The Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2006 is a collection of political and institutional data which have been assembled in the context of the research projects „Die Handlungsspielräume des Nationalstaates“ and “Critical junctures. An international comparison” directed by Klaus Armingeon and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. It consists of (mostly) annual data for 23 democratic countries for the period of 1960 to 2006. In the cases of Greece, Spain and Portugal, political data were collected only for the democratic periods\(^1\). The data set is suited for cross national, longitudinal and pooled time series analyses.

The data set contains some additional demographic, socio- and economic variables. However, these variables are not the major concern of the project, and are thus limited in scope. For a more in-depth source of these data, see the online databases of the OECD. For trade union membership, excellent data for European trade unions can be added from the CD-ROM of the Data Handbook by Bernhard Ebbinghaus and Jelle Visser (Trade Unions in Western Europe since 1945 (The Societies of Europe). New York, Basingstoke, Oxford: Grove's Dictionaries, Macmillan, 2000).

A few variables have been copied from a data set collected by E. Huber, Ch. Ragin, J. Stephens, D. Brady and J. Beckfield (2004), as well as from a data set collected by D. Quinn. We are grateful for the permission to include these data.

In any work using data from this data set, please quote both the data set, and where appropriate, the original source. Please quote this data set as: Klaus Armingeon, Marlène Gerber, Philipp Leimgruber, Michelle Beyeler. Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2006, Institute of Political Science, University of Berne 2008.

Last update: 2008-09-08

---

\(^1\) Data for Greece are missing during the period 1967-1973. Data for Portugal are missing until 1975, and for Spain until 1976.
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VARIABLE LIST

1. General variables

year       Year of observation
country    Country names
countryn   Country code: 1 Australia; 2 Austria; 3 Belgium; 4 Canada; 5 Denmark; 6 Finland; 7 France; 8 Germany; 9 Greece; 10 Iceland; 11 Ireland; 12 Italy; 13 Japan; 14 Luxembourg; 15 Netherlands; 16 New Zealand; 17 Norway; 18 Portugal; 19 Spain; 20 Sweden; 21 Switzerland; 22 United Kingdom; 23 USA.

Notes: Data up to the end of 1990 are for the Federal Republic of Germany before reunification only (West Germany); unless otherwise indicated, they are for the whole of Germany from 1991 onwards.

2. Governments

gov_right  Cabinet composition: right-wing parties in percentage of total cabinet posts, weighted by days.
            Source: Own calculations primarily based on Schmidt and Beyer (1992) and, since 1991, on the political data published in the European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues). For details see the appendix.

gov_cent   Cabinet composition: centre parties in percentage of total cabinet posts, weighted by days.
            Source: see gov_right.
### Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>gov_left</strong></td>
<td>Cabinet composition: social-democratic and other left parties in percentage of total cabinet posts, weighted by days.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>see <strong>gov_right</strong></td>
<td>1. Due to independents, the calculations of ‘gov_right’, ‘gov_cent’ and ‘gov_left’ do not always sum up to 100 percent. <strong>Italy 1995/96</strong> does not sum up to 100 percent mainly because of the caretaker government which was in force from 17.01.1995 until 17.05.1996. <strong>Canada 2005</strong> does not sum up to 100 percent as the House of Commons was dissolved on the defeat of the government on 28 November, 2005 so had no members at the end of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gov_party</strong></td>
<td>Cabinet composition (Schmidt-Index): (1) hegemony of right-wing (and centre) parties (gov_left=0), (2) dominance of right-wing (and centre) parties (gov_left&lt;33.3), (3) balance of power between left and right (33.3&lt;gov_left&lt;66.6), (4) dominance of social-democratic and other left parties (gov_left&gt;66.6), (5) hegemony of social-democratic and other left parties (gov_left=100).</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>Own calculations according to Schmidt (1992).</td>
<td>1. <strong>Italy 1996</strong>: Because of many non-partisans in government it is coded as a stand-off between left and right (3), even though the percentage of left parties in government is less than 33%. 2. <strong>Portugal 2001 and 2005</strong>: Because of many non-partisans in government it is coded as (4) dominance of social-democratic and other left parties, even though the percentage of left parties in government is less than 66%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gov_new</strong></td>
<td>New party composition of cabinet: (0) no change (1) change, if cabinet composition (gov_party) changed from last to present year.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>see <strong>gov_party</strong></td>
<td>Source: own calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gov_gap</strong></td>
<td>‘Ideological gap’ between new cabinet and old one. The gap is calculated as the difference of the index value (gov_party) of the outgoing and the incoming government. For an example, see the note below.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>see <strong>gov_party</strong></td>
<td>Source: own calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gov_type</strong></td>
<td>Type of Government. Classification: (1) single party majority government (2) minimal winning coalition (3) surplus coalition (4) single party minority government (5) multi party minority government (6) caretaker government (temporarily).</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>missing: Greece, Portugal, and Spain until 1990.</td>
<td>How to calculate gov_gap (an example): The cabinet in Australia in 1996 is coded (2) for the variable ‘gov_party’ (dominance of right- and centre parties). As in 1995, the government of Australia had a hegemony of social-democratic and other left parties, coded (5) for the variable ‘gov_party’, the value for ‘gov_gap’ in 1996 would be (-3), calculated as the difference of the ideology of the outgoing (2) and the incoming government (5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set 1, 1960-2006


Notes:
1. The indicator refers to that type of government that was in office for the longest period each year.
2. Spain 1990: 'gov_type' is coded as 1 (single party majority government), although the single government party had exactly 50.0% of parliamentary seats.

gov_chan Number of changes in government per year [termination of government due to (a) elections, (b) resignation of the Prime Minister, (c) dissension within government, (d) lack of parliamentary support, or (e) intervention by the head of state (Woldendorp/Keman/Budge 1998)].
Missing: see gov_type.
Source: see gov_type.

3. Elections

elect Date of election of national parliament (lower house). (If there were two elections in a year, the date of the second is given).
Source: European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues); Mackie & Rose (1991); Keesing's Archive; Parlino database (http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp).

vturn Voter turnout in election.
Missing: none.

As a general rule we entered data on votes and seats for a party if it reached at least 2% of votes in an election. If it did not reach that threshold, data for this party was not entered for this election (neither on votes nor on seats); rather it received a zero (see Appendix).

social1 Share of votes of the party classified as social1. Parties are classified according to Lane, McKay and Newton (1997).
For details about the classification and the period covered for each country: see the appendix.

social2 Share of votes of the party classified as social2.

etc.
4. Women in parliaments

womenpar Percentage of women in parliaments. Entries refer to the composition of the parliament by the end of the corresponding year.
Missing: none.
Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union (1995); Inter-Parliamentary Union (1997); Inter-Parliamentary Union Homepage, http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif-arc.htm (Download: 2008-05-19).

Notes:
In bicameral systems, data is taken for the lower house.

5. Party-system

rae_ele Index of electoral fractionalization of the party-system according to the formula \([F]\) proposed by Rae (1968).

\[
rae_{ele} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i^2 , \text{ where } v_i \text{ is the share of votes for party } i \text{ and } m \text{ the number of parties.}
\]
Missing: none.
Source: own calculations.

rae_leg Index of legislative fractionalization of the party-system according to the formula \([F]\) proposed by Rae (1968).

\[
rae_{leg} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^2 , \text{ where } s_i \text{ is the share of seats for party } i \text{ and } m \text{ the number of parties.}
\]
Missing: none.
Source: own calculations.

effpar_ele Effective number of parties on the votes level according to the formula \([N_2]\) proposed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). The effective number of parties carries the same information as the Rae-Index and is calculated from this index as follows: 

\[
effpar_{ele} = 1 / (1 - rae_{ele})
\]
Missing: none.
Source: own calculations.
**Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006**

**effpar_leg** Effective number of parties on the *seats* level according to the formula \(N_2\) proposed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). The effective number of parties carries the same information as the Rae-Index and is calculated from this index as follows: \(\text{effpar}\_\text{leg} = \frac{1}{1 - \text{rae}\_\text{leg}}\)

- **Period covered**: 1960-2006.
- **Missing**: none.
- **Source**: own calculations.

**dis_abso** Index of absolute disproportionality. A score of 1 means, for example, that on the *seats* level there is, on average, one (effective) party less than on the *votes* level. ‘Absolute’ refers to the calculation of the differences between the effective number of parties in elections and parliaments without taking into account the fractionalization of the party system. The stronger the fractionalization of the party system the more likely are, ceteris paribus, high values of dis_abso.

The index is calculated as follows:
\(\text{dis}\_\text{abso} = \text{effpar}\_\text{ele} - \text{effpar}\_\text{leg}\)

- **Period covered**: 1960-2006.
- **Missing**: none.
- **Source**: own calculations.

**dis_rel** Index of relative disproportionality. This index is weighted on the total number of parties on the *votes* level. It is calculated as follows:
\(\text{dis}\_\text{rel} = (\text{effpar}\_\text{ele} - \text{effpar}\_\text{leg}) / \text{effpar}\_\text{ele}\)

- **Period covered**: 1960-2006.
- **Missing**: none.
- **Source**: own calculations.

**dis_gall** Index of disproportionality according to the formula [least squares] proposed by Gallagher (1991). Calculated as follows:
\(\text{dis}\_\text{gall} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\frac{v_i - s_i}{s_i}\right)^2}\)

- **Period covered**: 1960-2006.
- **Missing**: none.
- **Source**: own calculations.

### 6. Institutions

The variables lfirst1 to lbank2 come from Lijphart (1999). They concern two dimensions of consensus-democracies. We (re-)calculated the indices so that variables ending with a ‘1’ (lfirst1, lsec1, leff1 etc.) have two entries: one representing the period 1945-1970, entered at year 1960; the other representing the period 1971-96, entered at year 1984. Variables ending with a ‘2’ (lfirst2, lsec2, leff2 etc.) are calculated for the whole period 1960-1996, data were entered at year 1960. For definition of the variables see Lijphart (1999).

- **lfirst1**: First (executives-parties) dimension
- **lfirst2**: First (executives-parties) dimension: Index \(60-96\)
- **lsec1**: Second (federal-unitary) dimension
- **lsec2**: Second (federal-unitary) dimension: Index \(60-96\)
- **leff1**: Effective number of parliamentary parties
- **leff2**: Effective number of parliamentary parties: Index \(60-96\)
- **lmin1**: Minimal winning one-party cabinets (%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lmin2</td>
<td>Minimal winning one-party cabinets (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lex1</td>
<td>Index of executive dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lex2</td>
<td>Index of executive dominance: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ldis1</td>
<td>Index of disproportionality (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ldis2</td>
<td>Index of disproportionality (%): Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lint1</td>
<td>Index of interest group pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lint2</td>
<td>Index of interest group pluralism: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfed1</td>
<td>Index of federalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfed2</td>
<td>Index of federalism: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbic1</td>
<td>Index of bicameralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbic2</td>
<td>Index of bicameralism: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrid1</td>
<td>Index of constitutional rigidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrid2</td>
<td>Index of constitutional rigidity: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljud1</td>
<td>Index of judicial review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljud2</td>
<td>Index of judicial review: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbank1</td>
<td>Index of central bank independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbank2</td>
<td>Index of central bank independence: Index 60-96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following three institutional variables we entered the corresponding values for the period: 1960-1996. If one needs a longer period, the missing fields can easily be completed. It should, however, be taken into account that some institutional changes may have occurred since the indicators were calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instcons</td>
<td>Index of institutional constraints of central state government in 1960-1990 period according to Schmidt (1996); Range: from 0 to 5, high values indicate powerful constraints, low values are indicative of a large manoeuvring room available to central state government. Description: additive index composed of 6 dummy-variables (‘1’ = constraints, ‘0’=else) (1) EU membership in most of the period under study =1, (2) degree of centralisation of state structure (federalism=1), (3) difficulty of amending constitutions (very difficult=1) (4) strong bicameralism =1 (5) central bank autonomy =1 (6) frequent referenda = 1. Source: Schmidt (1996: 172).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>Augmented index of institutional pluralism according to Colomer (1995); data for non-European states, Iceland and Luxembourg were added by Schmidt (1996). Minimum=0, maximum=7. 4 indicators (coded 0, 1 or 2): number of effective parties, bicameralism, elected president and decentralisation. Source: Schmidt (1996: 172).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structur</td>
<td>Augmented index of constitutional structures by Huber/Ragin/Stephens (1993: 728); data for Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain were added by Schmidt (1996: 172). In addition, Austria was attributed a value of „2” by Schmidt (federalism=1, modified proportional representation =1); data cover period until early 1990s (electoral reform in New Zealand 1993 not included). Description: additive index composed of five indicators: (1) federalism (0=absence, 1=weak, 2=strong) (2) parliamentary government =0, versus presidentialism or other =1 (3) proportional representation =0, modified proportional representation=1, majoritarian=2 (4) bicameralism (1=weak, 2=strong), (5) frequent referenda=1. Source: Huber/Ragin/Stephens (1993), Schmidt (1996).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrated economy. Siaroff Index (1999). ‘5’ indicating greatest integration, ‘1’ least integrated economies. The Siaroff Index can be considered as a proxy for corporatism.

Federalism. Coded 0 = no, 1 = weak, 2 = strong.
Missing: Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

Presidential system. Coded 0 = parliamentary, 1 = president or collegial executive.
Missing: see fed.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

Electoral system-single member districts, or Proportional representation. Coded 0 = proportional representation, 1 = modified proportional representation, 2 = single-member, simple plurality systems.
Missing: see fed.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

Strength of bicameralism. Coded 0 = no second chamber or second chamber with very weak powers, 1 = weak bicameralism, 2 = strong bicameralism.
Missing: see fed.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

Referendum. Coded 0 = none or infrequent, 1 = frequent.
Missing: see fed.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

Judicial review. Coded 0 = no, 1 = yes.
Missing: see fed.
Source: Huber et al. (2004).

7. Central bank independence

Index by Alesina (1988): from 1 to 4, the higher, the more independent. This index considers whether the central bank has final authority over monetary policy, whether government officials sit on the governing board of the bank, and whether more than half of the members are appointed by the government.
Missing: Austria, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, and Portugal.

Index by Eijffinger and Schaling: from 1 to 5, the higher, the more independent. Based on the location of final responsibility for monetary policy, the absence or presence of government officials on the board of central bank, and the percentage of board appointees made by the government.
Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006

Missing: Greece, Iceland, Ireland and Luxembourg.
Source: Eijffinger/Haan (1996), and own calculations.

bankgr_1  Index by Grilli, Masiandaro and Tabellini (1991), measuring only political independence, from 0 to 8, the higher, the more independent. Focuses on appointment procedures for board members, the length of members’ terms to office, and the existence of the statutory requirement to pursue monetary stability.
Missing: Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden.
Source: Grilli et al. (1991: 368), and own calculations.

bankgr_2  Index by Grilli, Masiandaro and Tabellini (1991), measuring political and economic independence: from 0 to 15, the higher, the more independent. Considers the political independence (see bankgr_1) and the extent to which the central bank is free from government influence in implementing monetary policy.
Missing: Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg, Norway and Sweden.
Source: Grilli et al. (1991: 368-369), and own calculations.

bankcuk  Unweighted legal-independence index by Cukierman LVAU (1994): aggregated from sixteen legal characteristics of central-bank charters grouped into four clusters: the appointment, dismissal, and legal term of office of the governor of the central bank; the institutional location of the final authority for monetary policy and the procedures for the resolution of conflicts between the government and the central bank; the importance of price stability in comparison to other objectives; and the stringency and universality of limitations on the ability of the government to borrow from the central bank. Range: from 0 to 1.
Missing: Portugal
Source: Cukierman (1994: 382), and own calculations.

bankfrei  Index by Freitag (1999): based on bankales, bankeff, bankgr_2 and bankcuk. Each of them has been divided into a category either above or under the median. The index goes from 1 to 3, where ‘1’ stands for a maximum of central bank independence (when all four indexes agree, that the central bank of this country is independent) and ‘3’ stands for a maximum of central bank dependence. The index has been changed in some countries due to reforms and changes in law: Austria (1985f), New Zealand (1990f) Canada (1991f), France, Finland, United Kingdom, Sweden and Belgium (1993f).
Missing: Iceland and Luxembourg.
Source: Freitag (1999), and own calculations.

8. Openness of the economy (statutory rules)

openness  Index for the financial openness of an economy. This index is the sum of ‘curracc’, ‘capital’ and an index for legal international agreements that constrain a nation’s ability to restrict exchange and capital flows. The result is a 0-14 measure of financial openness.
Missing: Iceland and Luxembourg.
Source: The data for this indicator were kindly provided from D. Quinn.
curacc  Index for restrictions on payments and receipts of goods and invisibles. For each dimension of exchange restriction a 0, .5, 1, 1.5, 2 scale had been adopted, from 0 meaning that e.g., import payments were forbidden, to 2 meaning, that e.g., import payments are unrestricted. For the 4 dimensions considered in ‘curacc’ this generates a 0-8 score, with 0 representing a closed economy and 8 representing an open economy.
Source: see openness. An update is taken from Huber et al. (2004).

capital  Index for restrictions on payments and receipts of capital. ‘capital’ is constructed in the same way as ‘curacc’. Since it considers only 2 dimensions of restrictions, a 0-4 score is generated, with 0 representing a closed economy and 4 representing an open economy.
Note: the coding is based on IMF: The Annual Report of Exchange Restrictions, various issues.
Missing: see curacc.
Source: see curacc.

9. Macroeconomic data

receipts  Total receipts of government as a percentage of GDP.

gdpgr  Growth of real GDP, percentage change from previous year.
Missing: none.

debt  Gross government debt (financial liabilities) as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see note below.

Notes:
Detailed sources used for each country. Please consider that there may be breaks in series.


Notes:


10. Labour force data


Notes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period Covered</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>civ_labf</strong></td>
<td>Civilian labour force, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>France: 2006</td>
<td>see ttl_labf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emp_civ</strong></td>
<td>Civilian employment, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>France: 2006</td>
<td>see ttl_labf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>labfopar</strong></td>
<td>Total labour force as a percentage of population 15-64 (participation rate).</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>see empratio, United States: 2005/06</td>
<td>see empratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emp_ag</strong></td>
<td>Civilian employment in agriculture, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>France: 2006</td>
<td>see ttl_labf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emp_ind</strong></td>
<td>Civilian employment in industry, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>France: 2006</td>
<td>see ttl_labf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emp_serv</strong></td>
<td>Civilian employment in services, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td>France: 2006</td>
<td>see ttl_labf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>emp_un</strong></td>
<td>Unemployed, in thousands.</td>
<td>1960-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006

Source: see ttt_labf.

unempl Unemployment rate as a percentage of civilian labour force.
Missing: see emp_un.
Source: see ttt_labf.

st_unemp Standardised unemployment rates (series adjusted for seasonal variations).
Period covered: For most countries from the early 1980s onwards or earlier, except for Austria (1993) and Switzerland (1992).
Missing: Iceland: entirely.


11. Industrial disputes and trade unions

nld Number of industrial disputes (strikes and lockouts).

wi Workers involved in labour disputes, in thousands.
Source: see nld.

wdlost Working-days lost (due to strikes and lockouts), in thousands.
Source: see nld.

strike Index of strike activity, working days lost per 1000 workers; calculation:
(wdlost/emp_civ)*1000.
Missing: see wdlost.
Source: own calculations.

Note concerning nld, wi, wdlost and strike: USA 1977 onwards: Excluding work stoppages involving fewer than 1,000 workers. For additional notes on minor variation in comparability and breaks in series, see data viewer on the ILO Laborsta Homepage.

grossu Total reported union members, in thousands.
Period covered: 1960-mid-90s.
12. Public social expenditure and revenue data

*Note:* The entry ‘0.00’ represents nil or less than half of the last digit used.

**sstran** Social security transfers as a percentage of GDP. Social assistance grants and welfare benefits paid by general government (benefits for sickness, old-age, family allowances, etc.).

**socexp_t** Total public social expenditure as a percentage of GDP.

**socexp_c** Public social expenditure in cash as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

**socexp_k** Public social expenditure in kind as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

**oldage** Total public expenditure on old age as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

**survivor** Total public survivor benefits as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

---

2 The variable “socexp_t” refers to the variable “socexp”, which was included in former CPDS I versions.
incapben  Total incapacity-related public benefits as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

health  Total public expenditure on health as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

family  Total public expenditure which supports families as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t.
Source: see socexp_t.

almp  Total public expenditure on active labour market programmes as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see socexp_t.

unemp  Cash expenditure compensating for unemployment as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see socexp_t.

housing  Total public expenditure on housing as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t. In addition: Belgium, Japan and USA: entirely.
Source: see socexp_t.

Notes:
Belgium, Japan, USA: Data do not exist.

othsocx  Public expenditure on other social policy areas as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see socexp_t. In addition: Denmark: 1980-82.
Source: see socexp_t.

13. Family policy

Note: The entry '0.00' represents nil or less than half of the last digit used.

fallow  Total public cash benefits for family allowances as a percentage of GDP.
mpleave  Total public cash benefits in the case of maternal and parental leave as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see fallow.

Notes:
1. Australia (-1994), New Zealand (-2001), USA: Data do not exist.

othfam_c  Other public cash benefits as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see fallow. In addition: Belgium, Luxembourg: 1980-89; Canada, Denmark, Switzerland, USA: entirely.
Source: see fallow.

Notes:
1. Canada, Denmark, Switzerland, USA: Data do not exist.
2. Belgium, Luxembourg (1980-89): Data are included in another category.

daycare  Total public social expenditure for day care and home-help services as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see fallow.

Notes:

othfam_k  Other public benefits in kind as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see fallow.

Notes:

14. Labour market policy

Notes:
1. The classification system of labour market programmes used by the OECD has recently been restructured (Employment Outlook 2005 onwards). To ensure consistency with the historical series, the “old” classification system with 5 categories of active measures (PES and administration, labour market training, youth measures, subsided employment, measures of the disabled) as presented in the Social Expenditure Database 1980-2003 was kept for the moment.
2. The entry ‘0.00’ represents nil or less than half of the last digit used.

servadmi  Public employment services and administration as a percentage of GDP.

**Notes:**

**training**
Public expenditure on labour market training as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

**Notes:**
1. Include training measures undertaken for reasons of labour market policy, other than special programmes for youth and the disabled.

**youmeas**
Public expenditure on youth measures as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

**Notes:**
1. Only special programmes for youth in transition from school to work are included. Thus they do not cover young people's participation in programmes that are open to adults as well.

**subsemp**
Public subsided employment. Targeted measures to promote or provide employment for unemployed persons and other groups specified as labour market policy priorities (other than youth or the disabled) as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

**Notes:**
2. Italy (2002/03), Luxembourg (1998-2000): Data is included in another category.

**subpriv**
Subsidies to regular employment in the private sector as a percentage of GDP.

**supenter**
Support of unemployed persons starting enterprises as a percentage of GDP.
Missing: see subspriv, except Denmark: 2001/02 and New Zealand: 1985/86.
Source: see subspriv.

jobcrea Direct job creation (public or non-profit) as a percentage of GDP.
Period covered: 1985-2002/03.
Missing: see subspriv.
Source: see subspriv.

measdis Public expenditure on measures of the disabled as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

Notes:
1. Only special programmes for the disabled are included. The category does not cover the total policy effort in support of the disabled.
3. Finland (1980-83), Italy (2002/03), Luxembourg (1998-2000): Data are included in another category.

unemcomp Public unemployment compensation as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

earretir Public expenditure on early retirement for labour market reasons as a percentage of GDP.
Source: see servadmi.

Notes:

15. International Labour Organization

ilo_tot Total number of ILO-conventions ratified (minus conventions denounced) up to the corresponding year, including conditional ratifications.
Missing: none.
16. Demographic data

pop  Total population, in thousands.
     Missing: none.
     Source: SourceOECD. Employment and Labour Market Statistics. Labour force
     (Download: 2008-08-29).

pop15_64  Population 15-64, in thousands.
         Missing: none.
         Source: see pop.

pop65  Population over 65, in thousands.
       Source: SourceOECD. Employment and Labour Market Statistics. Population
       (Download: 2008-08-29).

Notes:

elderly  Population 65 and over as a percentage of population.
        Missing: see pop65.
        Source: see pop65.

Notes:
Appendix

1  Notes concerning the variables gov_right, gov_cent, gov_left:

All entries were calculated on the basis of Schmidt and Beyer (1992), Woldendorp, Keman and Budge (1998), Ismayr (2003), Keesing’s Archive, European Journal of Political Research, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, People in Power (http://www.circa-uk.demon.co.uk/pip.html) and the Parline database (http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp). The classification of parties was done according to Schmidt (cf. Schmidt 1996). If there was no classification by Schmidt, it was done by us according to the assignments below.

‘Left’ denotes social democratic parties and political parties left of social democracy
‘Right’ denotes liberal and conservative parties
‘Center’ denotes center parties, in particular Christian Democratic or Catholic parties.

2  Assignment of governing political parties to left, center, right

Australia
- left  Australian Labour Party (ALP)
- center  -----
- right  Liberal Party (LIB)
          Country National Party (CNT)

Austria
- left  Socialist Party (SPÖ)
        Communist Party (KPÖ)
- center  People’s Party (ÖVP)
- right  Freedom Party (FPÖ)

Belgium
- left  Social Progressive Alternative/SPIRIT (SP.a/SPIRIT) (until 2001: Flemish Socialist Party)
        Communist Party (KPB/PCB)
        Francophone Socialist Party (PS)
        AGALEV
        ECOLO
- center  Christian Democrat & Flemish (CD & V) (until 2001: Christian People’s Party (CVP))
          Democrat Humanist Centre (CDH) (until 2002: Christian Social Party (PSC))
          Francophone Democratic Front (DFD)
          New Flemish Alliance (N-VA) (former: Flemish/People’s Union (VU))
          Democratic Union (DU)
          Wallon Rally (RW)
- right  Liberal Party (LP)
         Flemish Liberals & Democrats (VLD) (former: Party of Liberty and Progress (PVV))
        Reform Movement (MR) (former: Francophone Liberal Reform Party (PRL))

Canada
- left  -------
- center  Liberal Party (LIB)
- right  Progressive Conservative Party (PC)

**Denmark**
- left  Social Democrats (SD)
  Left Socialist Party (LSP)
  Socialist People’s Party (SPP)
  Communist Party (COM)
- center  Centre Democrats (CDM)
  Christian People’s Party (CPP)
- right  Liberals (Venstre) (LIB)
  Conservative People’s Party (Hoyre) (CON)
  Justice Party (JP)
  Radical Party (Social Liberal Party) (RV)

**Finland**
- left  Social Democrats (SDP)
  Finnish People’s Democratic Union (SKDL)
  Social Democratic League (TPSL)
  Left-Wing Alliance (VAS)
  Green League (VIHR)
- center  Centre Party (KESK)
  Liberal People’s Party (LKP)
  Christian League (SKL)
  Finnish Rural Party (SMP)
- right  National Coalition (KOK)
  Swedish People’s Party (SFP/RKP)

**France**
- left  Socialist Party (PS)
  Communist Party (PCF)
  Greens
  Movement for Citizens (MDC)
  Generation Ecology
  Left Radicals (PRG) (formerly Mouvement des radicaux de gauche (MRG) and Radical Socialist Party (RSP))
- center  Centre of Social Democrats (CDS), Democratic Force (FD)
  Popular Republican Movement (MRP)
  Centre of Progress and Modern Democracy (PDM)
  Union for French Democracy (UDF)
  Reformers’ Movement (REF, Reformer’s Movement)
  Republican Party (PR)
- right  Gaullistes (GAUL)
  Centre National des Indépendants (IND)
  Centre Democracy and Progress (CDP)
  Gaullists, Rally for the Republic (RPR) (formerly Union pour la Nouvelle République (UNR) and Union des Démocrates pour la République (UDR), in 2002: Union for a Presidential Majority (UMP))
  Radical Party (RAD)

**Germany**
- left  Social Democrats (SDP)
  Bündnis 90/Die Grünen
- center  Christian Democratic Union (CDU)
Christian Social Union (CSU)
- right
  German Party (DP)
  Free Democrats (FDP)

Greece
- left
  Pan-Hellenic Social Movement (PASOK)
  Communist Party (KKE)
- center
- right
  Political Spring (POLAN)
  New Democracy (ND)
  National Radical Union (ERE)
  Centre Union, Union of the Democratic Centre (EDIK)

Iceland
- left
  Social Democratic Party (SDP)
  People’s Alliance (PA, USP)
- center
  Progressive Party (PP)
  Union of Liberals and Leftists (ULL)
  Regional Equality Platform (REP)
- right
  Independence Party II (IP)
  Citizens’ Party (CP)

Ireland
- left
  Labour Party (LAB)
  Democratic Left (DL)
- center
  Republican Party (Clann na Poblachta) (CNP)
  Fine Gael (FG)
- right
  Party of the Land (Clann na Talmhan) (CNT)
  Progressive Democrats (PD)
  Fianna Fail (FF).

Italy
- left
  Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (PSIU)
  Communist Party (PCI)
  Socialist Party (PSI)
  United Socialist Party (PSU)
  Social Democratic Party (PSDI)
  Greens
  Party of the Democratic Left (PDS)
  The Democrats (DEM)
  Di Pietro List
  Socialists and Radicals (RnP, formerly Rose in the Fist)
- center
  Christian Democratic Party (DC)
  Republican Party (PRI)
  Italian Popular Party (PPI)
  Union of the Centre (UDC)
  Dini List – Italian Renewal (RI)
  Democratic Union (UD)
  Union of Republican Democrats (UDR), since 1999 known as UDEUR (Union of Democrats for Europe)
  Christian Democratic Centre, United Christian Democrats (CCD, CDU)
- right
  Liberal Party (PLI)
  Forza Italia (FI)
  Lombard League, Northern League (LN)
National Alliance (NA)

17.01.95 – 17.05.96: Caretaker government (Prime Minister: Dini)

**Japan**
- left  Social Democratic Party (SDP)
  Japan Communist Party (JCP)
  Democratic Socialist Party (DSP)
  United Democratic Socialists (UDS)
- center  Komei Party, Komeito (CGP)
  (New) Sakigake Party
- right  Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)
  Japan Renewal Party (JRP)
  Japan New Party (JNP)
  New Conservative Party (NCP)
  Liberal Party (LP)

**Luxembourg**
- left  Social Democratic Party (SDP)
  Communist Party (CP)
  Socialist Workers’ Party (LSAP)
- right  Democratic Party (DP).

**The Netherlands**
- left  Labour Party (PvdA)
  Political Party of the Radicals (PPR)
- center  Catholic People’s Party (KVP)
  Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA)
  Democratic Socialists’ 70 (DS’70)
  Democrats’ 66 (D66)
- right  People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD)
  Christian Historical Union (CHU)
  Anti Revolutionary Party (ARP)
  List Pim Fortuyn (LPF)

**New Zealand**
- left  Labour Party (LAB)
  Alliance
  Progressive Coalition
- center  ----- 
- right  National Party (NP)
  New Zealand First. (NZF)
  United Party

**Norway**
- left  Labour Party (DNA, AP)
  Socialist Left (SV), Socialist People’s Party
- center  Centre Party (SP), Farmers’ Party
  Christian People’s Party (KRF, CPP)
- right  Conservatives (Hoyre) (CON, H)
  Liberals (Venstre) (LIB, V)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Socialist Party (PSOE)</td>
<td>Popular Alliance, Popular Party (AP/PP)</td>
<td>Union of the Democratic Centre (UCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Social Democrats (S)</td>
<td>Agrarian Party, Center Party (C)</td>
<td>Conservatives, Moderate Unity Party (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Social Democrats (PSS/SPS)</td>
<td>Christian Democrats (PDC/CVP)</td>
<td>Radical Democrats (PRD/FDP) Swiss People’s Party (UDC/SVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Labour Party (LAB)</td>
<td>Conservative Party (CON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes concerning votes and seats of political parties in national parliaments (lower houses in bicameral systems)

As a general rule we entered data on votes and seats for a party if it reaches at least 2% of votes in an election. If it does not reach that threshold, data for this party will not be entered for this election (neither on votes nor on seats); rather it gets a zero.

For example, the only Liberal Party in country X has 1991: 1.7% (votes), 2.0% (seats); 1994: 2.0% (votes), 1.7% (seats); 1998: 5.0% (votes), 4.5% (seats); 2000: 0.9% (votes), 0.8% (seats). The data entered for the Liberal Party are therefore:

votes: seats:
liberal1 slibera1
1991: 0 1991: 0
1994: 2.0 1994: 1.7
2000: 0 2000: 0

In order to allow for detailed analyses of political make-up of parliaments, parties were classified according to the scheme developed by Lane/McKay/Newton (1997). The national parties in a given family of parties were given consecutive numbers. If, for example, there are three political parties in the socialist spectrum of the party system, they were given the names social1, social2, and social3. The share of votes and seats were entered under these variable names for each party. This structure of the data set allows for various reclassification and aggregations.

According to Lane/McKay/Newton (1997) we differentiate between 11 party families. Since sometimes data on votes or on seats are not available for parties separately due to electoral alliances, we added three party labels for electoral party coalitions (alliance of the left, alliance of the center, and alliance of the right). The maximum number of variables is due to the maximum number of parties within the family which reached at least 2% of votes in an election in at least one country.

The variable ‘others’ contains the percentage of total votes for all minor parties which got less than 2% of total votes each. The variable ‘sothers’ contains the percentage of total seats in parliament for all minor parties which got less than 2% of total votes each. Hence, the variables on votes, and on seats respectively, sum up to 100%.

There are two major problems with these classifications.
(1) The classification is time-invariant. However, some parties changed their programs, goals and clienteles considerably over time. A good example is the Swiss Peoples Party. It started as a party of protestant farmers and small business. Hence it is coded as ‘agrarian’. Due to the decreasing importance of farming in Switzerland, it became more and more an ordinary conservative party over the years. In the 1990s it added some right wing populist elements to its program and in 2008 many conservatives left the party, which is now dominated by right wing populist politicians. In spite of these changes, its code remains ‘agrarian’. Similarly, the British Labour Party is continuously coded ‘socialist’ although it has suffered significant programmatic changes.

(2) The second problem is right-wing populism, which has become an important element of Western party systems but is not accounted for in the classification by Lane, McKay and Newton. Major right wing populist parties are classified differently: as protest parties (e.g. the Danish People’s Party), as ultra-right parties (the French Front National), as ethnic parties (the Italian Lega Nord), as liberal parties (the Austrian Freedom’s Party) or as agrarian party (the Swiss People’s Party). This is due to the initial ideological orientation of these parties.
We recommend that users of the data set carefully consider whether our classifications fit their conceptual perspective and re-classify according to their needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party family</th>
<th>Variable name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>socialist</td>
<td>social1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left-socialist</td>
<td>leftsoc1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communist</td>
<td>comm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agrarian</td>
<td>agrarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>conserv1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td>relig1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>liberal1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultra-right</td>
<td>ultrar1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protest</td>
<td>protest1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green</td>
<td>green1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic</td>
<td>ethnic1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left alliance</td>
<td>leftall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center alliance</td>
<td>centall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right alliance</td>
<td>rightall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is no party for a given variable, ‘0’ is entered. For example, since the UK has no agrarian party, the variable ‘agarian’ has the value ‘0’ in the case of the UK.

The share of votes are entered under the party variable name. The share of seats are entered under the party variable name, preceded by an ‘s’ (for ‘seats’). For example, in the case of Australia under ‘social1’ votes for the Australian Labour Party are entered; the variable ‘ssocial1’ denotes share of seats of the Australian Labour party.

In the following list, the number assigned to a party name indicates the identification number which is given in Mackie and Rose (1991).

Assignments of political parties:

**Australia**
- social1 1) Labour Party (ALP)
- social2 21) Democratic Labour Party
- agrarian 7) Country Party, National Party
- conserv1 18) Australian Liberal Party
- conserv2 --- One Nation
- liberal1 27) Australian Democrats
- liberal2 23) Australia Party
- green1 --- Australian Greens

**Austria**
- social1 1) Socialist Party (SPÖ)
- comm1 5) Communist Party (KPÖ)
- relig1 2) People’s Party (ÖVP)
- liberal1 11) Freedom Party (FPÖ)
- liberal2 17) Liberal Forum
- protest1 12) Democratic Progressive Party
- protest2 --- Alliance for the Future of Austria (BZÖ)
- protest3 --- List Dr Martin – For Democracy, Control and Justice (Martin)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Alternative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belgium</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social 1: Socialist Party (since 1977 split into 30 and 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social 3: Francophone Socialist Party (PS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social 4: Democratic Union for the Respect of Labour (UDRT/RAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communist 1: Communist Party (KPB/PCB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Religious 1: Catholic Party (since 1965 split into 19 and 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Religious 3: Flemish Christian People's Party (CVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 1: Liberal Party (since 1971 split into 21 and 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 2: Flemish Liberals &amp; Democrats (VLD) (former: Flemish Party of Liberty and Progress (PVL))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 4: Vivant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 5: Liberal/Socialist cartels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ultrar 1: National Front (FN-NF) (Francophone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protest 1: ROSSEM/ROSSUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green 1: ECOLO (Francophone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green 2: AGALEV (Flemish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic 1: New Flemish Alliance (N-VA) (former: Flemish/People's Union (VU))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic 2: Francophone Democratic Front (FDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic 3: Walloon Rally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic 4: Flemish Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social 1: CCF, New Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservative 1: (Progressive) Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 1: Liberal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 2: Social Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 3: Ralliement des Créditistes (before 1965 and after 1968 belonging to 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protest 1: Reform Party/Canadian Alliance (joined Conservative Party in 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green 1: Greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic 1: Bloc Québécois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social 1: Social Democrats (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socialist 1: Socialist People's Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socialist 2: Left Socialist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communist 1: Communist Party (DKP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communist 2: Enhedslisten (EL) The Unity List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservative 1: Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservative 2: Independents' Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Religious 1: Christian People's Party (KrF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 1: Radical Party (Social Liberal Party) (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 2: Liberals (Venstre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 3: Justice Party (DRF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liberal 4: Centre Democrats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **liberal5** 17) Liberal Centre
- **protest1** 21) Progress Party (FP)
- **protest2** --- Danish People’s Party (DF, splinter from the Progress Party, see EJPR vol. 36:377)
- **protest3** 22) Common Course

**Finland**
- **social1** 1) Social Democrats (SDP)
- **leftsoc1** 15) Social Democratic League (before 1958 and after 1972 belonging to 1)
- **comm1** 13) Finnish People’s Democratic Union (SKDL)
- **comm2** 22) Democratic Alternative (DEVA)
- **comm3** 23) Left-Wing Alliance (VAS)
- **agrarian** 4) Centre Party (KESK)
- **conserv1** 8) National Coalition (KOK)
- **relig1** 16) Christian Democrats (KD) (until 1999: Christian League (SKL))
- **liberal1** 9) Liberal People’s Party (LKP)
- **liberal2** --- Progressive Finnish Party (NUORS)
- **protest1** 17) True Finns (PS) (until 1995: Finnish Rural Party (SMP))
- **green1** 20) Green League (VIHR)
- **ethnic1** 2) Swedish People’s Party (SFP/RKP)
- **centall** 1983: Electoral Alliance of Centre Party (4) and Liberal Party (9).

**France**
- **social1** 1) Socialist Party (PS)
- **social2** --- Other Left
- **leftsoc1** 19) Unified Socialist Party
- **leftsoc2** --- Extreme/Far Left (Extrême gauche)
- **comm1** 9) Communist Party
- **conserv1** 12) Conservatives/Moderates
- **conserv2** 14) Gaullists, Rally for the Republic (RPR) (in 2002: Union for a Presidential Majority (UMP))
- **conserv3** 20) Republican Party (PR)
- **conserv4** 30) Union for French Democracy (UDF)
- **conserv5** 23) Centre Democracy and Progress (CDP, only in 1973, afterwards belonging to 21)
- **relig1** 13) Popular Republican Movement
- **relig2** 21) Democratic Centre (since 1978 belonging to 30)
- **relig3** 26) Reformers’ Movement (only in 1973, as coalition of 2, 21 and some smaller Parties)
- **liberal1** 2) Radical Socialist Party (RSP)
- **liberal2** 25) Left Radicals (MRG) (see Hix, 1997: 37)
- **ultrar1** 29) National Front
- **green1** 28) Greens
- **green2** 31) Generation Ecology
- **green3** --- Other Ecologists (Autres Ecologistes)
- **leftall** 1967&1968: Electoral Alliance of Socialist Party (1) and Radical Socialist Party (2).

**Germany**
- **social1** 2) Social Democrats (SPD)
- **comm1** --- Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS) (since 2005: Left Party)
- **conserv1** 47) All-German Party (Gesamtdeutsche Partei)
- **conserv2** 41) German Party (DP)
- **relig1** 36) Christian Democratic Union (CDU)
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- relig2  37) Christian Social Union (CSU)
- liberal1  38) Free Democrats (FDP)
- ultrar1  49) National Democratic Party (NDP)
- ultrar2  57) Republicans
- green1  51) Greens/Alliance 90
- ethnic1  45) Refugee Party (GB/BHE)

1990 onwards: Data for unified Germany

Greece
- social1  37) Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK)
- social2  --- Democratic Social Movement
- comm1  4) Communist Party (KKE)
- comm2  25) United Democratic Left (EDA)
- comm3  47) Coalition of Left and Progress
- comm4  35) Communist Party of the Interior (KKEes)
- conserv1  29) National Radical Union (ERE)
- conserv2  31) Progressives (KP)
- conserv3  36) New Democracy (ND)
- conserv4  50) Political Spring (POLAN)
- conserv5  30) Popular Social Party (LKK)
- liberal1  32) Centre Union, Union of the Democratic Centre (EDIK)
- liberal2  1) Liberal Party (KF)
- liberal3  24) Farmers’ and Workers’ Rally (SAE)
- ultrar1  38) National Alignment, National Front (EM)
- ultrar2  --- Popular Orthodox Rally (LAOS)

No data are entered for the period 1967-1973 (dictatorship).

Iceland
- social1  7) Social Democrats (SDP)
- social2  22) Social Democratic Federation
- social3  --- People’s Movement (PM)
- leftsoc1  36) The (Social Democratic) Alliance (SDA), United Left (since 1999)
- leftsoc2  17) National Preservation Party
- comm1  37) Left-Greens (until 1999: People’s Alliance (PA))
- agrarian  8) Progressive Party (PP)
- conserv1  13) Independence Party II (IP)
- liberal1  20) Union of Liberals and Leftists (ULL)
- protest1  24) Citizens’ Party II
- protest2  38) Liberal Party (LP)
- green1  23) Women’s Alliance (WA)

1999: The People’s Alliance (14), the Social Democrats (7) and the Women’s Alliance (23) formed up the United Left and were assigned to the category leftsoc1. A breakaway group from the People’s Alliance (14) remains in the category comm1 as the Left-Green Party (EJPR 2000, vol. 38).

Ireland
- social1  8) Irish Labour Party
- leftsoc1  19) Workers’ Party
- leftsoc2  --- Democratic Left (joined Labour Party in 2002)
- relig1  14) Fine Gael
- liberal1  10) Fianna Fail
- liberal2  15) Party of the Land (Clann na Talmhan)
- green1  24) Green Party
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Italy
- ethnic1 6) Sinn Féin II, Sinn Féin III from 1982 onwards
- ethnic2 25) Progressive Democrats
- ethnic3 20) National H-Block Committee

- social1 3) Socialist Party (PSI) (in 2001: New PSI)
- social2 31) United Socialist Party (PSU/only in 1968, as coalition of 3 and 23)
- social3 23) Social Democratic Party (PSDI)
- leftsoc1 30) Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (PSIUP/ after 1972 belonging to 11)
- leftsoc2 --- Party of the Democratic Left (PDS) (reformist wing of the disbanded PCI (1991))
- comm1 11) Communist Party (PCI)
- comm2 50) Communist Refoundation (RC) (left wing of the disbanded PCI (1991))
- conserv1 61) Forza Italia
- conserv2 20) Monarchist Party
- conserv3 27) Popular Monarchist Party
- relig1 17) Christian Democratic Party (DC), (since 1994: Italian Popular Party (PPI))
- relig2 --- Segni Pact (Patto Segni)
- relig3 --- Christian Democratic Centre (CCD)/United Christian Democrats (CDU) (conservative wing of the former DC (since 1994))
- relig4 --- European Democracy (DE)
- liberal1 19) Liberal Party (PLI)
- liberal2 4) Republican Party (PRI)
- liberal3 34) Radical Party (PR)
- liberal4 --- Dini List – Italian Renewal
- liberal5 --- Di Pietro List
- ultra1 24) National Alliance (AN) (formerly Social Movement (MSI-DN))
- protest1 --- Pannella List Reformers
- green1 45) Greens (formerly Green Federation)
- ethnic1 42) Northern League (formerly Lombard League)
- leftall 2001: Sunflower (Greens and Social Democrats (PSDI)
2006: The Olive Tree (Democrats of the Left (DS), Margherita – Daisy (DI) and Rose in the Fist (Radical Party (RP) and Italian Social Democrats (SDI))
- centall 2001: La Margherita (PPI, the Democrats, Italian Renewal, UDEUR)

1994: Introduction of a new electoral system. 474 MPs of 630 are elected on the basis of a “single-ballot first-past-the-post system”, the remaining 156 seats are distributed on the basis of a “proportional formula” (EJPR 1995: 398). Data on votes refer to the (proportional) list votes, data on seats refer to the total of seats gained by the party (proportional plus plurality system). However, by the end of the year 2005, a party-list proportional representation system was re-introduced.

2006: The left alliance Olive Tree accounts for 31.3% and the minor alliance Rose in the Fist for 2.6% of the total votes. 34.9% of seats can be allocated to Olive Tree and additional 2.9% to Rose in the Fist.

Japan
- social1 35) Social Democratic Party (Socialist Party) (SDP)
- social2 44) Democratic Socialist Party (DSP)
- social3 --- Democratic Party of Japan (DP)
- comm1 31) Japanese Communist Party (JCP)
- conserv1 43) Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)
- conserv2 48) Japan Renewal Party (Shinseitō) (JRP)
- conserv3 49) Japan New Party (JNP)
## Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- conserv5</td>
<td>--- (New) Sakigake Party (Splinter from LDP, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig1</td>
<td>45) Komei Party, Komeito (Clean Government Party) (CGP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig2</td>
<td>1) Christian Social Party (PCS/CSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig3</td>
<td>2) Socialist Workers' Party (LSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig4</td>
<td>19) Social Democratic Party (SDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig5</td>
<td>21) Independent Socialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig6</td>
<td>7) Communist Party (KPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig7</td>
<td>1) Anti Revolutionary Party (ARP) (in 1998: Reformed Political Federation (RPF), a splinter from the ARP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig8</td>
<td>2) Catholic People's Party (KVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig9</td>
<td>6) Christian Historical Union (CHU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig10</td>
<td>32) Radical Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig12</td>
<td>--- Christian Union (merger of RPF and Reformed Political Union in 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig13</td>
<td>14) Political Reformed Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig14</td>
<td>24) People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (Liberal Party) (VVD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig15</td>
<td>29) Democrats' 66 (D66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig16</td>
<td>--- Centre Democrats (CD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig17</td>
<td>28) People's Party of the Right (formerly Farmers' Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig18</td>
<td>42) United Old Persons' League, General Association of Elderly People (AOV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Luxembourg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- social1</td>
<td>2) Socialist Workers' Party (LSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social2</td>
<td>19) Social Democratic Party (SDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social3</td>
<td>21) Independent Socialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- comm1</td>
<td>7) Communist Party (KPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig1</td>
<td>1) Christian Social Party (PCS/CSV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig2</td>
<td>16) Democratic Party (Liberal Party) (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig3</td>
<td>18) Independent Movement (after 1968 split into two factions, one belonging to 1 and the other to 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig4</td>
<td>20) Enrôlés de force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig5</td>
<td>24) Action Committee for Democracy and Pensions' Right (Pensions Action) (ADR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig6</td>
<td>27) Luxembourg for the Luxembourgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- green1</td>
<td>23) Green Alternative (GAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- green2</td>
<td>26) Green Left (GLEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- green3</td>
<td>28) Green Party (GLEI-GAP) (a merger of 23 and 26 in 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- social1</td>
<td>23) Labour Party (PvdA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social2</td>
<td>30) Democratic Socialists' 70 (before 1971 belonging to 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- leftsoc1</td>
<td>27) Pacifist Socialist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- leftsoc2</td>
<td>38) Socialist Party (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- comm1</td>
<td>10) Communist Party (CPN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig1</td>
<td>1) Anti Revolutionary Party (ARP) (in 1998: Reformed Political Federation (RPF), a splinter from the ARP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig2</td>
<td>2) Catholic People's Party (KVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig3</td>
<td>6) Christian Historical Union (CHU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig4</td>
<td>32) Radical Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig5</td>
<td>34) Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) (merger of ARP, KVP, and CHU in 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig6</td>
<td>--- Christian Union (merger of RPF and Reformed Political Union in 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relig7</td>
<td>14) Political Reformed Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- liberal1</td>
<td>24) People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (Liberal Party) (VVD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- liberal2</td>
<td>29) Democrats' 66 (D66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ultrar1</td>
<td>--- Centre Democrats (CD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protest1</td>
<td>28) People's Party of the Right (formerly Farmers' Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protest2</td>
<td>42) United Old Persons' League, General Association of Elderly People (AOV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- protest3 --- List Pim Fortuyn (LPF)
- protest4 --- Freedom Party/Group Wilders (PVV)
- green1 38) Green Left (merger of 10, 27, 32 and Evangelical People’s Party in 1989)

New Zealand
- social1 3) Labour Party
- social2 18) New Labour Party
- social3 20) Alliance (Merger of 11, 17, 18, and two minor parties in 1993)
- comm1 12) Socialist Unity Party (between 1972 and 1984, as a formation of the Communist Party)
- conserv1 9) National Party
- conserv2 --- United Future New Zealand
- relig1 15) New Zealand Party
- relig2 16) Christian Heritage
- liberal1 11) Social Credit Party, Democratic Party
- liberal2 --- Association of Consumers and Taxpayers (ACT)
- protest1 21) New Zealand First
- green1 13) Values Party
- green2 17) Green Party (Aotearoa) (was part of Alliance, 20, from 1991 until 1998)
- ethnic1 --- Maori Party

1996: Introduction of the Mixed Proportional System (MMP). Voters have two votes: one for the preferred party and one for the preferred candidate (EJPR 1997: 452). Data on votes refer to the percentages of ‘party votes’.

Norway
- social1 4) Labour Party (DNA)
- leftsoc1 14) Socialist Left (SV), Socialist People’s Party
- comm1 9) Communist Party
- agrarian 7) Centre Party (SP), Farmers’ Party
- conserv1 2) Conservatives (Hoyre) (H)
- relig1 10) Christian People’s Party (KRF)
- liberal1 1) Liberals (Venstre) (V)
- liberal2 16) Liberal People’s Party, New People’s Party
- protest1 15) Progress Party (FRP) (formerly Anders Lange’s Party)

Portugal
- social1 4) Socialist Party (PS)
- leftsoc1 7) Popular Democratic Union (UDP)
- leftsoc2 --- Block of the Left (B.E.) (Merger of Popular Democratic Union (7), Socialist Revolutionary Party and Poltica XXI in 1999)
- comm1 5) Democratic Movement
- conserv1 8) Popular Monarchist Party (PPM)
- relig1 1) Centre Social Democrats, Popular Party (CDS-PP)
- liberal1 3) Social Democrats, Popular Democrats (PPD/PSD)
- liberal2 17) Democratic Renewal Party (PRD)
- green1 16) Greens
Spain
- social1 1) Socialist Party (PSOE)
- social2 32) Popular Socialist Party (only in 1977, afterwards being part of 1)
- comm1 2) Communist Party, United Left (PCE/PSUC/IU)
- conserv1 28) Union of the Democratic Centre (UCD)
- conserv2 29) Popular Alliance, Popular Party (AP/PP)
- conserv3 50) Democratic and Social Centre (CDS)
- ultrar1 45) National Union (formed in January 1979 by the leader of Fuerza Nueva. The National Union also included Falange Espanola, the Alianza Nacional and other neo-fascist groups)
- ethnic1 44) Convergence and Unity (CiU)
- ethnic2 -- Catalanian Left Republicans (ERC)
- ethnic3 39/40) Coalition of Democratic Convergence of Catalonia and Democratic Left of Catalonia in 1977
- centall 1982: Electoral Alliance of Popular Alliance (29) and Popular Democratic Party.

Sweden
- social1 5) Social Democrats (S)
- comm1 10) Communist Party, Left Party (V)
- agrarian 7) Agrarian Party, Center Party (C)
- conserv1 6) Conservatives, Moderate Unity Party (M)
- relig1 20) Christian Democratic Union (KDS)
- liberal1 18) People’s Party (The Liberals) (FP)
- protest1 24) New Democracy (NYD)
- protest2 --- Sweden Democrats (SD)
- green1 23) Ecology/Green Party (MP)

Switzerland
- social1 5) Social Democrats (PSS/SPS)
- leftsoc1 18) Progressive Organisations (POCH)
- comm1 9) Communist Party (PdA)
- agrarian 6) Swiss People’s Party (UDC/SVP)
- relig1 1) Christian Democrats (PDC/CVP)
- relig2 8) Protestant People’s Party (EVP)
- liberal1 4) Radical Democrats (PRD/FDP)
- liberal2 12) Independents’ Party (LDU)
- liberal3 3) Liberal Party (PLS/LPS)
- protest1 14) National Action, Swiss Democrats (SD)
- protest2 16) Republican Movement
- protest3 22) Swiss Motorists (AP), Freedom Party
- green1 19) Greens (GPS)
- green2 20) Green Alliance (GBS), Alternative Greens (DACH)

United Kingdom
- social1 6) Labour Party
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook: Comparative Political Data Set I, 1960-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- conserv1 1) Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- liberal1 2) Liberal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- liberal2 21/22) Alliance Parties, Social Liberal Democrats, Liberal Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protest1 --- UK Independence Party (UKIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ethnic1 11) Scottish National Party (SNP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USA (House of Representatives)**
- conserv1 8) Republican Party
- liberal1 1) Democratic Party
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