.70 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_fail7_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party2

Original tag: barg_fail7_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.71 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_fail7_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party3

Original tag: barg_fail7_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.72 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_fail7_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party4

Original tag: barg_fail7_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.73 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_fail7_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party5

Original tag: barg_fail7_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.74 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_fail7_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party6

Original tag: barg_fail7_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.75 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_fail7_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party7

Original tag: barg_fail7_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.76 Parties involved in unsuccessful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_fail7_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail7_party8

Original tag: barg_fail7_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.77 Number of inconclusive bargaining rounds (barg_fail_rounds)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_fail_rounds

Original tag: barg_fail7_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Number of inconclusive bargaining rounds

4.2.1.78 Duration of successful bargaining round (barg_success_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_duration

Original tag: barg_success_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 476, Percent: 39.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 798, Percent: 2.63

Description:
Measured in days

4.2.1.79 Parties involved in successful bargaining round (barg_success_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_parties

Original tag: barg_success_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Party abbreviations, see party codebook

4.2.1.80 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 1 (barg_success_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party1

Original tag: barg_success_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 759, Percent: 63.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 4.4

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.81 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 2 (barg_success_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party2

Original tag: barg_success_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 556, Percent: 46.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 931, Percent: 3.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.82 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 3 (barg_success_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party3

Original tag: barg_success_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 508, Percent: 1.67

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.83 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 4 (barg_success_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party4

Original tag: barg_success_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 183, Percent: 15.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 261, Percent: 0.86

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.84 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 5 (barg_success_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party5

Original tag: barg_success_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 66, Percent: 5.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 81, Percent: 0.27

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.85 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 6 (barg_success_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party6

Original tag: barg_success_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 0.08

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.86 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 7 (barg_success_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party7

Original tag: barg_success_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.87 Parties involved in successful bargaining round: Party 8 (barg_success_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_success_party8

Original tag: barg_success_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.88 Total bargaining duration (barg_total_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_barg_total_duration

Original tag: barg_total_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 513, Percent: 42.96

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 888, Percent: 2.93

Description:

Measured in days

Time period between the first day of the first (potentially inconclusive) bargaining round and the last day of the successful bargaining attempt.

4.2.1.89 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) fractionalization: lower chamber (bp_fract)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_bp_fract

Original tag: bp_fract

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Same calculation as enpp, but using Banzhaf index values instead of party seat shares as weights.

4.2.1.90 Coalition (cab_coalition)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_coalition

Original tag: cab_coalition

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 757, Percent: 63.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:

Coalition government

0: no

1: yes

4.2.1.91 Cabinet composition (cab_composition1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_composition1

Original tag: cab_composition1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party abbreviations (see party codebook). List of cabinet parties, beginning with the party of the PM.

4.2.1.92 Cabinet composition (cab_composition2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_composition2

Original tag: cab_composition2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party Ids (see party codebook). List of cabinet parties, beginning with the party of the PM.

4.2.1.93 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_connected

Original tag: cab_connected

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 59.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1272, Percent: 4.19

Description:

Ideologically "connected cabinet" (i.e., the parties are next to one another) on economic left-right placement of political parties.
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.94 Cabinet duration (cab_duration_days)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_duration_days

Original tag: cab_duration_days

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Measured in days. Defined as the time period between cabinet's first and last day in office.

4.2.1.95 Maximum possible cabinet duration (cab_duration_max)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_duration_max

Original tag: cab_duration_max

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Measured in days. Defined as: remainder of the parliamentary term when cabinet assumes office until
(a) next constitutionally mandated parliamentary elections
(b) next constitutionally mandated presidential elections if it is required or customary for governments to resign at that time

4.2.1.96 Relative cabinet duration (cab_duration_relative)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_duration_relative

Original tag: cab_duration_relative

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Defined as the share (proportion) of potential duration the cabinet was in office.

4.2.1.97 Effective number of cabinet parties: lower chamber (cab_enpp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_enpp

Original tag: cab_enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 762, Percent: 63.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

Effective number of cabinet parties(lower chamber)

4.2.1.98 Formal minority cabinet (cab_formal_minority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_formal_minority

Original tag: cab_formal_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:

Formal minority
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.99 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE (cab_gravity)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_gravity

Original tag: cab_gravity

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

The Manifesto Project's RILE scale has been used to estimate party positions. For the calculation of the measure, consult the notes on coding principles.

4.2.1.100 Cabinet centre of gravity, RILE, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_gravity_logit

Original tag: cab_gravity_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Same as cab_gravity, but with logit-scaled (Lowe et al. 2011) party positions.

4.2.1.101 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_gravity_logit_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_gravity_logit_prosser

Original tag: cab_gravity_logit_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Same as cab_gravity_prosser, but with logit-scaled (Lowe et al. 2011) party positions.

4.2.1.102 Cabinet centre of gravity, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_gravity_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_gravity_prosser

Original tag: cab_gravity_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Prosser's (2014) suggested categories for estimating party positions from the Manifesto Project data has been used.

4.2.1.103 Cabinet ID (cab_id)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_id

Original tag: cab_id

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet code. First two digits: country Second two digits: cabinet number.

4.2.1.104 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat) (cab_majority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_majority

Original tag: cab_majority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:
Majority government
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.105 Minimal winning coalition (cab_mwc)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_mwc

Original tag: cab_mwc

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 705, Percent: 59.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1272, Percent: 4.19

Description:
MWC
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.106 Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (cab_mwcc)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_mwcc

Original tag: cab_mwcc

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:
Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet (MWCC).
0: no
1: yes
A cabinet is a MWCC if (i) it is connected, and (ii) it cannot remain winning AND connected by dropping a party.

4.2.1.107 MWCC including single-party cabinets (cab_mwccs)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_mwccs

Original tag: cab_mwccs

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 705, Percent: 59.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1272, Percent: 4.19

Description:
MWCC including single-party cabinets
0: no
1: yes
Minimal Winning Connected Cabinet including single-party majority governments.

4.2.1.108 Cabinet (cab_name)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_name

Original tag: cab_name

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet name (name of the PM consecutively numbered with Roman figures).

4.2.1.109 Number of cabinet parties (cab_num_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_num_parties

Original tag: cab_num_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Number of cabinet parties

4.2.1.110 Cabinet party 1 (cab_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party1

Original tag: cab_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.111 Cabinet party 2 (cab_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party2

Original tag: cab_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 46.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.112 Cabinet party 3 (cab_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party3

Original tag: cab_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 352, Percent: 29.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 512, Percent: 1.69

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.113 Cabinet party 4 (cab_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party4

Original tag: cab_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 15.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 0.86

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.114 Cabinet party 5 (cab_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party5

Original tag: cab_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 5.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 0.28

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.115 Cabinet party 6 (cab_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party6

Original tag: cab_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.116 Cabinet party 7 (cab_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party7

Original tag: cab_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.117 Cabinet party 8 (cab_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_party8

Original tag: cab_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.118 Cabinet polarization, RILE (cab_polar)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_polar

Original tag: cab_polar

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.2.1.119 Cabinet polarization, RILE, logit scaled (cab_polar_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_polar_logit

Original tag: cab_polar_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.2.1.120 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_polar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_polar_prosser

Original tag: cab_polar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.2.1.121 Cabinet polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_polar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_polar_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_polar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.2.1.122 Cabinet preference range, RILE (cab_prefrange)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_prefrange

Original tag: cab_prefrange

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the cabinet on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.2.1.123 Cabinet preference range, RILE, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_prefrange_logit

Original tag: cab_prefrange_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in the cabinet based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.2.1.124 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (cab_prefrange_logit_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_prefrange_logit_prosser

Original tag: cab_prefrange_logit_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_prefrange_logit, but using the categories suggested by Prosser (2014) for constructing the left-right scale

4.2.1.125 Cabinet preference range, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (cab_prefrange_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_prefrange_prosser

Original tag: cab_prefrange_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_prefrange, but using the categories suggested by Prosser (2014) for constructing the left-right scale

4.2.1.126 Cabinet seat share (cab_seatshare)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare

Original tag: cab_seatshare

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet seat share (0-1)

4.2.1.127 Cabinet strength: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_strength_lower

Original tag: cab_strength_lower

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties combined.

4.2.1.128 Cabinet strength including formal support parties: lower chamber (cab_strength_lower_supported)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_strength_lower_supported

Original tag: cab_strength_lower_supported

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties and all formal support parties.

4.2.1.129 Cabinet strength at date out: lower chamber (cab_strength_out)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_strength_out

Original tag: cab_strength_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 582, Percent: 48.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1002, Percent: 3.3

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share of all cabinet parties at termination of the cabinet.

4.2.1.130 Cabinet strength: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_strength_upper

Original tag: cab_strength_upper

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 226, Percent: 18.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 298, Percent: 0.98

Description:

Cabinet strength (upper chamber)

4.2.1.131 Cabinet strength at date out: upper chamber (cab_strength_upper_out)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_strength_upper_out

Original tag: cab_strength_upper_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 152, Percent: 12.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 197, Percent: 0.65

Description:

Cabinet strength, i.e., total seat share (upper chamber) of all cabinet parties at termination of the cabinet.

4.2.1.132 Surplus majority cabinet (cab_surplus)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_surplus

Original tag: cab_surplus

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 757, Percent: 63.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:

Surplus government
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.133 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_wpolar

Original tag: cab_wpolar

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_polar, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.2.1.134 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_wpolar_logit

Original tag: cab_wpolar_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_wpolar, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.2.1.135 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD (cab_wpolar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_wpolar_prosser

Original tag: cab_wpolar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_polar_prosser, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.2.1.136 Cabinet polarization, RILE, weighted SD, logit scaled (cab_wpolar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_wpolar_prosser_logit

Original tag: cab_wpolar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 59.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1275, Percent: 4.2

Description:

As cab_wpolar_prosser, but standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position.

4.2.1.137 Coalition agreement (coal_agree)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_agree

Original tag: coal_agree

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 555, Percent: 46.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 921, Percent: 3.04

Description:

0: N – No written coalition agreement
1: PRE – Pre-electoral written coalition agreement
2: POST – Post-electoral written coalition agreement
3: IE – Written coalition agreement in the case of coalitions formed during the parliamentary term (not immediately following elections)
4: PRE, POST – Pre- and post-electoral written coalition agreement
5: PRE, POST, IE – Pre-, post- and interelectoral written coalition agreements

4.2.1.138 Agreement public (coal_agree_public)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_agree_public

Original tag: coal_agree_public

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 34.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 749, Percent: 2.47

Description:

Agreement public:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.139 Conflict management mechanisms (coal_conf)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf

Original tag: coal_conf

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

IC – Inner cabinet: a subset of cabinet ministers which is not issue-specific and which is stable over time
CaC – Cabinet committee(s): typically issue-specific

4.2.1.140 CMM used for most common conflicts (coal_conf_common)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_common

Original tag: coal_conf_common

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

IC – Inner cabinet: a subset of cabinet ministers which is not issue-specific and which is stable over time
CaC – Cabinet committee(s): typically issue-specific

4.2.1.141 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_common_mech1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_common_mech1

Original tag: coal_conf_common_mech1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 532, Percent: 44.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 890, Percent: 2.93

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa

6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.142 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_common_mech2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_common_mech2

Original tag: coal_conf_common_mech2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 44, Percent: 3.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 63, Percent: 0.21

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.143 CMM used for most common conflicts: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_common_mech3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_common_mech3

Original tag: coal_conf_common_mech3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.144 CMM: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_mech1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech1

Original tag: coal_conf_mech1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 536, Percent: 44.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 897, Percent: 2.96

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa

6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.145 CMM: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_mech2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech2

Original tag: coal_conf_mech2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 413, Percent: 34.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 705, Percent: 2.32

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.146 CMM: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_mech3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech3

Original tag: coal_conf_mech3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 210, Percent: 17.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.147 CMM: Mechanism 4 (coal_conf_mech4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech4

Original tag: coal_conf_mech4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 72, Percent: 6.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 0.44

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.148 CMM: Mechanism 5 (coal_conf_mech5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech5

Original tag: coal_conf_mech5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.149 CMM: Mechanism 6 (coal_conf_mech6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_mech6

Original tag: coal_conf_mech6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.150 CMM used for most serious conflicts (coal_conf_serious)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_serious

Original tag: coal_conf_serious

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

IC – Inner cabinet: a subset of cabinet ministers which is not issue-specific and which is stable over time
CaC – Cabinet committee(s): typically issue-specific

4.2.1.151 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 1 (coal_conf_serious_mech1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_serious_mech1

Original tag: coal_conf_serious_mech1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström

(2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 534, Percent: 44.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 896, Percent: 2.95

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.152 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 2 (coal_conf_serious_mech2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_serious_mech2

Original tag: coal_conf_serious_mech2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 44, Percent: 3.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 87, Percent: 0.29

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.153 CMM used for most serious conflicts: Mechanism 3 (coal_conf_serious_mech3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_conf_serious_mech3

Original tag: coal_conf_serious_mech3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:

1: IC
2: CaC
3: CoC
4: Parl
5: PCa
6: PS
7: O

4.2.1.154 Coalition discipline in legisation (coal_disc_leg)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_disc_leg

Original tag: coal_disc_leg

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 552, Percent: 46.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 3.02

Description:

1: yes always
2: yes, except explicitly exempted
3: no, except explicit policies
4: no

4.2.1.155 Coalition discipline in other parliamentary behavior (coal_disc_parl)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_disc_parl

Original tag: coal_disc_parl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 552, Percent: 46.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 3.02

Description:

1: yes always
2: yes, except explicitly exempted
3: no, except explicit policies
4: no

4.2.1.156 Distribution of competences: all agreements (coal_distcomp_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distcomp_all

Original tag: coal_distcomp_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 373, Percent: 31.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703, Percent: 2.32

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.157 Distribution of competences (coal_distcomp_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distcomp_doc1

Original tag: coal_distcomp_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 374, Percent: 31.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.158 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 1 (coal_distcomp_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distcomp_doc2

Original tag: coal_distcomp_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.159 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 2 (coal_distcomp_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distcomp_doc3

Original tag: coal_distcomp_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.160 Distribution of competences: additional agreement number 3 (coal_distcomp_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distcomp_doc4

Original tag: coal_distcomp_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.161 Distribution of offices: all agreements (coal_distoff_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distoff_all

Original tag: coal_distoff_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 372, Percent: 31.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703, Percent: 2.32

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.162 Distribution of offices: (coal_distoff_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distoff_doc1

Original tag: coal_distoff_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 373, Percent: 31.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.163 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 1 (coal_distoff_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distoff_doc2

Original tag: coal_distoff_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.164 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 2 (coal_distoff_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distoff_doc3

Original tag: coal_distoff_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.165 Distribution of offices: additional agreement number 3 (coal_distoff_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_distoff_doc4

Original tag: coal_distoff_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.166 Election rule (coal_elec_rule)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_elec_rule

Original tag: coal_elec_rule

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 521, Percent: 43.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 880, Percent: 2.9

Description:
Election rule:

0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.167 Freedom of appointment (coal_free_appointment)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_free_appointment

Original tag: coal_free_appointment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 547, Percent: 45.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 914, Percent: 3.01

Description:

0: no, i.e. ministerial posts are subject to coalition approval/veto
1: yes

4.2.1.168 General rules: all agreements (coal_genrules_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_genrules_all

Original tag: coal_genrules_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 373, Percent: 31.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703, Percent: 2.32

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.169 General rules (coal_genrules_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_genrules_doc1

Original tag: coal_genrules_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 374, Percent: 31.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.170 General rules: additional agreement number 1 (coal_genrules_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_genrules_doc2

Original tag: coal_genrules_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.171 General rules: additional agreement number 2 (coal_genrules_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_genrules_doc3

Original tag: coal_genrules_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.172 General rules: additional agreement number 3 (coal_genrules_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_genrules_doc4

Original tag: coal_genrules_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.173 Agreement on junior ministers (coal_junmin)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_junmin

Original tag: coal_junmin

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 432, Percent: 36.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 2.27

Description:

0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.174 Agreement on non-cabinet positions (coal_noncab)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_noncab

Original tag: coal_noncab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 538, Percent: 45.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 888, Percent: 2.93

Description:

0: no, i.e. left to the discretion of parliament or individual ministers
1: yes

4.2.1.175 Policies: all agreements (coal_pol_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_pol_all

Original tag: coal_pol_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 373, Percent: 31.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703, Percent: 2.32

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.176 Policies (coal_pol_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_pol_doc1

Original tag: coal_pol_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 374, Percent: 31.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.177 Policies: additional agreement number 1 (coal_pol_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_pol_doc2

Original tag: coal_pol_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.178 Policies: additional agreement number 2 (coal_pol_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_pol_doc3

Original tag: coal_pol_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.179 Policies: additional agreement number 3 (coal_pol_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_pol_doc4

Original tag: coal_pol_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.180 Agreement on policies (coalition agreement) (coal_policy)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_policy

Original tag: coal_policy

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 540, Percent: 45.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 913, Percent: 3.01

Description:

0: no explicit agreement
1 on few selected policies
2: on a variety of issues, but not comprehensive
3: comprehensive policy platform

4.2.1.181 Policy specific procedural rules: all agreements (coal_polspec_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_polspec_all

Original tag: coal_polspec_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 373, Percent: 31.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703, Percent: 2.32

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.182 Policy specific procedural rules (coal_polspec_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_polspec_doc1

Original tag: coal_polspec_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 374, Percent: 31.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.183 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 1 (coal_polspec_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_polspec_doc2

Original tag: coal_polspec_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:

in percent

4.2.1.184 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 2 (coal_polspec_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_polspec_doc3

Original tag: coal_polspec_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.185 Policy specific procedural rules: additional agreement number 3 (coal_polspec_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_polspec_doc4

Original tag: coal_polspec_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
in percent

4.2.1.186 Size of agreement: all agreements (coal_size_agreement_all)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_size_agreement_all

Original tag: coal_size_agreement_all

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 376, Percent: 31.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:
approximate number of words
Corresponds to the sum of all coalition agreements

4.2.1.187 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_size_agreement_doc1

Original tag: coal_size_agreement_doc1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 376, Percent: 31.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 2.33

Description:
approximate number of words

4.2.1.188 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_size_agreement_doc2

Original tag: coal_size_agreement_doc2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 0.13

Description:

approximate number of words

4.2.1.189 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_size_agreement_doc3

Original tag: coal_size_agreement_doc3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:

approximate number of words

4.2.1.190 Size of agreement (coal_size_agreement_doc4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_coal_size_agreement_doc4

Original tag: coal_size_agreement_doc4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:

approximate number of words

4.2.1.191 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber, alternative operationalization (con_alt_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_con_alt_share

Original tag: con_alt_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the Christian democratic (50) or conservative (60) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.2.1.192 Seat share of conservative parties: lower chamber (con_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_con_share

Original tag: con_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the liberal (40) or conservative (60) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.2.1.193 Date in (date_in)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_date_in

Original tag: date_in

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

First day in cabinet life according to official criteria defined as:
(a) date that PM/cabinet was appointed by head of state
(b) date of investiture vote in parliament
(c) date of general election

4.2.1.194 Date in (String) (date_in_str)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_date_in_str

Original tag: date_in_str

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

In date as character string

4.2.1.195 Date out (date_out)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_date_out

Original tag: date_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Last day in cabinet life defined as:
(a) day of cabinet resignation
(b) day of general election

4.2.1.196 Date out (string) (date_out_str)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_date_out_str

Original tag: date_out_str

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Out date as character string

4.2.1.197 Deputy PM party 1 (deputy_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_party1

Original tag: deputy_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 81, Percent: 6.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 125, Percent: 0.41

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.198 Deputy PM party 2 (deputy_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_party2

Original tag: deputy_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 36, Percent: 0.12

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.199 Deputy PM party 3 (deputy_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_party3

Original tag: deputy_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.200 Deputy PM party 4 (deputy_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_party4

Original tag: deputy_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.201 Portfolio Deputy PM party 1 (deputy_port1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port1

Original tag: deputy_port1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Portfolio ID

4.2.1.202 Portfolio Deputy PM party 2 (deputy_port2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port2

Original tag: deputy_port2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Portfolio ID

4.2.1.203 Portfolio Deputy PM party 3 (deputy_port3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port3

Original tag: deputy_port3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Portfolio ID

4.2.1.204 Portfolio Deputy PM party 4 (deputy_port4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port4

Original tag: deputy_port4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Portfolio ID

4.2.1.205 Portfolio Deputy PM party 5 (deputy_port5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port5

Original tag: deputy_port5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Portfolio ID

4.2.1.206 Portfolio Deputy PM party 6 (deputy_port6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_deputy_port6

Original tag: deputy_port6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Portfolio ID

4.2.1.207 First policy dimension (label) (dim_first_label)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_first_label

Original tag: dim_first_label

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

First policy dimension (label)

4.2.1.208 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_first_median

Original tag: dim_first_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 63.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1322, Percent: 4.36

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks, Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.2.1.209 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_first_median_2nd

Original tag: dim_first_median_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks, Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others', only coded if a second median party exists

4.2.1.210 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_first_median_bp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_first_median_bp

Original tag: dim_first_median_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1318, Percent: 4.35

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.211 Second policy dimension (label) (dim_second_label)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_second_label

Original tag: dim_second_label

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Second policy dimension (label)

4.2.1.212 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_second_median

Original tag: dim_second_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 63.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1322, Percent: 4.36

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks, Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.2.1.213 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_second_median_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_second_median_2nd

Original tag: dim_second_median_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks, Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others', only coded if a second median party exists

4.2.1.214 Third policy dimension (label) (dim_third_label)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_third_label

Original tag: dim_third_label

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Third policy dimension (label)

4.2.1.215 Party of the median legislator: third policy dimension, lower chamber (dim_third_median)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_third_median

Original tag: dim_third_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 56, Percent: 4.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 88, Percent: 0.29

Description:
Party-IDs, see party codebooks, Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'

4.2.1.216 Election date (elecdate)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_elecdate

Original tag: elecdate

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Date of most recent parliamentary election:
(a) two-round elections: date of second round
(b) elections held over several days: date of last day

4.2.1.217 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (enpp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_enpp

Original tag: enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
All legislators subsumed under 'others' treated as one single party (minimum fragmentation)

4.2.1.218 Effective number of parliamentary parties: lower chamber (Other minor parties and independents excluded) (enpp_no_others)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_enpp_no_others

Original tag: enpp_no_others

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
All legislators subsumed under 'others' have been excluded from the calculation of the measure.

4.2.1.219 Issues excluded from agenda (exclagenda)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_exclagenda

Original tag: exclagenda

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 333, Percent: 27.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 519, Percent: 1.71

Description:

Issues excluded from agenda:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.220 Decade by date of formation (form_decade)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_decade

Original tag: form_decade

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

90: 1990s
100: 2000s
110: 2010s
120: 2020s

4.2.1.221 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_duration

Original tag: form_duration

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

Measured in days. Time period between 'Date out' of previous cabinet and 'Date in' of current cabinet.

4.2.1.222 Number of days required for cabinet formation (form_duration_alt)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_duration_alt

Original tag: form_duration_alt

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

Measured in days. Number of days since the election OR the 'Date out' of previous cabinet if it is terminated between elections. Thus, this alternative measurement ignores/doesn't count the time between 'Date out' of previous cabinet and the election date.

4.2.1.223 Final vote of investiture: abstentions (form_invest_abs)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_invest_abs

Original tag: form_invest_abs

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 314, Percent: 26.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 1.9

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of abstentions.

4.2.1.224 Final vote of investiture: contra (form_invest_con)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_invest_con

Original tag: form_invest_con

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 324, Percent: 27.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 591, Percent: 1.95

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of contra votes.

4.2.1.225 Final vote of investiture: pro (form_invest_pro)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_form_invest_pro

Original tag: form_invest_pro

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 324, Percent: 27.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 591, Percent: 1.95

Description:

Final vote of investiture. Number of pro votes.

4.2.1.226 Government type (govtype)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_govtype

Original tag: govtype

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

1: Min Minority cabinet: Holds less than 50 percent plus one seat in parliament. Single-party minority cabinets are likewise coded as 'Min'.

2: Maj Single-party majority cabinet: Holds 50percent plus one seat in parliament. Is not a coalition.

3: Mwc Minimal winning coalition: Is turned into a losing coalition by the subtraction of any of the coalition parties, i.e., if it loses a coalition party it holds less than 50 percent plus one seat.

4: Sur Surplus majority coalition: Can lose a coalition party and still be winning, i.e. control 50 percent plus one seat or more in the parliament

5: Non A non-partisan cabinet, e.g. appointed by a president to hold an election

4.2.1.227 Bicameralism (inst_bicam)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_bicam

Original tag: inst_bicam

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Bicameralism:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.228 Comments on institutional features (inst_comment)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_comment

Original tag: inst_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Comments

4.2.1.229 Constructive vote of no-confidence (inst_convote)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_convote

Original tag: inst_convote

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Constructive vote of no-confidence:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.230 PM powers (inst_pmpower)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_pmpower

Original tag: inst_pmpower

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM powers. Ranges from 1 to 8, with an increasing number indicating an increasingly more powerful PM.

4.2.1.231 Positive parliamentarism (inst_posparl)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_posparl

Original tag: inst_posparl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Positive parliamentarism:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.232 Semi-presidentialism (inst_semipres)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_inst_semipres

Original tag: inst_semipres

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Semi-presidentialism:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.233 Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems (invest_bicameral)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_bicameral

Original tag: invest_bicameral

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 273, Percent: 22.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 415, Percent: 1.37

Description:

Approval required for investiture vote in bicameral systems:
1: Only in first/lower chamber
2: In both chambers

4.2.1.234 Comments on investiture vote (invest_comment)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_comment

Original tag: invest_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Comments

4.2.1.235 Existence of investiture vote (invest_exist)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_exist

Original tag: invest_exist

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 765, Percent: 64.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1332, Percent: 4.39

Description:

Existence of investiture vote:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.236 Government in office after investiture object (invest_inoffice)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_inoffice

Original tag: invest_inoffice

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 23.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 1.65

Description:

Government in office after investiture object. In the case of multiple objects of investiture, indicates after which object the government can effectively act (e.g., has control over armed forces):
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.2.1.237 Object of investiture vote (invest_object)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_object

Original tag: invest_object

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Object of investiture vote. Lists all objects that need to pass an investiture vote, separated by commas:
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.2.1.238 Object of investiture vote: first object (invest_object1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_object1

Original tag: invest_object1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 473, Percent: 39.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 804, Percent: 2.65

Description:

Object of investiture vote: first object:
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.2.1.239 Object of investiture vote: second object (invest_object2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_object2

Original tag: invest_object2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 40, Percent: 3.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 95, Percent: 0.31

Description:

Object of investiture vote: second object:
1: Only PM
2: Whole cabinet
3: Single ministers
4: Government and its programme

4.2.1.240 Allowed number of investiture votes/rounds (invest_rounds_max)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_rounds_max

Original tag: invest_rounds_max

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 220, Percent: 18.43

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 419, Percent: 1.38

Description:

Only relevant if there is a maximum number of votes/rounds.

4.2.1.241 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_rule1

Original tag: invest_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 765, Percent: 64.07

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1332, Percent: 4.39

Description:

Decision rule for first investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.2.1.242 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_rule2

Original tag: invest_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 16.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 375, Percent: 1.24

Description:

Decision rule for second investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.2.1.243 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_rule3

Original tag: invest_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 133, Percent: 11.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 271, Percent: 0.89

Description:

Decision rule for third investiture vote/round:
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.2.1.244 Decision rule for first investiture vote (invest_rule4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_rule4

Original tag: invest_rule4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 0.15

Description:

Decision rule for forth investiture vote/round
1: Majority support (50percent+1 votes)
2: Plurality support
3: Plurality support among different options
4: No majority against
5: No investiture vote

4.2.1.245 Timing of investiture vote (invest_timing)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_invest_timing

Original tag: invest_timing

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 473, Percent: 39.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 804, Percent: 2.65

Description:

Timing of investiture vote:
1: Before taking office
2: After taking office
3: Both before and after taking office. When investiture votes must be held with respect to the government taking office.

4.2.1.246 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio10_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio1_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 101, Percent: 8.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 121, Percent: 0.4

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.247 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio10_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio1_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 36, Percent: 3.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 0.14

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.248 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 10 (jm_portfolio10_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio10_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio1_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 30

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.249 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio11_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio10_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 87, Percent: 7.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 162, Percent: 0.53

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.250 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio11_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio10_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 0.15

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.251 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 11 (jm_portfolio11_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio11_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio10_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.252 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio12_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio11_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 120, Percent: 10.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 176, Percent: 0.58

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.253 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio12_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio11_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 2.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.254 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio12_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio11_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.255 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 12 (jm_portfolio12_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio12_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio12_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.256 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio13_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio12_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 68, Percent: 5.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 115, Percent: 0.38

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.257 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio13_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio12_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.258 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 13 (jm_portfolio13_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio13_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio12_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.259 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio14_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio13_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 80, Percent: 6.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 127, Percent: 0.42

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.260 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio14_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio13_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 0.13

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.261 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 14 (jm_portfolio14_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio14_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio13_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.262 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio15_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio14_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 7.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 115, Percent: 0.38

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.263 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio15_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio14_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 0.12

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.264 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 15 (jm_portfolio15_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio15_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio14_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.265 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 16 (jm_portfolio16_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio16_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio15_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 3.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 74, Percent: 0.24

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.266 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 16 (jm_portfolio16_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio16_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio15_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.267 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 17 (jm_portfolio17_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio17_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio15_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 65, Percent: 5.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 72, Percent: 0.24

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.268 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 17 (jm_portfolio17_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio17_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio16_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.269 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 18 (jm_portfolio18_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio18_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio16_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 33, Percent: 2.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 0.17

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.270 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 18 (jm_portfolio18_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio18_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio17_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.271 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio19_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio17_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 55, Percent: 4.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 85, Percent: 0.28

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.272 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio19_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio18_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.273 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 19 (jm_portfolio19_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio19_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio18_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.274 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio1_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio19_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 3.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 71, Percent: 0.23

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.275 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio1_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio19_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.276 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 1 (jm_portfolio1_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio1_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio19_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.277 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 20 (jm_portfolio20_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio20_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio2_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 0.15

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.278 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 20 (jm_portfolio20_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio20_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio2_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.279 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 21 (jm_portfolio21_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio21_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio2_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 40, Percent: 3.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 71, Percent: 0.23

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.280 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 21 (jm_portfolio21_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio21_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio2_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.281 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio22_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio2_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 3.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 53, Percent: 0.17

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.282 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio22_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio20_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 1.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.283 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 22 (jm_portfolio22_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio22_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio20_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.284 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio23_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio21_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 2.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 0.11

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.285 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio23_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio21_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 25

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.286 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 23 (jm_portfolio23_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio23_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio22_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.287 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 25 (jm_portfolio25_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio25_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio22_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.288 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 25 (jm_portfolio25_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio25_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio22_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.289 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio26_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio23_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.290 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio26_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio23_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.291 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 26 (jm_portfolio26_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio26_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio23_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.292 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 27 (jm_portfolio27_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio27_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio25_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.293 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 27 (jm_portfolio27_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio27_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio25_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.294 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 28 (jm_portfolio28_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio28_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio26_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.295 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 29 (jm_portfolio29_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio29_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio26_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.296 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 29 (jm_portfolio29_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio29_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio26_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.297 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio2_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio27_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 11.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 208, Percent: 0.69

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.298 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio2_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio27_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 3.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 66, Percent: 0.22

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.299 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio2_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio28_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.300 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio2_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio29_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.301 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 2 (jm_portfolio2_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio2_party5

Original tag: jm_portfolio29_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.302 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 30 (jm_portfolio30_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio30_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio3_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.303 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 30 (jm_portfolio30_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio30_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio3_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.304 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 31 (jm_portfolio31_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio31_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio3_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.305 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 31 (jm_portfolio31_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio31_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio3_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.306 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 32 (jm_portfolio32_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio32_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio30_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.307 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 33 (jm_portfolio33_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio33_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio30_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.308 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 34 (jm_portfolio34_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio34_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio31_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.309 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 35 (jm_portfolio35_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio35_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio31_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.310 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 36 (jm_portfolio36_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio36_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio32_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.311 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 37 (jm_portfolio37_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio37_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio33_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.312 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 39 (jm_portfolio39_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio39_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio34_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.313 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio3_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio35_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 141, Percent: 11.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 221, Percent: 0.73

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.314 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio3_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio36_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 50, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.315 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio3_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio37_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.316 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 3 (jm_portfolio3_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio3_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio39_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.317 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 40 (jm_portfolio40_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio40_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio4_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.318 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 43 (jm_portfolio43_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio43_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio4_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.319 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 44 (jm_portfolio44_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio44_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio4_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.320 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 45 (jm_portfolio45_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio45_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio4_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.321 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 45 (jm_portfolio45_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio45_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio40_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.322 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 46 (jm_portfolio46_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio46_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio43_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.323 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio4_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio44_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 104, Percent: 8.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 164, Percent: 0.54

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.324 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio4_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio45_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 50, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.325 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio4_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio45_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.326 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 4 (jm_portfolio4_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio4_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio46_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.327 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio5_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio5_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 102, Percent: 8.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 179, Percent: 0.59

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.328 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio5_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio5_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 0.12

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.329 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio5_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio5_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.330 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 5 (jm_portfolio5_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio5_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio5_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 25

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.331 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio6_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio6_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 82, Percent: 6.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 124, Percent: 0.41

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.332 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio6_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio6_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.333 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 6 (jm_portfolio6_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio6_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio6_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.334 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio7_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio7_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 106, Percent: 8.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 154, Percent: 0.51

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.335 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio7_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio7_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 2.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54, Percent: 0.18

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.336 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio7_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio7_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.337 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio7_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio7_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.338 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 7 (jm_portfolio7_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio7_party5

Original tag: jm_portfolio7_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.339 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio8_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio8_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 86, Percent: 7.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 142, Percent: 0.47

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.340 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio8_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio8_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 3.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 51, Percent: 0.17

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.341 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio8_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio8_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 20

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.342 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio8_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio8_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.343 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 8 (jm_portfolio8_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio8_party5

Original tag: jm_portfolio8_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.344 Party 1 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party1

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 8.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.345 Party 2 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party2

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 40, Percent: 3.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 64, Percent: 0.21

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.346 Party 3 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party3

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.347 Party 4 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party4

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.348 Party 5 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party5

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.349 Party 6 junior minister portfolio 9 (jm_portfolio9_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_jm_portfolio9_party6

Original tag: jm_portfolio9_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.350 Information on junior ministers (junmin)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_junmin

Original tag: junmin

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 465, Percent: 38.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 2.59

Description:
1: there are no junior ministers according to the definition given below
2: all junior minsters are from the same party holding the portfolio
3: there are watchdog junior ministers at least for some portfolios and we have information for all of them
4: there are watchdog junior ministers at least for some portfolios and we have information for some of them
5: there are watchdog junior ministers at least for some portfolios but we have no information on any of them

4.2.1.351 Largest party in parliament (largest_party)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_largest_party

Original tag: largest_party

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

See party codebooks. Largest party in term of seats.

4.2.1.352 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_bp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_largest_party_bp

Original tag: largest_party_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of largest party in parliament (lower chamber)

4.2.1.353 Largest party in parliament in cabinet (largest_party_incab)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_largest_party_incab

Original tag: largest_party_incab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Largest party in parliament in cabinet
0: No
1: Yes

4.2.1.354 Seat share of largest party in parliament: lower chamber (largest_party_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_largest_party_share

Original tag: largest_party_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Seat share of largest party in parliament (lower chamber)

4.2.1.355 Minority situation in parliament (minority_sit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_minority_sit

Original tag: minority_sit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Minority situation in parliament i.e., no single party holds 50percent plus one seat or more of the parliamentary seats.
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.356 Type of new government (newgov_type)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_newgov_type

Original tag: newgov_type

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Records if a new cabinet is the result of an election, replacement of one or several cabinet parties without a preceding election, of if there has only been a change of PM without a preceding election. This variable does not apply to non-partisan cabinets.
1: Election
2: Replacement
3: PM change, but same party composition as previous cabinet
4: other
5: non-partisan

4.2.1.357 Number of cabinet members (num_ministers)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_num_ministers

Original tag: num_ministers

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Number of cabinet members

4.2.1.358 Number of ministries (num_ministries)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_num_ministries

Original tag: num_ministries

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Number of ministries

4.2.1.359 Number of parties in parliament (num_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_num_parties

Original tag: num_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Number of parties in parliament. All parties, excluding 'others'.

4.2.1.360 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale (parl_polar_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_polar_prosser

Original tag: parl_polar_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.2.1.361 Parliamentary polarization, Prosser (2014) left-right scale, logit scaled (parl_polar_prosser_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_polar_prosser_logit

Original tag: parl_polar_prosser_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) on Prosser's (2014) suggested categories in the Manifesto Project data for the general left-right dimension

4.2.1.362 Parliamentary polarization, RILE (parl_polar_rile)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_polar_rile

Original tag: parl_polar_rile

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.2.1.363 Parliamentary polarization, RILE, logit scaled (parl_polar_rile_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_polar_rile_logit

Original tag: parl_polar_rile_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Measured as the standard deviation from the weighted (by seats) mean position in cabinet, based on the logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011) of the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale

4.2.1.364 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE (parl_prefrange)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_prefrange

Original tag: parl_prefrange

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in parliament on the Manifesto Project's Right-Left (RILE) scale.

4.2.1.365 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, RILE, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_prefrange_logit

Original tag: parl_prefrange_logit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Same as parl_prefrange, but using logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011).

4.2.1.366 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale, logit scaled (parl_prefrange_logit_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_prefrange_logit_prosser

Original tag: parl_prefrange_logit_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Same as parl_prefrange_prosser, but using logit scaling (Lowe et al. 2011).

4.2.1.367 Parliamentary preference range: lower chamber, Prosser (2014) scale (parl_prefrange_prosser)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_parl_prefrange_prosser

Original tag: parl_prefrange_prosser

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

The distance between the left-most and right-most parties in parliament on the general-left right dimension in the Manifesto Project data based on the categories suggested by Prosser (2014)

4.2.1.368 Personal union (personalunion)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion

Original tag: personalunion

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 463, Percent: 38.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 761, Percent: 2.51

Description:

Personal union:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.369 Exception to personal union: Party 1 (personalunion_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party1

Original tag: personalunion_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 240, Percent: 20.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 340, Percent: 1.12

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.370 Exception to personal union: Party 2 (personalunion_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party2

Original tag: personalunion_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 128, Percent: 10.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.371 Exception to personal union: Party 3 (personalunion_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party3

Original tag: personalunion_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 5.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 72, Percent: 0.24

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.372 Exception to personal union: Party 4 (personalunion_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party4

Original tag: personalunion_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 0.11

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.373 Exception to personal union: Party 5 (personalunion_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party5

Original tag: personalunion_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5 Percent: 41.67

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.374 Exception to personal union: Party 6 (personalunion_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party6

Original tag: personalunion_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 50

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.375 Exception to personal union: Party 7 (personalunion_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_personalunion_party7

Original tag: personalunion_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 66.67

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.376 Formal cabinet decision rule (pmpower_formcab)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_formcab

Original tag: pmpower_formcab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:
Formal cabinet decision rule:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.377 Type of actual decision rule 1 (pmpower_formcab_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_formcab_rule1

Original tag: pmpower_formcab_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 729, Percent: 61.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1266, Percent: 4.17

Description:
Type of actual decision rule 1:
1: unanimity
2: majority
3: consensus defined by PM (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)
4: consensus defined by head of state (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)

4.2.1.378 Type of actual decision rule 2 (pmpower_formcab_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_formcab_rule2

Original tag: pmpower_formcab_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 0.14

Description:
Type of actual decision rule 2:
1: unanimity
2: majority
3: consensus defined by PM (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)
4: consensus defined by head of state (by way of summarizing cabinet debate)

4.2.1.379 Ministers' parliamentary accountability (pmpower_minaccount)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_minaccount

Original tag: pmpower_minaccount

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

Ministers' parliamentary accountability:
0: direct
1: via PM only
2: via vote of no confidence against full cabinet only

4.2.1.380 PM right to appoint ministers (pmpower_minappoint)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_minappoint

Original tag: pmpower_minappoint

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM right to appoint ministers:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.381 Type of actual appointment right (pmpower_minappoint_rule)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_minappoint_rule

Original tag: pmpower_minappoint_rule

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 739, Percent: 61.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

Type of actual appointment right:
1: yes, PM alone
2: yes, through formal act carried out by head of state
3: no, head of state has discretionary powers
4: other

4.2.1.382 PM right to dismiss ministers (pmpower_mindismiss)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_mindismiss

Original tag: pmpower_mindismiss

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM right to dismiss ministers:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.383 Type of actual dismissal right (pmpower_mindismiss_rule)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_mindismiss_rule

Original tag: pmpower_mindismiss_rule

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 676, Percent: 56.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1264, Percent: 4.17

Description:

Type of actual dismissal right:
1: yes, PM alone
2: yes, through formal act carried out by head of state
3: no, head of state has discretionary powers
4: other

4.2.1.384 PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting (pmpower_pmagenda)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmagenda

Original tag: pmpower_pmagenda

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM full control over agenda for cabinet meeting:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.385 PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries (pmpower_pmjurisdiction)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmjurisdiction

Original tag: pmpower_pmjurisdiction

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM formal right to determine jurisdiction of ministries:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.386 Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs (pmpower_pmoffice)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmoffice

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 740, Percent: 61.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1259, Percent: 4.15

Description:

Regular bureaucratic structure in PM's office designed to monitor departmental affairs:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.387 Description of structure 1 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmoffice_rule1

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 45.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 915, Percent: 3.02

Description:

Description of structure 1:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.2.1.388 Description of structure 2 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmoffice_rule2

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 266, Percent: 22.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 417, Percent: 1.37

Description:

Description of structure 2:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.2.1.389 Description of structure 3 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmoffice_rule3

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 53, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 119, Percent: 0.39

Description:

Description of structure 3:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.2.1.390 Description of structure 4 (pmpower_pmoffice_rule4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmoffice_rule4

Original tag: pmpower_pmoffice_rule4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 0.14

Description:

Description of structure 4:
1: personal staff (political appointees)
2: civil service staff
3: PM occupies specific (PM) portfolio
4: other

4.2.1.391 PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers (pmpower_pmsteering)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pmpower_pmsteering

Original tag: pmpower_pmsteering

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1336, Percent: 4.4

Description:

PM steering or coordination rights vis-à-vis cabinet ministers:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.392 Party 1 holding portfolio 10 (portfolio10_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio10_party1

Original tag: portfolio1_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 412, Percent: 34.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 652, Percent: 2.15

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.393 Party 1 holding portfolio 11 (portfolio11_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio11_party1

Original tag: portfolio10_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 438, Percent: 36.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 738, Percent: 2.43

Description:

REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.394 Party 2 holding portfolio 11 (portfolio11_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio11_party2

Original tag: portfolio11_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 0.11

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.395 Party 1 holding portfolio 12 (portfolio12_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio12_party1

Original tag: portfolio11_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 469, Percent: 39.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 757, Percent: 2.5

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.396 Party 2 holding portfolio 12 (portfolio12_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio12_party2

Original tag: portfolio12_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.397 Party 1 holding portfolio 13 (portfolio13_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio13_party1

Original tag: portfolio12_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 313, Percent: 26.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 532, Percent: 1.75

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.398 Party 2 holding portfolio 13 (portfolio13_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio13_party2

Original tag: portfolio13_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.399 Party 1 holding portfolio 14 (portfolio14_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio14_party1

Original tag: portfolio13_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 353, Percent: 29.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 560, Percent: 1.85

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.400 Party 2 holding portfolio 14 (portfolio14_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio14_party2

Original tag: portfolio14_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.401 Party 1 holding portfolio 15 (portfolio15_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio15_party1

Original tag: portfolio14_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 341, Percent: 28.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 527, Percent: 1.74

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.402 Party 2 holding portfolio 15 (portfolio15_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio15_party2

Original tag: portfolio15_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.403 Party 1 holding portfolio 16 (portfolio16_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio16_party1

Original tag: portfolio15_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 23.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 1.5

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.404 Party 2 holding portfolio 16 (portfolio16_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio16_party2

Original tag: portfolio16_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 0.11

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.405 Party 1 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio17_party1

Original tag: portfolio16_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 280, Percent: 23.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 424, Percent: 1.4

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.406 Party 2 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio17_party2

Original tag: portfolio17_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.407 Party 3 holding portfolio 17 (portfolio17_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio17_party3

Original tag: portfolio17_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.408 Party 1 holding portfolio 18 (portfolio18_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio18_party1

Original tag: portfolio17_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 251, Percent: 21.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 363, Percent: 1.2

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.409 Party 1 holding portfolio 19 (portfolio19_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio19_party1

Original tag: portfolio18_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 236, Percent: 19.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 362, Percent: 1.19

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.410 Party 2 holding portfolio 19 (portfolio19_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio19_party2

Original tag: portfolio19_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.411 Party 1 holding portfolio 1 (portfolio1_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio1_party1

Original tag: portfolio19_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 46.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.412 Party 1 holding portfolio 20 (portfolio20_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio20_party1

Original tag: portfolio2_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 164, Percent: 13.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 251, Percent: 0.83

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.413 Party 2 holding portfolio 20 (portfolio20_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio20_party2

Original tag: portfolio2_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.414 Party 1 holding portfolio 21 (portfolio21_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio21_party1

Original tag: portfolio20_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 159, Percent: 13.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 280, Percent: 0.92

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.415 Party 2 holding portfolio 21 (portfolio21_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio21_party2

Original tag: portfolio20_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.416 Party 1 holding portfolio 22 (portfolio22_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio22_party1

Original tag: portfolio21_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 123, Percent: 10.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 189, Percent: 0.62

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.417 Party 2 holding portfolio 22 (portfolio22_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio22_party2

Original tag: portfolio21_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.418 Party 1 holding portfolio 23 (portfolio23_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio23_party1

Original tag: portfolio22_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 115, Percent: 9.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 0.64

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.419 Party 2 holding portfolio 23 (portfolio23_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio23_party2

Original tag: portfolio22_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 0.08

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.420 Party 1 holding portfolio 24 (portfolio24_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio24_party1

Original tag: portfolio23_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 103, Percent: 8.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 0.58

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.421 Party 2 holding portfolio 24 (portfolio24_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio24_party2

Original tag: portfolio23_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.422 Party 1 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio25_party1

Original tag: portfolio24_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 74, Percent: 6.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131, Percent: 0.43

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.423 Party 2 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio25_party2

Original tag: portfolio24_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.424 Party 3 holding portfolio 25 (portfolio25_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio25_party3

Original tag: portfolio25_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.425 Party 1 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio26_party1

Original tag: portfolio25_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 62, Percent: 5.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 113, Percent: 0.37

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.426 Party 2 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio26_party2

Original tag: portfolio25_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.427 Party 3 holding portfolio 26 (portfolio26_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio26_party3

Original tag: portfolio26_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.428 Party 1 holding portfolio 27 (portfolio27_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio27_party1

Original tag: portfolio26_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 41, Percent: 3.43

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.429 Party 2 holding portfolio 27 (portfolio27_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio27_party2

Original tag: portfolio26_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.430 Party 1 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio28_party1

Original tag: portfolio27_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 65, Percent: 5.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 109, Percent: 0.36

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.431 Party 2 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio28_party2

Original tag: portfolio27_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.432 Party 3 holding portfolio 28 (portfolio28_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio28_party3

Original tag: portfolio28_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.433 Party 1 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio29_party1

Original tag: portfolio28_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 5.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 111, Percent: 0.37

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.434 Party 2 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio29_party2

Original tag: portfolio28_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.435 Party 3 holding portfolio 29 (portfolio29_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio29_party3

Original tag: portfolio29_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.436 Party 1 holding portfolio 2 (portfolio2_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio2_party1

Original tag: portfolio29_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 536, Percent: 44.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 906, Percent: 2.99

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.437 Party 2 holding portfolio 2 (portfolio2_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio2_party2

Original tag: portfolio29_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59, Percent: 0.19

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.438 Party 1 holding portfolio 30 (portfolio30_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio30_party1

Original tag: portfolio3_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 90, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 123, Percent: 0.41

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.439 Party 1 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio31_party1

Original tag: portfolio3_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 8.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 138, Percent: 0.45

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.440 Party 2 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio31_party2

Original tag: portfolio30_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.441 Party 3 holding portfolio 31 (portfolio31_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio31_party3

Original tag: portfolio31_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.442 Party 1 holding portfolio 32 (portfolio32_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio32_party1

Original tag: portfolio31_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 36, Percent: 3.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 48, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.443 Party 2 holding portfolio 32 (portfolio32_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio32_party2

Original tag: portfolio31_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 100

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.444 Party 1 holding portfolio 33 (portfolio33_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio33_party1

Original tag: portfolio32_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 63, Percent: 5.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 98, Percent: 0.32

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.445 Party 2 holding portfolio 33 (portfolio33_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio33_party2

Original tag: portfolio32_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.446 Party 1 holding portfolio 34 (portfolio34_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio34_party1

Original tag: portfolio33_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 2.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 38, Percent: 0.13

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.447 Party 2 holding portfolio 34 (portfolio34_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio34_party2

Original tag: portfolio33_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.448 Party 1 holding portfolio 35 (portfolio35_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio35_party1

Original tag: portfolio34_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 5.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.449 Party 2 holding portfolio 35 (portfolio35_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio35_party2

Original tag: portfolio34_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.450 Party 1 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio36_party1

Original tag: portfolio35_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.451 Party 2 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio36_party2

Original tag: portfolio35_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.452 Party 3 holding portfolio 36 (portfolio36_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio36_party3

Original tag: portfolio36_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.453 Party 1 holding portfolio 37 (portfolio37_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio37_party1

Original tag: portfolio36_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 52, Percent: 0.17

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.454 Party 1 holding portfolio 38 (portfolio38_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio38_party1

Original tag: portfolio36_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 48, Percent: 0.16

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.455 Party 2 holding portfolio 38 (portfolio38_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio38_party2

Original tag: portfolio37_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.456 Party 1 holding portfolio 39 (portfolio39_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio39_party1

Original tag: portfolio38_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 49, Percent: 4.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.2

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.457 Party 1 holding portfolio 3 (portfolio3_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio3_party1

Original tag: portfolio38_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 542, Percent: 45.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 904, Percent: 2.98

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.458 Party 2 holding portfolio 3 (portfolio3_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio3_party2

Original tag: portfolio39_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.459 Party 1 holding portfolio 40 (portfolio40_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio40_party1

Original tag: portfolio4_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.460 Party 1 holding portfolio 41 (portfolio41_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio41_party1

Original tag: portfolio4_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 0.1

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.461 Party 1 holding portfolio 42 (portfolio42_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio42_party1

Original tag: portfolio40_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 0.08

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.462 Party 2 holding portfolio 42 (portfolio42_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio42_party2

Original tag: portfolio41_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.463 Party 1 holding portfolio 43 (portfolio43_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio43_party1

Original tag: portfolio42_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 2.43

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 41, Percent: 0.14

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.464 Party 1 holding portfolio 44 (portfolio44_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio44_party1

Original tag: portfolio42_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 1.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.465 Party 1 holding portfolio 45 (portfolio45_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio45_party1

Original tag: portfolio43_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.466 Party 1 holding portfolio 46 (portfolio46_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio46_party1

Original tag: portfolio44_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.467 Party 1 holding portfolio 47 (portfolio47_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio47_party1

Original tag: portfolio45_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.468 Party 1 holding portfolio 48 (portfolio48_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio48_party1

Original tag: portfolio46_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 0.09

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.469 Party 1 holding portfolio 49 (portfolio49_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio49_party1

Original tag: portfolio47_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 16.67

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.470 Party 1 holding portfolio 4 (portfolio4_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio4_party1

Original tag: portfolio48_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 45.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 907, Percent: 2.99

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.471 Party 2 holding portfolio 4 (portfolio4_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio4_party2

Original tag: portfolio49_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.472 Party 1 holding portfolio 50 (portfolio50_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio50_party1

Original tag: portfolio5_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.473 Party 1 holding portfolio 51 (portfolio51_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio51_party1

Original tag: portfolio5_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.474 Party 1 holding portfolio 52 (portfolio52_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio52_party1

Original tag: portfolio50_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 16.67

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.475 Party 1 holding portfolio 53 (portfolio53_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio53_party1

Original tag: portfolio51_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.476 Party 1 holding portfolio 54 (portfolio54_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio54_party1

Original tag: portfolio52_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.477 Party 1 holding portfolio 55 (portfolio55_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio55_party1

Original tag: portfolio53_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.478 Party 1 holding portfolio 56 (portfolio56_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio56_party1

Original tag: portfolio54_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.479 Party 1 holding portfolio 57 (portfolio57_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio57_party1

Original tag: portfolio55_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.480 Party 1 holding portfolio 58 (portfolio58_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio58_party1

Original tag: portfolio56_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.481 Party 1 holding portfolio 59 (portfolio59_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio59_party1

Original tag: portfolio57_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.482 Party 1 holding portfolio 5 (portfolio5_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio5_party1

Original tag: portfolio58_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 518, Percent: 43.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 861, Percent: 2.84

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.483 Party 2 holding portfolio 5 (portfolio5_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio5_party2

Original tag: portfolio59_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 33, Percent: 0.11

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.484 Party 1 holding portfolio 60 (portfolio60_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio60_party1

Original tag: portfolio6_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.485 Party 1 holding portfolio 6 (portfolio6_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio6_party1

Original tag: portfolio6_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 466, Percent: 39.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 764, Percent: 2.52

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.486 Party 1 holding portfolio 7 (portfolio7_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio7_party1

Original tag: portfolio7_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 475, Percent: 39.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 795, Percent: 2.62

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.487 Party 1 holding portfolio 8 (portfolio8_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio8_party1

Original tag: portfolio8_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 421, Percent: 35.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 716, Percent: 2.36

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.488 Party 2 holding portfolio 8 (portfolio8_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio8_party2

Original tag: portfolio8_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.489 Party 1 holding portfolio 9 (portfolio9_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio9_party1

Original tag: portfolio9_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 484, Percent: 40.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 796, Percent: 2.62

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.490 Party 2 holding portfolio 9 (portfolio9_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_portfolio9_party2

Original tag: portfolio9_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 36, Percent: 0.12

Description:
REPDEM Party ID

4.2.1.491 Post-electoral cabinet (post_election_cab)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_post_election_cab

Original tag: post_election_cab

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Post-electoral cabinet
0: No
1: Yes

4.2.1.492 Presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_appoint_pm

Original tag: pres_appoint_pm

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:
Presidential power to appoint PM:
0: No appointment power
1: Free choice

2: Constitution gives open room for interpretation
3: Constitution gives clear instruction

4.2.1.493 Restrictions on presidential power to appoint PM (pres_appoint_pm_restr)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_appoint_pm_restr

Original tag: pres_appoint_pm_restr

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Clarification on what constitutional restrictions apply if a president has limited appointment power.

4.2.1.494 Comments on presidential powers (pres_comment)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_comment

Original tag: pres_comment

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Comments on presidential powers

4.2.1.495 Presidential decree powers (pres_decree)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_decree

Original tag: pres_decree

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

Presidential decree powers:
0: No decree power
1: Decree power
2: Decrees need to be countersigned by PM

4.2.1.496 Presidential decree powers: explanation (pres_decree_expl)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_decree_expl

Original tag: pres_decree_expl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Provides further detail on any decree powers held by the president, if any.

4.2.1.497 Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative (pres_dismiss)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_dismiss

Original tag: pres_dismiss

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

Presidential power to dismiss PM/cabinet at own initiative:
0: No dissolution at own initiative
1: Free choice (at own initiative)
2: In case of parliamentary (in)activity

4.2.1.498 No codebook entry (pres_dissolve_parl)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_dissolve_parl

Original tag: pres_dissolve_parl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

No codebook entry

4.2.1.499 Presidential right of initiative (legislation) (pres_init)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_init

Original tag: pres_init

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

Presidential right of initiative (legislation):
0: No (President cannot initiate legislation)
1: Yes (President can initiate legislation)

4.2.1.500 Popularly elected president (pres_pop)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_pop

Original tag: pres_pop

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Popularly elected president:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.501 Presidential power of referenda (pres_refer)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_refer

Original tag: pres_refer

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Presidential power of referenda. All relevant referenda powers are listed, separated by commas:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.2.1.502 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_refer_rule1

Original tag: pres_refer_rule1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 193, Percent: 16.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 351, Percent: 1.16

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, first right:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.2.1.503 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_refer_rule2

Original tag: pres_refer_rule2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 71, Percent: 5.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131, Percent: 0.43

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, second right
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.2.1.504 Presidential power of referenda: first right (pres_refer_rule3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_refer_rule3

Original tag: pres_refer_rule3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström

(2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05

Description:

Presidential power of referenda, third right:
0: No right to initiate referenda
1: Right to initiate referenda
2: Right to initiate referenda in assent with parliament/government
3: Right to initiate referenda on initiative of the people
4: Right to initiate referenda on special issues

4.2.1.505 Presidential power to select the PM (pres_select_pm)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_select_pm

Original tag: pres_select_pm

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

Presidential power to select the PM:
0: No power or only formal powers
1: Selecting power

4.2.1.506 Presidential veto powers (pres_veto)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_veto

Original tag: pres_veto

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 350, Percent: 29.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 614, Percent: 2.02

Description:

Presidential veto powers:
0: No veto power
1: Veto can be overruled by supermajority
2: Veto can be overruled by majority of the new parliament after new elections
3: Veto can be overruled by absolute majority
4: Veto can be overruled by simple majority
5: Veto of president leads to a referendum

4.2.1.507 Presidential veto powers: explanation (pres_veto_expl)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_pres_veto_expl

Original tag: pres_veto_expl

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Provides further detail on any veto powers held by the president, if any.

4.2.1.508 Proximity to election: lower chamber (prox_election)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_prox_election

Original tag: prox_election

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Proximity to election: lower chamber
1 (FE): Cabinets formed immediately following an election and ended by the next election.
2 (F): Cabinets formed immediately following an election.
3 (N): Cabinets neither formed immediately following an election nor ended by the next election.
4 (E): Cabinets ended by an election.

4.2.1.509 Proximity to election: upper chamber (prox_election_upper)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_prox_election_upper

Original tag: prox_election_upper

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 113, Percent: 9.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 133, Percent: 0.44

Description:

Proximity to election: upper chamber
1 (FE): Cabinets immediately following an election and ended by the next election.
2 (F): Cabinets immediately following an election.
3 (N): Cabinets neither immediately following an election nor ended by the next election.
4 (E): Cabinets ended by an election.

4.2.1.510 Seat share of radical left/right parties: lower chamber (rad_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_rad_share

Original tag: rad_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:

Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the socialist or other left parties (20) or nationalist and radical right parties (70) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.2.1.511 Party seats lower chamber: Party 1 (seats_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party1

Original tag: seats_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 29.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 579, Percent: 1.91

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 1

4.2.1.512 Party seats lower chamber: Party 10 (seats_party10)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party10

Original tag: seats_party10

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 23.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 444, Percent: 1.46

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 10

4.2.1.513 Party seats lower chamber: Party 11 (seats_party11)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party11

Original tag: seats_party11

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 23.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 448, Percent: 1.48

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 11

4.2.1.514 Party seats lower chamber: Party 12 (seats_party12)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party12

Original tag: seats_party12

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 330, Percent: 27.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 569, Percent: 1.88

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 12

4.2.1.515 Party seats lower chamber: Party 13 (seats_party13)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party13

Original tag: seats_party13

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 218, Percent: 18.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 356, Percent: 1.17

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 13

4.2.1.516 Party seats lower chamber: Party 14 (seats_party14)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party14

Original tag: seats_party14

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 12.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 209, Percent: 0.69

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 14

4.2.1.517 Party seats lower chamber: Party 15 (seats_party15)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party15

Original tag: seats_party15

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 15.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 268, Percent: 0.88

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 15

4.2.1.518 Party seats lower chamber: Party 16 (seats_party16)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party16

Original tag: seats_party16

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 155, Percent: 12.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 251, Percent: 0.83

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 16

4.2.1.519 Party seats lower chamber: Party 17 (seats_party17)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party17

Original tag: seats_party17

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 177, Percent: 14.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 235, Percent: 0.77

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 17

4.2.1.520 Party seats lower chamber: Party 18 (seats_party18)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party18

Original tag: seats_party18

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 111, Percent: 9.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 124, Percent: 0.41

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 18

4.2.1.521 Party seats lower chamber: Party 19 (seats_party19)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party19

Original tag: seats_party19

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 13.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 215, Percent: 0.71

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 19

4.2.1.522 Party seats lower chamber: Party 2 (seats_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party2

Original tag: seats_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 185, Percent: 15.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 326, Percent: 1.07

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 2

4.2.1.523 Party seats lower chamber: Party 20 (seats_party20)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party20

Original tag: seats_party20

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 106, Percent: 8.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 122, Percent: 0.4

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 20

4.2.1.524 Party seats lower chamber: Party 21 (seats_party21)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party21

Original tag: seats_party21

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 62, Percent: 5.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 72, Percent: 0.24

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 21

4.2.1.525 Party seats lower chamber: Party 22 (seats_party22)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party22

Original tag: seats_party22

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 89, Percent: 7.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91, Percent: 0.3

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 22

4.2.1.526 Party seats lower chamber: Party 23 (seats_party23)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party23

Original tag: seats_party23

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 72, Percent: 6.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 71, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.39

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 23

4.2.1.527 Party seats lower chamber: Party 24 (seats_party24)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party24

Original tag: seats_party24

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 102, Percent: 8.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 115, Percent: 0.38

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 24

4.2.1.528 Party seats lower chamber: Party 25 (seats_party25)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party25

Original tag: seats_party25

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 2.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 0.1

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 25

4.2.1.529 Party seats lower chamber: Party 26 (seats_party26)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party26

Original tag: seats_party26

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 2.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 8.33

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 26

4.2.1.530 Party seats lower chamber: Party 27 (seats_party27)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party27

Original tag: seats_party27

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 2.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30, Percent: 0.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 27

4.2.1.531 Party seats lower chamber: Party 28 (seats_party28)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party28

Original tag: seats_party28

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 1.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 0.05

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 28

4.2.1.532 Party seats lower chamber: Party 29 (seats_party29)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party29

Original tag: seats_party29

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 1.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 0.07

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 29

4.2.1.533 Party seats lower chamber: Party 3 (seats_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party3

Original tag: seats_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 33.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 688, Percent: 2.27

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 3

4.2.1.534 Party seats lower chamber: Party 30 (seats_party30)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party30

Original tag: seats_party30

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 16, Percent: 1.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 30

4.2.1.535 Party seats lower chamber: Party 31 (seats_party31)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party31

Original tag: seats_party31

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15, Percent: 1.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 31

4.2.1.536 Party seats lower chamber: Party 32 (seats_party32)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party32

Original tag: seats_party32

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19, Percent: 1.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 0.07

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 32

4.2.1.537 Party seats lower chamber: Party 33 (seats_party33)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party33

Original tag: seats_party33

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 33

4.2.1.538 Party seats lower chamber: Party 34 (seats_party34)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party34

Original tag: seats_party34

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 34

4.2.1.539 Party seats lower chamber: Party 35 (seats_party35)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party35

Original tag: seats_party35

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 1.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 35

4.2.1.540 Party seats lower chamber: Party 36 (seats_party36)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party36

Original tag: seats_party36

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.03

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 36

4.2.1.541 Party seats lower chamber: Party 37 (seats_party37)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party37

Original tag: seats_party37

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 37

4.2.1.542 Party seats lower chamber: Party 38 (seats_party38)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party38

Original tag: seats_party38

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 38

4.2.1.543 Party seats lower chamber: Party 39 (seats_party39)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party39

Original tag: seats_party39

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 39

4.2.1.544 Party seats lower chamber: Party 4 (seats_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party4

Original tag: seats_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 303, Percent: 25.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 615, Percent: 2.03

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 4

4.2.1.545 Party seats lower chamber: Party 40 (seats_party40)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party40

Original tag: seats_party40

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 40

4.2.1.546 Party seats lower chamber: Party 41 (seats_party41)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party41

Original tag: seats_party41

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 41

4.2.1.547 Party seats lower chamber: Party 42 (seats_party42)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party42

Original tag: seats_party42

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 25

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 42

4.2.1.548 Party seats lower chamber: Party 43 (seats_party43)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party43

Original tag: seats_party43

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 43

4.2.1.549 Party seats lower chamber: Party 45 (seats_party45)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party45

Original tag: seats_party45

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 45

4.2.1.550 Party seats lower chamber: Party 48 (seats_party48)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party48

Original tag: seats_party48

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 48

4.2.1.551 Party seats lower chamber: Party 49 (seats_party49)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party49

Original tag: seats_party49

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 49

4.2.1.552 Party seats lower chamber: Party 5 (seats_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party5

Original tag: seats_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 404, Percent: 33.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 762, Percent: 2.51

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 5

4.2.1.553 Party seats lower chamber: Party 50 (seats_party50)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party50

Original tag: seats_party50

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10, Percent: 0.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 10

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 50

4.2.1.554 Party seats lower chamber: Party 51 (seats_party51)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party51

Original tag: seats_party51

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 66.67

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 51

4.2.1.555 Party seats lower chamber: Party 52 (seats_party52)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party52

Original tag: seats_party52

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 52

4.2.1.556 Party seats lower chamber: Party 53 (seats_party53)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party53

Original tag: seats_party53

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 53

4.2.1.557 Party seats lower chamber: Party 54 (seats_party54)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party54

Original tag: seats_party54

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 54

4.2.1.558 Party seats lower chamber: Party 56 (seats_party56)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party56

Original tag: seats_party56

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 56

4.2.1.559 Party seats lower chamber: Party 57 (seats_party57)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party57

Original tag: seats_party57

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 57

4.2.1.560 Party seats lower chamber: Party 58 (seats_party58)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party58

Original tag: seats_party58

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 58

4.2.1.561 Party seats lower chamber: Party 59 (seats_party59)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party59

Original tag: seats_party59

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 59

4.2.1.562 Party seats lower chamber: Party 6 (seats_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party6

Original tag: seats_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 330, Percent: 27.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 2.22

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 6

4.2.1.563 Party seats lower chamber: Party 60 (seats_party60)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party60

Original tag: seats_party60

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 60

4.2.1.564 Party seats lower chamber: Party 61 (seats_party61)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party61

Original tag: seats_party61

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 61

4.2.1.565 Party seats lower chamber: Party 65 (seats_party65)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party65

Original tag: seats_party65

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 65

4.2.1.566 Party seats lower chamber: Party 7 (seats_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party7

Original tag: seats_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 414, Percent: 34.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 724, Percent: 2.39

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 7

4.2.1.567 Party seats lower chamber: Party 8 (seats_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party8

Original tag: seats_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 289, Percent: 24.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 528, Percent: 1.74

Description:

Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 8

4.2.1.568 Party seats lower chamber: Party 9 (seats_party9)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party9

Original tag: seats_party9

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 341, Percent: 28.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 621, Percent: 2.05

Description:
Number of seats (lower chamber): Party 9

4.2.1.569 Seat share of socialist and green parties: lower chamber (soc_green_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_soc_green_share

Original tag: soc_green_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:
Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the ecologist parties (10), socialist or other left parties (20), or social democratic parties (30) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.2.1.570 Seat share of socialist parties: lower chamber (soc_share)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_soc_share

Original tag: soc_share

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 760, Percent: 63.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1314, Percent: 4.33

Description:
Includes parties that are coded as belonging to the socialist or other left parties (20) or social democratic parties (30) party families in the Manifesto Project data.

4.2.1.571 Support parties (support_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_parties

Original tag: support_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
See party codebooks. Only includes formal support parties, i.e., those that have a formal written agreement with the government guaranteeing, at minimum, support in issues of confidence and supply

4.2.1.572 Support party 1 (support_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party1

Original tag: support_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 105, Percent: 8.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 184, Percent: 0.61

Description:
Support party 1

4.2.1.573 Support party 2 (support_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party2

Original tag: support_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 34, Percent: 2.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 73, Percent: 0.24

Description:

Support party 2

4.2.1.574 Support party 3 (support_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party3

Original tag: support_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Description:

Support party 3

4.2.1.575 Support party 4 (support_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party4

Original tag: support_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 12.5

Description:

Support party 4

4.2.1.576 Support party 5 (support_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party5

Original tag: support_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Support party 5

4.2.1.577 Support party 6 (support_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party6

Original tag: support_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Support party 6

4.2.1.578 Support party 7 (support_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party7

Original tag: support_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Support party 7

4.2.1.579 Support party 8 (support_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_support_party8

Original tag: support_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Support party 8

4.2.1.580 Technocrat ministry majority (techno_maj)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_techno_maj

Original tag: techno_maj

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1337, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Technocrat ministry majority
0: No
1: Yes

4.2.1.581 Technocrat PM (techno_pm)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_techno_pm

Original tag: techno_pm

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 769, Percent: 64.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1337, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Technocrat PM
0: No
1: Yes

4.2.1.582 Broad policy remit (techno_remit)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_techno_remit

Original tag: techno_remit

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Broad policy remit
0: No
1: Yes
A cabinet without a broad policy remit is considered a caretaker cabinet.

4.2.1.583 Description of dominant policy area (term_descr)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_descr

Original tag: term_descr

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

No codebook entry

4.2.1.584 Discretionary termination (term_disc)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc

Original tag: term_disc

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Discretionary termination:
0: No
1: Yes

4.2.1.585 Cabinet defeat in parliament (term_disc_cabdefeat)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_cabdefeat

Original tag: term_disc_cabdefeat

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Cabinet defeat in parliament:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.586 Conflict between coalition parties: Parties involved (term_disc_conflict_parties)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_conflict_parties

Original tag: term_disc_conflict_parties

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.587 Conflict between coalition parties (personnel) (term_disc_conflict_pers)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_conflict_pers

Original tag: term_disc_conflict_pers

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Conflict between coalition parties (personnel):
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.588 Conflict between coalition parties (policy) (term_disc_conflict_pol)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_conflict_pol

Original tag: term_disc_conflict_pol

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Conflict between coalition parties (policy):
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.589 Early parliamentary election (term_disc_earlyelec)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_earlyelec

Original tag: term_disc_earlyelec

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Early parliamentary election:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.590 Voluntary enlargement of coalition (term_disc_enlarge)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_enlarge

Original tag: term_disc_enlarge

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Voluntary enlargement of coalition:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.591 Intra party conflict (term_disc_intra)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_intra

Original tag: term_disc_intra

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Intra party conflict:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.592 Intra party conflict: Type of conflict (term_disc_intra_conflict)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_intra_conflict

Original tag: term_disc_intra_conflict

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Intra party conflict, Type of conflict:
L – Conflict in national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) (NB: This is conflict contained in the leadership.)
NL – Conflict between united national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) and non-leaders (party activists, party congress delegates, backbench MPs, regional leaders, etc.)
LNL – Conflict in national party leadership (national executive committee, cabinet, parliamentary party leadership) including grass-roots mobilization (i.e. conflict is not confined to the top level)

4.2.1.593 Intra party conflict: Party involved (term_disc_intra_party)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_intra_party

Original tag: term_disc_intra_party

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks

4.2.1.594 Other voluntary reason (term_disc_voluntary)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_voluntary

Original tag: term_disc_voluntary

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Other voluntary reason:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.595 Economic event (term_event_econ)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_event_econ

Original tag: term_event_econ

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Economic event:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.596 International or national security event (term_event_intnat)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_event_intnat

Original tag: term_event_intnat

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

International or national security event:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.597 Non-parliamentary elections (term_event_nonparlelec)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_event_nonparlelec

Original tag: term_event_nonparlelec

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Non-parliamentary elections:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.598 Personal event (term_event_pers)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_event_pers

Original tag: term_event_pers

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Personal event:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.599 Popular opinion shock (term_event_popshock)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_event_popshock

Original tag: term_event_popshock

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Popular opinion shock:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.600 Ministry involved (term_ministry)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_ministry

Original tag: term_ministry

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

States which ministry that were involved in termination.

4.2.1.601 Other constitutional reason (term_tech_const)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_tech_const

Original tag: term_tech_const

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Other constitutional reason:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.602 Death of PM (term_tech_death)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_tech_death

Original tag: term_tech_death

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Death of PM:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.603 Regular parliamentary election (term_tech_regelec)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_tech_regelec

Original tag: term_tech_regelec

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Regular parliamentary election:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.604 Party of the median legislator: first policy dimension, upper chamber (upper_dim_first_median)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_dim_first_median

Original tag: upper_dim_first_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 12.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 197, Percent: 0.65

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'.

4.2.1.605 Party of the median legislator: second policy dimension, upper chamber (upper_dim_second_median)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_dim_second_median

Original tag: upper_dim_second_median

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 12.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 197, Percent: 0.65

Description:

Party-IDs, see party codebooks. Excluding legislators subsumed under 'others'.

4.2.1.606 Effective number of parliamentary parties: upper chamber (upper_enpp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_enpp

Original tag: upper_enpp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 192, Percent: 16.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 238, Percent: 0.78

Description:

Effective number of parliamentary parties in upper chamber. All legislators subsumed under 'others' treated as one single party (minimum fragmentation).

4.2.1.607 Cabinet majority (50percent + 1) seat: upper chamber (upper_majority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_majority

Original tag: upper_majority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 227, Percent: 19.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 298, Percent: 0.98

Description:

Cabinet majority (50percent + 1 seat) in upper chamber
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.608 Party seats upper chamber: Party 1 (upper_seats_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party1

Original tag: upper_seats_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 58, Percent: 4.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91, Percent: 0.3

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 1

4.2.1.609 Party seats upper chamber: Party 10 (upper_seats_party10)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party10

Original tag: upper_seats_party10

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 33, Percent: 2.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44, Percent: 0.15

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 10

4.2.1.610 Party seats upper chamber: Party 11 (upper_seats_party11)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party11

Original tag: upper_seats_party11

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 74, Percent: 6.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 103, Percent: 0.34

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 11

4.2.1.611 Party seats upper chamber: Party 12 (upper_seats_party12)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party12

Original tag: upper_seats_party12

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 7.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 110, Percent: 0.36

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 12

4.2.1.612 Party seats upper chamber: Party 13 (upper_seats_party13)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party13

Original tag: upper_seats_party13

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 13

4.2.1.613 Party seats upper chamber: Party 14 (upper_seats_party14)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party14

Original tag: upper_seats_party14

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 20, Percent: 1.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24, Percent: 0.08

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 14

4.2.1.614 Party seats upper chamber: Party 15 (upper_seats_party15)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party15

Original tag: upper_seats_party15

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 45, Percent: 3.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54, Percent: 0.18

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 15

4.2.1.615 Party seats upper chamber: Party 16 (upper_seats_party16)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party16

Original tag: upper_seats_party16

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 5.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 90, Percent: 0.3

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 16

4.2.1.616 Party seats upper chamber: Party 17 (upper_seats_party17)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party17

Original tag: upper_seats_party17

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 94, Percent: 7.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 116, Percent: 0.38

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 17

4.2.1.617 Party seats upper chamber: Party 18 (upper_seats_party18)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party18

Original tag: upper_seats_party18

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37, Percent: 0.12

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 18

4.2.1.618 Party seats upper chamber: Party 19 (upper_seats_party19)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party19

Original tag: upper_seats_party19

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 79, Percent: 6.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 0.28

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 19

4.2.1.619 Party seats upper chamber: Party 2 (upper_seats_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party2

Original tag: upper_seats_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 2

4.2.1.620 Party seats upper chamber: Party 20 (upper_seats_party20)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party20

Original tag: upper_seats_party20

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 3.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 64, Percent: 0.21

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 20

4.2.1.621 Party seats upper chamber: Party 21 (upper_seats_party21)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party21

Original tag: upper_seats_party21

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 0.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 21

4.2.1.622 Party seats upper chamber: Party 22 (upper_seats_party22)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party22

Original tag: upper_seats_party22

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 43, Percent: 3.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 46, Percent: 0.15

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 22

4.2.1.623 Party seats upper chamber: Party 23 (upper_seats_party23)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party23

Original tag: upper_seats_party23

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 39, Percent: 3.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 40, Percent: 0.13

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 23

4.2.1.624 Party seats upper chamber: Party 24 (upper_seats_party24)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party24

Original tag: upper_seats_party24

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 66, Percent: 5.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75, Percent: 0.25

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 24

4.2.1.625 Party seats upper chamber: Party 25 (upper_seats_party25)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party25

Original tag: upper_seats_party25

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9, Percent: 0.03

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 25

4.2.1.626 Party seats upper chamber: Party 26 (upper_seats_party26)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party26

Original tag: upper_seats_party26

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.04

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 26

4.2.1.627 Party seats upper chamber: Party 27 (upper_seats_party27)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party27

Original tag: upper_seats_party27

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8, Percent: 0.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 27

4.2.1.628 Party seats upper chamber: Party 29 (upper_seats_party29)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party29

Original tag: upper_seats_party29

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 1.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14, Percent: 0.05

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 29

4.2.1.629 Party seats upper chamber: Party 3 (upper_seats_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party3

Original tag: upper_seats_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 101, Percent: 8.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 135, Percent: 0.45

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 3

4.2.1.630 Party seats upper chamber: Party 30 (upper_seats_party30)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party30

Original tag: upper_seats_party30

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 30

4.2.1.631 Party seats upper chamber: Party 31 (upper_seats_party31)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party31

Original tag: upper_seats_party31

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 31

4.2.1.632 Party seats upper chamber: Party 32 (upper_seats_party32)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party32

Original tag: upper_seats_party32

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 32

4.2.1.633 Party seats upper chamber: Party 33 (upper_seats_party33)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party33

Original tag: upper_seats_party33

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 33

4.2.1.634 Party seats upper chamber: Party 34 (upper_seats_party34)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party34

Original tag: upper_seats_party34

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 34

4.2.1.635 Party seats upper chamber: Party 35 (upper_seats_party35)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party35

Original tag: upper_seats_party35

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 16.67

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 35

4.2.1.636 Party seats upper chamber: Party 36 (upper_seats_party36)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party36

Original tag: upper_seats_party36

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 36

4.2.1.637 Party seats upper chamber: Party 37 (upper_seats_party37)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party37

Original tag: upper_seats_party37

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 50

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 37

4.2.1.638 Party seats upper chamber: Party 38 (upper_seats_party38)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party38

Original tag: upper_seats_party38

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 38

4.2.1.639 Party seats upper chamber: Party 39 (upper_seats_party39)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party39

Original tag: upper_seats_party39

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 39

4.2.1.640 Party seats upper chamber: Party 4 (upper_seats_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party4

Original tag: upper_seats_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 59, Percent: 4.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 94, Percent: 0.31

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 4

4.2.1.641 Party seats upper chamber: Party 40 (upper_seats_party40)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party40

Original tag: upper_seats_party40

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 40

4.2.1.642 Party seats upper chamber: Party 41 (upper_seats_party41)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party41

Original tag: upper_seats_party41

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 41

4.2.1.643 Party seats upper chamber: Party 44 (upper_seats_party44)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party44

Original tag: upper_seats_party44

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 44

4.2.1.644 Party seats upper chamber: Party 45 (upper_seats_party45)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party45

Original tag: upper_seats_party45

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 45

4.2.1.645 Party seats upper chamber: Party 46 (upper_seats_party46)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party46

Original tag: upper_seats_party46

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 46

4.2.1.646 Party seats upper chamber: Party 47 (upper_seats_party47)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party47

Original tag: upper_seats_party47

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 50

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 47

4.2.1.647 Party seats upper chamber: Party 48 (upper_seats_party48)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party48

Original tag: upper_seats_party48

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 48

4.2.1.648 Party seats upper chamber: Party 49 (upper_seats_party49)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party49

Original tag: upper_seats_party49

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 49

4.2.1.649 Party seats upper chamber: Party 5 (upper_seats_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party5

Original tag: upper_seats_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 54, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 95, Percent: 0.31

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 5

4.2.1.650 Party seats upper chamber: Party 50 (upper_seats_party50)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party50

Original tag: upper_seats_party50

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.02

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 50

4.2.1.651 Party seats upper chamber: Party 54 (upper_seats_party54)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party54

Original tag: upper_seats_party54

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7, Percent: 0.02

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 54

4.2.1.652 Party seats upper chamber: Party 55 (upper_seats_party55)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party55

Original tag: upper_seats_party55

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 55

4.2.1.653 Party seats upper chamber: Party 56 (upper_seats_party56)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party56

Original tag: upper_seats_party56

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 56

4.2.1.654 Party seats upper chamber: Party 57 (upper_seats_party57)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party57

Original tag: upper_seats_party57

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 57

4.2.1.655 Party seats upper chamber: Party 58 (upper_seats_party58)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party58

Original tag: upper_seats_party58

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 58

4.2.1.656 Party seats upper chamber: Party 59 (upper_seats_party59)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party59

Original tag: upper_seats_party59

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 59

4.2.1.657 Party seats upper chamber: Party 6 (upper_seats_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party6

Original tag: upper_seats_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 47, Percent: 0.15

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 6

4.2.1.658 Party seats upper chamber: Party 60 (upper_seats_party60)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party60

Original tag: upper_seats_party60

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1, Percent: 0.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 60

4.2.1.659 Party seats upper chamber: Party 7 (upper_seats_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party7

Original tag: upper_seats_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 77, Percent: 6.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 111, Percent: 0.37

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 7

4.2.1.660 Party seats upper chamber: Party 8 (upper_seats_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party8

Original tag: upper_seats_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 3.57

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 8

4.2.1.661 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9 (upper_seats_party9)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party9

Original tag: upper_seats_party9

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 78, Percent: 6.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 94, Percent: 0.31

Description:

Number of seats (upper chamber): Party 9

4.2.1.662 Total number of seats: upper chamber (upper_seats_total)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_total

Original tag: upper_seats_total

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 228, Percent: 19.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 300, Percent: 0.99

Description:

Total number of seats (upper chamber)

4.2.1.663 Year of cabinet formation (year_in)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_year_in

Original tag: year_in

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Year of cabinet formation

4.2.1.664 Year/month of cabinet formation (year_month_in)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_year_month_in

Original tag: year_month_in

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Year/month of cabinet formation

4.2.1.665 Year/month of cabinet termination (year_month_out)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_year_month_out

Original tag: year_month_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Year/month of cabinet termination

4.2.1.666 Year out (year_out)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_year_out

Original tag: year_out

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Year of cabinet termination

4.2.1.667 Unique id (unique_id)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_unique_id

Original tag: unique_id

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Variable identifying unique combinations of cab_id and an alphanumerically sorted version of cab_composition2 or potential_government.

4.2.1.668 Full duration technical termination (cab_duration_full)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_duration_full

Original tag: cab_duration_full

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

0: no
1: yes

Takes the value 1 if the cabinet terminates due to technical reasons and its relative duration is greater than 90percent

4.2.1.669 Single party majority cabinet (cab_sp_majority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_sp_majority

Original tag: cab_sp_majority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:

0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.670 Minority cabinet (cab_minority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minority

Original tag: cab_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.671 Single party minority cabinet (cab_sp_minority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_sp_minority

Original tag: cab_sp_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.672 Minority coalition (cab_coal_minority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_coal_minority

Original tag: cab_coal_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 756, Percent: 63.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.673 Substantial minority cabinet (cab_sub_minority)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_sub_minority

Original tag: cab_sub_minority

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 757, Percent: 63.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1333, Percent: 4.39

Description:
0: no
1: yes

Any minority cabinet that does not reach majority status with seats added from formal support parties.

4.2.1.674 Total number of seats: lower chamber (seats_total)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_total

Original tag: seats_total

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
Total number of seats: lower chamber

4.2.1.675 Cabinet seat share including formal support parties (cab_seatshare_supported)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_supported

Original tag: cab_seatshare_supported

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
To be announced

4.2.1.676 Bargaining power (Banzhaf index) of the dim_first_median_2nd_bp party of the median legislator: first policy dimension; lower chamber; 2nd party (dim_first_median_2nd_bp)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_dim_first_median_2nd_bp

Original tag: dim_first_median_2nd_bp

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13, Percent: 0.04

Description:
To be announced

4.2.1.677 Conflict between coalition parties (policy and/or personnel) (term_disc_conflict)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_term_disc_conflict

Original tag: term_disc_conflict

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 771, Percent: 64.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:
0: no
1: yes

4.2.1.678 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (seats_party9998)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party9998

Original tag: seats_party9998

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 35, Percent: 2.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Description:
To be announced

4.2.1.679 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (seats_party9999)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_seats_party9999

Original tag: seats_party9999

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 422, Percent: 35.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 699, Percent: 2.3

Description:

To be announced

4.2.1.680 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9998 (upper_seats_party9998)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party9998

Original tag: upper_seats_party9998

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 56, Percent: 4.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 0.22

Description:

To be announced

4.2.1.681 Party seats upper chamber: Party 9999 (upper_seats_party9999)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_upper_seats_party9999

Original tag: upper_seats_party9999

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 5.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 95, Percent: 0.31

Description:

To be announced

4.2.1.682 Cabinet party 1, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party1

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 754, Percent: 63.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1331, Percent: 4.39

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 1, corresponding to the same party as in ‘cab_party1‘.

4.2.1.683 Cabinet party 2, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party2

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 552, Percent: 46.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 2, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party2'.

4.2.1.684 Cabinet party 3, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party3

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 343, Percent: 28.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 504, Percent: 1.66

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 3, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party3'.

4.2.1.685 Cabinet party 4, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party4

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 179, Percent: 14.99

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 0.86

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 4, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party4'.

4.2.1.686 Cabinet party 5, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party5

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 68, Percent: 5.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 0.28

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 5, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party5'.

4.2.1.687 Cabinet party 6, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party6

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 6, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party6'.

4.2.1.688 Cabinet party 7, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party7

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 7, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party7'.

4.2.1.689 Cabinet party 8, seat share in cabinet (cab_seatshare_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_seatshare_party8

Original tag: cab_seatshare_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:

The seat share in the cabinet for party 8, corresponding to the same party as in 'cab_party8'.

4.2.1.690 Cabinet party 1, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party1)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party1

Original tag: cab_minshare_party1

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 46.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 1 in the cabinet, where 1 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party1'.

4.2.1.691 Cabinet party 2, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party2)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party2

Original tag: cab_minshare_party2

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 554, Percent: 46.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 2 in the cabinet, where 2 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party2'.

4.2.1.692 Cabinet party 3, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party3)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party3

Original tag: cab_minshare_party3

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 352, Percent: 29.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 512, Percent: 1.69

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 3 in the cabinet, where 3 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party3'.

4.2.1.693 Cabinet party 4, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party4)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party4

Original tag: cab_minshare_party4

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 15.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 0.86

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 4 in the cabinet, where 4 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party4'.

4.2.1.694 Cabinet party 5, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party5)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party5

Original tag: cab_minshare_party5

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 5.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 84, Percent: 0.28

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 5 in the cabinet, where 5 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party5'.

4.2.1.695 Cabinet party 6, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party6)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party6

Original tag: cab_minshare_party6

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 21, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27, Percent: 0.09

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 6 in the cabinet, where 6 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party6'.

4.2.1.696 Cabinet party 7, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party7)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party7

Original tag: cab_minshare_party7

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 20

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 7 in the cabinet, where 7 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party7'.

4.2.1.697 Cabinet party 8, share of ministers (cab_minshare_party8)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_minshare_party8

Original tag: cab_minshare_party8

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 33.33

Description:

The share of total ministers held by party 8 in the cabinet, where 8 corresponds to the same party as in 'cab_party8'.

4.2.1.698 Cabinet ID, old standard (old_cab_id)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_old_cab_id

Original tag: old_cab_id

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Old Cabinet ID

4.2.1.699 Unique ID for old cabinet ID and government composition (old_unique_id)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_old_unique_id

Original tag: old_unique_id

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1338, Percent: 4.41

Description:

Unique ID based on a SHA256 hash of a concatenated string of old_cab_id, ., and potential_government. E.g., if old_cab_id is 101, and potential_government is 10001,10004,10005, the concatenated string is 1001.10001,10004,10005

5 V-DEM

Based at the University of Gothenburg, the **Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)** Research Project takes a comprehensive approach to understanding democratization. This approach encompasses multiple core principles: electoral, liberal, majoritarian, consensual, participatory, deliberative, and egalitarian. Each Principle is represented by a separate index, and each is regarded as a separate outcome in the proposed study. In this manner V-Dem reconceptualizes democracy from a single outcome to a set of outcomes. In addition, V-Dem breaks down each core principle into its constituent components, each to be measured separately. Components include features such as free and fair elections, civil liberties, judicial independence, executive constraints, gender equality, media freedom, and civil society. Finally, each component is disaggregated into specific indicators. This fundamentally different approach to democratization is made possible by the V-Dem Database, which measures 450+ indicators annually from 1789 to the present for all countries of the world. The V-Dem approach stands out, first, as a large global collaboration among scholars with diverse areas of expertise; second, as the first project attempting to explain different varieties of democracy; and third, thanks to the highly disaggregated V-Dem data, the first project to explore causal mechanisms linking different aspects of democracy together. With five Principal Investigators, 19 Project Managers with special responsibility for issue areas covered in the V-Dem dataset, around 23 Regional Managers, 134 Country Coordinators and more than 4000 Country Experts, the V-Dem project is one of the world's largest social science data collection projects on democracy. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.v-dem.net/`

5.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16

Dataset tag: vdem_cy

Output Unit: V-Dem Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_name and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns county_id or country_text_id and year.

Description: All 531 V-Dem indicators and 245 indices + 60 other indicators from other data sources. For R users, we recommend to install our vdemdata R package which includes the most recent V-Dem dataset and some useful functions to explore the data.

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Michael, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, David Altman, Fabio Angiolillo, Michael Bernhard, Agnes Cornell, M. Steven Fish, Linnea Fox, Lisa Gastaldi, Haakon Gjerløw, Adam Glynn, Ana Good God, Sandra Grahn, Allen Hicken, Katrin Kinzelbach, Kyle L. Marquardt, Kelly McMann, Valeriya Mechkova, Anja Neundorf, Pamela Paxton, Daniel Pemstein, Johannes von Römer, Brigitte Seim, Rachel Sigman, Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jeffrey Staton, Aksel Sundström, Marcus Tannenberg, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Felix Wiebrecht, Tore Wig, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2026. "V-Dem Codebook v16" Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.
and:
Pemstein, Daniel, Kyle L. Marquardt, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Juraj Medzihorsky, Joshua Krusell, Farhad Miri, and Johannes von Römer. 2025. "The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data". V-Dem Working Paper No. 21. 10th edition. University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute.

V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://v-dem.net/documents/55/codebook.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://v-dem.net/data/reference-documents/`

5.1.1 Identifier Variables in the V-Dem Datasets

Variables in this section identify the observations in the dataset.

5.1.1.1 Gap index (gap_index)

Long tag: vdem_cy_gap_index

Original tag: gap_index

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28092, Percent: 100

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28092, Percent: 92.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
CLARIFICATION: Indication that party was not present in national legislature.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
DATA RELEASE: 11-15.
CITATION: **?**.

5.1.2 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices

This section includes the V-Dem mid-level indices, subcomponents of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V-Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

5.1.2.1 Freedom of association index (thick) (v2x_frassoc_thick)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_frassoc_thick

Original tag: v2x_frassoc_thick

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27419, Percent: 97.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27419, Percent: 90.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken, Michael Bernhard, Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are parties, including opposition parties, allowed to form and to participate in elections, and to what extent are civil society organizations able to form and to operate freely?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2psparban v2psbars v2psoppaut v2elmulpar v2cseeorgs v2csreprss v2x_elecreg
DATA RELEASE: 1-15. Release 1-3 used a different aggregation formula for the thinner index v2x_frassoc.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for party ban (v2psparban), barriers to parties (v2psbars), opposition parties autonomy (v2psoppaut), elections multiparty (v2elmulpar), CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs) and CSO repression (v2csreprss). Since the multiparty elections indicator is only observed in election years, its values have first been repeated within election regime periods as defined by v2x_elecreg.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.2.2 Civil society participation index (v2x_cspart)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_cspart

Original tag: v2x_cspart

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 97.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 90.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Are major CSOs routinely consulted by policymakers; how large is the involvement of people in CSOs; are women prevented from participating; and is legislative candidate nomination within party organization highly decentralized or made through party primaries?
CLARIFICATION: The sphere of civil society lies in the public space between the private sphere and the state. Here, citizens organize in groups to pursue their collective interests and ideals. We call these groups civil society organizations CSOs. CSOs include, but are by no means limited to, interest groups, labor unions, spiritual organizations if they are engaged in civic or political activities, social movements, professional associations, charities, and other non-governmental organizations.
The core civil society index CCSI is designed to provide a measure of a robust civil society, understood as one that enjoys autonomy from the state and in which citizens freely and actively pursue their political and civic goals, however conceived.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pscnslnl v2cscnsult v2csprtcpt v2csgender
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for candidate selection — national/local (v2pscnslnl), CSO consultation (v2cscnsult), CSO participatory environment (v2csprtcpt), and CSO women participation (v2csgender).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Elections

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys) **Elections:** Among national elections we distinguish elections to: (i) the lower or unicameral chamber of the legislature (including constituent or constitutional assemblies), (ii) the upper chamber of the legislature, and (iii) the presidency. For present purposes an executive who is elected by a legislature is considered a *prime minister*, not a president. In order to be considered a *president*, an executive must, under ordinary circumstances, be chosen directly by the electorate (perhaps mediated by an electoral college).

Non-election specific coding: The following questions are not election-specific and should be coded for every year from 1900 (or when applicable) to the present.

Election specific questions: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date. If you have coded for V-Dem in the past, your previous scores will be displayed in the survey. You are welcome to revise previously submitted scores in all surveys. For this section, we kindly ask you make sure that you have coded all election years.

Election specific questions – Historical clarification: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. National elections include elections to the presidency (if applicable) and legislature (lower and upper house, whatever applies), whether direct or indirect, as well as constituent assembly elections. It does not include other elections, *e.g.*, subnational elections, plebiscites, initiatives, referendums, or by-elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date."

Subnational elections and offices: This section of the survey asks a small number of questions about *subnational* elections and offices. You will be instructed to identify two subnational levels, referred to as "regional government" and "local government". Questions in this section should be answered for every year, rather than for specific elections.

Lower chamber election: The following questions pertain to specific lower chamber or

unicameral legislative elections. The dates of these elections have been pre-coded.

Executive and legislative versions of Election specific variables

- In order to subset election specific variables for executive elections only (previously *_ex) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecpres is 1.
- In order to subset election specific variables for legislative elections only (previously *_leg) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecparl is 1.

5.1.3.1 Election type (v2eltype)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2eltype

Original tag: v2eltype

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5099, Percent: 18.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5099, Percent: 16.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: What type of election was held on this date?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply. Whenever possible, specify the exact date of each election. If the election unfolds across more than one day, enter the date for the first day. If the precise date is unavailable, enter the first of the month; if the month is unknown, enter January 1. Multiple-round elections (*e.g.*, two-round elections) are counted separately. (More than one election in a single year can be accommodated.)
RESPONSES:
0: Legislative; lower, sole, or both chambers, first or only round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_0]
1: Legislative, lower, sole, or both chambers, second round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_1]
2: Legislative, upper chamber only, first or only round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_2] (Not yet coded)
3: Legislative, upper chamber only, second round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_3] (Not yet coded)
4: Constituent Assembly, first or only round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_4]
5: Constituent Assembly, second round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_5]
6: Presidential, first or only round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_6]
7: Presidential, second round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_7]
8: Metropolitan or supranational legislative, first or only round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_8] (Not yet coded)
9: Metropolitan or supranational legislative, second round. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2eltype_9] (Not yet coded)
SCALE: Series of dichotomous scales.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple selection.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); Marshall & Gurr (2020); **?**; **?**; **?**,
NOTES: All direct elections and elections by an electoral college that is elected by the people and has the sole purpose of electing an executive or members of parliament are coded. Note that single-party elections, elections held under limited suffrage and for only parts of a parliament, as well as elections of which the results are subsequently cancelled are included.

Elections for constituent assemblies that come to perform functions beyond drafting and adopting a new constitution (*e.g.* legislating, electing president, adopting budget, etc) are also included and coded under category 0 and 1 (Legislative; lower, sole, or both chambers; first or second round). Direct elections for prime minister (*e.g.* Israel in 1996-2001) are coded under category 6. Excluded are elections that are not decisive, i.e. when the HOS alone is selecting the candidate(s). The variable includes elections where results were declared invalid after the fact, *e.g.* by a constitutional court, since they also provide information on the quality of democracy.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.2 Public campaign finance (v2elpubfin)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elpubfin

Original tag: v2elpubfin

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27091, Percent: 96.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27091, Percent: 89.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is significant public financing available for parties' and/or candidates' campaigns for national office?
RESPONSES:
0: No. Public financing is not available.
1: Little. There is public financing but it is so small or so restricted that it plays a minor role in most parties' campaigns.
2: Ambiguous. There is some public financing available but it is unclear whether it plays a significant role for parties.
3: Partly. Public financing plays a significant role in the campaigns of many parties.
4: Yes. Public financing funds a significant share of expenditures by all, or nearly all parties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.

YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.3 Elections multiparty (v2elmulpar)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elmulpar

Original tag: v2elmulpar

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 56.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 52.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Was this national election multiparty?
RESPONSES:
0: No. No-party or single-party and there is no meaningful competition (includes situations where a few parties are legal but they are all *de facto* controlled by the dominant party).
1: Not really. No-party or single-party (defined as above) but multiple candidates from the same party and/or independents contest legislative seats or the presidency.
2: Constrained. At least one real opposition party is allowed to contest but competition is highly constrained — legally or informally.
3: Almost. Elections are multiparty in principle but either one main opposition party is prevented (*de jure* or *de facto*) from contesting, or conditions such as civil unrest (excluding natural disasters) prevent competition in a portion of the territory.
4: Yes. Elections are multiparty, even though a few marginal parties may not be permitted to contest (*e.g.* far-right/left extremist parties, anti-democratic religious or ethnic parties).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.4 Election vote buying (v2elvotbuy)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elvotbuy

Original tag: v2elvotbuy

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15982, Percent: 56.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15982, Percent: 52.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, was there evidence of vote and/or turnout buying?
CLARIFICATION: Vote and turnout buying refers to the distribution of money or gifts to individuals, families, or small groups in order to influence their decision to vote/not vote or whom to vote for. It does not include legislation targeted at specific constituencies, i.e. quot;porkbarrelquot; legislation.
RESPONSES:
0: Yes. There was systematic, widespread, and almost nationwide vote/turnout buying by almost all parties and candidates.
1: Yes, some. There were non-systematic but rather common vote-buying efforts, even if only in some parts of the country or by one or a few parties.
2: Restricted. Money and/or personal gifts were distributed by parties or candidates but these offerings were more about meeting an 'entry-ticket' expectation and less about actual vote choice or turnout, even if a smaller number of individuals may also be persuaded.
3: Almost none. There was limited use of money and personal gifts, or these attempts were limited to a few small areas of the country. In all, they probably affected less than a few percent of voters.
4: None. There was no evidence of vote/turnout buying.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.5 Election other voting irregularities (v2elirreg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elirreg

Original tag: v2elirreg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15980, Percent: 56.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15980, Percent: 52.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, was there evidence of other intentional irregularities by incumbent and/or opposition parties, and/or vote fraud?
CLARIFICATION: Examples include use of double IDs, intentional lack of voting materials, ballot-stuffing, misreporting of votes, and false collation of votes. This question does not refer to lack of access to registration, harassment of opposition parties, manipulations of the voter registry or vote-buying (dealt with in previous questions).
RESPONSES:
0: Yes. There were systematic and almost nationwide other irregularities.
1: Yes, some. There were non-systematic, but rather common other irregularities, even if only in some parts of the country.
2: Sporadic. There were a limited number of sporadic other irregularities, and it is not clear whether they were intentional or disfavored particular groups.
3: Almost none. There were only a limited number of irregularities, and many were probably unintentional or did not disfavor particular groups' access to participation.
4: None. There was no evidence of intentional other irregularities. Unintentional irregularities resulting from human error and/or natural conditions may still have occurred.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.6 Election government intimidation (v2elintim)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elintim

Original tag: v2elintim

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 56.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15984, Percent: 52.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, were opposition candidates/parties/campaign workers subjected to repression, intimidation, violence, or harassment by the government, the ruling party, or their agents?
CLARIFICATION: Other types of clearly distinguishable civil violence, even if politically motivated, during the election period should *not* be factored in when scoring this indicator (it is dealt with separately).
RESPONSES:
0: Yes. The repression and intimidation by the government or its agents was so strong that the entire period was quiet.
1: Yes, frequent: There was systematic, frequent and violent harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents during the election period.
2: Yes, some. There was periodic, not systematic, but possibly centrally coordinated — harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents.
3: Restrained. There were sporadic instances of violent harassment and intimidation by the government or its agents, in at least one part of the country, and directed at only one or two local branches of opposition groups.
4: None. There was no harassment or intimidation of opposition by the government or its agents, during the election campaign period and polling day.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

5.1.3.7 Election other electoral violence (v2elpeace)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elpeace

Original tag: v2elpeace

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15988, Percent: 56.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15988, Percent: 52.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, was the campaign period, election day, and post-election process free from other types not by the government, the ruling party, or their agents) of violence related to the conduct of the election and the campaigns (but not conducted by the government and its agents)?
RESPONSES:
0: No. There was widespread violence between civilians occurring throughout the election period, or in an intense period of more than a week and in large swaths of the country. It resulted in a large number of deaths or displaced refugees.
1: Not really. There were significant levels of violence but not throughout the election period or beyond limited parts of the country. A few people may have died as a result, and some people may have been forced to move temporarily.
2: Somewhat. There were some outbursts of limited violence for a day or two, and only in a small part of the country. The number of injured and otherwise affected was relatively small.
3: Almost. There were only a few instances of isolated violent acts, involving only a few people; no one died and very few were injured.
4: Peaceful. No election-related violence between civilians occurred.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

5.1.3.8 Election boycotts (v2elboycot)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elboycot

Original tag: v2elboycot

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15883, Percent: 56.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15883, Percent: 52.37

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, did any registered opposition candidates or parties boycott?
CLARIFICATION: A boycott is a deliberate and public refusal to participate in an election by a candidate or party who is eligible to participate.
RESPONSES:
0: Total. All opposition parties and candidates boycotted the election.
1: Significant. Some but not all opposition parties or candidates boycotted but they constituted a major opposition force.
2: Ambiguous. Some but not all opposition parties or candidates boycotted but it is unclear whether they would have constituted a major electoral force.
3: Minor. A few opposition parties or candidates boycotted and they were relatively insignificant ones.
4: Nonexistent. No parties or candidates boycotted the elections.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.9 Election free campaign media (v2elfrcamp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elfrcamp

Original tag: v2elfrcamp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13071, Percent: 46.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13071, Percent: 43.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr

QUESTION: In this national election, did parties or candidates receive either free or publicly financed access to national broadcast media?
RESPONSES:
0: Either no parties or only the governing party receives free access.
1: Some parties in addition to the governing party receive free access.
2: All parties receive free access.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.10 Election paid campaign advertisements (v2elpdcamp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elpdcamp

Original tag: v2elpdcamp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13079, Percent: 46.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13079, Percent: 43.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, were parties or candidates able to run paid campaign ads on national broadcast media?
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all.
1: It is permitted but regulated in ways that, in practice, favor the government and its allies.
2: It is permitted without limit.
3: It is permitted but regulated in ways that, in practice, foster fair competition.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds, main-country-coded thresholds.

5.1.3.11 Election domestic election monitors (v2eldommon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2eldommon

Original tag: v2eldommon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3870, Percent: 13.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3870, Percent: 12.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: In this national election, were election monitors from all parties and independent domestic election monitors allowed to monitor the vote at polling stations across the country?
RESPONSES:
0: No
1: Yes
SCALE: Dichotomous.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.12 Election losers accept results (v2elaccept)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elaccept

Original tag: v2elaccept

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15933, Percent: 56.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15933, Percent: 52.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Did losing parties and candidates accept the result of this national election within three months?
RESPONSES:
0: None. None of the losing parties or candidates accepted the results the election, or all opposition was banned.
1: A few. Some but not all losing parties or candidates accepted the results but those who constituted the main opposition force did not.
2: Some. Some but not all opposition parties or candidates accepted the results but it is unclear whether they constituted a major opposition force or were relatively insignificant.
3: Most. Many but not all opposition parties or candidates accepted the results and those who did not had little electoral support.
4: All. All parties and candidates accepted the results.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.13 Election assume office (v2elasmoff)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elasmoff

Original tag: v2elasmoff

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15980, Percent: 56.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15980, Percent: 52.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Following this national election, did winners assume office according to prescribed constitutional rules and norms?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The official winner of the election was prevented from assuming office by *unconstitutional* means.
1: Partially. The official winner/winning party or largest vote-getter was forced at least in part by unconstitutional means to share power, or delay assuming power for more than 6 months.
2: Yes. Constitutional rules and norms were followed and the official winner/winning party or largest vote-getter assumed office accordingly (or continued in office).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: The question text between contemporary and historical differ in inclusion of quot;within 12 months of the electionquot;. In contemporary it is excluded while included in historical.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.14 Name of largest party (v2lpname)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lpname

Original tag: v2lpname

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3577, Percent: 12.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3577, Percent: 11.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: What is the name of the largest party in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Based on seat share. If two parties have an equal amount of seats, vote share decides which of the two is larger. Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent. Leave this question blank if election was

nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Text.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**, websites of National Election Commissions.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.15 Name of second largest party (v2slpname)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2slpname

Original tag: v2slpname

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3223, Percent: 11.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3223, Percent: 10.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: What is the name of the second largest party in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Based on seat share. If two parties have an equal amount of seats, vote share decides which of the two is larger. Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Text.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**, websites of National Election Commissions.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.16 Name of third largest party (v2tlpname)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2tlpname

Original tag: v2tlpname

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2684, Percent: 9.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2684, Percent: 8.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: What is the name of the third largest party in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Based on seat share. If two parties have an equal amount of seats, vote share decides which of the two is larger. Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Text.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**, websites of National Election Commissions.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1791-2024

5.1.3.17 Election HOG turnover ordinal (v2elturnhog)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elturnhog

Original tag: v2elturnhog

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), Cahoon, Ben (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4001, Percent: 14.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4001, Percent: 13.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: Was there turnover in the office of the head of government (HOG) as a result of this national election?
CLARIFICATION: Turnover can occur in presidential, semi-presidential, as well as parliamentary systems, and it refers not only to the individual person holding office but also to that person's party. If the HOS and HOG are the same person, the coding is the same for the two variables. The second round of election is coded as the first.
RESPONSES:
0: No. The head of government- retained his/her position either as a result of the outcome of the election, or because the elections do not affect the HOG.
1: Half. The head of government is a different individual than before the election but from the same party that was in power before the election, or a new independent candidate is elected. In parliamentary systems this code applies when the head of government changes as an effect of alternations in the ruling coalition, changes in party leadership.
2: Yes. The executive(s) - head of state and head of government- lost their position(s) as a result of the outcome of the election. In presidential systems this code applies when the new president is both a different person and from a different party than before the election or an independent candidate is elected. In parliamentary systems the ruling party or coalition of parties lost and the new head of government is from a different party or from a new coalition. This code also applies if this is the first head of government elected for a newly (semi-) independent state country.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; Cahoon, Ben (2026); **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), V-Dem country coordinators
DATA RELEASE: 3-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.18 Elections HOS turnover ordinal (v2elturnhos)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elturnhos

Original tag: v2elturnhos

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), Cahoon, Ben (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4005, Percent: 14.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4005, Percent: 13.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: Was there turnover in the office of the head of state (HOS) as a result of this national election?
CLARIFICATION: Turnover can occur in presidential, semi-presidential, as well as parliamentary systems, and it refers not only to the individual person holding office but also to that person's party.
RESPONSES:
0: No. The head of state retained their position either as a result of the outcome of the election, or because the elections do not affect the HOS.
1: Half. The head of state is a different individual than before the election but from the same party that was in power before the election, or a new independent candidate is elected.
2: Yes. The head of state lost their position(s) as a result of the outcome of the election. In presidential systems this code applies when the new president is both a different person and from a different party than before the election or an independent candidate is elected. This code also applies if this is the first head of state elected for a newly (semi-) independent state country.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; Cahoon, Ben (2026); **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**, V-Dem country coordinators.
DATA RELEASE: 3-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.19 Election executive turnover ordinal (v2eltvrexo)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2eltvrexo

Original tag: v2eltvrexo

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), Cahoon, Ben (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3589, Percent: 12.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3589, Percent: 11.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: Was there turnover in the executive office as a result of this national election?
CLARIFICATION: Turnover in the executive can occur in presidential, semi-presidential, as well as parliamentary systems, and it refers not only to the individual person holding office but also to that person's party. This question considers whether turnover occurs both in the office of head of state and head of government, even if one of the positions is not contested in the particular elections.
RESPONSES:
0: No. The executive(s) — head of state and head of government — retained their position either as a result of the outcome of the election, or because the elections do not affect the executive.
1: Half. The head of state or head of government is a different individual than before the election but from the same party (or independent) that was in power before the election. In parliamentary systems this code applies when the head of government changes as an effect of alternations in the ruling coalition, changes in party leadership, or a new independent head of government. In semi-presidential regimes, this code applies when the elections result in co-habitation after a period when one party (or independent) has held both offices, or if one of the executive office holders — the head of state or head of government changes, while the other retains their position.
2: Yes. The executive(s) — head of state and head of government — lost their position(s) as a result of the outcome of the election. In presidential systems this code applies when the new president is both a different person and from a different party (or independent) than before the election. In parliamentary systems the ruling party or coalition of parties lost and the new head of government is from a different party or from a new coalition. In semi-presidential regimes, this code applies when one party holds both the office of the head of state and head of government after a period of co-habitation, or if the holders of both offices change in terms of person and party (or independent) in the same election. This code also applies if this is the first head of state and/or head of government elected for a newly (semi-) independent state country.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; Cahoon, Ben (2026); **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), V-Dem country coordinators.
NOTES: Converted from (B) to (A) coding.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.20 Lower chamber electoral system (v2elloelsy)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elloelsy

Original tag: v2elloelsy

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3172, Percent: 11.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3172, Percent: 10.46

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Jan Teorell

QUESTION: What was the electoral system used in this election for the lower or unicameral chamber of the legislature?

CLARIFICATION: Mixed majoritarian systems were coded as a two-round system. Regarding multi-member districts we coded list PR with large multi-member districts when the mean district size = 7. Constituent Assembly elections are excluded from the coding, since they often use specifically designed electoral systems. Further information on the following electoral system types can be found in Reynolds/Reilly, *The New International IDEA Handbook* (2005), chapter two and Annex B (Glossary of Terms) — downloadable, free of charge, at www.idea.int/publications/esd/.

RESPONSES:

0: First-past-the-post (FPP, aka plurality) in single-member constituencies. The candidate with the most votes wins the seat.

1: Two-round system in single-member constituencies. Like FPP except that a threshold — usually 50percent + 1 — is required to avoid a runoff between the two top vote-getters.

2: Alternative vote in single-member districts. Voters rank-order their preferences for the candidates who compete for a single seat. If any candidate receives an absolute majority of first preferences, s/he is elected.

If not, then the least successful candidates (based on first-preferences) are eliminated and their votes reallocated to the second-preferences. This process is repeated until a candidate reaches 50percent +1 of the votes.

3: Block vote in multi-member districts. Electors have as many votes as there are seats within that district and can rank-order them (within or across parties) as they please.

4: Party block vote in multi-member districts. Voters cast a vote for a single party (but not for individual candidates within the party's list). The party with the most votes (*i.e.*, a plurality) wins all the seats in that district.

5: Parallel (SMD/PR). Some seats are in single-member districts (allocated by FPP or two-round electoral rules) and other seats are in multimember districts (allocated by some form of PR). These districts are overlapping, meaning that each elector votes twice: once in the single-member district race and once in the multi-member district race. Results are independent.

6: Mixed-member proportional (SMD with PR compensatory seats). Some seats are in single-member districts (allocated by FPP or two-round electoral rules) and other seats are in multimember districts (allocated by some form of PR). These districts are overlapping, meaning that each elector votes twice: once in the single-member district race and once in the multi-member district race. Results are not independent. Specifically, the multimember seats are used to rectify disproportionalities achieved in the single-member district election — by adding seats, as necessary.

This means that the representation of parties in the legislature is determined entirely by the PR ballot. It also means that the result of an MMP election is similar to the result of a PR election: parties achieve representation according to their nationwide vote share (on the PR ballot).

7: List PR with small multi-member districts (mean district size lt; 7). Each party presents a list of candidates for election within a district. Electors vote for a party, and parties receive seats in (rough) proportion to their overall share of the vote. Mean district size is less than seven.

8: List PR with large multi-member districts (mean district size gt; 7). Each party presents a list of candidates for election within a district. Electors vote for a party, and parties receive seats in (rough) proportion to their overall share of the vote. Mean district size is greater than seven.

9: Single-transferable vote (STV) in multi-member districts. Electors rank-order candidates

nominated for a district. Candidates that surpass a specified quota of first-preference votes are elected. The remaining seats are chosen by reallocating the votes of the least successful candidates to elector's second- (or third-) preferences until the specified quota is reached. This process is repeated until all seats for that district are filled.
10: Single non-transferable vote (SNTV) in multi-member districts. Each elector chooses a single candidate. The candidates with the most votes (a plurality) win. (The number of winners is of course determined by the size of the district.)
11: Limited vote in multi-member districts.
Electors have more than one vote but fewer votes than the number of seats in the district. The candidates with the most votes (a plurality) win. (The number of winners is of course determined by the size of the district.)
12: Borda Count in single- or multi-member districts. Electors use numbers to mark preferences among candidates and each preference is assigned a value. For example, in a ten-candidate field a first preference is worth one, a second preference is worth .9, and so forth. These are summed and the candidate(s) with the highest total(s) is/are elected.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**.
DATA RELEASE: 7-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.3.21 Lower chamber election seats (v2elloseat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elloseat

Original tag: v2elloseat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3571, Percent: 12.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3571, Percent: 11.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats were there in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed. For (the relatively few) cases with staggered terms, at present only Argentina, this question only regards seats contested in this election.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.

SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.22 Lower chamber election seats won by largest party (v2ellostlg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellostlg

Original tag: v2ellostlg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3373, Percent: 12.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3373, Percent: 11.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, how many seats were obtained by the largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.23 Lower chamber election seat share won by largest party (v2ellostsl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellostsl

Original tag: v2ellostsl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3373, Percent: 12.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3373, Percent: 11.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: In this election, what percentage (percent) of the total seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature was obtained by the largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.24 Lower chamber election seats won by second largest party (v2ellostsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellostsm

Original tag: v2ellostsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3171, Percent: 11.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3171, Percent: 10.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature were obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.25 Lower chamber election seat share won by second largest party (v2ellostss)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellostss

Original tag: v2ellostss

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3168, Percent: 11.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3168, Percent: 10.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, what percentage (percent) of the total seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature was obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.

RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.26 Lower chamber election seats won by third largest party (v2ellosttm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellosttm

Original tag: v2ellosttm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2748, Percent: 9.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2748, Percent: 9.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature were obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1791-2024

5.1.3.27 Lower chamber election seat share won by third largest party (v2ellostts)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellostts

Original tag: v2ellostts

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2739, Percent: 9.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2739, Percent: 9.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, what percentage (percent) of the total seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature was obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1791-2024

5.1.3.28 Lower chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v2ellovtlg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellovtlg

Original tag: v2ellovtlg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2875, Percent: 10.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2875, Percent: 9.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.* , no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.29 Lower chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v2ellovtsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellovtsm

Original tag: v2ellovtsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2657, Percent: 9.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2657, Percent: 8.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the second largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.* , no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.

RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.30 Lower chamber election vote share of third-largest vote-getter (v2ellovttm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellovttm

Original tag: v2ellovttm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2394, Percent: 8.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2394, Percent: 7.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the third largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Candidates elected as independents are treated as one group, with the name of independent (see party name variables). Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.* , no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1795-2024

5.1.3.31 Lower chamber election statutory threshold (v2elthresh)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elthresh

Original tag: v2elthresh

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3278, Percent: 11.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3278, Percent: 10.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: For this election, what was the statutory threshold (percent share of votes) that a party needed to obtain in order to gain representation in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: In cases where thresholds are applied at a regional level, and in cases of mixed electoral systems where a threshold is applied in more than one tier, the threshold that applies to the most seats should be considered. If there are separate thresholds for individual parties and coalitions, code the threshold pertaining to parties. If there is no statutory threshold, enter 0. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1816-2024

5.1.3.32 Lower chamber election turnover (v2eltvrig)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2eltvrig

Original tag: v2eltvrig

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System

(IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3456, Percent: 12.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3456, Percent: 11.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
QUESTION: Did control of the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature change as a result of this election, according to official results?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The majority party or ruling coalition includes the same or substantially the same parties, even if some minor parties (holding less than 10 percent of the seats in the legislature) left or joined the coalition, or because the elections do not affect the lower chamber.
1: Half. A minority party or coalition who was not in control of the chamber before the elections assumed the leading position in the legislature but is dependent on other parties for support. Or, a post-election ruling coalition includes some old parties and some new parties and the new parties represent more than 10 percent of the seats in the legislature.
2: Yes. The incumbent party or coalition lost its majority or plurality-dominant position in the legislature and a different party or coalition assumes the majority position.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): V-Dem country coordinators; **?**; **?**, **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
NOTES: Converted from (B) to (A) coding.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-2024

5.1.3.33 Subnational election area less free and fair characteristics (v2elsnlfc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elsnlfc

Original tag: v2elsnlfc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15357, Percent: 54.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15357, Percent: 50.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country in which elections are significantly *less* free and fair?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.

RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_11]
12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_14]
15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.34 Subnational election area more free and fair characteristics (v2elsnmrfc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elsnmrfc

Original tag: v2elsnmrfc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15334, Percent: 54.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15334, Percent: 50.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country in which elections are significantly *more* free and fair?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.

RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_11]
12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_14]
15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.3.35 Lower chamber hybrid system reserved seats (v2elloreseat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elloreseat

Original tag: v2elloreseat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1011, Percent: 3.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1011, Percent: 3.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, how many reserved seats were there, either in the 'base' or in the 'upper' tier?
CLARIFICATION: This variable refers to hybrid (or split) electoral systems where electoral rules differ geographically. In such systems, we treat the reserved seats as a second tier, compute an eff_M for them separately and take the weighted average (where the weight is the proportion of S allocated in each tier). Leave this question blank if the election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed. We only consider seats that are filled by popular elections and are reserved for minorities with regards to ethnicity, religion, or social group. We do not consider seats filled by appointment, or quotas (e.g. gender quotas). We do not consider non-elected or non-voting seats.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.3.36 Lower chamber upper tier electoral districts (v2elloupdis)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elloupdis

Original tag: v2elloupdis

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1010, Percent: 3.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1010, Percent: 3.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, how many electoral districts were there in the 'upper' tier?
CLARIFICATION: In an electoral system with one tier, v2elloupdis=0. In proportional systems with more than one tier, the 'upper' tier is the tier with fewer seats. In mixed systems, the 'upper' tier is the PR (proportional representation) part of the system. In hybrid systems where electoral rules differ geographically, v2elloupdis=0. Does not include appointed (nonelected) and reserved seats. Leave this question blank if the election was

nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed. If there are more than two tiers, include these extra upper tiers into this category.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.3.37 Lower chamber base tier electoral districts (v2ellobadis)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellobadis

Original tag: v2ellobadis

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1011, Percent: 3.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1011, Percent: 3.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, how many electoral districts were there in the 'base' (or 'nominal') tier?

CLARIFICATION: In electoral systems with one tier, the 'base' tier includes all elected seats. In proportional systems with more than one tier, the 'base' tier is the tier with most seats. In mixed systems, the 'base' tier is the SMD (singe-member district) part of the system. In hybrid systems where electoral rules differ geographically, the 'base' tier includes all elected seats. Does not include appointed (nonelected) and reserved seats. Leave this question blank if the election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**.
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.

YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.3.38 Lower chamber base or nominal tier seats (v2ellobaseat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2ellobaseat

Original tag: v2ellobaseat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1010, Percent: 3.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1010, Percent: 3.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats were there in the 'base' (or 'nominal') tier?
CLARIFICATION: In electoral systems with one tier, the 'base' tier includes all elected seats. In proportional systems with more than one tier, the 'base' tier is the tier with most seats. In mixed systems, the 'base' tier is the SMD (singe-member district) part of the system. In hybrid systems where electoral rules differ geographically, the 'base' tier includes all elected seats. Does not include appointed (nonelected) and reserved seats. Leave this question blank if the election was nonpartisan, i.e., no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
Numeric.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v2eltype_0, v2eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Political parties:

A "political party" refers to an organization that nominates candidates for public office. A party may refer to a longstanding coalition such as the CDU/CSU in Germany if that coalition functions in most respects like a single party. Sometimes, the identity of a party is obscured by name changes. However, if the party/coalition changes names but retains key personnel and is still run by and for

the same constituency then it should be considered the same organization. Our notion of a party includes loose factional groupings such as the Tories and Whigs in the 19th-century Britain or the Caps and Hats in 18th-century Sweden. Unless stated otherwise the following questions pertain to parties that compete for seats in the national legislature or for the presidency.

Most of the questions in the following section ask you to generalize across parties in a particular country (and at a particular point in time). We realize that practices vary from party to party; these are, after all, highly diverse organizations. However, for our purposes it is important to consider what the most common practices are.

In answering these questions it is sometimes important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens on the ground). In order to clarify the *de jure/de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues wherever you see them. And if there is no clarification of the issue, assume that the question is referring to practices rather than formal rules.

5.1.4.1 Barriers to parties (v2psbars)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psbars

Original tag: v2psbars

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27422, Percent: 97.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27422, Percent: 90.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How restrictive are the barriers to forming a party?
CLARIFICATION: Barriers include legal requirements such as requirements for membership or financial deposits, as well as harassment.
RESPONSES:
0: Parties are not allowed.
1: It is impossible, or virtually impossible, for parties not affiliated with the government to form (legally).
2: There are significant obstacles (*e.g.* party leaders face high levels of regular political harassment by authorities).
3: There are modest barriers (*e.g.* party leaders face occasional political harassment by authorities).
4: There are no substantial barriers.
ORDERING: If your answer is 1-4, proceed to the next question [v2psoppaut]. If your answer is 0, skip to the question about Party organization [v2psorgs].
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.2 Party Ban (v2psparban)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psparban

Original tag: v2psparban

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27360, Percent: 97.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27360, Percent: 90.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are any parties banned?
CLARIFICATION: This does not apply to parties that are barred from competing for failing to meet registration requirements or support thresholds.
RESPONSES:
0: Yes. All parties except the state-sponsored party (and closely allied parties) are banned.
1: Yes. Elections are non-partisan or there are no officially recognized parties.
2: Yes. Many parties are banned.
3: Yes. But only a few parties are banned.
4: No. No parties are officially banned.
ORDERING: If your answer is 4, skip the next question [v2psbantar].
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.3 Opposition parties autonomy (v2psoppaut)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psoppaut

Original tag: v2psoppaut

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 23444, Percent: 83.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23444, Percent: 77.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are opposition parties independent and autonomous of the ruling regime?
CLARIFICATION: An opposition party is any party that is not part of the government, *i.e.*, that has no control over the executive.
RESPONSES:
0: Opposition parties are not allowed.
1: There are no autonomous, independent opposition parties. Opposition parties are either selected or co-opted by the ruling regime.
2: At least some opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.
3: Most significant opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.
4: All opposition parties are autonomous and independent of the ruling regime.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.4 Party organizations (v2psorgs)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psorgs

Original tag: v2psorgs

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26812, Percent: 95.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26812, Percent: 88.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How many political parties for national-level office have permanent organizations?
CLARIFICATION: A permanent organization connotes a substantial number of personnel who are responsible for carrying out party activities outside of the election season.
RESPONSES:
0: No parties.
1: Fewer than half of the parties.
2: About half of the parties.
3: More than half of the parties.
4: All parties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.5 Party Branches (v2psprbrch)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psprbrch

Original tag: v2psprbrch

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26883, Percent: 95.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26883, Percent: 88.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How many parties have permanent local party branches?

RESPONSES:
0: None.
1: Fewer than half.
2: About half.
3: More than half.
4: All.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.6 Party linkages (v2psprlnks)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psprlnks

Original tag: v2psprlnks

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25752, Percent: 91.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25752, Percent: 84.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Among the major parties, what is the main or most common form of linkage to their constituents?
CLARIFICATION: A party-constituent linkage refers to the sort of quot;goodquot; that the party offers in exchange for political support and participation in party activities.
RESPONSES:
0: Clientelistic. Constituents are rewarded with goods, cash, and/or jobs.
1: Mixed clientelistic and local collective.
2: Local collective. Constituents are rewarded with local collective goods, *e.g.*, wells, toilets, markets, roads, bridges, and local development.
3: Mixed local collective and policy/programmatic.
4: Policy/programmatic. Constituents respond to a party's positions on national policies, general party programs, and visions for society.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

5.1.4.7 Distinct party platforms (v2psplats)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psplats

Original tag: v2psplats

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26147, Percent: 93.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26147, Percent: 86.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How many political parties with representation in the national legislature or presidency have publicly available party platforms (manifestos) that are publicized and relatively distinct from one another?
CLARIFICATION: In order to be counted in the affirmative, parties must have platforms that are both distinct (either in terms of content or generalized ideology) and publicly disseminated.
This question is *not* intended to measure how much the public actually knows about these platforms or whether they are important in structuring policymaking.
RESPONSES:
0: None, or nearly none.
1: Fewer than half.
2: About half.
3: More than half.
4: All, or nearly all.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.8 Candidate selection–National/local (v2pscnslnl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pscnslnl

Original tag: v2pscnslnl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25471, Percent: 90.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25471, Percent: 83.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How centralized is legislative candidate selection within the parties?
CLARIFICATION: The power to select candidates for national legislative elections is often divided between local/municipal party actors, regional/state-level party organizations, and national party leaders. One level usually dominates the selection process, while sometimes candidate selection is the outcome of bargaining between the different levels of party organization.
RESPONSES:
0: National legislative candidates are selected exclusively by national party leaders.
1: National legislative candidate selection is dominated by national party leaders but with some limited influence from local or state level organizations.
2: National legislative candidates are chosen through bargaining across different levels of party organization.
3: National legislative candidates are chosen by regional or state-level organizations, perhaps with some input from local party organizations or constituency groups.
4: National legislative candidates are chosen by a small cadre of local or municipal level actors.
5: National legislative candidates are chosen by constituency groups or direct primaries.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.9 Legislative party cohesion (v2pscohesv)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pscohesv

Original tag: v2pscohesv

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25019, Percent: 89.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25019, Percent: 82.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is it normal for members of the legislature to vote with other members of their party on important bills?
RESPONSES:
0: Not really. Many members are elected as independents and party discipline is very weak.
1: More often than not. Members are more likely to vote with their parties than against them, but defections are common.
2: Mostly. Members vote with their parties most of the time.
3: Yes, absolutely. Members vote with their parties almost all the time.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds, expert thresholds, main-country-coded thresholds.

5.1.4.10 Party competition across regions (v2pscomprg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pscomprg

Original tag: v2pscomprg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25001, Percent: 89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25001, Percent: 82.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Which of the following best describes the nature of electoral support for major parties (those gaining over 10 percent of the vote)?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
0: Most major parties are competitive in only one or two regions of the country, *i.e.*, their support is heavily concentrated in a few areas.
1: Most major parties are competitive in some regions of the country, but not in others.
2: Most major parties are competitive in most regions of the country.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.11 National party control (v2psnatpar)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psnatpar

Original tag: v2psnatpar

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19638, Percent: 69.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19638, Percent: 64.75

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How unified is party control of the national government?
CLARIFICATION: With respect to the executive, consider only those offices that have effective power over policymaking. (If there is a monarch or president with very little policymaking power, this office should not be considered.) With respect to bicameral

legislatures, consider only the chamber, or chambers, that have effective policymaking power. (If the upper chamber is inactive or clearly subordinate, consider only the lower chamber.) Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
0: Unified coalition control. A single multi-party coalition controls the executive and legislative branches of the national government. (This is true almost by definition in a parliamentary system where a single coalition gathers together a majority of seats.).
1: Divided party control. (A) Different parties or individuals (unconnected to parties) control the executive and the legislature or (B) Executive power is divided between a president/monarch and a prime minister, each of which belongs to different parties; or between a non-partisan monarch and a prime minister.
2: Unified party control. A single party controls the executive and legislative branches of the national government. (This is true almost by definition in a parliamentary system where a single party has a majority of seats.).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.4.12 Subnational party control (v2pssunpar)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pssunpar

Original tag: v2pssunpar

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25096, Percent: 89.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25096, Percent: 82.74

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does a single party control important policymaking bodies across subnational units (regional and local governments)?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
RESPONSES:
0: In almost all subnational units (at least 90percent), a single party controls all or virtually all policymaking bodies.

1: In most subnational units (66percent-90percent), a single party controls all or virtually all policymaking bodies.
2: In few subnational units (less than 66percent), a single party controls all or virtually all policymaking bodies.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.4.13 Party ban target (v2psbantar)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psbantar

Original tag: v2psbantar

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 22387, Percent: 79.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22387, Percent: 73.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: If any parties are banned, what label best describes these parties?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Ethnic party. [v2psbantar_0]
1: Religious party. [v2psbantar_1]
2: Regional/local party. [v2psbantar_2]
3: Leftist extremist party. [v2psbantar_3]
4: Rightist extremist party. [v2psbantar_4]
5: Other. [v2psbantar_5]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
NOTES: The answer categories for contemporary and historical differ in the inclusion of the word quot;extremistquot;. In contemporary it is included while excluded in the historical answer categories.
DATA RELEASE: 3-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Executive:

In this section, we distinguish between the head of state (HOS) and the head of government (HOG). The *head of state* is an individual or collective body that serves as the chief public representative of the country. Sometimes this is a largely ceremonial role, *e.g.* a monarch who reigns but does not rule, or a president whose powers are strictly circumscribed. The *head of government* is the chief officer(s) of the executive branch of government, typically presiding over a cabinet. In a parliamentary system, this is usually the prime minister. In a presidential system, this is usually the president, who then serves as both, head of state and head of government. In a typical semi-presidential system, the president serves as head of state and the prime minister serves as head of government.

These definitions are grounded in the *functions* that each office performs, as described above. Titles can be confusing. Do not assume, for example, that simply because an individual holds the title of "president" s/he is serving as the chief public representative of the country. Likewise, it may be that the *effective* head of state/head of government is someone other than the *official* head of state/head of government. In this instance, the following questions apply to the person who effectively wields this power. In some socialist systems, for example, the official head of state was a person within the state bureaucracy, but in practice the chief public representative of the country was the chairman of the communist party. It is the latter who is the "effective" head of state, and hence should be the focus of your answers. The same applies if the head of state/head of government is so old, sick or perhaps mentally disabled that s/he cannot perform his/her functions, which are instead performed by someone else. It is the latter person who is the effective head of state/head of government.

If you are considering a semi sovereign territory, such as a colony, an annexed territory or a member of the British Commonwealth, please answer the following questions with respect to the head of state and (if separate) the head of government who is located in the territory in question. Thus, in a typical British colony the governor-general—not the King/Queen of England—would be understood as the head of state. Likewise, in a British colony the local prime minister in the colony—not the prime minister in London—would be understood as the head of government.

In order to mitigate potential misunderstandings, the identities of the head of state and head of government for each country have been pre-coded for as many years as possible. Thus, when conducting your coding make sure to pay close attention to the names of these individuals, which you can see by clicking on the year grid for a particular year in the first question of this section, "HOS name." This is your key to what we mean by "head of state" or "head of government."

Note also that when the two functions are fused in the same office, we ask you to code only the head of state section of the survey. Any precoded years contain an orange triangle. This means that either the score or text and/or specific date have already been entered, so we are asking you only to add your confidence in the precoded rating; we do not want you to change the rating, as we need all the Country Experts to answer the subsequent questions for the same executives. If you feel strongly that the precoded information is wrong, please rate your confidence in the preloaded information and then consult your V-Dem contact. You will have to rate confidence in all the available years in order to proceed to the next question.

In order to avoid spending time on short-lived executives, we have included only executives who held office for at least 100 days.

5.1.5.1 HOS appointment in practice (v2expathhs)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2expathhs

Original tag: v2expathhs

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), Constitute Project (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27792, Percent: 98.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27792, Percent: 91.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
QUESTION: How did the head of state reach office?
CLARIFICATION: If several bodies were involved in the appointment process, select the one that exerted the most critical impact on the decision. However, in the next question we ask separately about whether the approval of the legislature was necessary. Response category 7 should only be selected if the head of state is directly elected, not if he or she was appointed by the legislature after an election. We count as direct elections (category 7) also those indirect elections carried out by an electoral college, whose only purpose is to elect the president. In cases where an elected president dies, resigns, or is legally removed from office, and a line of succession is defined by the constitution, we code a vice president ascending to the presidency according to how they assumed the vice presidency. *E.g.*, coded under category 7 when elected on the same ticket as the outgoing president, or 6 if they were appointed by the legislature.
RESPONSES:
0: Through the threat of or application of force, such as a coup or rebellion.
1: Appointed by a foreign power.
2: Appointed by the ruling party (in a one-party system).
3: Appointed by a royal council.
4: Through hereditary succession.
5: Appointed by the military.
6: Appointed by the legislature.
7: Directly through a popular election (regardless of the extension of the suffrage).
8: Other.
ORDERING: If you select 1-5, skip to question quot;HOS selection by legislature in practice [v2exaphos]quot;. If you selected 6-7, skip to question [v2excomhs].
SCALE: Nominal (v2expathhs), or a series of dichotomous scales.
SOURCE(S): **?**; Constitute Project (2026), V-Dem country coordinators.
NOTES: Converted from B to A coding. v2expathhs is coded according to appointment dates of the Head of State. The same is true for coups or rebellions where the date when the HOS was appointed through a coup, or the first day in office after the coup, is coded.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Coded on HOS appointment dates and December 31 (v2exnamhos).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5.2 HOS control over (v2exctlhs)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exctlhs

Original tag: v2exctlhs

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27713, Percent: 98.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27713, Percent: 91.37

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: In practice, from which of the following bodies must the head of state customarily seek approval prior to making important decisions on domestic policy?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply. In case the HOS does not have the power to make important decisions on domestic policy, select 0 (None).
RESPONSES:
0: None. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_0]
1: A foreign power. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_1]
2: The ruling party or party leadership body (in a one-party system). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_2]
3: A royal council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_3]
4: The military. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_4]
5: A religious body. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_5]
6: A tribal or ethnic council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_6]
7: Other. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhs_7]
ORDERING: If you select 7, proceed to the next question [v2exctlhos]. If you select 0-6, skip to question quot;HOS dissolution in practicequot; [v2exdfdshs].
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5.3 HOS party (v2exparhos)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exparhos

Original tag: v2exparhos

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Cahoon, Ben (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Nils Düpont
QUESTION: What is the name of the political party to which the head of state belongs?
CLARIFICATION: "Technical" refers to non-party leaders, such as members of the royal family, military leaders, foreign leaders, governors, or collective bodies. "Independent" refers to leaders without party affiliation in systems where the leader would normally be affiliated to a party. This does not include leaders in systems where a candidate who is running on a party platform is required to leave the party for the duration of their term. Appointed leaders are considered to be affiliated with the party or body that appointed them.
RESPONSES:
Text.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; Cahoon, Ben (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 11-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Coded on HOS appointment dates and December 31.
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.5.4 HOG appointment in practice (v2expathhg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2expathhg

Original tag: v2expathhg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), Constitute Project (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13380, Percent: 47.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13380, Percent: 44.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
QUESTION: How did the head of government gain access to office?
CLARIFICATION: If several bodies were involved in the appointment process, select the one that exerted the most critical impact on the decision. However, in the next question we ask separately about whether the approval of the legislature was necessary. Response category 8 should only be selected if the head of government is directly elected, not if he or she was appointed by the legislature after an election. If the same person or body is both head of state and head of government, they are only coded as head of state.
RESPONSES:
0: Through the threat of or application of force, such as a coup or rebellion.
1: Appointed by a foreign power.
2: Appointed by the ruling party (in a one-party system).
3: Appointed by a royal council.

4: Through hereditary succession.
5: Appointed by the military.
6: Appointed by the head of state.
7: Appointed by the legislature.
8: Directly through a popular election (regardless of the extension of the suffrage).
9: Other.
ORDERING: If you selected 1-6, skip to question quot;HOG selection by legislature in practicequot; [v2exaphogp]. If you selected 7-8, skip to question [v2excomex].
SCALE: Nominal (v2expathhg), or a series of dichotomous scales.
SOURCE(S): **?**; Constitute Project (2026), V-Dem country coordinators.
NOTES: Converted from (B) to (A) coding. v2expathhg is coded according to appointment dates of the Head of Government. The same is true for coups or rebellions where the date when the HOG was appointed through a coup, or the first day in office after the coup, is coded.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Coded on HOG appointment dates and December 31 (v2exnamhog).
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2exhoshog is 1
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5.5 HOG control over (v2exctlhg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exctlhg

Original tag: v2exctlhg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13285, Percent: 47.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13285, Percent: 43.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: In practice, from which of the following bodies does the head of government customarily seek approval prior to making important decisions on domestic policy?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply. In case the HOG does not have the power to make important decisions on domestic policy, select 0 (None).
RESPONSES:
0: None. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_0]
1: A foreign power. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_1]
2: The ruling party or party leadership body (in a one-party system). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_2]
3: A royal council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_3]
4: The military. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_4]
5: The head of state. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_5]
6: A religious body. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_6]
7: A tribal or ethnic council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_7]

8: Other. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exctlhg_8]
ORDERING: If you select 8, proceed to the next question [v2exctlhog]. If you select 0-7, skip to question HOG dissolution in practice [v2exdjdshg].
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2exhoshog is 1
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5.6 HOG party (v2expothog)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2expothog

Original tag: v2expothog

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Cahoon, Ben (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9645, Percent: 34.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9645, Percent: 31.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Nils Düpont
QUESTION: What is the name of the political party to which the head of government belongs?
CLARIFICATION: "Technical" refers to non-party leaders, such as members of the royal family, military leaders, foreign leaders, governors, or collective bodies. "Independent" refers to leaders without party affiliation in systems where the leader would normally be affiliated to a party. This does not include leaders in systems where a candidate who is running on a party platform is required to leave the party for the duration of their term. Appointed leaders are considered to be affiliated with the party or body that appointed them.
RESPONSES:
Text.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; Cahoon, Ben (2026).
DATA RELEASE: 11-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Coded on HOG appointment dates and December 31.
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.5.7 HOG removal by other in practice (v2exrmhgnp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exrmhgnp

Original tag: v2exrmhgnp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13314, Percent: 47.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13314, Percent: 43.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which of the following bodies would be likely to succeed in removing the head of government if it took actions (short of military force) to do so?
CLARIFICATION: The question refers to whether any of these bodies are considered to hold this power of removal in practice, regardless of whether this is regulated by law and whether this power has been exercised or not. Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: None. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_0]
1: A foreign power. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_1]
2: The ruling party or party leadership body (in a one-party system). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_2]
3: A royal council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_3]
4: The military. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_4]
5: The head of state. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_5]
6: A religious body. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_6]
7: A tribal or ethnic council. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_7]
8: Other. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2exrmhgnp_8]
ORDERING: If you select 8, proceed to the next question [v2exrmhgop]. If you select 0-7, skip to question HOG control [v2exctlhg].
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple selection
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2exhoshog is 1
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.5.8 Regime interregnum (v2regint)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regint

Original tag: v2regint

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 99.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28051, Percent: 92.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen, Tore Wig, Vilde Lunnan Djuve
QUESTION: Is there an identifiable political regime?
CLARIFICATION: This question is used to identify so-called interregnum periods, where no political regime is in control over the entity. Different types of political situations can lead to periods of time under which there is no identifiable political regime, one example being a civil war in which none of the parties have clear control over political bodies and processes in the country. However, the interregnum coding is employed conservatively, meaning that partial control over political bodies and processes in fairly large parts of the country (which is often the case also during civil wars) is sufficient for a 0 score.

Please note that the expert coded (C) questions on support and opposition groups in the regime survey are only coded when v2regint=1.
RESPONSES:
0: No.
1: Yes.
SCALE: Dichotomous
SOURCE(S): **?**, various region- and country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2023
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

5.1.5.9 Regime support groups (v2regsupgroups)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regsupgroups

Original tag: v2regsupgroups

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26925, Percent: 95.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26925, Percent: 88.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which groups does the current political regime rely on in order to maintain power? (Check all that apply.)
CLARIFICATION: Consider which group(s) is supportive of the regime, and, if it/they were to retract support would substantially increase the chance that the regime would lose power.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. [v2regsupgroups_0]
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. [v2regsupgroups_1]
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive). [v2regsupgroups_2]
3: Business elites. [v2regsupgroups_3]
4: The state bureaucracy. [v2regsupgroups_4]
5: The military. [v2regsupgroups_5]
6: An ethnic or racial group(s). [v2regsupgroups_6]
7: A religious group(s). [v2regsupgroups_7]
8: Local elites, including customary chiefs. [v2regsupgroups_8]
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions. [v2regsupgroups_9]
10: Urban middle classes. [v2regsupgroups_10]
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). [v2regsupgroups_11
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). [v2regsupgroups_12]
13: A foreign government or colonial power. [v2regsupgroups_13]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2023
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

5.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

The Legislature:

The following questions pertain to the legislature, an assembly of deputies or representatives with powers to consider, pass, amend, or repeal laws. If there is no legislature in the country you are coding for some period of years, do not code any questions for those year. If you are considering a semi-sovereign territory such as a colony please answer this question with respect to the legislature that is seated within the territory in question (such as the local legislative assembly in a British colony, not the Parliament in London). A popular election need not involve universal suffrage; indeed, suffrage may be highly restricted. A "direct election" can include seats reserved for special groups (*e.g.*, ethnic groups or women) so long as these members are chosen by popular election.

Frequently, it is important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens on the ground). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues. Note that sometimes we ask different coders to code different aspects of a question. So, you might get a question about the *de facto* state of affairs, but another source might provide the answer to the *de jure* state of affairs.

5.1.6.1 Legislature opposition parties (v2lgoppart)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgoppart

Original tag: v2lgoppart

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18464, Percent: 65.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18464, Percent: 60.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Steven Fish, Matthew Kroenig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are opposition parties (those not in the ruling party or coalition) able to exercise oversight and investigatory functions against the wishes of the governing party or coalition?
RESPONSES:
0: No, not at all.
1: Occasionally.
2: Yes, for the most part.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2lgbicam is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.6.2 Lower chamber gender quota (v2lgqugen)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgqugen

Original tag: v2lgqugen

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Quota Project (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18957, Percent: 67.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18957, Percent: 62.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton
QUESTION: Is there a national-level gender quota for the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: National-level quotas either reserve some seats for women in the legislature (as a whole or per district) or mandate through statutory law that all political parties must nominate a certain percentage of female candidates or candidates considered for nomination. A sanction for noncompliance imposes a penalty on a party that fails to meet the quota provisions. Examples of sanctions for noncompliance include rejection of the party list, loss of public campaign funds, or other financial penalties. Weak sanctions are those that parties may be able to ignore, such as a very weak financial penalty. Strong sanctions provide strong deterrents for noncompliance. An example of a strong sanction would be the rejection of a party's list. Countries with both candidate quotas and reserved seats are recorded at the stronger level. This variable records quotas from the date of implementation. The quota adoption date may be earlier, sometimes by several years. Data on quota adoption is available from the QAROT dataset (Hughes, Paxton, Clayton, and Zetterberg 2017) while the theoretical implications of adoption vs. implementation are discussed in Hughes, Paxton, Clayton, and Zetterberg (2018).
RESPONSES:
0: No national level gender quota.
1: Yes, a statutory gender quota for all parties without sanctions for noncompliance.
2: Yes, statutory gender quota for all parties with weak sanctions for noncompliance.
3. Yes, statutory gender quota for all parties with strong sanctions for noncompliance.
4: Yes, there are reserved seats in the legislature for women.
ORDERING: If you answer 1-4, proceed to the next question [v2lgqugens]. If you answer 0, skip to question [v2lglegllo].
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): Quota Project (2025); **?**; **?**, coding by project manager.
NOTES: Converted from (B) to (A) coding.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.6.3 Lower chamber gender quota placement mandate (v2lgqugens)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgqugens

Original tag: v2lgqugens

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Quota Project (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1750, Percent: 6.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1750, Percent: 5.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton
QUESTION: Does the national-level quota for the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature contain a placement mandate?
CLARIFICATION: A placement mandate is a rule concerning rank order on the party list, usually to ensure that women are placed in electable positions on the party list. An example would a rule stating that no more than three of the top five candidates can be of the same gender. Coded only for years where a gender quota was present.
RESPONSES:
0: No.
1: Yes.
ORDERING: Only answer this question if you answered 1-4 on previous question [v2lgqugen].
SCALE: Dichotomous.
SOURCE(S): Quota Project (2025); **?**; **?**, coding by project manager.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2lgqugen is 0
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1947-2024

5.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Society

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civil society organization:

The following set of questions focus on civil society organizations (CSOs). These include interest groups, labor unions, religiously inspired organizations (if they are engaged in civic or political activities), social movements, professional associations, and classic non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but *not* businesses, political parties, government agencies, or religious organizations that are primarily focused on spiritual practices. A CSO must also be at least nominally independent of government and economic institutions.

Civil society organization – Historical clarification: The following set of questions focus on civil society organizations (CSOs). These include interest groups, labor unions, religiously inspired organizations (if they are engaged in civic or political activities), social movements, professional associations, and classic non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but not businesses, political parties, government agencies, or religious organizations that are primarily focused on spiritual practices. A CSO must also be at least nominally independent of government and economic institutions.

If no CSOs exist at all for a particular time period, code the following relevant questions as giving the "lowest score" (indicating, for instance, strong repression or no consultation, a 0).

Religious organizations: In this section, we ask two questions regarding religious organizations. These may be religiously inspired civil society organizations (CSOs) or organizations whose purpose is primarily spiritual.

5.1.7.1 Religious organization repression (v2csrlgrep)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2csrlgrep

Original tag: v2csrlgrep

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27595, Percent: 98.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27595, Percent: 90.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does the government attempt to repress religious organizations?
RESPONSES:
0: Severely. The government violently and actively pursues all real and even some imagined members of religious organizations. It seeks not only to deter the activity of such groups but also to effectively liquidate them. Examples include Stalinist Russia and Maoist China.
1: Substantially. In addition to the kinds of harassment outlined in 2 and 3 below, the government also arrests, tries, and imprisons leaders of and participants in oppositional religious organizations who have acted lawfully. Other sanctions include disruption of public gatherings and violent sanctions of activists (beatings, threats to families, destruction of valuable property).
2: Moderately. In addition to material sanctions outlined in 3 below, the government also engages in minor legal harassment (detentions, short-term incarceration) to dissuade religious organizations from acting or expressing themselves. The government may also restrict the scope of their actions through measures that restrict association of religious civil society organizations with each other or political parties, bar religious civil society organizations from taking certain actions, or block international contacts.
3: Weakly. The government uses material sanctions (fines, firings, denial of social services) to deter oppositional religious organizations from acting or expressing themselves. They may also use burdensome registration or incorporation procedures to slow the formation of new religious civil society organizations and sidetrack them from engagement. The government may also organize parallel religious organizations to crowd out independent religious organizations.
4: No. Religious civil society organizations are free to organize, associate, strike, express themselves, and to criticize the government without fear of government sanctions or harassment.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - The Media

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Media: Two types of media are distinguished in this section: (1) print (newspapers and magazines) and broadcast (radio and television), and (2) online media. We ask that you evaluate these categories as a whole. Thus, "the print and broadcast media" can provide a wide range of perspectives in a

country even when individual publications or programs take a consistently narrow perspective.

Historical clarification: Two types of media are distinguished in this section: (1) print (newspapers and magazines) and (2) broadcast (radio) media. The latter is, however, only for reference to the contemporary era, and should of course be ignored before it appeared. But when applicable, we ask that you evaluate these categories as a whole. If there is no print or broadcast media at all in a given time period, leave the following questions blank (missing) for this time period. Please also explicitly note in the comments section at the end for which years there was no print or broadcast media at all.

5.1.8.1 Media bias (v2mebias)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2mebias

Original tag: v2mebias

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27061, Percent: 96.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27061, Percent: 89.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is there media bias against opposition parties or candidates?
CLARIFICATION: We ask you to take particular care in rating the year-to-year variation on this question if media bias tends to increase or decrease in election years. Coverage can be considered quot;more or less impartialquot; when the media as a whole present a mix of positive and negative coverage of each party or candidate.
RESPONSES:
0: The print and broadcast media cover only the official party or candidates, or have no political coverage, or there are no opposition parties or candidates to cover.
1: The print and broadcast media cover more than just the official party or candidates but all the opposition parties or candidates receive only negative coverage.
2: The print and broadcast media cover some opposition parties or candidates more or less impartially, but they give only negative or no coverage to at least one newsworthy party or candidate.
3: The print and broadcast media cover opposition parties or candidates more or less impartially, but they give an exaggerated *amount* of coverage to the governing party or candidates.
4: The print and broadcast media cover all newsworthy parties and candidates more or less impartially and in proportion to their newsworthiness.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Exclusion:

The following survey contains questions pertaining to exclusion. Political, economic and social well-being may depend on whether groups or individuals are excluded from positions of power, the state's protection of rights and freedoms, access to public goods and services, and opportunities to work or do business with the state.

Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. It is not necessary for all members of a group to be excluded in order for group-based exclusion to occur. Exclusion occurs even when only a single individual is excluded based on her or his identity or membership (perceived or actual) in a particular group.

Political groups are defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates. A common form of partisan exclusion is when state services or regulations are implemented in a way that seeks to reward the incumbent's political supporters and punish non-supporters.

Socio-Economic position defines groups based on attributes of wealth, occupation, or other economic circumstances such as owning property. Exclusion of economic groups occurs when, for example, those who are not property owners are restricted from voting, or when fees associated with justice, health or education are set at a rate that is unaffordable for poorer individuals.

Social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, migration status, or some combination thereof. (It does not include identities grounded in sexual orientation, gender, or socioeconomic status.) Social group identity is contextually defined and is likely to vary across countries and through time. Social group identities are also likely to cross-cut, so that a given person could be defined in multiple ways, i.e., as part of multiple groups. Nonetheless, at any given point in time there are social groups within a society that are understood - by those residing within that society - to be different, in ways that may be politically relevant. Contrast Identity group.

Geographic group refers to those living in rural or urban areas. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer and there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road. (World Development Report, 2009: 54).

5.1.9.1 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clpolcl

Original tag: v2clpolcl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein

et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 67.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 62.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do members of all political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties, or are some groups generally in a more favorable position?
CLARIFICATION: A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates that can be distinguished from others in terms of enjoyment of civil liberties. Responses should not reflect which party controls the legislature and executive. Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Some political groups enjoy much fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
1: Some political groups enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
2: Some political groups enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
3: Some political groups enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
4: All political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2023

5.1.9.2 Access to public services distributed by political group (v2peapspol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peapspol

Original tag: v2peapspol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18964, Percent: 67.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18964, Percent: 62.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is access to basic public services, such as order and security, primary education, clean water, and healthcare, distributed equally across political groups?
CLARIFICATION: A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates. This question asks if political group is an important cleavage in society for the distribution of public services. Thus, if there are inequalities in access to public services, but these are not mainly due to differentiation between particular political groups, the code should be "4" (equal). The situation could of course vary by type of public service, such that a political group is denied access to some basic public services but not others. Please base your response on whether access to most of the aforementioned services are distributed equally or unequally.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their political group affiliation 75 percent (percent) or more of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
1: Unequal. Because of their political group affiliation 25 percent (percent) or more of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their political group affiliation 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their political group affiliation only 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
4: Equal. Because of their political group affiliation less than 5 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2023

5.1.9.3 Access to state jobs by political group (v2peasjpol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasjpol

Original tag: v2peasjpol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 67.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 62.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr

QUESTION: Are state jobs equally open to qualified individuals regardless of their association with a political group?
CLARIFICATION: A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their political group affiliation, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
1: Unequal. Because of their political group affiliation, 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their political group affiliation, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their political group affiliation, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
4: Equal. Because of their political group affiliation, less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2023

5.1.9.4 Access to state business opportunities by political group (v2peasbepol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbepol

Original tag: v2peasbepol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 67.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 62.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals or firms regardless of an individual's association with a political group?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc. A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates that can be distinguished from others in terms of access to power. Responses should not reflect which party controls the

legislature and executive.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their political group affiliation 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because of their political group affiliation 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their political group affiliation 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their political group affiliation 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because of their political group affiliation less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack equal access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2023

5.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civic and Academic Space:

In this survey, we ask you to assess several issues concerning the space for and state of civil society and academia. First, we ask about some general issues such as polarization and peaceful assembly. Then, we probe into mobilization for mass events and associations. Finally, we ask you to consider questions related to academia.

5.1.10.1 Engagement in independent political associations (v2capolit)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2capolit

Original tag: v2capolit

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19241, Percent: 68.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19241, Percent: 63.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sebastian Hellmeier
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr

QUESTION: What share of the population is regularly active in independent political interest associations, such as environmental associations, animal rights groups, or LGBT rights groups?
CLARIFICATION: Political associations include all associations whose main purpose is the change of policy or practice at the state or societal level. It does NOT include political parties or trade unions. An organization is independent if it is not controlled by the state or the ruling party and membership is voluntary. We consider an individual as active if they attend a meeting, activity or event at least twice a year.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no one.
1: A small share of the population (less than 5percent).
2: A moderate share of the population (about 5 to 15 percent).
3: A large share of the population (about 16 percent to 25percent).
4: A very large share of the population (about 26percent or more).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1900-2024
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: country-date latent trait estimates, universal thresholds, expert thresholds, main-country-coded thresholds.

5.1.11 Historical V-Dem - Elections

This part of the codebook contains variables pertaining to the Historical V-Dem data collection. A maximum of 91 countries are included in the sample (see the country table), but some variables (in particular C type variables) cover fewer countries, as coding is still ongoing. For more information on the Historical V-Dem project, please refer to the Organization and Management document (`https://www.v-dem.net/static/website/img/refs/orgmanv111.pdf`) or the Historical V-Dem page: `https://www.v-dem.net/hdata.html`. The vast majority of questions coded by Historical V-Dem are V-Dem indicators previously coded back to 1900, and these indicators are found in other sections of the codebook with merged time series extending all the way from 1789 to the present.

The *Historical V-Dem Elections-* section includes new A, A* and C type indicators that have (at least so far) only been coded for Historical V-Dem, with the modal time series spanning the years 1789-1920 (although time series coverage is different for some variables). This section also includes v3elcomvot, which is coded as a type C variable in Historical V-Dem, while v2elcomvot is coded as a type A variable in Contemporary V-Dem.

For instructions given to the coders (as shown in the surveys), please see introductions to the corresponding theme in the corresponding V-Dem Indicators section.

5.1.11.1 Ballot printing (v3elbalstat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elbalstat

Original tag: v3elbalstat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1030, Percent: 3.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1030, Percent: 3.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Who prints ballot papers?
CLARIFICATION: Leave blank if all or nearly all voting is verbal (viva voce).
RESPONSES:
0: Political parties or candidates print all (or nearly all) the ballot papers.
1. Both the state and parties or candidates print the ballot papers.
2: The state prints all (or nearly all) ballot papers.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v3elbalpap is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2010

5.1.11.2 Minority or majority government (v3elncbmaj)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elncbmaj

Original tag: v3elncbmaj

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2692, Percent: 9.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2692, Percent: 8.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In the first cabinet after this national election, did the political parties that were represented in the cabinet hold a majority of the seats in the (lower chamber of) the

legislature?
RESPONSES:
0: Parties are not allowed.
1: No, the parties represented in cabinet held less than half of the (lower chamber) legislative seats.
2: Yes, the parties represented in cabinet held half, or more than half, of the (lower chamber) legislative seats.
3: Parties are allowed but nonexistent or so diffuse as to be more like factions, and the factions represented in government hold less than half of the (lower chamber) legislative seats.
4: Parties are allowed but nonexistent or so diffuse as to be more like factions, but the factions represented in government hold half, or more than half, of the (lower chamber) legislative seats.
SCALE: Nominal
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025), various country specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1920

5.1.11.3 Upper chamber election turnover (v3eltvriguc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3eltvriguc

Original tag: v3eltvriguc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18, Percent: 0.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: Did control of the upper chamber of the legislature change as a result of this election, according to official results?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The same party/group/coalition remained in control of the majority of seats.

1: Partly. The leading position within a coalition changed. Or, a new coalition includes some old groups/parties and some new groups/parties.

2: Yes. Another party/group/coalition gained control of the majority of seats.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1831-1900

5.1.11.4 Upper chamber election seats (v3elupseat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elupseat

Original tag: v3elupseat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 77, Percent: 0.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 77, Percent: 0.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats were there in the upper chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1900

5.1.11.5 Upper chamber election seats won by largest party (v3elupstsl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elupstsl

Original tag: v3elupstsl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 73, Percent: 0.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 73, Percent: 0.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: In this election to the upper chamber of the legislature, how many seats were obtained by the largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1900

5.1.11.6 Upper chamber election seats won by second largest party (v3elupstsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elupstsm

Original tag: v3elupstsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 73, Percent: 0.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 73, Percent: 0.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats in the upper chamber of the legislature were obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.

DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1900

5.1.11.7 Upper chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3elupvtlg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elupvtlg

Original tag: v3elupvtlg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: In this election to the upper chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments; websites of national bureau of statistics; various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1894-1900

5.1.11.8 Upper chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3elupvtsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elupvtsm

Original tag: v3elupvtsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson

& Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3, Percent: 0.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: In this election to the upper chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the second largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1894-1900

5.1.11.9 Total votes (v3ttlvote)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ttlvote

Original tag: v3ttlvote

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 398, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 398, Percent: 1.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: What is the total number of votes cast in this election.
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of

statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.12 Historical V-Dem - Political Parties

This part of the codebook contains variables pertaining to the Historical V-Dem data collection. A maximum of 91 countries are included in the sample (see the country table), but some variables (in particular C type variables) cover fewer countries, as coding is still ongoing. For more information on the Historical V-Dem project, please refer to the Organization and Management document (`https://www.v-dem.net/static/website/img/refs/orgmanv111.pdf`) or the Historical V-Dem page: `https://www.v-dem.net/hdata.html`. The vast majority of questions coded by Historical V-Dem are V-Dem indicators previously coded back to 1900, and these indicators are found in other sections of the codebook with merged time series extending all the way from 1789 to the present.

The *Historical V-Dem - Political Parties*- section includes new A, A* and C type indicators that have (at least so far) only been coded for Historical V-Dem, with the modal time series spanning the years 1789-1920 (although time series coverage is different for some variables). This section also includes v3elcomvot, which is coded as a type C variable in Historical V-Dem, while v2elcomvot is coded as a type A variable in Contemporary V-Dem.

For instructions given to the coders (as shown in the surveys), please see introductions to the corresponding theme in the corresponding V-Dem Indicators section.

5.1.12.1 Party identification (v3partyid)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3partyid

Original tag: v3partyid

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6563, Percent: 23.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6563, Percent: 21.64

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Do voters identify with a political party?
CLARIFICATION: When party identification is strong, vote choice is largely determined by a voter's party affiliation (and his/her affiliation with that party) rather than attachments to particular candidates, non-partisan issue-positions, or material incentives (*e.g.*, vote-buying).

Likewise, when party identification is strong, voters retain loyalty to a single party rather than switching from one party to another across elections or across offices in the same election (ticket-splitting). In this fashion we can somewhat crudely distinguish between partisans and non-partisans. Note that this question refers only to voters, not to members of the population who do not vote (because they are disenfranchised, choose not to vote, or are discouraged from voting). Leave this question blank if there are no national elections.
RESPONSES:
0: There are national elections, but there are no political parties.
1: Only one party is allowed to participate in national elections.
2: More than one party participates, and nearly all voters are non-partisans.
3: More than one party participates, and most voters are non-partisans.
4: More than one party participates, and voters are equally divided between partisans and non-partisans.
5: More than one party participates, and most voters are partisans.
6: More than one party participates, and nearly all voters are partisans.
SCALE: Nominal, but categories 2—6 constitute ordinal.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2010

5.1.12.2 Party age largest (v3psagefirst)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3psagefirst

Original tag: v3psagefirst

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2507, Percent: 8.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2507, Percent: 8.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: How many years have passed since the party that holds the most seats in the lower chamber (or only chamber) of the legislature was formed?
CLARIFICATION: 1. In case of multiple elections in the same year, the party age was coded for the parliament that sat for the most days. In cases where two parties were tied in the number of seats, the one with the most votes nationally was considered the largest. 2. In cases where the share of electoral vote was not available, the party which formed the governing coalition was coded as the largest instead of the opposition party.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025).

DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1920

5.1.12.3 Party age executive (v3psagepm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3psagepm

Original tag: v3psagepm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2254, Percent: 8.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2254, Percent: 7.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: How many years have passed since the party controlling the executive was formed?
CLARIFICATION: If there is a coalition government, you should count the party of the prime minister was counted. In case of multiple elections in the same year, the party age was coded for the parliament that sat for the most days.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025).
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1920

5.1.12.4 Party age second largest (v3psagesecond)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3psagesecond

Original tag: v3psagesecond

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson

& Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2437, Percent: 8.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2437, Percent: 8.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: How many years have passed since the party that holds the second most seats in the lower chamber (or only chamber) of the legislature was formed?
CLARIFICATION: 1. In case of multiple elections in the same year, the party age was coded for the parliament that sat for the most days. In cases where two parties were tied in the number of seats, the one with the most votes nationally was considered the largest. 2. In cases where the share of electoral vote was not available, the party which formed the governing coalition was coded as the largest instead of the opposition party.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025).
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1920

5.1.12.5 Party age third largest (v3psagethird)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3psagethird

Original tag: v3psagethird

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1226, Percent: 4.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1226, Percent: 4.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: How many years have passed since the party that holds the third most seats in the lower chamber (or only chamber) of the legislature was formed?

CLARIFICATION: 1. In case of multiple elections in the same year, the party age was coded for the parliament that sat for the most days. In cases where two parties were tied in the number of seats, the one with the most votes nationally was considered the largest. 2. In cases where the share of electoral vote was not available, the party which formed the governing coalition was coded as the largest instead of the opposition party.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025).
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: ?.
YEARS: 1791-1920

5.1.13 Historical V-Dem - The Legislature

This part of the codebook contains variables pertaining to the Historical V-Dem data collection. A maximum of 91 countries are included in the sample (see the country table), but some variables (in particular C type variables) cover fewer countries, as coding is still ongoing. For more information on the Historical V-Dem project, please refer to the Organization and Management document (`https://www.v-dem.net/static/website/img/refs/orgmanv111.pdf`) or the Historical V-Dem page: `https://www.v-dem.net/hdata.html`. The vast majority of questions coded by Historical V-Dem are V-Dem indicators previously coded back to 1900, and these indicators are found in other sections of the codebook with merged time series extending all the way from 1789 to the present.

The *Historical V-Dem - The Legislature*- section includes new A, A* and C type indicators that have (at least so far) only been coded for Historical V-Dem, with the modal time series spanning the years 1789-1920 (although time series coverage is different for some variables). This section also includes v3elcomvot, which is coded as a type C variable in Historical V-Dem, while v2elcomvot is coded as a type A variable in Contemporary V-Dem.

For instructions given to the coders (as shown in the surveys), please see introductions to the corresponding theme in the corresponding V-Dem Indicators section.

5.1.13.1 Lower chamber quota for social groups (v3lgqumin)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3lgqumin

Original tag: v3lgqumin

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025), Constitute Project (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5009, Percent: 17.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5009, Percent: 16.51

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: Is there a national-level quota for any social groups in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: These quotas are sometimes informally known as quot;minority quotas.quot; Do not record gender quotas here (as gender is not part of what we mean by a social group). Also, do not include special rules that benefit parties defined by social group but do not guarantee seats for these groups. For example, do not count a rule exempting parties from threshold requirements. Code quot;yesquot; only if the groups covered by the quota have full voting rights in the legislature.
RESPONSES:
0: No national level quota for any social group.
1: Yes, there are reserved seats for at least one social group.
SCALE: Dichotomous
SOURCE(S): Constitute Project (2026); Library of Congress (2025).
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: ?.
YEARS: 1789-1920

5.1.14 Historical V-Dem - Historical V-Dem Modified

This part of the codebook contains variables pertaining to the Historical V-Dem data collection. A maximum of 91 countries are included in the sample (see the country table), but some variables (in particular C type variables) cover fewer countries, as coding is still ongoing. For more information on the Historical V-Dem project, please refer to the Organization and Management document (`https://www.v-dem.net/static/website/img/refs/orgmanv111.pdf`) or the Historical V-Dem page: `https://www.v-dem.net/hdata.html`. The vast majority of questions coded by Historical V-Dem are V-Dem indicators previously coded back to 1900, and these indicators are found in other sections of the codebook with merged time series extending all the way from 1789 to the present.

V-Dem indicators that are different to their contemporary counterparts, for the purpose of gathering additional relevant information for the historical period in Historical V-Dem. These variables are also merged into their v2 equivalents.

First, In contrast to contemporary V-Dem, Historical V-Dem codes upper chamber elections and thus also includes eltype category 2. Those observations are treated as missing in the historical-contemporary merged version of v2eltype. Due to election specific variables being cleaned by v2eltype, these do not include upper chamber elections either. In order to include historical data on upper chamber elections we thus also provide v3eltype and v3 election specific variables that are cleaned by v3eltype.

Second, Historical V-Dem codes additional chambers compared to contemporary V-Dem. When merging v2lgbicam and v3lgbicam the categories get recoded as follows:

- Categories 3 (tricameral) and 4 (quadricameral) become category 2 for the merged v2lgbicam.
- Category 9 (Other types of legislature) becomes category 0 for the merged v2lgbicam.

In order to include historical data on additional chambers, we thus also provide v3lgbicam and v3 chamber specific variables that are cleaned by v3lgbicam.

5.1.14.1 Lower chamber electoral system (v3elloelsy)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elloelsy

Original tag: v3elloelsy

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 534, Percent: 1.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 534, Percent: 1.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: What was the electoral system used in this election for the lower or unicameral chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Further information on the following electoral system types can be found in Reynolds/Reilly, The New International IDEA Handbook (2005), chapter two and Annex B (Glossary of Terms) – downloadable, free of charge, at www.idea.int/publications/esd/.
RESPONSES:
0: First-past-the-post (FPP, aka plurality) in single-member constituencies. The candidate with the most votes wins the seat.

1: Two-round system in single-member constituencies. Like FPP except that a threshold — usually 50percent + 1 — is required to avoid a runoff between the two top vote-getters.

2: Alternative vote in single-member districts. Voters rank-order their preferences for the candidates who compete for a single seat. If any candidate receives an absolute majority of first preferences, s/he is elected. If not, then the least successful candidates (based on first-preferences) are eliminated and their votes reallocated to the second-preferences. This process is repeated until a candidate reaches 50percent +1 of the votes.

3: Block vote in multi-member districts. Electors have as many votes as there are seats within that district and can rank-order them (within or across parties) as they please.

4: Party block vote in multi-member districts. Voters cast a vote for a single party (but not for individual candidates within the party's list). The party with the most votes (*i.e.*, a plurality) wins all the seats in that district.

5: Parallel (SMD/PR). Some seats are in single-member districts (allocated by FPP or two-round electoral rules) and other seats are in multimember districts (allocated by some form of PR). These districts are overlapping, meaning that each elector votes twice: once in the single-member district race and once in the multi-member district race. Results are independent.

6: Mixed-member proportional (SMD with PR compensatory seats). Some seats are in single-member districts (allocated by FPP or two-round electoral rules) and other seats are in multimember districts (allocated by some form of PR). These districts are overlapping, meaning that each elector votes twice: once in the single-member district race and once in the multi-member district race. Results are not independent. Specifically, the multimember seats are used to rectify disproportionalities achieved in the single-member district election — by adding seats, as necessary. This means that the representation of parties in the legislature

is determined entirely by the PR ballot. It also means that the result of an MMP election is similar to the result of a PR election: parties achieve representation according to their nationwide vote share (on the PR ballot)

7: List PR with small multi-member districts (mean district size lt; 7). Each party presents a list of candidates for election within a district. Electors vote for a party, and parties receive seats in (rough) proportion to their overall share of the vote. Mean district size is less than seven.

8: List PR with large multi-member districts (mean district size gt; 7). Each party presents a list of candidates for election within a district. Electors vote for a party, and parties receive seats in (rough) proportion to their overall share of the vote. Mean district size is greater than seven.

9: Single-transferable vote (STV) in multi-member districts. Electors rank-order candidates nominated for a district. Candidates that surpass a specified quota of first-preference votes are elected. The remaining seats are chosen by reallocating the votes of the least successful candidates to elector's second- (or third-) preferences until the specified quota is reached. This process is repeated until all seats for that district are filled.
10: Single non-transferable vote (SNTV) in multi-member districts. Each elector chooses a single candidate. The candidates with the most votes (a plurality) win. (The number of winners is of course determined by the size of the district.)

11: Limited vote in multi-member districts.
Electors have more than one vote but fewer votes than the number of seats in the district. The candidates with the most votes (a plurality) win. (The number of winners is of course determined by the size of the district.)

12: Borda Count in single- or multi-member districts. Electors use numbers to mark preferences among candidates and each preference is assigned a value. For example, in a ten-candidate field a first preference is worth one, a second preference is worth .9, and so forth. These are summed and the candidate(s) with the highest total(s) is/are elected.
SCALE: Nominal
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026); **?**, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1902

5.1.14.2 Lower chamber election seats (v3elloseat)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elloseat

Original tag: v3elloseat

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 655, Percent: 2.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 655, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats were there in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.3 Lower chamber election seats won by largest party (v3ellostlg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellostlg

Original tag: v3ellostlg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 497, Percent: 1.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 497, Percent: 1.64

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, how many seats were obtained by the largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.4 Lower chamber election seat share won by largest party (v3ellostsl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellostsl

Original tag: v3ellostsl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 486, Percent: 1.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 486, Percent: 1.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, what percentage (percent) of the total seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature was obtained by the largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.5 Lower chamber election seats won by second largest party (v3ellostsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellostsm

Original tag: v3ellostsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson

& Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 502, Percent: 1.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 502, Percent: 1.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, how many seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature were obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.6 Lower chamber election seat share won by second largest party (v3ellostss)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellostss

Original tag: v3ellostss

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 494, Percent: 1.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 494, Percent: 1.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election, what percentage (percent) of the total seats in the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature was obtained by the next-largest party?
CLARIFICATION: Does not include appointed (nonelected) seats. Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval

ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.7 Lower chamber election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3ellovtlg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellovtlg

Original tag: v3ellovtlg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 0.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 260, Percent: 0.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.8 Lower chamber election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3ellovtsm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3ellovtsm

Original tag: v3ellovtsm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 213, Percent: 0.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 213, Percent: 0.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this election to the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the second largest party in the first/only round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.9 Effective number of cabinet parties (v3elncbpr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elncbpr

Original tag: v3elncbpr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 921, Percent: 3.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 921, Percent: 3.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
QUESTION: In the first cabinet after this national election, how many political parties were represented in the cabinet?
RESPONSES:
0: Parties are not allowed.
1: One party.
2: Two parties.
3: Three parties.
4: Four or more parties.
SCALE: Nominal
SOURCE(S): Library of Congress (2025), various country specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v3eltype).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1920

5.1.14.10 Lower chamber election turnover (v3eltvrig)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3eltvrig

Original tag: v3eltvrig

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Library of Congress (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 164, Percent: 0.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 164, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: Did control of the lower (or unicameral) chamber of the legislature change as a result of this election, according to official results?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The majority party or ruling coalition includes the same or substantially the same parties, even if some minor parties (holding less than 10 percent of the seats in the legislature) left or joined the coalition, or because the elections do not affect the lower chamber.
1: Half. A minority party or coalition who was not in control of the chamber before the elections assumed the leading position in the legislature but is dependent on other parties for support. Or, a post-election ruling coalition includes some old parties and some new parties and the new parties represent more than 10 percent of the seats in the legislature.
2: Yes. The incumbent party or coalition lost its majority or plurality-dominant position in the legislature and a different party or coalition assumes the majority position.

SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; Library of Congress (2025), various country-specific sources, constitutions, websites of National Parliament.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Lower chamber election dates (v3eltype_0, v3eltype_1)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1790-1912

5.1.14.11 Presidential election vote share of largest vote-getter (v3elvotlrg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elvotlrg

Original tag: v3elvotlrg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 140, Percent: 0.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 140, Percent: 0.46

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this presidential election, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the winning candidate in the first round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
Record only direct presidential elections. Cases where the presidents are elected indirectly by the legislature (*i.e.* Germany) are not being coded since there is no popular vote share. However, in countries where electoral college is present (*i.e.* U.S.), the percentage of popular vote should be recorded if available.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Presidential election dates (v3eltype_6, v3eltype_7)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1792-1919

5.1.14.12 Presidential election vote share of second-largest vote-getter (v3elvotsml)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3elvotsml

Original tag: v3elvotsml

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 81, Percent: 0.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 81, Percent: 0.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
QUESTION: In this presidential election, what percentage (percent) of the vote was received by the second most successful candidate in the first round?
CLARIFICATION: Leave this question blank if election was nonpartisan, *i.e.*, no parties (not even pro-government parties) were allowed.
Record only direct presidential elections. Cases where the presidents are elected indirectly by the legislature (*i.e.* Germany) are not being coded since there is no popular vote share. However, in countries where electoral college is present (*i.e.* U.S.), the percentage of popular vote should be recorded if available.
SCALE: Interval
ANSWER-TYPE: Percent
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**; **?**, websites of national parliaments, websites of national bureau of statistics, various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
DATE SPECIFIC: Presidential election dates (v3eltype_6, v3eltype_7)
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1792-1919

5.1.14.13 Legislature opposition parties (v3lgoppart)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3lgoppart

Original tag: v3lgoppart

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5630, Percent: 20.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5630, Percent: 18.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Steven Fish, Matthew Kroenig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are opposition parties (those not in the ruling party or coalition) able to exercise oversight and investigatory functions against the wishes of the governing party or coalition?
RESPONSES:
0: No, not at all.
1: Occasionally.
2: Yes, for the most part.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v3lgbicam is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1789-2010

5.1.15 Historical V-Dem - Overlap Period Discrepancies

This part of the codebook contains variables pertaining to the Historical V-Dem data collection. A maximum of 91 countries are included in the sample (see the country table), but some variables (in particular C type variables) cover fewer countries, as coding is still ongoing. For more information on the Historical V-Dem project, please refer to the Organization and Management document (`https://www.v-dem.net/static/website/img/refs/orgmanv111.pdf`) or the Historical V-Dem page: `https://www.v-dem.net/hdata.html`. The vast majority of questions coded by Historical V-Dem are V-Dem indicators previously coded back to 1900, and these indicators are found in other sections of the codebook with merged time series extending all the way from 1789 to the present.

This section includes A and A* variables where there is a discrepancy in the coding of some observations between the Historical and Contemporary V-Dem coding for the overlap period (typically 1900-1920). The v2-versions of these variables, reported elsewhere in the codebook, report the Contemporary V-Dem scores in cases of discrepancies in the overlap period.

Remaining inconsistencies in the Historical and Contemporary V-Dem coding, that are not due to substantive differences in the indicators, will be sorted out for version 10 of the dataset.

5.1.15.1 HOS appointment in practice (v3expathhs)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v3expathhs

Original tag: v3expathhs

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8117, Percent: 28.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8117, Percent: 26.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
QUESTION: How did the head of state reach office?
CLARIFICATION: If several bodies were involved in the appointment process, select the one that exerted the most critical impact on the decision. However, in the next question we ask separately about whether the approval of the legislature was necessary. Response category 7 should only be selected if the head of state is directly elected, not if he or she was appointed by the legislature after an election.
RESPONSES:
0: Through the threat of or application of force, such as a coup or rebellion.
1: Appointed by a foreign power.
2: Appointed by the ruling party (in a one-party system).
3: Appointed by a royal council.
4: Through hereditary succession.
5: Appointed by the military.
6: Appointed by the legislature.
7: Directly through a popular election (regardless of the extension of the suffrage).
8: Other.
SCALE: Nominal
SOURCE(S): Various country-specific sources.
DATA RELEASE: 8-15.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Maximum
DATE SPECIFIC: Coded on HOS appointment dates and December 31 (v3exnamhos).
CITATION: **?**.
YEARS: 1789-1933

5.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Regimes of the World (RoW)

The *Regimes of the World Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

5.1.16.1 Regimes of the world - the RoW Measure (v2x_regime)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_regime

Original tag: v2x_regime

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Lührmann et al. (2018), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes,

von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19760, Percent: 70.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19760, Percent: 65.15

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Marcus Tannenberg, Staffan I Lindberg
QUESTION: How can the political regime overall be classified considering the competitiveness of access to power (polyarchy) as well as liberal principles?
RESPONSES:
0: Closed autocracy: No multiparty elections for the chief executive or the legislature.

1: Electoral autocracy: De-jure multiparty elections for the chief executive and the legislature, but failing to achieve that elections are free and fair, or de-facto multiparty, or a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites of polyarchy as measured by V-Dem's Electoral Democracy Index (v2x_polyarchy).

2: Electoral democracy: De-facto free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral Democracy Index (v2x_polyarchy), but either access to justice, or transparent law enforcement, or liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive not satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component Index (v2x_liberal).

3: Liberal democracy: De-facto free and fair multiparty elections and a minimum level of Dahl's institutional prerequisites for polyarchy as measured by V- Dem's Electoral Democracy Index (v2x_polyarchy) are guaranteed as well as access to justice, transparent law enforcement and the liberal principles of respect for personal liberties, rule of law, and judicial as well as legislative constraints on the executive satisfied as measured by V-Dem's Liberal Component Index (v2x_liberal).

SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): v2x_elecreg v2xlg_elecreg v2xex_elecreg v2elmulpar_osp_ex v2elmulpar_osp_leg v2elmulpar_osp v2elfrfair_osp v2elfrfair_osp_leg v2elfrfair_osp_ex v2expathhg v2expathhs v2ex_legconhos v2ex_hosw v2x_polyarchy v2x_liberal v2clacjstm_osp v2clacjstw_osp v2cltrnslw_osp v2exaphogp
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
AGGREGATION: Electoral democracies score above 2 on the indicators for multi–party (v2elmulpar_osp) and free and fair elections (v2elfrfair_osp), as well as above 0.5 on the Electoral Democracy Index (v2x_polyarchy). Liberal democracy meets the criteria for Electoral democracy but also satisfy the liberal dimensions by a score above 0.8 on the V–Dem Liberal Component index (v2x_liberal), as well as a score above 3 on transparent law enforcement (v2cltrnslw_osp), access to justice for men (v2clacjstm_osp) and women (v2clacjstw_osp). Electoral autocracies fail to meet one or more of the above–mentioned criteria of electoral democracies, but subject the chief executive and the legislature to de–jure multiparty elections as indicated by a score above 1 on the V–Dem multiparty elections indicator (v2elmulpar_osp). Closed autocracy if either no multiparty elections for the legislature take place (v2xlg_elecreg == 0) or the chief executive is not elected in direct or indirect multiparty elections. To identify whether this is the case, we take into account if there is no basic multiparty competition in elections (v2elmulpar_osp lt; 1) and the relative power of the Head of State (HoS) and the Head of Government (HoG) as well as the appointment procedures. The V–Dem variable v2ex_hosw identifies if the HoS (v2ex_hosw gt; 0.5) or HoG (v2ex_hosw lt; or equal to 0.5) is the chief executive. If the HoG is the chief executive, the variable v2expathhg indicates whether the HoG is directly (8) or indirectly (7) elected or appointed by the HoS (6). In the first case, we consider whether executive elections (v2xex_elecreg == 0) take place, in the second case whether legislative elections take place (v2xlg_elecreg == 0) and in the third case how HoS is selected as follows. The variable v2expathhs indicates whether the HoS is directly (7) or indirectly (6) elected. Thus, in the

first case, we consider whether executive elections (v2xex_elecreg) take place, in the second case whether legislative elections take place and the legislature approves on HoG (v2xlg_elecreg == 0 and v2exaphog == 0). This also applies for the cases if the HoS is the chief executive.
CITATION: Lührmann et al. (2018); **?**
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Executive Bases of Power

The *Executive Bases of Power Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

5.1.17.1 Ruling party dimension index (v2x_ex_party)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_ex_party

Original tag: v2x_ex_party

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Teorell & Lindberg (2019), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 28011, Percent: 99.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 28011, Percent: 92.35

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
QUESTION: To what extent is the power base of the chief executive determined by a ruling party?
CLARIFICATION: Representing one of five regime dimensions, each of which may be more or less present in any given case, this index taps into the extent to which a ruling party appoints and dismisses the chief executive.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2expathhs v2expathhg v2exremhsp_ord v2exrmhsol_2 v2exrmhsol_3 v2exrmhsol_4 v2exhoshog v2ex_hosw
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
AGGREGATION: The index is based on whether the quot;chief executivequot; was (a) appointed by the ruling party, and (b) can be dismissed by the ruling party. Both condition (a) and (b) are coded as present (1) or not (0); we then average across the two. In nominally dual systems, where the head of state (HOS) and the head of government (HOG) are not the same individual, we determine who is the quot;chief executivequot; by comparing HOS and HOG powers over the appointment and dismissal of cabinet ministers. We aggregate across the two executives by taking the average weighted by their relative powers over cabinet formation and dismissal.

CITATION: Teorell & Lindberg (2019); **?**
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Party Institutionalization

The *Party Institutionalization Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

5.1.18.1 Party institutionalization index (v2xps_party)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xps_party

Original tag: v2xps_party

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Bizzarro Neto et al. (2017), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18163, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18163, Percent: 59.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh
QUESTION: To what extent are political parties institutionalized?
CLARIFICATION: Party institutionalization refers to various attributes of the political parties in a country, *e.g.*, level and depth of organization, links to civil society, cadres of party activists, party supporters within the electorate, coherence of party platforms and ideologies, party-line voting among representatives within the legislature. A high score on these attributes generally indicates a more institutionalized party system.
This index considers the attributes of all parties with an emphasis on larger parties, *i.e.*, those that may be said to dominate and define the party system.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2psorgs v2psprbrch v2psprlnks v2psplats v2pscohesv v2lgello
DATA RELEASE: 1-15. Release 1-6 Party system institutionalization index, release 7 changed to Party institutionalization index.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by adding scaled indicators for party organizations (v2psorgs), party branches (v2psprbrch), party linkages (v2psprlnks), distinct party platforms (v2psplats), and legislative party cohesion (v2pscohesv, set to missing when the lower chamber of legislature (v2lgello) does not exist). The index is then converted to its CDF in order to range from 0 to 1.
CITATION: Bizzarro Neto et al. (2017); **?**
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Consensual Democracy Dimensions

The *Consensual Democracy Dimensions Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

5.1.19.1 Divided party control index (v2x_divparctrl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_divparctrl

Original tag: v2x_divparctrl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19638, Percent: 69.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19638, Percent: 64.75

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge, Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: Are the executive and legislature controlled by different political parties?
CLARIFICATION: This variable is a reordered version of the continuous measurement model estimates for indicator v2psnatpar: National party control. After reordering, the positive extreme signifies Divided party control. A Different parties or individuals unconnected to parties control the executive and the legislature or B Executive power is divided between a president/monarch and a prime minister, each of which belongs to different parties; or between a non-partisan monarch and a prime minister. The intermediate values signify Unified coalition control. A single multi-party coalition controls the executive and legislative branches of the national government. This is true almost by definition in a parliamentary system where a single coalition gathers together a majority of seats. And the negative extreme signifies quot;Unified party control. A single party controls the executive and legislative branches of the national government. This is true almost by definition in a parliamentary system where a single party has a majority of seats.quot;
SCALE: Interval, from low to high.
SOURCE(S): v2psnatpar v2psnatpar_ord
NOTES: V-Dem originally intended to generate indices to measure concepts inspired by Arend Lijphart's two dimensions of consensus vs. majoritarian democracy. The project no longer plans to produce such indices. Instead, it offers the two indices, the Divided party control index and the Division of power index, which are conceptually thinner than Lijphart's concepts and not equivalent substitutes for them. However, these alternatives are useful for some purposes.
DATA RELEASE: 6-15. For Version 6 as Divided party control of legislature index v2x_lgdivparctrl, 7 modified to Divided party control index.
AGGREGATION: The reordering is accomplished in two steps. First, 5 is subtracted from v2psnatpar when the ordinal version of this variable, v2psnatpar_ord, is 2. This moves the ordinal score corresponding to unified party control to the lowest values. Then the result is

standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: **?**
YEARS: 1900-2024

5.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Coordinated Information Operations

The Digital Society Survey, designed by the Digital Society Project, contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the internet and social media. The data collected through expert-coded surveys provides information on topics related to coordinated information operations, digital media freedom, online media polarization, social cleavages as well as state internet regulation capacity and approach.

Principal investigators for the Digital Society Project are Valeriya Mechkova, Daniel Pemstein, Brigitte Seim, Steven Wilson.

For more information, please visit `www.digitalsocietyproject.org`.

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Digital society: The following survey contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the Internet and social media. Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

The government and its agents include official government organs, such as bureaucracies, courts, intelligence services, and the military, but also unofficial agents, such as officially unaffiliated cyber-warfare operatives who perform services, even "off-book" work, on behalf of the government.

Major political parties include the group of political parties that hold a significant number of seats in national legislative body(-ies), or earn a significant number of votes in elections for the executive. When we ask you to consider "major political parties," you do not need to consider parties that run in elections but receive only a small minority of seats or votes, or those that receive no seats at all.

We define the Internet as all information that people access over public and private digital networks, worldwide. The Internet includes both publicly accessible digital spaces and private or gated information transmission platforms. The Internet does not include traditional media transmission mechanisms such as paper, television, traditional voice telephone, and radio.

Social media are a subset of Internet platforms that enable normal individuals to create and share content with networks of other people. Social media platforms are available to the public, although content on such networks may be shared privately within subgroups of users. Social media includes both publicly visible, or semi-public platforms, like Facebook, Flickr, Friendster, Google+, Instagram, Myspace, LinkedIn, Twitter, VKontakte, and Weibo and private social networking and messaging platforms like Signal, Slack, Snapchat, or WhatsApp.

Domestic online media is any media source originating in the country in question. For example, the New York Times' website is domestic online media in the United States, but not in India, even though it operates bureaus in India. Media includes any source reporting on current events or political issues, ranging from well-established brands to newsletters and websites run by an individual.

Cyber security threats include penetration of private digital networks, using means ranging from exploiting software vulnerabilities, password cracking, or social engineering (e.g., tricking individuals into revealing passwords or other information necessary to break into a digital system) to obtain information or disrupt an organization or individual's use of digital networks and tools. They also include unauthorized alterations of an individual or organization's digital presence, such as defacing websites and commandeering social media accounts. These threats range from unsophisticated (e.g., exploitation of failure to password protect private networks or use of common passwords by authorized users, and spear phishing) to moderate (e.g., embedding malicious code in emails or exploiting well-known software flaws that organizations have failed to patch), to sophisticated (e.g., exploiting unknown exploits in commonly used software or even embedding exploits into commercial systems unbeknownst to their creators).

Clarification: When we discuss shutting down online content, please consider instances where a website (or websites) have been taken entirely offline as well as instances where a website (or websites) have been slowed down or had access similarly intentionally inhibited, such that use of this website

is challenging. In other words, both outright shutting down and more subtle measures that inhibit access should be considered when answering these questions.

Clarification: When we discuss "censorship" or "censoring" content online, we are not concerned with censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, or defamatory speech, unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions.

5.1.20.1 Party dissemination of false information domestic (v2smpardom)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smpardom

Original tag: v2smpardom

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do major political parties and candidates for office use social media to disseminate misleading viewpoints or false information to influence their own population?
RESPONSES:
0: Extremely often. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on all key political issues.
1: Often. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on many key political issues.
2: About half the time. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on some key political issues, but not others.
3: Rarely. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on only a few key political issues.
4: Never, or almost never. Major political parties and candidates never disseminate false information on key political issues.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.20.2 Party dissemination of false information abroad (v2smparab)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smparab

Original tag: v2smparab

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do major political parties and candidates for office use social media to disseminate misleading viewpoints or false information to influence citizens of other countries abroad?
RESPONSES:
0: Extremely often. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on all key political issues.
1: Often. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on many key political issues.
2: About half the time. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on some key political issues, but not others.
3: Rarely. Major political parties and candidates disseminate false information on only a few key political issues.
4: Never, or almost never. Major political parties and candidates never disseminate false information on key political issues.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.21 Digital Society Survey - Digital Media Freedom

The Digital Society Survey, designed by the Digital Society Project, contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the internet and social media. The data collected through expert-coded surveys provides information on topics related to coordinated information operations, digital media freedom, online media polarization, social cleavages as well as state internet regulation capacity and approach.

Principal investigators for the Digital Society Project are Valeriya Mechkova, Daniel Pemstein, Brigitte Seim, Steven Wilson.

For more information, please visit `www.digitalsocietyproject.org`.

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Digital society: The following survey contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the Internet and social media. Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

The government and its agents include official government organs, such as bureaucracies, courts, intelligence services, and the military, but also unofficial agents, such as officially unaffiliated cyber-warfare operatives who perform services, even "off-book" work, on behalf of the government.

Major political parties include the group of political parties that hold a significant number of seats in national legislative body(-ies), or earn a significant number of votes in elections for the executive. When we ask you to consider "major political parties," you do not need to consider parties that run in elections but receive only a small minority of seats or votes, or those that receive no seats at all.

We define the Internet as all information that people access over public and private digital networks, worldwide. The Internet includes both publicly accessible digital spaces and private or gated information transmission platforms. The Internet does not include traditional media transmission mechanisms such as paper, television, traditional voice telephone, and radio.

Social media are a subset of Internet platforms that enable normal individuals to create and share content with networks of other people. Social media platforms are available to the public, although content on such networks may be shared privately within subgroups of users. Social media includes both publicly visible, or semi-public platforms, like Facebook, Flickr, Friendster, Google+, Instagram, Myspace, LinkedIn, Twitter, VKontakte, and Weibo and private social networking and messaging platforms like Signal, Slack, Snapchat, or WhatsApp.

Domestic online media is any media source originating in the country in question. For example, the New York Times' website is domestic online media in the United States, but not in India, even though it operates bureaus in India. Media includes any source reporting on current events or political issues, ranging from well-established brands to newsletters and websites run by an individual.

Cyber security threats include penetration of private digital networks, using means ranging from exploiting software vulnerabilities, password cracking, or social engineering (e.g., tricking individuals into revealing passwords or other information necessary to break into a digital system) to obtain information or disrupt an organization or individual's use of digital networks and tools. They also include unauthorized alterations of an individual or organization's digital presence, such as defacing websites and commandeering social media accounts. These threats range from unsophisticated (e.g., exploitation of failure to password protect private networks or use of common passwords by authorized users, and spear phishing) to moderate (e.g., embedding malicious code in emails or exploiting well-known software flaws that organizations have failed to patch), to sophisticated (e.g., exploiting unknown exploits in commonly used software or even embedding exploits into commercial systems unbeknownst to their creators).

Clarification: When we discuss shutting down online content, please consider instances where a website (or websites) have been taken entirely offline as well as instances where a website (or websites) have been slowed down or had access similarly intentionally inhibited, such that use of this website is challenging. In other words, both outright shutting down and more subtle measures that inhibit access should be considered when answering these questions.

Clarification: When we discuss "censorship" or "censoring" content online, we are not concerned with censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, or defamatory speech, unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions.

5.1.21.1 Political parties cyber security capacity (v2smpolcap)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smpolcap

Original tag: v2smpolcap

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do the major political parties have sufficiently technologically skilled staff and resources to mitigate harm from cyber security threats?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The government does not have the capacity to counter even unsophisticated cyber security threats.
1: Not really. The government has the resources to combat only unsophisticated cyber attacks.
2: Somewhat. The government has the resources to combat moderately sophisticated cyber attacks.
3: Mostly. The government has the resources to combat most sophisticated cyber attacks.
4: Yes. The government has the resources to combat sophisticated cyber attacks, even those launched by highly skilled actors.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.22 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages

The Digital Society Survey, designed by the Digital Society Project, contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the internet and social media. The data collected through expert-coded surveys provides information on topics related to coordinated information operations, digital media freedom, online media polarization, social cleavages as well as state internet regulation capacity and approach.

Principal investigators for the Digital Society Project are Valeriya Mechkova, Daniel Pemstein, Brigitte Seim, Steven Wilson.

For more information, please visit `www.digitalsocietyproject.org`.

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Digital society: The following survey contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the Internet and social media. Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

The government and its agents include official government organs, such as bureaucracies, courts, intelligence services, and the military, but also unofficial agents, such as officially unaffiliated cyber-warfare operatives who perform services, even "off-book" work, on behalf of the government.

Major political parties include the group of political parties that hold a significant number of seats in national legislative body(-ies), or earn a significant number of votes in elections for the executive.

When we ask you to consider "major political parties," you do not need to consider parties that run in elections but receive only a small minority of seats or votes, or those that receive no seats at all.

We define the Internet as all information that people access over public and private digital networks, worldwide. The Internet includes both publicly accessible digital spaces and private or gated information transmission platforms. The Internet does not include traditional media transmission mechanisms such as paper, television, traditional voice telephone, and radio.

Social media are a subset of Internet platforms that enable normal individuals to create and share content with networks of other people. Social media platforms are available to the public, although content on such networks may be shared privately within subgroups of users. Social media includes both publicly visible, or semi-public platforms, like Facebook, Flickr, Friendster, Google+, Instagram, Myspace, LinkedIn, Twitter, VKontakte, and Weibo and private social networking and messaging platforms like Signal, Slack, Snapchat, or WhatsApp.

Domestic online media is any media source originating in the country in question. For example, the New York Times' website is domestic online media in the United States, but not in India, even though it operates bureaus in India. Media includes any source reporting on current events or political issues, ranging from well-established brands to newsletters and websites run by an individual.

Cyber security threats include penetration of private digital networks, using means ranging from exploiting software vulnerabilities, password cracking, or social engineering (e.g., tricking individuals into revealing passwords or other information necessary to break into a digital system) to obtain information or disrupt an organization or individual's use of digital networks and tools. They also include unauthorized alterations of an individual or organization's digital presence, such as defacing websites and commandeering social media accounts. These threats range from unsophisticated (e.g., exploitation of failure to password protect private networks or use of common passwords by authorized users, and spear phishing) to moderate (e.g., embedding malicious code in emails or exploiting well-known software flaws that organizations have failed to patch), to sophisticated (e.g., exploiting unknown exploits in commonly used software or even embedding exploits into commercial systems unbeknownst to their creators).

Clarification: When we discuss shutting down online content, please consider instances where a website (or websites) have been taken entirely offline as well as instances where a website (or websites) have been slowed down or had access similarly intentionally inhibited, such that use of this website is challenging. In other words, both outright shutting down and more subtle measures that inhibit access should be considered when answering these questions.

Clarification: When we discuss "censorship" or "censoring" content online, we are not concerned with censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, or defamatory speech, unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions.

5.1.22.1 Party/candidate use of social media in campaigns (v2smcamp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smcamp

Original tag: v2smcamp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do major political parties and candidates use social media during electoral campaigns to communicate with constituents?
RESPONSES:
0: None. Major political parties and candidates do not use social media during electoral campaigns to communicate with constituents.
1: A little. Major political parties and candidates rarely use social media during electoral campaigns to communicate with constituents.
2: Somewhat. Major political parties and candidates sometimes use social media during electoral campaigns to communicate with constituents.
3: Substantial. Major political parties and candidates frequently use social media during electoral campaigns to communicate with constituents.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.22.2 Political parties hate speech (v2smpolhate)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smpolhate

Original tag: v2smpolhate

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do major political parties use hate speech as part of their rhetoric?
CLARIFICATION: Hate speech is any speech that is intended to insult, offend, or intimidate members of specific groups, defined by race, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, or similar trait.
RESPONSES:

0: Extremely often.
1: Often.
2: Sometimes.
3: Rarely.
4: Never, or almost never.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 2000-2024

5.1.23 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Ordinal Versions of Indices

This section lists other indicators on democracy, that may help in evaluating the causes and effects of democracy or which may provide convergent validity tests for V-Dem data, divided into sections based on source.

5.1.23.1 Civil society participation index ordinal (e_v2x_cspart_3c)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_v2x_cspart_3c

Original tag: e_v2x_cspart_3C

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 97.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 90.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
AVAILABLE VERSIONS: *_3C, *_4C, *_5C
QUESTION: Are major CSOs routinely consulted by policymaker; how large is the involvement of people in CSOs; are women prevented from participating; and is legislative candidate nomination within party organization highly decentralized or made through party primaries?
CLARIFICATION: These are ordinalized versions of the V-Dem civil society participation index. The original index ranges from 0 to 1. These transformations offer three different ordinal versions with three (_3C), four (_4C), and five (_5C) levels respectively.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): v2pscnslnl v2cscnsult v2csprtcpt v2csgender
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
AGGREGATION: Same transformation rule as for quot;v2x_libdem_3C/_4C/_5Cquot;.
CITATION: **?**; *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.23.2 Freedom of association (thick) index ordinal (e_v2x_frassoc_thick_3c)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_v2x_frassoc_thick_3c

Original tag: e_v2x_frassoc_thick_3C

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27419, Percent: 97.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27419, Percent: 90.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
AVAILABLE VERSIONS: *_3C, *_4C, *_5C
QUESTION: To what extent are parties, including opposition parties, allowed to form and to participate in elections, and to what extent are civil society organizations able to form and to operate freely?
CLARIFICATION: These are ordinalized versions of the V-Dem freedom of association (thick) index. The original index ranges from 0 to 1. These transformations offer three different ordinal versions with three (_3C), four (_4C), and five (_5C) levels respectively.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): v2psparban v2psbars v2psoppaut v2elmulpar v2cseeorgs v2csreprss
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
AGGREGATION: Same transformation rule as for quot;v2x_libdem_3C/_4C/_5Cquot;.
CITATION: **?**; *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.23.3 Party institutionalization index ordinal (e_v2xps_party_3c)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_v2xps_party_3c

Original tag: e_v2xps_party_3C

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18163, Percent: 64.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18163, Percent: 59.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
AVAILABLE VERSIONS: *_3C, *_4C, *_5C
QUESTION: To what extent are political parties institutionalized?
CLARIFICATION: These are ordinalized versions of the V-Dem party institutionalization index. The original index ranges from 0 to 1. These transformations offer three different ordinal versions with three (_3C), four (_4C), and five (_5C) levels respectively.

SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): v2psorgs v2psprbrch v2psprlnks v2psplats v2pscohesv v2lgello
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
AGGREGATION: Same transformation rule as for quot;v2x_libdem_3C/_4C/_5Cquot;.
CITATION: **?**; *V-Dem Codebook* (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2024

5.1.24 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy

This section lists other indicators on democracy, that may help in evaluating the causes and effects of democracy or which may provide convergent validity tests for V-Dem data, divided into sections based on source.

5.1.24.1 Lexical index (e_lexical_index)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_lexical_index

Original tag: e_lexical_index

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Skaaning (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27252, Percent: 97.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27252, Percent: 89.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the lexical index of democracy in the country?
RESPONSES:
0: No elections
1: No party or one-party elections
2: Multi-party elections for legislature
3: Multi-party elections for legislature and executive
4: Minimally competitive elections
5: Male or female suffrage
6: Universal suffrage
SOURCE(S): Skaaning (2025).
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
CITATION: Skaaning (2025).
YEARS: 1789-2023

5.1.25 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Political Institutions and Political Events

This section lists other indicators on democracy, that may help in evaluating the causes and effects of democracy or which may provide convergent validity tests for V-Dem data, divided into sections based on source.

5.1.25.1 Parties in legislature (e_legparty)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_legparty

Original tag: e_legparty

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Przeworski et al. (2013)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12597, Percent: 44.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12597, Percent: 41.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
CLARIFICATION: Number of parties in the legislature. By quot;partyquot; we take here any recognizable, named grouping, regardless whether and how they appeared in elections. This variable is coded regardless whether the legislature was elected or appointed.
RESPONSES:
-1: if no legislature.
0: if none (including cases where parties are officially banned).
1: if one (including cases where other parties are officially banned).
2: if more.
SCALE: Nominal.
SOURCE(S): Przeworski et al. (2013).
NOTES: During the early period candidates typically competed in elections on an individual basis, without any kind of centralized party organizations or shared programs. Within legislatures, however, they often coalesced into groups, currents, factions, "sentiments," etc. Hence, subjective judgments are inevitable in coding this variable. Our rule of thumb was to code as parties any kind of groups that bare a label that survived over two consecutive legislatures. This was true in several countries of "Liberals" and "Conservatives." In other countries, notably France between 1815 and 1848, however, the divisive issues, the parliamentary groups, and their labels changed frequently, and such cases are coded as "none." A legislature consisting of one party and independents is coded as one party. When there is more than one observation per country–year, the one which has higher value is taken.
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
CITATION: Przeworski et al. (2013).
YEARS: 1789-2008

5.1.26 Other Democracy Indices and Indicators - Polity5

This section lists other indicators on democracy, that may help in evaluating the causes and effects of democracy or which may provide convergent validity tests for V-Dem data, divided into sections based on source.

5.1.26.1 Political competition (e_polcomp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_e_polcomp

Original tag: e_polcomp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Marshall & Gurr (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 17282, Percent: 61.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17282, Percent: 56.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: Is there any (institutionalized) political competition?
CLARIFICATION: This variable combines information presented in two component variables: the degree of institutionalization, or regulation, of political competition (e_parreg) and the extent of government restriction on political competition (e_parcomp).
RESPONSES:
1: Repressed Competition: While no significant political activity is permitted outside the ranks of the hegemonic regime, nevertheless, some organized political participation occurs within the regime through highly circumscribed institutional channels.
2: Restricted Competition: Some organized political activity occurs outside the ranks of the hegemonic regime, but the regime systematically limits its form, extent, or both in ways that exclude substantial groups from participating in the political arena and/or suppresses the contestation of rival political interests.
3: Authoritarian-guided liberalization of repressed or restricted competition or the deepening of hegemonic control: Used to indicate either the concerted effort on the part of hegemonic regimes to open up their political systems to limited (and typically factional) political competition or the transformation of factional-based quot;quasi-democraciesquot; or quot;weak authoritarian regimesquot; into more repressive hegemonic systems in which political competition is increasingly institutionalized and restricted.
4: Uninstitutionalized Competition: Political participation is decentralized and fluid in character — revolving around personalities, regional interests, and religious/ethnic/clan groups. There are no enduring national political organizations and systematic regime control of political activity is limited, that is, a situation characterized by a coincidence of weak state and weak society. In the contemporary context, uninstitutionalized competition is most likely to occur in resource poor countries and/or following the collapse of central authority under a (former) repressive, authoritarian state.
5: Gradual transition from uninstitutionalized (unregulated) competition to more regulated forms of political competition (the increasing regulation of competition may be centrally-guided or decentralized through the gradual development of political parties and interest groups).
6: Factional/Restricted Competition: Polities that oscillate more or less regularly between intense factionalism and faction-based restrictions: that is, when one faction secures power it uses that power to promote its exclusive interests and favor group members while restricting the political access and activities of other, excluded groups, until it is displaced in turn.
7: Factional Competition: There are relatively stable and enduring political groups which compete for political influence at the national level — parties, regional groups, or ethnic groups — but particularistic/parochial agendas tend to be exclusive and uncompromising with limited social integration or accommodation across identity boundaries. Factional competition is distinguished by a relative balance of group capabilities that prevents any one of the groups from capturing state power and imposing restrictions on other groups.
8: Political liberalization or democratic retrenchment: persistent over coercion: relatively coercive/restrictive transitions either from factional/restricted competition to institutionalized competitive participation or from institutionalized competitive participation to factional/restricted competition. In either case, this code reflects the unconsolidated

nature of liberal political participation in otherwise procedurally democratic polities.
9: Political liberalization or democratic retrenchment: limited and/or decreasing overt coercion: This code is used to indicate relatively peaceful transitions either to or from institutionalized competitive participation. In either case, this code reflects the unconsolidated nature of liberal political participation in otherwise procedurally open electoral polities.
10: Institutionalized open electoral participation: Relatively stable and enduring political groups regularly compete for political influence with little use of coercion. No significant or substantial groups, issues, or types of conventional political action are regularly excluded from the political process.
SOURCE(S): Marshall & Gurr (2020).
NOTES: Standarized authority codes (i.e. -66, -77, -88) are set to missing for the online graphs.
DATA RELEASE: 5-15.
CITATION: Marshall & Gurr (2020).
YEARS: 1789-2018

5.1.27 Varieties of Indoctrination

The Varieties of Indoctrination (V-Indoc) dataset is constructed based on an expert survey fielded in collaboration with V-Dem and led by the ERC-funded project "Democracy under Threat: How Education can Save it" (DEMED). The dataset contains indices and indicators that measure indoctrination efforts in education and the media across 160 countries from 1945 to 2021. The indices capture broad dimensions of indoctrination such as indoctrination potential and indoctrination content, while the indicators cover topics related to the curriculum, teachers, schools, and the media. The principal investigators are Anja Neundorf, Eugenia Nazrullaeva, Ksenia Northmore-Ball, Katerina Tertytchnaya, and Wooseok Kim. For more information, please visit `https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/az/democracyresearch/`.

5.1.27.1 Political influence, non state-owned media (v2medpolnonstate)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2medpolnonstate

Original tag: v2medpolnonstate

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9849, Percent: 35.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9849, Percent: 32.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: For the print and broadcast media outlets NOT owned by the state, how often

do political authorities influence how these cover political issues?
CLARIFICATION: Political authorities can be national / sub-national / local public authorities and include ruling political parties and office holders, such as presidents, prime minister or ministers. Political authorities can influence the coverage of non-state owned outlets both directly and indirectly. Indirect forms of control might include politically motivated awarding of broadcast frequencies, withdrawal of financial support, influence over printing facilities (e.g. subsidized newsprint) and distribution networks, selected distribution of advertising, onerous registration requirements, and prohibitive tariffs. They might also include tax privileges, bribery, and cash payments. Indirect forms of control may also include the intimidation of owners, advertisers, and editors, through the use of threats and violence.
RESPONSES:
0: Political authorities (almost) never influence the coverage of key political issues.
1: Political authorities sometimes influence the coverage of key political issues.
2: Political authorities often influence the coverage of key political issues.
3: Political authorities almost always influence the coverage of key political issues.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: Please answer this question only when both v2medstateprint and v2medstatebroad are not both 4.
DATA RELEASE: 13-15.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2medstateprint and v2medstatebroad are both 4.
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); **?**.
YEARS: 1945-2021

5.1.28 Party Systems

The following indices refer to a variety of latent positions that party systems have on several policy orientations and governance. The Party Systems indices are designed by aggregating individual parties' policy orientations in a given country-election-year using data from the Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V-Party, v2) during the period between 1970-2019 for 178 countries. To find out more about this data and/or the component variables that underly these indicies, please visit `https://www.v-dem.net/data/v-party-dataset/`. The indices in this section have been developed by Fabio Angiolillo and Felix Wiebrecht. The following applies to all indices in this section:

- These indices are only computed for election-years, as identified by V-Party. They are not calculated for non-election years as the aggregation equation relies on political parties' institutional positions which can change across the legislature.
- The codehigh and codelow versions of the indices are derived by simply using the corresponding versions from each component. This propagates the uncertainty measurement from the component variables to the indices.
- All country-election-year components used for the party systems indices are weighted by the seat shares for each political party within a given party system (v2passeatshare). In the equations for each index, the weights are denoted by ws and are indexed by gp for government parties, op for opposition parties, and t for election-year. These components are weighted in order to adjust for the size of each party in influencing the party system.

5.1.28.1 Opposition Parties' Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_democracy_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_democracy_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo et al. (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do the parties in the opposition show commitment to democratic norms prior to elections?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Democracy Index (OPDI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more authoritarian opposition parties and higher values with more democratic opposition parties. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where the country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xpa_antiplural v2paseatshare v2pagovsup v2x_polyarchy
NOTES: The OPDI is a restricted version of the PSDI index. It only captures the democratic levels for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (t).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The OPDI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPDI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2xpa_antiplural}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo et al. (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.2 Government Coalition Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion_government

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do parties in the governing coalition reject cultural superiority and support immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Exclusion Index (GCEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with government coalitions' more inclusive stances and higher values with government coalitions' more exclusive stances. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The GCEXI is a restricted version of the PSEXI index. It captures only the aggregated positions on exclusion for parties in the government. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The GCEXI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCEXI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.3 Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do opposition parties reject cultural superiority and support

immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (OPEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more inclusive opposition parties and higher values with opposition parties advocating for more exclusion. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The OPEXI is a restricted version of the PSEXI index. It only captures the aggregated exclusion positions for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (t).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The OPREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPREI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.4 Party-System Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent does the party system reject cultural superiority and support immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Exclusion Index (PSEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more inclusive party systems and higher values with more exclusive party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab
NOTES: The PSEXI is calculated by using three V-Party variables: v2paculsup, v2paimmig, and v2pawomlab. Using these variables a measure of political parties' exclusion preferences is

calculated. Then, seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare) is used to weigh the index and parties are divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0,1, or 2) or those in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The PSEXI is a derivative of the measure party_exclusion_index_PS, which is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{PS}} = 2(\text{v2paculsup}) + 0.5(\text{v2paimmig} + \text{v2pawomlab})$$

The PSEXI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSEXI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \left[\left(\&\sum_{p=1}^{N}(\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})\right) + \&\sum_{p=1}^{N}(\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})\right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.5 Opposition Parties' Religion Index (v2xpas_religion_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_religion_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_religion_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do political parties in the opposition invoke God, religion, or sacred/religious texts to justify their policy positions?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Religion Index (OPREI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with less religious opposition parties and higher values with more religious opposition parties. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2parelig v2paseatshare v2pagovsup

NOTES: The OPREI is a restricted version of the PSREI index. It only captures the religious levels for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The OPREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPREI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2parelig}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.6 Government Coalition Religion Index (v2xpas_religion_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_religion_government

Original tag: v2xpas_religion_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1635, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1635, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do political parties in the governing coalition invoke God, religion, or sacred/religious texts to justify their policy positions?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Religion Index (GCREI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with less religious governmental coalition and higher values with more religious governmental coalition. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2parelig v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The GCREI is a restricted version of the PSREI index. It captures only religious levels for parties in the governmental coalition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The GCREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCREI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2parelig}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.7 Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_economic_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1850, Percent: 6.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1850, Percent: 6.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are opposition parties located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (OPLRI) ranges from approximately -4 to 4, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning opposition parties and higher values with more right-leaning opposition parties. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (-4-4).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The OPLRI is a restricted version of the PSLRI index. It only captures the aggregated economic position levels for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (t).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The OPREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPREI}_{\text{PS}} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.8 Government Coalition Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic_government

Original tag: v2xpas_economic_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are parties in the governing coalition located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Left-Right Index (GCLRI) ranges from approximately -4 to 4, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning government coalitions and higher values with more right-leaning government coalitions. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (-4-4).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The GCLRI is a restricted version of the PSLRI index. It only captures the aggregated economic position levels for parties in the government. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The GCLRI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCLRI}_{\text{PS}} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.9 Party-System Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic

Original tag: v2xpas_economic

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are parties in the party system located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Left-Right Index (PSLRI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning party systems and higher values with more right-leaning party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The PSLRI is calculated by using two V-Party indicators: (1) the economic left-right scale indicator for each political party in the party system (v2pariglef) and (2) the seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare). Parties are further divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0,1, or 2) or those in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The PSREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSREI}_{\text{PS}} = \left[\left(\& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}}) \right) + \& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}}) \right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.10 Party-System Religion Index (v2xpas_religion)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_religion

Original tag: v2xpas_religion

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken,

Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1635, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1635, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do political parties in the party system invoke God, religion, or sacred/religious texts to justify their policy positions?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Religion Index (PSREI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with less religious party systems and higher values with more religious party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2parelig v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The PSREI is calculated by using two V-Party indicators: (1) the religious principle indicator for each political party in a given party system (v2parelig) and (2) the seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare). Parties are further divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0,1, or 2) or in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (t).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The PSREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSREI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \left[\left(\& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2parelig}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}}) \right) + \& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2parelig}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}}) \right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.11 Government Coalition Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_democracy_government

Original tag: v2xpas_democracy_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo et al. (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do the parties in the government show commitment to democratic norms prior to elections?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Democracy Index (GCDI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more authoritarian governmental coalitions and higher values with more democratic governmental coalitions. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xpa_antiplural v2paseatshare v2pagovsup v2x_polyarchy
NOTES: The GCDI is a restricted version of the PSDI index. It only captures the democratic levels for parties in a governmental coalition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The GCDI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCDI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2xpa_antiplural}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo et al. (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.1.28.12 Party-System Democracy Index (v2xpas_democracy)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_democracy

Original tag: v2xpas_democracy

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo et al. (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1787, Percent: 6.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1787, Percent: 5.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent does the party system show commitment to democratic norms

prior to elections?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Democracy Index (PSDI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more authoritarian party systems and higher values with more democratic party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xpa_antiplural v2paseatshare v2pagovsup v2x_polyarchy
NOTES: The PSDI is calculated by using two V-Party variables: (1) the anti-pluralist index for each political party in a given party system (v2xpa_antiplural) and (2) the seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare). Political parties are further divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0, 1, or 2) or those in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). To account for hegemonic or competitive authoritarian regimes that allow opposition parties to exist, missing values for a non-existent opposition are replaced with 0 if the electoral democracy index (v2x_polyarchy) scores lower than 0.5 for that country-election-year. Consequently, these missing values are separated from missing values due to delayed formation of the executive, or inability for parties to reach a governmental coalition resulting in missing values for the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-15.
AGGREGATION: The PSDI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSDI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \left[\left(\& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2xpa_antiplural}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}}) \right) + \& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2xpa_antiplural}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}}) \right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo et al. (2023); **?**
YEARS: 1970-2019

5.2 V-Dem V-Party v2

Dataset tag: vdem_vparty

Output Unit: V-Dem Party-Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per party, country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a party and a country in combination with a date, using the columns v2paid and historical_date. To make the party Ids more comprehensive, we also include the party name (v2paenname) in the Output Unit.

Description: The V-Party dataset includes global data on Political Parties.

Dataset citation: Staffan I. Lindberg, Nils Düpont, Masaaki Higashijima, Yaman Berker Kavasoglu, Kyle L. Marquardt, Michael Bernhard, Holger Döring, Allen Hicken, Melis Laebens, Juraj Medzihorsky, Anja Neundorf, Ora John Reuter, Saskia Ruth–Lovell, Keith R. Weghorst, Nina Wiese- homeier, Joseph Wright, Nazifa Alizada, Paul Bederke, Lisa Gastaldi, Sandra Grahn, Garry Hindle, Nina Ilchenko, Johannes von Römer, Steven Wilson, Daniel Pemstein, and Brigitte Seim. 2022. "Codebook Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V–Party) V2". Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project. https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2

and:

Lindberg, Staffan I., Nils Düpont, Masaaki Higashijima, Yaman Berker Kavasoglu, Kyle L. Marquardt, Michael Bernhard, Holger Döring, Allen Hicken, Melis Laebens, Juraj Medzihorsky, Anja Neundorf, Ora John Reuter, Saskia Ruth–Lovell, Keith R. Weghorst, Nina Wiesehomeier, Joseph Wright, Nazifa Alizada, Paul Bederke, Lisa Gastaldi, Sandra Grahn, Garry Hindle, Nina Ilchenko, Johannes von Römer, Steven Wilson, Daniel Pemstein, and Brigitte Seim. "Varieties of

Party Identity and Organization (V–Party) Dataset V2." Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project, 2022. https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2.

and:

Pemstein, Daniel, Kyle. L. Marquardt, Eitan Tselgov, Yi–ting Wang, Juraj Medzihorsky, Joshua Krusell, Farhad Miri, and Johannes von Römer. 2020. "The V–Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross–National and Cross–Temporal Expert–Coded Data". V–Dem Working Paper No. 21. 5th edition. University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute

Link to original codebook
`https://v-dem.net/documents/6/vparty_codebook_v2.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.v-dem.net/vpartyds.html`

5.2.1 Identifier Variables

This section lists the identifier variables in the V-Dem V-Party Dataset

5.2.1.1 Party name, English (v2paenname)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paenname

Original tag: v2paenname

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: Harmonized English name.
CLARIFICATION: The most common English name for this party in political science datasets as recorded in Party Facts' core parties (Döring and Regel 2019).
RESPONSES:
Text
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021). For a full list of names used by a wide range of academic sources for the party in question see `https://partyfacts.herokuapp.com/data/partycodes/`.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.2 Party name, Original (v2paorname)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paorname

Original tag: v2paorname

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: Harmonized original party name
CLARIFICATION: The most common original name for this party in political science datasets as recorded in Party Facts' core parties (Döring and Regel 2019).
RESPONSES:
Text
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021). For a full list of names used by a wide range of academic sources for the party in question see `https://partyfacts.herokuapp.com/data/partycodes/`.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.3 Party short name (v2pashname)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pashname

Original tag: v2pashname

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: Harmonized short name
CLARIFICATION: Harmonized short name.
RESPONSES:
Text
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021). For a full list of names used by a wide range of academic sources for the party in question see `https://partyfacts.herokuapp.com/data/partycodes/`.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.4 Numeric party identifier (v2paid)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paid

Original tag: v2paid

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: Unique identifier for each party.
CLARIFICATION: Unique, numeric identificator for each party as recorded in Party Facts' core parties dataset (D"oring and Regel 2019). In case a party changed names of scholars, sources, etc. used (slightly) different names when referring to this entity.)
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021). For a full list of names used by a wide range of academic sources for the party in question see `https://partyfacts.herokuapp.com/data/partycodes/`.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.5 Party Facts ID (A) (pf_party_id)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_pf_party_id

Original tag: pf_party_id

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: Party Facts ID
SCALE: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.6 Start and end year of gap in party coding (A) (party_gaps)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_party_gaps

Original tag: party_gaps

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: The starting and ending year in which the party was out of national legislature.
CLARIFICATION: The default format is *YYYY–YYYY*. Several time spans can be listed in

this manner and are separated by comma. The starting year indicates the first year after the available election year for a party. The ending gap year is specified as the last year before available election for the party in question.
RESPONSES:
Text
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.7 Party Facts URL (A) (pf_url)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_pf_url

Original tag: pf_url

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A*
QUESTION: URL to party's webpage at Party Facts website
SCALE: Text
SOURCE(S): Party Facts (Döring and Regel 2019; Bederke 2021).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.

5.2.1.8 Gap index (A) (gap_index)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_gap_index

Original tag: gap_index

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A*
CLARIFICATION: Indication that party was not present in national legislature.
RESPONSES: Numeric
DATA RELEASE: 2.

5.2.1.9 CHES Party Code (E) (ches_id)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ches_id

Original tag: CHES_ID

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: Unique identifier for each party from Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES).
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.1.10 GPS Party Code (E) (gps_id)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_gps_id

Original tag: GPS_ID

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: Unique numeric code for each party in the Global Party Survey (GPS) dataset.
RESPONSES: Numeric
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020).
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CITATION: Norris (2020).

5.2.2 Indices

This section lists variables related to indices.

5.2.2.1 Anti-Pluralism Index (D) (v2xpa_antiplural)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2xpa_antiplural

Original tag: v2xpa_antiplural

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh
QUESTION: To what extent does the party show a lacking commitment to democratic norms prior to elections?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2paopresp v2paplur v2paminor v2paviol
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
AGGREGATION: The index is computed as a transformed weighted average of the input variables using the following formula:

$$\text{v2xpa_antiplural}_i = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{0.5 * \text{v2paopresp}_i + 2 * \text{v2paplur}_i + \text{v2paminor}_i + \text{v2paviol}_i}{4.5}\right),$$

where i indexes observations and Φ is the standard normal cummulative density function. For each observation, the posterior distribution of the index is obtained by computing the value of the index for each draw from the posterior distributions of v2paopresp_i, v2paplur_i, v2paminor_i and v2paviol_i, and then summarized.

5.2.2.2 Populism Index (D) (v2xpa_popul)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2xpa_popul

Original tag: v2xpa_popul

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh
QUESTION: To what extent do representatives of the party use populist rhetoric (narrowly defined)?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2paanteli v2papeople
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
AGGREGATION: The index is computed as the harmonic mean of rescaled v2paanteli_osp and v2papeople_osp posterior distributions, using the following formula:

$$\text{v2xpa_popul}_i = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{x_i} + \frac{1}{y_i}},$$

where i indexes each observation,

$$x_i = \frac{1}{4}\text{v2paanteli_osp}_i,$$

and

$$y_i = \frac{1}{4}\text{v2papeople_osp}_i.$$

For each observation, the posterior distribution of the index is obtained by computing the value of the index for each draw from the posterior distributions of v2paanteli_osp_i and v2papeople_osp_i, and then summarized.

5.2.3 Party Basics

This section lists variables related to basic party information.

5.2.3.1 Seat share (v2paseatshare)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paseatshare

Original tag: v2paseatshare

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: Seat share the party gained in the election to the lower chamber.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Döring and Düpont (2020).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.2 Seat number (v2panumbseat)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2panumbseat

Original tag: v2panumbseat

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: Number of seats the party gained in the election to the lower chamber.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Döring and Düpont (2020).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.3 Seats total (v2patotalseat)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2patotalseat

Original tag: v2patotalseat

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: Total number of seats in the lower chamber.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Döring and Düpont (2020).

DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.4 Vote share (v2pavote)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pavote

Original tag: v2pavote

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: Vote share the party gained in the election to the lower chamber.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SOURCE(S): Döring and Düpont (2020).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.5 Temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2paallian)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paallian

Original tag: v2paallian

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: Was the party part of a temporary pre-electoral alliance in this national election or is the entity actually an alliance?
RESPONSES:
0: No.
1: Yes, party was part of an alliance.
2: Yes, entity is an alliance of two or more parties.
SOURCE(S): Döring and Düpont (2020).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.6 Name of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2panaallian)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2panaallian

Original tag: v2panaallian

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: If the party was part of a temporary pre-electoral temporary alliance, what was the name of that alliance?
RESPONSES:
Text
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2paallian is 0.

5.2.3.7 Vote share of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2pavallian)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pavallian

Original tag: v2pavallian

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: If the party was part of a temporary pre-electoral temporary alliance, what was the vote share of the alliance?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2paallian is 0.

5.2.3.8 Seats of temporary pre-electoral alliance (v2panoallian)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2panoallian

Original tag: v2panoallian

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: A
QUESTION: If the party was part of a temporary pre-electoral temporary alliance, how many seats did the alliance gain?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2paallian is 0.

5.2.3.9 Party continuation (v2paelcont)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paelcont

Original tag: v2paelcont

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Did the party participate in the previous election under its current name?
CLARIFICATION: This question concerns the election prior to the one you are coding. If you choose option 2, please provide the previous party name in the comments field.
RESPONSES:
0: Yes, party participated in the previous election under the same name.
1: No, party did not participate in the previous election.
2: No, but the party participated in the previous election under a different name.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.10 Party continuation (C) (v2paelcont_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paelcont_nr

Original tag: v2paelcont_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Did the party participate in the previous election under its current name?
RESPONSES: 0: Yes, party participated in the previous election under the same name.
1: No, party did not participate in the previous election.

2: No, but the party participated in the previous election under a different name.
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.11 Government support (v2pagovsup)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pagovsup

Original tag: v2pagovsup

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A,C
QUESTION: Does this party support the government formed immediately after this election?
CLARIFICATION: This question refers to the initial support, by the party, of the first government formed based on this election. It does not include caretaker cabinets that are in office until the first cabinet forms.
RESPONSES:
0: Yes, as senior partner. The Head of Government belongs to this party.
1: Yes, as junior partner. The Head of Government does not belong to this party, but one or more cabinet ministers do.
2: Yes, but the party is not officially represented in government.
3: No, party is in opposition to the government.
4: Not applicable. No government took office based on this election (yet).
NOTES: The data collected using expert survey and aggregated by mode was cross–checked by a research assistant.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.3.12 Pariah Party (v2papariah)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2papariah

Original tag: v2papariah

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In the years before this election, to what extent have other parties distanced themselves from this party?
RESPONSES:
0: Entirely. All other parties are unwilling to accept formal or informal parliamentary support from this party (e.g. joint legislative initiative; toleration).
1: To a great extent. One or more parties has accepted informal parliamentary support from this party (e.g. joint legislative initiative; toleration) or has signaled that it would be willing to do so. No party is willing to accept formal support from this party.
2: To some extent. One or more parties has accepted formal parliamentary support from this party (e.g. formed a coalition) or has signaled that it would be willing to do so. Most other parties are not willing to accept informal support from this party (e.g. joint legislative initiative; toleration).
3: Not at all. One or more parties has accepted formal parliamentary support from this party (e.g. coalition) or has signaled that it would be willing to do so. Most other parties are willing to accept informal support from this party (e.g. joint legislative initiative; toleration).
NOTES: We show the following question for coding only for election years during which more than two parties won a substantial seat share (more than 5percent) in the election.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see

V–Dem Methodology).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4 Party Identity

This section lists variables related to party identity and ideology.

5.2.4.1 Anti-elitism (v2paanteli)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paanteli

Original tag: v2paanteli

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How important is anti-elite rhetoric for this party?
CLARIFICATION: Elites are relatively small groups that have a greater say in society than others, for instance due to their political power, wealth or societal standing. The specific groups considered to be the elite may vary by country and even from party to party within the same country as do the terms used to describe them. In some cases, "elites" can also refer to an international elite.
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all important. The leadership of this party never makes statements against the elite.
1: Not important. The leadership of this party rarely makes statements against the elite.
2: Somewhat important. The leadership of this party sometimes makes statements against the elite.
3: Important. The leadership of this party often makes statements against the elite.
4: Very important. The leadership of this party makes statements against the elite whenever possible.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.2 People-centrism (v2papeople)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2papeople

Original tag: v2papeople

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do leaders of this party glorify the ordinary people and identify themselves as part of them?
CLARIFICATION: Many parties and leaders make reference to the "people", but only some party leaders describe the ordinary people specifically as a homogenous group and emphasize/claim that they are part of this group and represent it. This means that they do not acknowledge the existence of divergent interests and values in society, but rather suggest that the "people" have a unified political will which should guide all political action. Often this group is glorified and romanticized, describing an ideal-typical ordinary person/commoner, who embodies the national ideal.
RESPONSES:
0: Never. The party leadership never glorifies and identifies with the ordinary people.
1: Usually not. The party leadership generally does not glorify and identify with the ordinary people.

2: About half of the time. The party leadership sometimes glorifies and identifies with the ordinary people.
3: Usually. The party leadership generally glorifies and identifies with the ordinary people, which they claim to represent.
4: Always. The party leadership always glorifies and identifies with the ordinary people, which they claim to represent.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.3 Political Opponents (v2paopresp)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paopresp

Original tag: v2paopresp

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Prior to this election, have leaders of this party used severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents?
CLARIFICATION: Severe personal attacks and demonization includes dehumanizing opponents or describing them as an existential threat or as subversive, criminal or foreign agents.
RESPONSES:
0: Always. Party leaders always used severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents
1: Usually. Party leaders usually used severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents
2: About half of the time. Party leaders sometimes used severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents.
3: Usually not. Party leaders usually did not use severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents.
4: Never. Party leaders never used severe personal attacks or tactics of demonization against their opponents.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.
CLEANING: Set to missing when there are more than two answers per coder for this question for a particular date, country, and party.

5.2.4.4 Political Pluralism (v2paplur)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paplur

Original tag: v2paplur

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Prior to this election, to what extent was the leadership of this political party clearly committed to free and fair elections with multiple parties, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association?
CLARIFICATION: Party leaders show no commitment to such principles if they openly support an autocratic form of government without elections or freedom of speech, assembly and association (e.g. theocracy; single-party rule; revolutionary regime). Party leaders show a

full commitment to key democratic principles if they unambiguously support freedom of speech, media, assembly and association and pledge to accept defeat in free and fair elections.
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all committed. The party leadership was not at all committed to free and fair, multi-party elections, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association.
1: Not committed. The party leadership was not committed to free and fair, multi-party elections, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association.
2: Weakly committed. The party leadership was weakly committed to free and fair, multi-party elections, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association.
3: Committed. The party leadership was committed to free and fair, multi-party elections, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association.
4: Fully committed. The party leadership was fully committed to free and fair, multi-party elections, freedom of speech, media, assembly and association.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.5 Minority Rights (v2paminor)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paminor

Original tag: v2paminor

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: According to the leadership of this party, how often should the will of the majority be implemented even if doing so would violate the rights of minorities?
CLARIFICATION: This concerns the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which apply to everyone "without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status." The declaration protects - among others - freedom of speech, property, religion, peaceful assembly and association.
RESPONSES:
0: Always. The leadership of this party argues that the will of the majority should always determine policy even if such policy violates minority rights.
1: Usually. The leadership of this party argues that the will of the majority should usually determine policy even if such policy violates minority rights.
2: Half of the time. The leadership of this party argues that the will of the majority should about half of the time determine policy even if such policy violate minority rights.
3: Usually not. The leadership of this party argues that the will of the majority should usually not determine policy if such policy violates minority rights.
4: Never. The leadership of this party argues that the will of the majority should never determine policy if such policy violates minority rights.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.6 Rejection of Political Violence (v2paviol)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paviol

Original tag: v2paviol

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the leadership of this party explicitly discourage the use of violence against domestic political opponents?
CLARIFICATION: "Domestic political opponents" refers to all political opponents, with the exception of those who are engaged in an armed conflict with the state. They may be other political parties or other political groups and movements.
RESPONSES:
0: Encourages. Leaders of this party often encourage the use of violence against domestic political opponents.
1: Sometimes encourages. Leaders of this party sometimes encourage the use of violence against domestic political opponents and generally refrain from discouraging it.
2: Discourages about half of the time. Leaders of this party occasionally discourage the use of violence against domestic political opponents, and do not encourage it.
3: Generally discourages. Leaders of this party often discourage the use of violence against its domestic political opponents.
4: Consistently discourages. Leaders of this party consistently reject the use of violence against its domestic political opponents.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.7 Immigration (v2paimmig)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paimmig

Original tag: v2paimmig

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What is the party's position regarding immigration into the country?
CLARIFICATION: Immigration refers to individuals entering the country for an indefinite, long-term or permanent period of time.
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly opposes. This party strongly opposes all or almost all forms of immigration into the country.
1: Opposes. This party opposes most forms of immigration into the country.
2: Ambiguous/No position. This party has no clear policy with regard to immigration into the country.
3: Supports. This party supports most forms of immigration into the country.
4: Strongly supports. This party strongly supports all or almost all forms of immigration into the country.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.8 LGBT Social Equality (v2palgbt)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2palgbt

Original tag: v2palgbt

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What is this party's position toward social equality for the lesbian, gay,

bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community?
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly opposes. This party is strongly opposed to LGBT social equality.
1: Opposes. This party is opposed to LGBT social equality.
2: Ambiguous/No position. This party has no clear policy with regard to LGBT social equality.
3: Supports. This party supports LGBT social equality.
4: Strongly supports. This party strongly supports LGBT social equality.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.9 Cultural Superiority (v2paculsup)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paculsup

Original tag: v2paculsup

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the party leadership promote the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole?
CLARIFICATION: This question refers to key non-economic cleavages in society, which could, for example, be based on caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, or some combination thereof. This question further refers to cultural issues related to the national history and identity of a country. This question does not pertain to social groups based on gender or sexual orientation.
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly promotes. The party strongly promotes the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
1: Promotes. The party promotes the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
2: Ambiguous. The party does not take a specific position on the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
3: Opposes. The party opposes the promotion of the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
4: Strongly opposes. The party strongly opposes the promotion of the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.10 Religious Principles (v2parelig)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2parelig

Original tag: v2parelig

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does this party invoke God, religion, or sacred/religious texts to justify its positions?
RESPONSES:
0: Always, or almost always. The party almost always invokes God, religion, or

sacred/religious texts to justify its positions.
1: Often, but not always. The party often, but not always, invokes God, religion, or religious texts to justify its positions.
2: About half of the time. The party about half of the time invokes God, religion, or religious texts to justify its positions.
3: Rarely. The party rarely invokes God, religion, or religious texts to justify its positions.
4: Never. The party never invokes God, religion, or religious texts to justify its positions.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.11 Gender Equality (v2pagender)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pagender

Original tag: v2pagender

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What is the share of women in national-level leadership positions of this political party?
CLARIFICATION: This question does NOT concern the share of women in the legislature.
RESPONSES:
0: None.
1: Small minority (about 1-15percent).
2: Medium minority (about 16-25percent).
3: Large minority (about 26-39percent).
4: Balanced (about 40percent or more).
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.12 Working Women (v2pawomlab)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pawomlab

Original tag: v2pawomlab

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does this party support the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: Measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market include - but are not limited to - legal provisions on equal treatment and pay, parental leave and financial support for child care.
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly opposes. This party strongly opposes all or almost all types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
1: Opposes. This party opposes most types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
2: Ambiguous/No position. This party has no clear policy with regard to measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
3: Supports. This party supports most types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.

4: Strongly supports. This party strongly supports all or almost all types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.13 Economic Left-Right Scale (v2pariglef)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pariglef

Original tag: v2pariglef

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Please locate the party in terms of its overall ideological stance on economic issues.
CLARIFICATION: Parties on the economic left want government to play an active role in the economy. This includes higher taxes, more regulation and government spending and a more generous welfare state. Parties on the economic right emphasize a reduced economic role for government: privatization, lower taxes, less regulation, less government spending, and a leaner welfare state.
RESPONSES:
0: Far-left.
1: Left.
2: Center-left.
3: Center.
4: Center-right.
5: Right.
6: Far-right.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.14 Welfare (v2pawelf)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pawelf

Original tag: v2pawelf

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the party promote means-tested or universalistic welfare policies?
RESPONSES:
0: The party does not support either type of policies and opposes any public welfare policy.
1: The party solely promotes means-tested welfare policies.
2: The party mainly promotes means-tested policies, but a significant portion (e.g. 1/4 or 1/3) is universalistic and potentially benefits everyone in the population.
3: The party roughly equally supports means-tested and universalistic welfare policies.
4: The party mainly promotes universalistic policies, but a significant portion (e.g. 1/4 or 1/3) of its policies are means-tested.
5: The party solely promotes universalistic welfare policies for all groups of the society.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see

V–Dem Methodology).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.15 Clientelism (v2paclient)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paclient

Original tag: v2paclient

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do the party and its candidates provide targeted and excludable (clientelistic) goods and benefits - such as consumer goods, cash or preferential access to government services - in an effort to keep and gain votes?
CLARIFICATION: In some cases, parties and their candidates deliver targeted and excludable goods and benefits directly to individual voters with the explicit intention to keep or gain votes. In other cases, they rely on brokers or companies as intermediaries. In some countries, candidates promise procurement contracts or favorable regulatory decisions to companies in exchange for ensuring their workers vote for the party/candidate. Such efforts count as an instance of clientelism, if they are clearly targeted at one specific company and excludable. On the other hand, handing out of small gifts can be common in some contexts without the intention to "buy votes" but rather as courtesy or part of what all candidates do ("entry ticket"). Such activities do not count as attempts to "keep or gain votes".
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all. The party and its candidates do not provide targeted goods and benefits in order to keep and gain votes.
1: A minor extent. The party and its candidates provide targeted goods and benefits to a minor extent in order to keep and gain votes.
2: A moderate extent. The party and its candidates provide targeted goods and benefits to a moderate extent in order to keep and gain votes.
3: A large extent. The party and its candidates provide targeted goods and benefits to a sizeable extent in order to keep and gain votes.
4: As its main effort. The party and its candidates provide targeted goods and benefits to the extent that it constitutes the party's main effort in order to keep and gain votes.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.4.16 Salience and Mobilization (v2pasalie_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pasalie_nr

Original tag: v2pasalie_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which of the following issues are most relevant for the party's effort to gain and keep voters?
CLARIFICATION: Choose only the key issue(s). Though you may choose up to three issues, if only one issue is most relevant, choose only that issue. Most of these issues have been covered in this survey; if you need additional clarification as to what a category represents, you can return to the relevant question.
RESPONSES: 0: Anti-elitism. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_0]
1: People-centrism. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_1]
2: Political pluralism (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_2]

3: Minority rights (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_3]
4: Immigration (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_4]
5: LGBT social equality (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_5]
6: Cultural superiority (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_6]
7: Religious principles (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_7]
8: Gender equality (pro or contra). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_8]
9: Welfare. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_9]
10: Economic issues (including infrastructure and taxes). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_10]
11: Clientelism in order to keep or gain votes (the distribution of targeted and excludable benefits towards supporters). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_11]
12: Environmental protection. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_12]
13: Farmers' issues. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_13]
14: The leader. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_14]
15: Anti-corruption. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_15]
16: Intimidation/violence. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_16]
17: Other. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pasalie_17]
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates

5.2.5 Party Organisation

This section lists variables related to how parties operate and are organised internally.

5.2.5.1 Local Party Office (v2palocoff)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2palocoff

Original tag: v2palocoff

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does this party maintain permanent offices that operate outside of election campaigns at the local or municipal-level?
CLARIFICATION: By "local or municipal" we mean low level administrative divisions that are ranked below regions, provinces, or states. We refer to offices that ensure professional personal and continued interaction of the party with citizens. Permanent offices operate outside of election campaigns.
RESPONSES:
0: The party does not have permanent local offices.
1: The party has permanent local offices in few municipalities.
2: The party has permanent local offices in some municipalities.
3: The party has permanent local offices in most municipalities.
4: The party has permanent local offices in all or almost all municipalities.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.2 Local Organizational Strength (v2paactcom)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paactcom

Original tag: v2paactcom

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what degree are party activists and personnel permanently active in local communities?
CLARIFICATION: Please consider the degree to which party activists and personnel are active both during election and non-election periods. Party personnel refers to paid staff.
RESPONSES:
0: There is negligible permanent presence of party activists and personnel in local communities.
1: There is minor permanent presence of party activists and personnel in local communities.
2: There is noticeable permanent presence of party activists and personnel in local communities.
3: There is significant permanent presence of party activists and personnel in local communities.
4: There is widespread permanent presence of party activists and personnel in local communities.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.3 Affiliate Organizations (v2pasoctie)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pasoctie

Original tag: v2pasoctie

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does this party maintain ties to prominent social organizations?
CLARIFICATION: When evaluating the strength of ties between the party and social organizations please consider the degree to which social organizations contribute to party operations by providing material and personnel resources, propagating the party's message to its members and beyond, as well as by directly participating in the party's electoral campaign and/or mobilization efforts. Social organizations include: Religious organizations (e.g. churches, sects, charities), trade unions/syndical organizations or cooperatives, cultural and social associations (e.g. sports clubs, neighborhood associations), political associations (e.g. environmental protection) and professional and business associations. Social organizations do not include paramilitary units or militias.
RESPONSES:
0: The party does not maintain ties to any prominent social organization.
1: The party maintains weak ties to prominent social organizations.
2: The party maintains moderate ties to prominent social organizations.
3: The party maintains strong ties to prominent social organizations.
4: The party controls prominent social organizations.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.4 Candidate Nomination (v2panom)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2panom

Original tag: v2panom

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Which of the following options best describes the process by which the party decides on candidates for the national legislative elections?
CLARIFICATION: If nomination procedures vary across constituencies consider the most common practice.
RESPONSES:
0: The party leader unilaterally decides on which candidates will run for the party in national legislative elections.
1: The national party leadership (i.e. an executive committee) collectively decides which candidates will run for the party in national legislative elections.
2: Delegates of local/regional organizations decide which candidates will run for the party in national legislative elections.
3: All party members decide on which candidates will run for the party in national legislative elections in primaries/caucuses.
4: All registered voters decide on which candidates will run for the party in national legislative elections in primaries/caucuses.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.5 Internal Cohesion (v2padisa)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2padisa

Original tag: v2padisa

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do the elites in this party display disagreement over party strategies?
CLARIFICATION: Party strategies include election campaign strategy, policy stance, distribution of party financial resources, cooperation with other parties (i.e. coalition formation), and the selection of legislative and presidential candidates as well as the party leader. Party elites are prominent and influential party members such as current and former ministers, members of parliament or the party leadership, regional and municipal leaders, and opinion leaders. They do not necessarily have to be the part of the official party leadership.
RESPONSES:
0: Party elites display almost complete disagreement over party strategies and many party elites have left the party.
1: Party elites display a high level of visible disagreement over party strategies and some of them have left the party.
2: Party elites display some visible disagreement over party strategies, but none of them have left the party.
3: Party elites display negligible visible disagreement over party strategies.
4: Party elites display virtually no visible disagreement over party strategies.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.6 Personalization of Party (v2paind)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paind

Original tag: v2paind

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent is this party a vehicle for the personal will and priorities of one individual leader?
RESPONSES:
0: The party is not focused on the personal will and priorities of one individual leader.
1: The party is occasionally focused on the personal will and priorities of one individual party leader.
2: The party is somewhat focused on the personal will and priorities of one individual party leader.
3: The party is mainly focused on the personal will and priorities of one individual party leader.
4: The party is solely focused on the personal will and priorities of one individual party leader.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.7 Party Resources (v2pafunds_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pafunds_nr

Original tag: v2pafunds_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: What were the major sources of party funds for this election campaign?
CLARIFICATION: Choose up to three most important ones. If a main source of funding for this campaign
comes from the party's assets such as properties and stocks, please code where these assets originally came from.
RESPONSES:
0: Formal state subsidies for political parties. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_0]
1: Large-scale donations from individuals. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_1]
2: Large-scale donations from companies. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_2]
3: Large-scale donations from civil society organizations (including trade unions). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_3]
4: Membership fees and small-scale supporters' donations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_4] 5: Informal use of state resources as incumbent party. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_5]
6: Funds of the party leader. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_6]
7: Funds of candidates. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_7]
SOURCE(S): Quality of Government Standard Dataset (2019).
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.5.8 Party Support Group (v2pagroup_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pagroup_nr

Original tag: v2pagroup_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: To which particular group in society does the core membership and supporters

of this party belong?
CLARIFICATION: Choose only the key groups. Though you may choose up to three groups, if only one
group is most relevant, please only choose that group.
RESPONSES: 0: No specific, clearly identifiable group. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_0]
1: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_1]
2: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_- 2]
3: Business elites. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_3]
4: The military. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_4]
5: An ethnic or racial group(s). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_5]
6: A religious group(s). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_6]
7: Local elites, including customary chiefs. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_7]
8: Urban working classes, including labor unions. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_8]
9: Urban middle classes. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_9]
10: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_10]
11: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_11]
12: Regional groups or separatists. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_12]
13: Women. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_13]
14: Other specific groups. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_14]
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

5.2.6 Populism

This section lists variables measuring populist features of parties.

5.2.6.1 Salience of anti–establishment rhetoric (E) (ep_antielite_salience)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_antielite_salience

Original tag: ep_antielite_salience

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the salience of anti–establishment and anti–elite rhetoric?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Not important at all" to "Extremely important" (0–10)
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.6.2 Salience of reducing political corruption (E) (ep_corrupt_salience)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_corrupt_salience

Original tag: ep_corrupt_salience

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the salience of reducing political corruption?
RESPONSES:

Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Not important at all" to "Extremely important" (0–10)
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.6.3 Members vs. leadership party policy choices (E) (ep_members_vs_leadership)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_members_vs_leadership

Original tag: ep_members_vs_leadership

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the position on whether members/activists or leadership has control over party policy choices?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Members/activists have complete control over party policy choices" to "Leadership had complete control over party policy choices" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.6.4 Position on direct vs. representative democracy (E) (ep_people_vs_elite)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_people_vs_elite

Original tag: ep_people_vs_elite

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the position on direct vs. representative democracy?
CLARIFICATION: Some political parties take the position that "the people" should have the final say on the most important issues, for example, by voting directly in referendums. At the opposite pole are political parties that believe that elected representatives should make the most important political decisions.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Elected office holders should make the most important decisions" to "lt;lt;The peoplegt;gt;, not politicians, should make the most important decisions" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
NOTES: In CHES 2019 survey words "direct" and "representative democracy" are changed to "people" and "elected representatives" accordingly. For this codebook, the entry in CHES 2017 survey was used.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.6.5 Populism type (E) (ep_type_populism)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_type_populism

Original tag: ep_type_populism

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: The Party Populism typology categorizes whether parties favor the use of pluralism or populist rhetoric categorized into four groups (V8_Ord).
RESPONSES:
1: Strongly Pluralist.
2: Moderately Pluralist.
3: Moderately Populist.
4: Strongly Populist.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

5.2.6.6 Populist values type (E) (ep_type_populist_values)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_type_populist_values

Original tag: ep_type_populist_values

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: The Populist Values typology combines the categories of rhetoric (V8_Bin) and the social values (B6_Bin) for each party.
RESPONSES:
1: Pluralist–Liberal.
2: Pluralist–Conservative.
3: Populist–Liberal.
4: Populist–Conservative.
SCALE: Ordinal.
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

5.2.6.7 Populist rhetoric (E) (ep_v8_popul_rhetoric)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_v8_popul_rhetoric

Original tag: ep_v8_popul_rhetoric

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: Where would you place each party on the following scale?
CLARIFICATION: Parties can also be classified by their current use of *populist* or *pluralist* rhetoric. *Populist* language typically challenges the legitimacy of established political institutions and emphasizes that the will of the people should prevail. By contrast, *pluralist* rhetoric rejects these ideas, believing that elected leaders should govern, constrained by minority rights, bargaining and compromise, as well as checks and balances on executive power.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Strongly favors pluralist rhetoric" to "Strongly favors populist rhetoric" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)

DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

5.2.6.8 Populist saliency (E) (ep_v9_popul_saliency)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_v9_popul_saliency

Original tag: ep_v9_popul_saliency

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: And how *important* is populist rhetoric currently for each of the following parties? Where would you place each party on the following scale?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "No importance" to "Great importance" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

5.2.7 Liberal-Traditional Scaling

This section measures weather parties lean towards liberal values or traditional values.

5.2.7.1 Position on democratic freedoms and rights (E) (ep_galtan)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_galtan

Original tag: ep_galtan

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the position of the party in a particular year in terms of their views on democratic freedoms and rights?
CLARIFICATION: "Libertarian" or "postmaterialist" parties favor expanded personal freedoms, for example, access to abortion, active euthanasia, same-sex marriage, or greater democratic participation. "Traditional" or "authoritarian" parties often reject these ideas; they value order, tradition, and stability, and believe that the government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Libertarian/Postmaterialist" to "Traditional/Authoritarian" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
NOTES: In CHES 2019 survey words "democratic freedoms" and "rights" in the wording of the question are changed to "social" and "cultural values" accordingly. The formulation of the clarification section is also nonsignificantly different in comparison with CHES 1999-2017, which is used in this codebook.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.7.2 Salience of libertarian or traditional issues (E) (ep_galtan_salience)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_galtan_salience

Original tag: ep_galtan_salience

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Bakker et al. (2020), Polk et al. (2017)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: What is the relative salience of libertarian/traditional issues in the party's public stance in a particular year?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "No importance" to "Great importance" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Bakker *et al.* (2015), Polk *et al.* (2017), Bakker *et al.* (2020)

5.2.7.3 Social Liberalism-Conservatism (E) (ep_v6_lib_cons)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_v6_lib_cons

Original tag: ep_v6_lib_cons

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: Where would you place each party on the following scale?
CLARIFICATION: Parties can also be classified by their current social values. Those with *liberal* values favor expanded personal freedoms, for example, on abortion rights, same–sex marriage, and democratic participation. Those with *conservative* values reject these ideas in favor of order, tradition and stability, believing that government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues.
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "Very liberal" to "Very conservative" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)
NOTES: Only original score is included.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

5.2.7.4 Social values saliency (E) (ep_v7_lib_cons_saliency)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_ep_v7_lib_cons_saliency

Original tag: ep_v7_lib_cons_saliency

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022*b*)

Variable citation: Norris (2020)

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: E
QUESTION: And how *important* are liberal/conservative social values for each of the following parties? Where would you place each party on the following scale?
RESPONSES:
Numeric
SCALE: Interval, from "No importance" to "Great importance" (0–10).
SOURCE(S): Norris (2020)
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CITATION: Norris (2020)

6 Bibliography

Angiolillo, F. & Wiebrecht, F. (2023), 'From Individual Parties to Party Systems: A New Approach to Calculate Systems' Variabels', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* (146).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp146.pdf*

Angiolillo, F., Wiebrecht, F. & Lindberg, S. (2023), 'Democractic-Autocratic Party Systems: A New Index', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* (143).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp_143.pdf*

Armingeon, K., Engler, S., Leeman, L. & Weisstanner, D. (2024), 'Supplement to the comparative political data set - government composition 1960-2022'.

Armingeon, K., Engler, S., Leemann, L. & Weisstanner, D. (2024), 'Comparative political data set 1960-2022'. Zurich/Lueneburg/Lucerne: University of Zurich, Leuphana University Lueneburg, and University of Lucerne.

Bakker, R., Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J., Steenbergen, M. & Vachudova, M. A. (2020), '2019 Chapel Hill Expert Survey'. Version 2019.1.
URL: *https://www.chesdata.eu/2019-chapel-hill-expert-survey*

Bergman, Torbjörn, G. I. & Hellström, J. (2024), 'Coalition politics in central eastern europe: Governing in times of crisis', *London: Routledge.* . REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.
URL: *https://repdem.org*

Bergman, Torbjörn, H. B. & Hellström, J. (2021), 'Coalition governance in western europe.', *Oxford: Oxford University Press.* . REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.
URL: *https://repdem.org*

Bizzarro Neto, F., Hicken, A. & Self, D. (2017), 'The V-Dem Party Institutionalization Index: A New Global Indicator (1900-2015)', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2017**(48).
URL: *https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer_public/00/6d/006dc36d-9497-4d53-95f8-c117fa12c2f6/v-dem_working_paper_2017_48.pdf https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2968265*

Bjørnskov, C. & Rode, M. (2020), 'Regime types and regime change: A new dataset on democracy, coups, and political institutions', *Review of International Organizations* **15**, 531–551.

Bormann, N.-C. & Golder, M. (2022), 'Democratic electoral systems around the world, 1946–2020', *Electoral Studies* **78**, 102487.
URL: *https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261379422000476*

Bäck, H., Teorell, J., Von Hagen-Jamar, A. & Quiroz Flores, A. (2021), 'War, performance, and the survival of foreign ministers', *Foreign Policy Analysis* **17**(2).

Cahoon, Ben (2026), 'WorldStatesmen.org'.
URL: *https://www.worldstatesmen.org/*

Cheibub, J. A., Gandhi, J. & Vreeland, J. R. (2010), 'Democracy and dictatorship revisited', *Public Choice* **143**(1-2), 67–101.

Constitute Project (2026), 'Constitute'.
URL: *https://www.constituteproject.org/*

Coppedge, M., Alvarez, A. & Maldonado, C. (2008), 'Two persistent dimensions of democracy: Contestation and inclusiveness', *The Journal of Politics* **70**(3), 632–647.

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Grahn, S., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Krusell, J., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Medzihorsky, J., Natsika, N., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., von Römer, J., Seim, B.,

Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wiebrecht, F., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-dem country-year dataset v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., Pernes, J., von Römer, Johannes Seim, B., Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-Dem Codebook v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Donner, S., Hartmann, H. & Steinkamp, S. (2024), *Transformation Index BTI 2024: Governance in International Comparison*, Bertelsmann Stiftung.
URL: *http://www.bti-project.org*

Emanuele, V. (2015), 'Dataset of electoral volatility and its internal components in western europe (1946-2015)'.
URL: *http://www.vincenzoemanuele.com/dataset-of-electoral-volatility.html*

Emanuele, V. (2016), 'Dataset of new parties and party system innovation in western europe since 1945'.
URL: *http://www.vincenzoemanuele.com/dataset-of-electoral-volatility.html*

Emanuele, V., Angelucci, D., Marino, B., Puleo, L. & Vegetti, F. (2020), 'The congealing of a new cleavage? the evolution of the demarcation bloc in europe (1979–2019)', *Italian Political Science Review* pp. 1–20.

ESS Round 1: European Social Survey Round 1 Data (2002), Data file edition 6.6, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 11: European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC) (2024), Ess11 - integrated file, edition 2.0 [data set], Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research.
URL: *http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/*

ESS Round 2: European Social Survey Round 2 Data (2004), Data file edition 3.6, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006), Data file edition 3.7, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008), Data file edition 4.5, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), Data file edition 3.4, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), Data file edition 2.4, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), Data file edition 2.2, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), Data file edition 2.2, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018), Data file edition 3.1, Technical report, Sikt - Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.

EVS (2020), 'European Values Study 2017: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2017)'.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.4232/1.13560*

Freedom House (2024), 'Freedom in the world 2024'.
URL: *https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world*

Gerring, J., Nong, X., Chatterton, B., Cojocaru, L., Dalli, C. M., Knutsen, C. H., Kokkonen, A., Smith, D. S., Teorell, J., Selsky, S., Ward, D. & Jeon, J. Y. (2024), Leader tenure through the ages: The growth of constraints. Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin.

Gerring, J., Thacker, S. C. & Moreno, C. (2005), 'Centripetal democratic governance: A theory and global inquiry', *American Political Science Review* **99**(4), 567–581.
URL: *http://www.jstor.org/stable/30038965*

Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024), 'Africa integrity indicators 2014-2024'.
URL: *https://www.africaintegrityindicators.org/*

Hellström, J., Bergman, T., Lindahl, J., Bäck, H., Ilonszki, G., Müller, W. C. & Strøm, K. (2025), 'Party government in europe database (paged) – coalition governance in central eastern and western europe dataset, version 2024.12'. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Hellström, J., Bergman, T., Lindahl, J. & Gustafsson, E. K. (2026), 'The representative democracy data archive (repdem) – basic dataset, version 2026.02'. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Henisz, W. J. (2017), 'The Political Constraint Index (POLCON) Dataset 2017 release'.
URL: *https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/profile/1327*

Hughes, M. M., Paxton, P., Clayton, A. & Zetterberg, P. (2017), 'Quota adoption and reform over time (qarot), 1947-2015'. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2017-08-16.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.3886/E100918V1*

Hyde, S. D. & Marinov, N. (2021), 'Codebook for national elections across democracy and autocracy dataset, 5.0'.
URL: *https://nelda.co/*

Inter-Parliamentary Union (2024), 'Parline database: Monthly ranking of women in national parliaments'.
URL: *https://data.ipu.org/women-ranking*

Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) (2025), 'IPU Parline: Global data on national parliaments'.
URL: *https://data.ipu.org/*

International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) (2026), 'IFES Election Guide'.
URL: *https://www.electionguide.org/home/*

Johnson, J. W. & Wallack, J. S. (2012), 'Electoral systems and the personal vote'.
URL: *http://hdl.handle.net/1902.1/17901*

Library of Congress (2025), 'Country Studies'.
URL: *https://countrystudies.us/*

Lindberg, S. I., Düpont, N., Higashijima, M., Kavasoglu, Y. B., Marquardt, K. L., Bernhard, M., Döring, H., Hicken, A., Laebens, M., Medzihorsky, J., Neundorf, A., Reuter, O. J., Ruth–Lovell, S., Weghorst, K. R., Wiesehomeier, N., Wright, J., Alizada, N., Bederke, P., Gastaldi, L., Grahn, S., Hindle, G., Ilchenko, N., von Römer, J., Wilson, S., Pemstein, D. & Seim, B. (2022*a*), 'Varieties of party identity and organization (v–party) dataset v2', *Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project* .
URL: *https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2*

Lindberg, S. I., Düpont, N., Higashijima, M., Kavasoglu, Y. B., Marquardt, K. L., Bernhard, M., Döring, H., Hicken, A., Laebens, M., Medzihorsky, J., Neundorf, A., Reuter, O. J., Ruth–Lovell, S., Weghorst, K. R., Wiesehomeier, N., Wright, J., Alizada, N., Bederke, P., Gastaldi, L., Grahn, S., Hindle, G., Ilchenko, N., von Römer, J., Wilson, S., Pemstein, D. & Seim, B. (2022*b*), 'Varieties of party identity and organization (v–party) dataset v2', *Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project* .
URL: *https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2*

Lührmann, A., Tannenberg, M. & Lindberg, S. I. (2018), 'Regimes of the World (RoW): Opening New Avenues for the Comparative Study of Political Regimes', *Politics and Governance* **6**(1), 1–18.

Mark, S., Cingranelli, D., Filippov, M. & Richards, D. L. (2023), 'The cirights data project scoring manual v2.11.06.23 (november 6, 2023)'. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4625036 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4625036.

Marshall, M. G. & Gurr, T. R. (2020), 'Polity5 Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2018'.
URL: *http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscrdata.html*

Norris, P. (2020), 'Measuring populism worldwide', *Party Politics* **26**(6), 697–717.
URL: *https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1354068820927686*

NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2020), 'European social survey cumulative file, ess 1-9'. Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
URL: *http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/*

Nyrup, J. & Bramwell, S. (2020), 'Who governs? a new global dataset on members of cabinets', *American Political Science Review* **114**(4), 1366–1374.

Pemstein, D., Marquardt, K. L., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y., Medzihorsky, J., Krusell, J., Miri, F. & von Römer, J. (2026), 'The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2026**(21, 11th edition).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp21_2026.pdf*

Pemstein, D., Marquardt, K. L., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Medzihorsky, J., Krusell, J., Miri, F. & von Römer, J. (2023), 'The v-dem measurement model: Latent variable analysis for cross-national and cross-temporal expert-coded data', `https://v-dem.net/wp.html`,.

Polk, J., Rovny, J., Bakker, R., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Koedam, J., Kostelka, F., Marks, G., Schumacher, G., Steenbergen, M. & Vachudova, M. A. (2017), 'Explaining the salience of anti–elitism and reducing political corruption for political parties in Europe with the Chapel Hill Expert Survey', *Research & Politics* pp. 1–9.

Povitkina, M., Alvarado Pachon, N. & Dalli, C. M. (2021), 'The quality of government environmental indicators dataset, version sep21', *University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government* .

Przeworski, A., Newman, S., Park, S. K., Queralt, D., Rivero, G. & Shin, K. J. (2013), *Political Institutions and Political Events (PIPE) Data Set.*, Department of Politics, New York University, New York.

Quota Project (2025), 'Quota Project: School for Women's Political Education'.
URL: *https://www.quotaproject.org/*

Schiller, C. & Hellmann, T. (2024), 'Sustainable governance indicators 2024', *Bertelsmann Stiftung* . Date accessed: 18 January 2025.
URL: *https://www.sgi-network.org*

Skaaning, S.-E. (2025), 'Lexical Index of Electoral Democracy (LIED) dataset v6.8'. Accessed on 2025-12-05.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/WPKNIT*

Stockemer, D. & Sundström, A. (2022), 'Introducing the worldwide age representation in parliaments (warp) data set', *Social Science Quarterly* **103**(7), 1765–1774.
URL: *https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ssqu.13221*

Teorell, J., Hellström, J. & Noonan, J. (2023), 'Historical Cabinets (H-CAB) Dataset v1'.
URL: *https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data*

Teorell, J. & Lindberg, S. I. (2019), 'Beyond Democracy-Dictatorship Measures: A New Framework Capturing Executive Bases of Power, 1789-2016', *Perspectives on Politics* **17**(1), 66–84.

Teorell, J., Sundström, A., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Alvarado Pachon, N., Phiri, V. S., Chen, C. & Liu, Z. (2026), *The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan26*. QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.
URL: *https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government*

Teorell, J. & Wahman, M. (2018), 'Institutional stepping stones for democracy: How and why multipartyism enhances democratic change', *Democratization* **25**(1), 78–97.

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*a*), 'Electoral system design database'.
URL: *https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/electoral-system-design*

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2024*b*), 'Voter turnout database'.
URL: *https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voter-turnout*

Transparency International (2017), 'Global corruption barometer 9th edition'.
URL: *https://www.transparency.org/research/gcb*

Vanhanen, T. (2019), 'Measures of democracy 1810-2018 dataset'. Version 8.0.
URL: *http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:fsd:T-FSD1289*

Wig, T., Hegre, H. & Regan, P. M. (2015), 'Updated data on institutions and elections 1960–2012: presenting the iaep dataset version 2.0', *Research & Politics* **2**(2).

World Bank (2024), 'World development indicators'.
URL: *https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators*