

Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) Technical Report

Reference Number: CSES-2010-001

Electoral Turnouts Reported in Modules 1 and 2

Prepared by:
Sebastian Netscher
GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences
sebastian.netscher@gesis.org

Version:
October 24, 2010

CSES website: <http://www.cses.org>
CSES Secretariat: cses@umich.edu

Abstract

This technical report focuses on national turnouts included in the first two modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES). The CSES Secretariat has investigated how to improve variables A5010 and B5006, specifically. To achieve this, this paper compares differences in the values published by the CSES to several external sources. Furthermore, multiple ways of turnout computation are used to explain the reported differences, concluding with several proposals on how to improve the published data.

Contents

1. <i>An overall comparison of turnouts</i>	3
2. <i>Electoral turnouts above the one percentage-point threshold</i>	6
3. <i>Countries of problematic turnout values</i>	9
4. <i>Expedient corrections of CSES data</i>	15
References	18
<i>Appendix: Additional codebook remarks and syntax files</i>	20

This technical report summarizes some general findings about the national turnout statistics included in variables A5010 and B5006 for the first two modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES). The CSES Secretariat has evaluated the degree to which it will be necessary to correct the overall national turnouts. This is because external sources may change official turnout accounts following an election. Such changes may be the result of later revisions of data through the official electoral commissions, national courts, or tribunals, due to irregularities in the election campaign, at the ballot boxes or in the process of vote counting.

In contrast, data published by the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems are a snapshot of the official election results at a specific point in time. Information provided by external sources is then fixed for the CSES data. Consequently, later changes are not included, and data might differ compared to the official national election reports published over the years. In general such variations are small and it is not in line with the philosophy of CSES to correct the data frequently according to such minor changes. However, in some cases sizable differences occurred.

In order to deal with such variations, this report focuses in the first section on a short overview of the turnout included in the data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, and compares them with two external sources, namely:

- *the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA)*, and
- *the Parline Database on National Parliaments of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)*.

As a result of this first part, a few countries differ considerably in their turnout values. As a result, the second section of the report examines all those countries, in which the variation between the CSES and the two external sources is above a one percentage-point threshold. For a more detailed examination of problematic data, *Psephos Adam Carr's Election Archive (Psephos)* is used as an additional external source. Furthermore, the calculation of turnout varies. In contrast to the first section, where the reported statistics are based on the registered electorate and the total amount of votes, irrespective of its validity, the second part takes valid votes as well as the total amount of population in voting age into account.

Finally, a few countries remain where the turnout differences could not be explained by modifying the calculations. Consequently, the third section focuses on those elections again, using country specific reports to clarify the underlying problems. Therefore, two primary sources are used:

- the national electoral commissions' reports from the countries and elections of interest, and
- reports on election observation by different organisations, e.g. the *Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)* or the *International Foundation of Electoral Systems (IFES)*.

Additionally, the third part refers to some of the presidential elections included in the CSES data. Mostly, such events are two round elections. In cases where a majority for one candidate is not reached after the first vote, turnout rates are available for both electoral rounds and might vary.

The concluding part of this paper summarizes the major findings and offers proposals on how to deal with data of those elections with strong variations. Appended to the report, additional remarks for the CSES codebook, as well as syntax-files for SPSS and STATA are included to correct the published turnout variables.

Some preliminary comments about the CSES data and the participating countries in each of the modules are necessary: First, each of the datasets include one case of a repeated country study for the same election. This concerns Belgium (1999) in the first, and Germany (2002) in the second module, where the double inclusions are both due to split sampling processes of regions or because

of change in methods of interviewing. Naturally the nationwide turnouts are equal within both studies of each country. Consequently, the following discussion and tables include Belgium (1999) and Germany (2002) only once. Second, Portugal implemented data in both modules for the same parliamentary election of 2002. However, where the tables below are separated by the modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, this country is always listed twice.

1. An overall comparison of turnouts

Tables 1.a and 1.b below give an overview of turnout comparison for the CSES, IDEA, and IPU, categorized by the two modules. Besides the national turnout statistics, the year of the corresponding election as well as its type is included in columns two and three of the charts. The last three columns reflect the absolute differences between the statistics of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems and the two external sources, as well as the one between IDEA and IPU. The values reported by the external sources are based on the registered voters and the total amount of ballot cast, irrespectively of its validity.

For the Hong Kong elections no external data are available, neither at IDEA nor at IPU. The special case of Hong Kong will be discussed in detail in the third part of this paper. Furthermore, IPU misses information on a number of specific elections. This is in general true for all presidential polls, which are by self-definition of the Parline-Project not part of its database.

Most of the calculated differences in the tables are below a one percentage-point threshold, at least in comparison with one of the two external resources. However, especially in the first CSES module not even half of the national turnouts (16 out of 38 election studies) are within the given limit. Out of those countries in line with the defined threshold, eight elections show a difference of less than one percentage-point compared to IDEA as well as to IPU. Another seven turnout values are at least relatively similar to the statistics provided by IDEA. Additionally, the variation for the Portuguese election of 2002, published by IPU, is below a one percentage-point limit. Finally, turnout statistics for Belarus (2001), as well as Thailand (2001) are not included in the CSES data, yet. These two elections are not discussed any further in the following two sections, but are taken into account in the concluding part of the report.

In contrast, besides the two studies of Hong Kong (1998 and 2000), values of 18 national electoral turnouts are above the one percentage-point threshold and will be examined in more detail in the second section. In total, further explanations are needed for the differences in the turnouts of Australia (1996), Canada (1997), Denmark (1998), Great Britain (1997), Hungary (1998), Israel (1996), Lithuania (1997), Mexico (1997), New Zealand (1996), Norway (1997), Peru (2001), Romania (1996), Slovenia (1996), Spain (1996 and 2000), Taiwan (1996), Ukraine (1998), and the USA (1996).

In the second module the frequency of relatively similar turnout rates is higher. All in all, 34 out of 40 national statistics are in line with the one percentage-point threshold, compared to the external sources. For 21 of the elections below the limit, IDEA and IPU report turnout values similar to those of the CSES data. In contrast, for Australia (2004), Chile (2005), Norway (2001), and Spain (2004), as well as for six of the presidential elections, the limit is only kept by IDEA, while the variations to IPU are bigger than one percent. Furthermore, the difference of the statistics for the Norwegian election of 2001, when consulting the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems and IPU, is exactly at the limit of the one percentage-point threshold. Turnout values published by IDEA for

Table 1.a: Comparison of turnout for CSES Module 1

Country	Year	Type	Turnout			Differences		
			CSES	IDEA	IPU	CSES-IDEA	CSES-IPU	IDEA-IPU
Australia	1996	Parliament	0.8250	0.9583	0.9647	0.1333	0.1397	0.0064
Belgium	1999	Parliament	0.9050	0.9058	0.9058	0.0008	0.0008	0.0000
Belarus	2001	President	-	0.8386	-	-	-	-
Canada	1997	Parliament	0.5620	0.6700	0.6874	0.1080	0.1254	0.0174
Chile	1999	President	0.9050	0.9063	-	0.0013	-	-
Czech Republic	1996	Parliament	0.7670	0.7629	0.7641	0.0041	0.0029	0.0011
Denmark	1998	Parliament	0.8310	0.8595	0.8595	0.0285	0.0285	0.0000
Germany	1998	Parliament	0.8220	0.8220	0.8220	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Great Britain	1997	Parliament	0.5940	0.7146	0.7160	0.1206	0.1220	0.0014
Hong Kong	1998	Parliament	0.5320	-	-	-	-	-
Hong Kong	2000	Parliament	0.4350	-	-	-	-	-
Hungary	1998	Parliament	0.5990	0.5669	0.5626	0.0321	0.0364	0.0042
Iceland	1999	Parliament	0.8470	0.8407	0.8407	0.0063	0.0063	0.0000
Israel	1996	Parliament	0.8470	0.7932	0.7932	0.0538	0.0538	0.0000
Japan	1996	Parliament	0.5980	0.5900	-	0.0080	-	-
Lithuania	1997	President	0.5000	0.7366	-	0.2366	-	-
Mexico	1997	Parliament	0.5440	0.5769	0.5673	0.0329	0.0233	0.0096
Mexico	2000	President	0.6390	0.6396	-	0.0006	-	-
Netherlands	1998	Parliament	0.7300	0.7323	-	0.0023	-	-
New Zealand	1996	Parliament	0.8300	0.8828	0.8828	0.0528	0.0528	0.0000
Norway	1997	Parliament	0.7680	0.7833	0.7803	0.0153	0.0123	0.0030
Peru	2000	Parliament	0.8280	0.8198	0.7955	0.0082	0.0325	0.0243
Peru	2001	Parliament	0.6320	0.8137	0.8039	0.1817	0.1719	0.0098
Poland	1997	Parliament	0.4880	0.4793	0.4793	0.0087	0.0087	0.0000
Portugal	2002	Parliament	0.6160	0.6284	0.6234	0.0124	0.0074	0.0050
Romania	1996	Parliament	0.7820	0.7601	0.7601	0.0219	0.0219	0.0000
Russia	1999	Parliament	0.6180	0.6233	0.6233	0.0053	0.0053	0.0000
Russia	2000	President	0.6870	0.6864	-	0.0006	-	-
Slovenia	1996	Parliament	0.7550	0.7367	0.7367	0.0183	0.0183	0.0000
South Korea	2000	Parliament	0.5720	0.5721	-	0.0001	-	-
Spain	1996	Parliament	0.8060	0.7806	0.7747	0.0254	0.0313	0.0059
Spain	2000	Parliament	0.7730	0.6871	0.7063	0.0859	0.0667	0.0192
Sweden	1998	Parliament	0.8140	0.8139	0.8139	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
Switzerland	1999	Parliament	0.4340	0.4322	0.4333	0.0018	0.0007	0.0011
Thailand	2001	Parliament	-	0.6995	0.6995	0.6995	0.6995	0.0000
Taiwan	1996	Parliament	0.7510	0.7621	-	0.0111	-	-
Ukraine	1998	Parliament	0.6810	0.7065	-	0.0255	-	-
USA	1996	Parliament	0.4900	0.6597	-	0.1697	-	-

Table 1.b: Comparison of turnout for CSES Module 2

Country	Year	Type	Turnout			Differences		
			CSES	IDEA	IPU	CSES-IDEA	CSES-IPU	IDEA-IPU
Albania	2005	Parliament	0.4923	0.4923	0.4923	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Australia	2004	Parliament	0.9482	0.9432	0.9241	0.0050	0.0241	0.0192
Belgium	2003	Parliament	0.9190	0.9160	0.9163	0.0030	0.0027	0.0003
Brazil	2002	President	0.8230	0.7953	-	0.0277	-	-
Bulgaria	2001	Parliament	0.6677	0.6663	0.6731	0.0014	0.0054	0.0068
Canada	2004	Parliament	0.6090	0.6091	0.6091	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
Chile	2005	Parliament	0.8767	0.8767	0.8656	0.0000	0.0111	0.0112
Czech Republic	2002	Parliament	0.5800	0.5795	0.5795	0.0005	0.0005	0.0000
Denmark	2001	Parliament	0.8710	0.8715	0.8708	0.0005	0.0002	0.0007
Finland	2003	Parliament	0.6970	0.6671	0.6967	0.0299	0.0003	0.0296
France	2002	President	0.7161	0.7971	-	0.0810	-	-
Germany	2002	Parliament	0.7910	0.7908	0.7908	0.0002	0.0002	0.0000
Great Britain	2005	Parliament	0.6130	0.6136	0.6179	0.0006	0.0049	0.0043
Hong Kong	2004	Parliament	0.5564	-	-	-	-	-
Hungary	2002	Parliament	0.7053	0.7351	0.7052	0.0298	0.0001	0.0299
Iceland	2003	Parliament	0.8770	0.8770	0.8774	0.0000	0.0004	0.0004
Ireland	2002	Parliament	0.6257	0.6257	0.6257	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Israel	2003	Parliament	0.6781	0.6781	0.6781	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Italy	2006	Parliament	0.8360	0.8362	0.8362	0.0002	0.0002	0.0000
Japan	2004	Upper House	0.5664	0.5654	0.5654	0.0010	0.0010	0.0000
Kyrgyzstan	2005	President	0.7812	0.7497	-	0.0315	-	-
Mexico	2003	Parliament	0.4168	0.4168	0.4168	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Netherlands	2002	Parliament	0.7910	0.7906	-	0.0004	-	-
New Zealand	2002	Parliament	0.7700	0.7698	0.7698	0.0002	0.0002	0.0000
Norway	2001	Parliament	0.7550	0.7548	0.7450	0.0002	0.0100	0.0098
Peru	2006	Parliament	0.8871	0.8866	0.8866	0.0005	0.0005	0.0000
Philippines	2004	President	0.7710	0.8410	-	0.0700	-	-
Poland	2001	Parliament	0.4629	0.4618	0.4629	0.0011	0.0000	0.0011
Portugal	2002	Parliament	0.6148	0.6284	0.6234	0.0136	0.0086	0.0050
Portugal	2005	Parliament	0.6426	0.6426	0.6426	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Romania	2004	Parliament	0.5850	0.5851	-	0.0001	-	-
Russia	2004	President	0.6439	0.6439	-	0.0000	-	-
Slovenia	2004	Parliament	0.6065	0.6064	0.6064	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
South Korea	2004	Parliament	0.5990	0.5998	-	0.0008	-	-
Spain	2004	Parliament	0.7566	0.7566	0.7721	0.0000	0.0155	0.0156
Sweden	2002	Parliament	0.8011	0.8011	0.8011	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Switzerland	2003	Parliament	0.4540	0.4522	0.4522	0.0018	0.0018	0.0000
Taiwan	2001	Parliament	0.6616	0.6616	-	0.0000	-	-
Taiwan	2004	President	0.8028	0.8028	-	0.0000	-	-
USA	2004	Parliament	0.5620	0.6875	0.6875	0.1255	0.1255	0.0000

Finland (2003), Hungary (2002) and for Portugal (2002) are above the defined limit, while the statistics of IPU are similar to the one of the CSES. However, for five elections, namely Brazil (2002), France (2002), Kyrgyzstan (2005), Philippines (2004), and the USA (2004), neither the differences between reported turnouts in comparison to IDEA nor to IPU values are within the threshold. The remaining case, mentioned at the beginning of this section already, is Hong Kong (2004).

To summarize, taken both modules together, the data of national statistics reported by the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems are below the limit of one percentage-point for 50 out of 77 election studies (counting Portugal 2002 only once), at least in comparison with one of the two external sources. Those studies do not need to be discussed any further in the following sections. Same is true for the elections of Hong Kong (1998, 2000, and 2004), Belarus (2001), and Thailand (2001), which will be reviewed in the third and fourth part. In contrast, for 22 national turnout values the variations are bigger than the one percentage-point limit and will thus be examined in more detail in the following.

2. Electoral turnouts above the one percentage-point threshold

This second part will have a closer look at the differences in turnout statistics from 22 national elections remaining unexplained in the former section. The following paragraphs are structured as follows: First, the elections with problematic national turnouts are compared with a third external source, namely *Psephos Adam Carr's Election Archive* (Psephos). Next, the calculation of the turnout is modified, taking the amount of valid votes in contrast to the absolute amount of votes into account. Finally, the quotient of computation is changed, using the total amount of national population of voting age instead of the registered electorate.

The turnout statistics given by Psephos are additionally included in Table 2.a. Obviously, it allows calculating electoral turnouts only for a handful of the problematic studies. However, it decreases variations for at least two of the turnout values in the second module of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, namely for Brazil (2002) and for France (2002). In the later case the difference of about 8.1 percentage-points in comparison to the statistics of IDEA is quite high. Consequently, there is a need to go back to this election in the third section, to give some further explanations.

Table 2.b compares the turnout values of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems with the amount of valid votes reported by IDEA and IPU. It is important to notice that the use of valid votes instead of the total amount, irrespectively of its validity, might be inaccurate. In the context of research on electoral systems, dropping invalid votes from the turnout might bias the results of comparison. This is especially true if invalid votes could not be separated by those ballots filled out incorrectly, and those which are protest ballots indeed. Furthermore, the amount of invalid ballots might vary immensely between countries as well as between elections. For an illustration, the Peruvian elections of 2006 might be a good example: According to IDEA more than a quarter of the vote cast for the parliamentary election (26.5%) had been invalid. In comparison, the amount of invalid votes in the presidential election, held at the same day, has been quite low, by about 7.4%.

However, using only the amount of valid ballots instead of the total vote cast, decreases the differences between the data of the CSES and the two external sources for several countries of the first module. The differences in the turnout statistics for the Mexican election of 1997 is reduced below the one percentage-points threshold according to both external sources. Moreover, the

Table 2.a: Comparison of turnout with Psephos Adam Carr's Election Archive

Module 1									
Country	Year	Type	Turnout				Differences		
			CSES	IDEA	IPU	Psephos	CSES- Psephos	IDEA- Psephos	IPU- Psephos
Australia	1996	Parliament	0.8250	0.9583	0.9647	0.9577	0.1327	0.0006	0.0070
Canada	1997	Parliament	0.5620	0.6700	0.6874	-	-	-	-
Denmark	1998	Parliament	0.8310	0.8595	0.8595	-	-	-	-
Great Britain	1997	Parliament	0.5940	0.7146	0.7160	0.7146	0.1206	0.0000	0.0014
Hungary	1998	Parliament	0.5990	0.5669	0.5626	0.5648	0.0342	0.0020	0.0022
Israel	1996	Parliament	0.8470	0.7932	0.7932	-	-	-	-
Lithuania	1997	President	0.5000	0.7366	-	0.7145	0.2145	0.0221	-
Mexico	1997	Parliament	0.5440	0.5769	0.5673	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	1996	Parliament	0.8300	0.8828	0.8828	-	-	-	-
Norway	1997	Parliament	0.7680	0.7833	0.7803	-	-	-	-
Peru	2001	Parliament	0.6320	0.8137	0.8039	-	-	-	-
Romania	1996	Parliament	0.7820	0.7601	0.7601	-	-	-	-
Slovenia	1996	Parliament	0.7550	0.7367	0.7367	-	-	-	-
Spain	1996	Parliament	0.8060	0.7806	0.7747	-	-	-	-
Spain	2000	Parliament	0.7730	0.6871	0.7063	0.6998	0.0732	0.0127	0.0065
Taiwan	1996	Parliament	0.7510	0.7621	-	-	-	-	-
Ukraine	1998	Parliament	0.6810	0.7065	-	-	-	-	-
USA	1996	Parliament	0.4900	0.6597	-	-	-	-	-
Module 2									
Brazil	2002	President	0.8230	0.7953	-	0.8230	0.0000	0.0277	-
France	2002	President	0.7161	0.7971	-	0.7160	0.0001	0.0811	-
Kyrgyzstan	2005	President	0.7812	0.7497	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	2004	President	0.7710	0.8410	-	-	-	-	-
USA	2004	Parliament	0.5620	0.6875	0.6875	-	-	-	-

variations between the CSES values and those published by IPU decrease below the limit for Norway (1997) and Peru (2001). Same is true for Spain (2000) and the presidential election of the Ukraine (1998), in comparison with the IDEA database.

As a final step of this section, the report turns away from using the total amount of registered voters as a quotient for the calculations. In contrast, computed statistics are based on the voting age population. This quotient could be even more criticized than the use of valid votes, as discussed before. In most of the participating countries of the CSES, registration is obligatory to cast a vote. If only a fair proportion of citizens register themselves for the poll, research on the base of the voting age population might be heavily biased. This is also true as long as other lawful reasons might cause differences between the two groups, e.g. in Ireland, where the right to vote is denied for undischarged bankrupts.

Table 2.b: Comparison of turnout based on the valid votes

Module 1								
Country	Year	Type	Turnout			Differences		
			CSES	IDEA	IPU	CSES-IDEA	CSES-IPU	IDEA-IPU
Australia	1996	Parliament	0.8250	0.8912	0.9338	0.0662	0.1088	0.0426
Canada	1997	Parliament	0.5620	0.6700	0.6776	0.1080	0.1156	0.0076
Denmark	1998	Parliament	0.8310	0.8515	0.8530	0.0205	0.0220	0.0015
Great Britain	1997	Parliament	0.5940	0.7126	0.7146	0.1186	0.1206	0.0020
Hungary	1998	Parliament	0.5990	0.5669	-	0.0321	-	-
Israel	1996	Parliament	0.8470	0.7712	0.7760	0.0758	0.0710	0.0048
Lithuania	1997	President	0.5000	0.7286	-	0.2286	-	-
Mexico	1997	Parliament	0.5440	0.5444	0.5512	0.0004	0.0072	0.0068
New Zealand	1996	Parliament	0.8300	0.8788	0.8568	0.0488	0.0268	0.0220
Norway	1997	Parliament	0.7680	0.7783	0.7767	0.0103	0.0087	0.0016
Peru	2001	Parliament	0.6320	0.7234	0.6320	0.0914	0.0000	0.0914
Romania	1996	Parliament	0.7820	0.6951	0.7108	0.0869	0.0712	0.0157
Slovenia	1996	Parliament	0.7550	0.6777	0.6933	0.0773	0.0617	0.0156
Spain	1996	Parliament	0.8060	0.6801	0.7709	0.1259	0.0351	0.0908
Spain	2000	Parliament	0.7730	0.7656	0.6904	0.0074	0.0826	0.0752
Taiwan	1996	Parliament	0.7510	0.7301	-	0.0209	-	-
Ukraine	1998	Parliament	0.6810	0.6755	-	0.0055	-	-
USA	1996	Parliament	0.4900	0.6597	-	0.1697	-	-
Module 2								
Kyrgyzstan	2005	President	0.7812	0.7407	-	0.0405	-	-
Philippines	2004	President	0.7710	0.8410	-	0.0700	-	-
USA	2004	Parliament	0.5620	0.6875	-	0.1255	-	-

Table 2.c gives an overview of the turnouts based on the voting age population. As an external source, IDEA is used exclusively, due to the fact that this is the only database providing necessary information for computation. The table includes not only the newly calculated turnouts but also the one based on the percentage of registered voters, as well as the corresponding differences. Obviously, most of the remaining variations could be explained by using the total amount of citizens in voting age. All in all, for 12 out of 17 elections, differences between the CSES and IDEA decrease below the one percentage-points threshold. In contrast, five country turnouts remain above the defined limit. The following third section of this report focuses on these countries, namely Great Britain (1997), Lithuania (1997), Kyrgyzstan (2005), and the Philippines (2004).

Table 2.c: Comparison of turnouts based on population of voting age

Module 1								
Country	Year	Type	IDEA			difference CSES to		Diff. of Reg. to Voting Age
			CSES	Reg. Voters	Voting Age	Reg. Voters	Voting Age	
Australia	1996	Parliament	0.8250	0.9583	0.8237	0.1333	0.0013	0.1346
Canada	1997	Parliament	0.5620	0.6700	0.5706	0.1080	0.0086	0.0994
Denmark	1998	Parliament	0.8310	0.8595	0.8313	0.0285	0.0003	0.0282
Great Britain	1997	Parliament	0.5940	0.7146	0.6939	0.1206	0.0999	0.0207
Hungary	1998	Parliament	0.5990	0.5669	0.5903	0.0321	0.0087	0.0234
Israel	1996	Parliament	0.8470	0.7932	0.8467	0.0538	0.0003	0.0535
Lithuania	1997	President	0.5000	0.7366	0.7071	0.2366	0.2071	0.0295
New Zealand	1996	Parliament	0.8300	0.8828	0.8302	0.0528	0.0002	0.0526
Romania	1996	Parliament	0.7820	0.7601	0.7820	0.0219	0.0000	0.0219
Slovenia	1996	Parliament	0.7550	0.7367	0.7575	0.0183	0.0025	0.0208
Spain	1996	Parliament	0.8060	0.7806	0.8056	0.0254	0.0004	0.0250
Taiwan	1996	Parliament	0.7510	0.7621	0.7510	0.0111	0.0000	0.0112
USA	1996	Parliament	0.4900	0.6597	0.4908	0.1697	0.0008	0.1689
Module 2								
Kyrgyzstan	2005	President	0.7812	0.7497	0.6580	0.0315	0.1232	0.0916
Philippines	2004	President	0.7710	0.8410	0.7514	0.0700	0.0196	0.0896
USA	2004	Parliament	0.5620	0.6875	0.5666	0.1255	0.0046	0.1209

3. Countries of problematic turnout values

Contrary to the former sections, this part examines each of the remaining problematic elections separately. For the explanation of these cases, different external sources are used. In general, this section is based on the reports of the official national electoral commissions of the corresponding countries. Additionally, information of international organisation observing elections is taken into account. Moreover, some of the presidential elections, included in both modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, are discussed once again. Typically, those political events are two round elections. Consequently the turnout rates might vary between them. To complete the discussion of the corresponding values, all countries with a second round are examined here, too. However, the presidential elections of Belarus (2001) and Russia (2000) in the first module, as well as of Russia (2004) and Taiwan (2004) in the second module were only one round elections and are consequently not discussed any further. In this section, the remaining countries are ordered alphabetically and not according to their CSES module.

3.a The Brazilian presidential Election of 2002

For Brazil (2002) the CSES data in the second module refers to a presidential election. In general IDEA publishes the results and turnout rates of the second round of election, while the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems tries to cover the statistic for both events. Table 3.a below lists the corresponding values separated by the rounds. Additional information is taken from *IFES Election Guide*, which fits the data of IDEA for the second round perfectly. Moreover, the turnout value given by *IFES Election Guide* for the first round differs from the CSES data only slightly by about 0.94 percentage-points.

	1 st round	2 nd round
CSES	0.8230	-
IDEA	-	0.7953
Election Guide	0.8226	0.7953

3.b The presidential Election of Chile 1999

Similar to the Brazilian case, the CSES data published for Chile (1999) in the first module covers a presidential election. The corresponding turnout rates for both events are reported in Table 3.b. Once again additional information is taken from *IFES Election Guide*, which totally fits the statistics of IDEA for the second round of the election. In contrast, the remaining difference between the IFES-statistic for the first round and the data published by the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems is about 0.55 percentage-points.

	1 st round	2 nd round
CSES	0.9050	-
IDEA	-	0.9063
Election Guide	0.8995	0.9063

3.c The Hong Kong elections of 1998, 2000, and 2004

An external election archive on turnout values for elections of Hong Kong is not available. Hence, the following explanations are based on the reports by the official Electoral Commission of this administrative unit. Table 3.c lists the turnout statistics included in the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems in comparison with those of the commission. Obviously, CSES data are similar, or the differences are at least below the one percentage-points threshold for all three studies. Consequently any further discussion of the Hong Kong elections is obsolete.

Country	Year	Type	Turnout		Difference
			CSES	Commission	
Hong Kong	1998	Parliament	0.5320	0.5329	0.0009
Hong Kong	2000	Parliament	0.4350	0.4357	0.0007
Hong Kong	2004	Parliament	0.5564	0.5564	0.0000

Source: Election Commission of Hong Kong; own calculation of turnouts

3.d The French presidential Election of 2002

As mentioned above already, the turnout rates for the French presidential election of 2002 differ greatly between the external sources. While there are no data available on IPU, the turnout reported by IDEA (79.7%) is about 8.1 percentage-points higher than the one given by Psephos (71.6%). Furthermore, only the later one is below the defined limit in comparison with the corresponding CSES statistic. Two possible reasons might cause the differences between the external sources. First, the CSES election study for France refers to a two round presidential election and turnouts might vary between these rounds. Second, the French electorate does not only incorporate citizens living in France, but also those in overseas departments, e.g. La Reunion or Guadeloupe, where the native population is eligible to participate in the election, too.

Round of Election	Turnout based on	Calculated Turnout
1 st round	total electorate (incl. overseas)	0.7160
	continental French electorate	0.7284
2 nd round	total electorate (incl. overseas)	0.7971
	continental French electorate	0.8095
overall	total electorate (incl. overseas)	0.7565
	continental French electorate	0.7689

Source: Election Commission of France; own calculation of turnouts

Table 3.d gives an overview of the turnout statistics for the corresponding election, separated between the two rounds as well as between the continental electorate and the overall one. Information is based on the Minister of Interior of France. Obviously, the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, as well as Psephos, refers to the first round of the election, based on the total electorate. In contrast, the turnout given by IDEA corresponds to the second round. This contrast explains the reported difference of turnout values in the Tables 1.b and 2.a sufficiently.

3.e The election of Great Britain 1997

All tables presented for the British parliament election in 1997 so far cover large differences of about 12- percentage-points between the external sources and the value included in the data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. This variation could not be explained, whether by using the valid votes exclusively, nor by calculation of the turnout statistics based on the total amount of voters in voting age population. In contrast, the comparison of the statistics published by IDEA and IPU differs only slightly, independently from the way of calculation.

		CSES	IDEA	IPU	Differences		
					CSES- IDEA	CSES- IPU	IDEA- IPU
1997	total turnout	0.5940	0.7146	0.7160	0.1206	0.1220	0.0014
	valid turnout	0.5940	0.7126	0.7146	0.1186	0.1206	0.0020
2001	total turnout	0.5940	0.5938	0.5938	0.0002	0.0002	0.0000
	valid turnout	0.5940	0.5898	0.5938	0.0042	0.0002	0.0041

To illustrate this difference, Table 3.e takes the turnout rates of the British parliament election in 2001 into account as well. In contrast to the one of 1997, the later turnout values match the data of the CSES almost perfectly. This result suggests that the British turnout data included in the first module of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems is miscoded, using the 2001 instead of the 1997 election.

3.f The Kyrgyzstani presidential election of 2005

For the Kyrgyzstani election of 2005 no official results by an Electoral Commission are available. Neither do IPU nor Psephos report Kyrgyzstani election results. In contrast, IDEA and *IFES Election Guide* report an equal turnout value of 74.97% differing by 3.15 percentage-points from the one included in the data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. Additionally, the *Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe* (OSCE), which observed the elections of 2005, published a short report. There, the OSCE (2005: 23) mentions a “turnout of 74.67 percent”, without any further explanation of the source or the kind of calculation. While the reported statistic differs only slightly from IDEA, the contrast to CSES is 3.45 percentage-points. In comparison, Table 3.f lists the number of valid votes per candidates published by the OSCE, including 1,929,374 ballot cast in total. On the contrary, the total amount of registered voters is somehow unclear, varying greatly according to the time of measurement:

“As of 26 June, when printing of ballots started, the number of voters on the voter lists countrywide was 2,691,478. Yet the number of voters on the voter lists at the start of election day was 2,555,246, and the number of voters in the main voter lists at the end of voting was 2,562,603” (OSCE 2005: 9).

Furthermore, the OSCE covers an amount of 17,456 invalid votes (see OSCE 2005: 23), which yields to the computation of six different turnout statistics. According to the values in Table 3.f, the

turnout included in the CSES data fits the value of the total votes based on the registered electorate at the evening of the election day (July 10th, 2005), perfectly.

Name of the candidate	votes	Percentage
Akbaraly Aitikeev	72,604	0.0362
Kurmanbek Bakiev	1,776,156	0.8871
Tursunbay Bakir uulu	78,701	0.0393
Keneshbek Dushebaev	10,253	0.0051
Jypar Jeksheev	18,166	0.0090
Toktayym Umetalieva	10,445	0.0052
Against all candidates	18,197	0.0090
Invalid votes	17,456	0.0090
Sum	2,001,978	0.9999

	total votes	valid votes
CSES	0.7812	
reg. electorate (June, 26 th)	0.7438	0.7373
reg. electorate (July, 10 th , morning)	0.7835	0.7766
reg. electorate (July, 10 th , evening)	0.7812	0.7744

Source: OSCE 2005; own calculation of turnouts

3.g The Lithuanian presidential Election of 1997

Similar to the variation in the data of election in Great Britain (1997), mentioned above, the difference in the CSES' turnout statistic for the Lithuanian presidential election (1997) remains unexplained. None of the external sources used in the first two sections report a value that could be rated at least similar to the one of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. In contrast, the difference between the data of the CSES and the one published by IDEA as well as by the official Electoral Commission is about 23.7 percentage-points. Moreover, the use of any other external source is unsuccessful in explaining the existing differences.

In contrast, comparing the CSES turnout rates with those published by IDEA and IPU for the Lithuanian parliamentary election of 1996, enlightens the variation. Table 3.g. additionally includes the corresponding statistics for this electoral event. Both external sources report an equal national turnout of about 52.3%. Furthermore, if the valid votes are taken into account, the differences in the turnout value published by IPU decreases by about 2.61 percentage-points below the one percentage-point limit. Once again, the presented result suggests that the information included in the data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems is miscoded.

Table 3.g: Turnout values for the Lithuanian elections of 1996 and 1997

			1 st round	2 nd round
	CSES		0.5000	-
Presidential Election of 1997	IDEA	total votes	-	0,7366
		valid votes	-	0,7286
	Election Commission	total votes	0.7145	0.7366
		valid votes	0.7024	0.7284
Parliament Election of 1996	IDEA	total votes	0,5292	-
		valid votes	0,4802	-
	Election Commission	total votes	0.5292	-
		valid votes	0.5027	-
	IPU	total votes	0,5292	-
		valid votes	0,5031	-

3.h The Philippine presidential election of the Philippines 2004

The final turnout of an election causing exceptional strong problems is the one of the Philippines in 2004. Compared to the published statistics of IDEA and the *IFES Election Guide* (both 84.1%), the value included in the second CSES module (77.1%) differs by about 7 percentage-points. Unfortunately this election is rarely documented. An official website of the Electoral Commission is available, but without providing electoral results for 2004. Moreover, the *Social Weather Station*, a research institution of the Philippines, calculates a turnout rate of about 81.3%, without any further explanation. Finally, several international organisations observed the election. Similar to other documentations, the report of the *International Foundation of Electoral Systems* (IFES) points out that

Table 3.h: Collection of turnout statistics for Philippine parliament election 2004

	registered voters	votes	turnout	invalid	valid
CSES	-	-	0.7710	-	-
Philippines Websites					
Electoral Commission (Parliament)	43,536,028	-	-	-	-
Social Weather Stations	-	-	0.8130	-	-
External Recourses					
IDEA - registered electorate	43,536,028	36,613,800	0.8410	0.1190	0.7220
IDEA - voting age population	48,727,136	36,613,800	0.7514	0.1190	0.6324
IFES Election Guide	-	-	0.8410	-	-
IFES report	-	-	-	-	0.7400

“the 2004 Philippine elections were characterized by serious administrative shortcomings brought about by failed automation plans, fiscal restraints, and poor management by the Electoral Commission. It was also characterized by significant violence and allegations of wide scale fraud.” (IFES 2004: 36; see also Manikas 2004).

In addition, the IFES-report covers a turnout of about 74.0%, based on the amount of valid votes.

To summarize the findings on the Philippine election of 2004, Table 3.h gives an overview of the statistics available due to the corresponding event. Obviously, an unambiguous turnout value is far from being available. Different sources vary greatly in their reported statistics. Consequently, the data does not seem reliable and the final use of any kind of information is – for this case especially - up to the researcher’s decision. However, the smallest absolute difference to CSES data refer to the turnout given by IDEA based on the voting age population (1.96 percentage-points).

4. Expedient corrections of CSES data

Overall, this report examines a few variations in the turnout rates comparing the CSES data to several external sources. This final section briefly summarizes the major findings of the paper and gives some proposals on the data that might be changed. Appended, additional codebook remarks for the turnout variables A5010 and B5006, as well as syntax-files for SPSS and STATA are included to correct data in the way discussed as follows.

Table 4.a gives an overview of the findings for the first module of Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. Two elections, namely the presidential election of Belarus (2001) and the parliamentary election of Thailand (2001), have not been included in the CSES. For both countries, turnout statistics are implemented now for the first time, taken from the IDEA database. This data was crosschecked with information from the *IFES Election Guide*, in the case of Belarus, and IPU for Thailand, respectively.

The variations found in the studies of Great Britain (1997) and Lithuania (1997) cause problems. As sections 3.c and e explains, the turnout variables of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems seem to be miscoded for these two countries. Consequently, changes are necessary to correct the two values. Information is taken from IDEA once again. Its data for Great Britain are relatively similar to the one published by IPU. In the case of Lithuania, the information given by IDEA totally fits the one of the *IFES Election Guide*.

Another 16 elections included in the first module are based on the amount of valid votes or the population of voting age. As discussed earlier, both computations are critical to use. Consequently, the turnout values of the first module are changed for all of these countries. Finally, the rates published by the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems are in general expanded to two decimal places. Using the statistics provided by IDEA, four national turnout values slightly differ between this database and the information of other external sources:

- For Canada (1997) the turnout statistics vary between IDEA and IPU by about 1.74 percentage-points. As the information published by IDEA is similar to the one of the official Canadian Electoral Commission, it is presumably more reliable.
- The turnout rates reported for the Mexican election of 2000 differ between IDEA (57.24%) and IPU (63.67%) by 6.43 percentage-points. In contrast, the statistics published by the Mexican Federal Electoral Institute (*Instituto Federal Electoral*) covers a national turnout rate of about 63.64%, which is quite similar to the one of IPU. Here, data of the Federal Electoral Institute is used.

Table 4.a: Summary of countries for CSES Module 1

below the threshold	valid votes	voting age population	problematic studies
Belgium (1999)	Mexico (1997)	Australia (1996)	Belarus (2001)
Chile (1999)	Norway (1997)	Canada (1997)	Great Britain (1997)
Czech Republic (1996)	Peru (2001)	Denmark (1998)	Lithuania (1997)
Germany (1998)	Spain (2000)	Hungary (1998)	Thailand (2001)
Hong Kong (1998)	Ukraine (1998)	Israel (1996)	
Hong Kong (2000)		New Zealand (1996)	
Iceland (1999)		Romania (1996)	
Japan (1996)		Slovenia (1996)	
Mexico (2000)		Spain (1996)	
Netherlands (1998)		Taiwan (1996)	
Peru (2000)		USA (1996)	
Poland (1997)			
Portugal (2002)			
Russia (1999)			
Russia (2000)			
South Korea (2000)			
Sweden (1998)			
Switzerland (1999)			

- In the case of the Peruvian election of 2000, the comparison of turnout yields to a variation of about 2.43 percentage-points between IDEA and IPU. However, the election was observed by the European Union (EU), which published two slightly different statements: While the interims report handed over to the European Parliament in April 2001 reports a turnout statistic of 80.42%, the final EU-report mentions a rate of 81.37% which totally fits the values of IDEA. According to IDEA and the later EU-document, the turnout statistic of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems is corrected to 81.37%.
- Finally, values for the Spanish election of 2000 differ by 1.92 percentage-points, comparing the IDEA and the IPU databases. However, the statistics published by IDEA are similar to the one given by the Spanish Minister of Interior for the corresponding election.

The findings for the second CSES module are summarized in Table 4.b. Obviously, most of the countries are below the one percentage-points threshold. In contrast, three election studies do not fit this limit. In detail, the turnout for the USA (2004) is based on the absolute amount of citizens in voting age. According to the fact that registration is a necessary condition for a vote cast in the United States of America, the turnout included in the CSES, based on voting age population can be criticized. The appended syntax-files correct this value due to the total amount of registered voters, published by IDEA.

Moreover, two additional countries of the second module are questionable according to different turnout statistics published by different sources. For the Kyrgyzstani election of 2005, different values could be calculated due to variations in the reported amount of the registered voters. The transformation included in the appendix refers to the statistics published by IDEA, too. This value is relatively similar to the one reported by the OSCE for June, 26th, 2005, the day when the printing of the ballot papers started.

Table 4.a: Summary of countries for CSES Module 2

below the threshold	voting age population	problematic studies
Albania (2005)	USA (2004)	Kyrgyzstan (2005)
Australia (2004)		Philippines (2004)
Belgium (2003)		
Brazil (2002)		
Bulgaria (2001)		
Canada (2004)		
Chile (2005)		
Czech Republic (2002)		
Denmark (2001)		
Finland (2003)		
France (2002)		
Germany (2002)		
Great Britain (2005)		
Hong Kong (2004)		
Hungary (2002)		
Iceland (2003)		
Ireland (2002)		
Israel (2003)		
Italy (2006)		
Japan (2004)		
Mexico (2003)		
Netherlands (2002)		
New Zealand (2002)		
Norway (2001)		
Peru (2006)		
Poland (2001)		
Portugal (2002)		
Portugal (2005)		
Romania (2004)		
Russia (2004)		
Slovenia (2004)		
South Korea (2004)		
Spain (2004)		
Sweden (2002)		
Switzerland (2003)		
Taiwan (2001)		
Taiwan (2004)		

Finally, making use of data on the Philippine election of 2004 is controversial in general. As the reports used for this paper mention, the political event was characterized by poor organization and electoral violence. The correction included in the appendix refers to IDEA once again. The statistic published there is similar to the one given by the *IFES Electoral Guide*, differing by 3 percentage-points compared to the data of the *Social Weather Station*. However, researchers should take care

about the fact that the available turnout values vary according to the used source. Consequently, analysis based on the Philippines' turnout need to be discussed.

To summarize, in most situations, information to correct the data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems is taken from IDEA, with the exception of the Hong Kong and Mexican studies. In the case of Hong Kong (1998, 2000, and 2004), the results published by the official Electoral Commission are used. For the Mexican election of 2000, the data on turnout rate is taken from the Federal Electoral Institute. However, while for the second module only those studies are corrected which show variations above the one percentage-point limit, in the first module data are replaced completely due to the expansion of a second decimal place. Finally, presidential elections included in both modules are corrected, now reporting the first round, while the turnout statistics for the second round are mentioned in the additional codebook remarks.

References

Electoral Commission of Canada:

<http://www.elections.ca/>

Electoral Commission of Hong Kong:

<http://www.eac.gov.hk/>

Electoral Commission of Hong Kong. Electoral Report 1998:

http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/1998_report.htm

Electoral Commission of Hong Kong. Electoral Report 2000:

http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/2000_report.htm

Electoral Commission of Hong Kong. Electoral Report 2004:

http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/2004_report.htm

Electoral Commission of Lithuania:

<http://www3.lrs.lt/>

Electoral Commission of the Philippines:

<http://www.comelec.gov.ph/>

European Parliament (2001): Account of the mission to observe the parliamentary elections, and the first round of the presidential elections, held in Peru on 8 April 2001.

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/election_observation/missions/20010408_peru_en.pdf

European Union Election Observation Commission (2001): Peru – General Election. Final Report:

<http://aceproject.org/regions-en/countries-and-territories/PE/reports/peru-general-elections-2001-final-report-by-the>

IDEA – International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance:

<http://www.idea.int/>

IFES Final Report. Erben, Peter / Hagerdon Thakur, Beverly / Jenness, Craig / Smith, Ian (2004): CEPPS

Philippines Election Observation Program. Strengthening the Electoral Process:

http://www.ifes.org/~media/Files/Publications/Project%20Report/2004/107/Philippines_2004_Election_Report.pdf

IFES Election Guide:

<http://www.electionguide.org/>

Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico (Instituto Federal Electoral):

<http://www.ife.org.mx/>

IPU – Parliaments Online (Parline):

<http://www.ipu.org/parline/>

Manikas, Peter (2004): Report on the 2004 Philippine Elections. National Democratic Institute for International Affairs:

http://www.ndi.org/files/1745_ph_elections_083104_body.pdf

Minister of Interior of France:

<http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/>

Minister of Interior of Spain:

<http://www.mir.es/DGPI/>

OSCE - Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2005): Kyrgyz Republic Presidential Election
10 July 2005. Final Report. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission:

<http://www.osce.org/item/17585.html>

Psephos - Adam Carr's Election Archive:

<http://psephos.adam-carr.net/>

Social Weather Stations

<http://www.sws.org.ph/>

Appendix: Additional codebook remarks and syntax files

CSES Module 1

Codebook remarks

A5010 >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT

Percentage of Voting Age Population who cast ballots
.....

000.00-100.00. PERCENT OF VOTING AGE POPULATION WHO CAST
BALLOTS

999. MISSING

| NOTES: A5010

| Please note that official turnout figures are calculated using
| www.idea.net in general, based on the amount of registered
| voters. In cases, where different databases for calculation are
| used, an additional codebook remark is included.
| Furthermore, given values cover the turnout for the Lower House
| elections of the corresponding country, as long as no other
| information is provided in the following.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BELARUS (2001): A5010

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. According to the results of the election,
| no second round was held.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - CHILE (1999): A5010

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. Turnout at the second round was 90.63%.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (1998): A5010

| Data is taken from the official Electoral Commission of Hong
| Kong (http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/1998_report.htm).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2000): A5010

| Data is taken from the official Electoral Commission of Hong
| Kong (http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/2000_report.htm).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - LITHUANIA (1997): A5010

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. Turnout at the second round was 73.66%.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - MEXICO (2000): A5010

| Data is taken from the Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico

```

| (http://www.ife.org.mx/).
|
| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2002): B5006
|
| Turnout value for the elections is taken from the Parline
| database (www.ipu.org).
|
| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - RUSSIA (2000): A5010
|
| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. According to the results of the election,
| no second round was held.

```

SPSS-syntax

```

/*****
* The syntax corrects for the national turnout variable A5010, last
* published August, the 4th, 2004, data version "CSES-MODULE-1".
*****/
if A1004 = "AUS_1996" A5010 = 95.83.
if A1004 = "BELF1999" A5010 = 90.58.
if A1004 = "BELW1999" A5010 = 90.58.
if A1004 = "BLR_2001" A5010 = 83.86.
if A1004 = "CAN_1997" A5010 = 67.00.
if A1004 = "CHE_1999" A5010 = 43.22.
if A1004 = "CHL_1999" A5010 = 89.95.
if A1004 = "CZE_1996" A5010 = 76.29.
if A1004 = "DEU_1998" A5010 = 82.20.
if A1004 = "DNK_1998" A5010 = 85.95.
if A1004 = "ESP_1996" A5010 = 78.06.
if A1004 = "ESP_2000" A5010 = 68.71.
if A1004 = "GBR_1997" A5010 = 71.46.
if A1004 = "HKG_1998" A5010 = 53.29.
if A1004 = "HKG_2000" A5010 = 43.57.
if A1004 = "HUN_1998" A5010 = 56.69.
if A1004 = "ISL_1999" A5010 = 84.07.
if A1004 = "ISR_1996" A5010 = 79.32.
if A1004 = "JPN_1996" A5010 = 59.00.
if A1004 = "KOR_2000" A5010 = 57.21.
if A1004 = "LTU_1997" A5010 = 71.45.
if A1004 = "MEX_1997" A5010 = 57.69.
if A1004 = "MEX_2000" A5010 = 63.64.
if A1004 = "NLD_1998" A5010 = 73.23.
if A1004 = "NOR_1997" A5010 = 78.33.
if A1004 = "NZL_1996" A5010 = 88.28.
if A1004 = "PER_2000" A5010 = 81.98.
if A1004 = "PER_2001" A5010 = 81.37.
if A1004 = "POL_1997" A5010 = 47.93.
if A1004 = "PRT_2002" A5010 = 62.84.
if A1004 = "ROU_1996" A5010 = 76.01.
if A1004 = "RUS_1999" A5010 = 62.33.
if A1004 = "RUS_2000" A5010 = 68.64.
if A1004 = "SVN_1996" A5010 = 73.67.
if A1004 = "SWE_1998" A5010 = 81.39.
if A1004 = "THA_2001" A5010 = 69.95.
if A1004 = "TWN_1996" A5010 = 76.21.
if A1004 = "UKR_1998" A5010 = 70.65.
if A1004 = "USA_1996" A5010 = 65.97.

```

exe.

STATA-syntax

```
/******  
* The syntax corrects for the national turnout variable A5010, last *  
* published August, the 4th, 2004, data version "CSES-MODULE-1". *  
*****/  
replace A5010 =95.83 if A1004=="AUS_1996"  
replace A5010 =90.58 if A1004=="BELF1999"  
replace A5010 =90.58 if A1004=="BELW1999"  
replace A5010 =83.86 if A1004=="BLR_2001"  
replace A5010 =67.00 if A1004=="CAN_1997"  
replace A5010 =43.22 if A1004=="CHE_1999"  
replace A5010 =89.95 if A1004=="CHL_1999"  
replace A5010 =76.29 if A1004=="CZE_1996"  
replace A5010 =82.20 if A1004=="DEU_1998"  
replace A5010 =85.95 if A1004=="DNK_1998"  
replace A5010 =78.06 if A1004=="ESP_1996"  
replace A5010 =68.71 if A1004=="ESP_2000"  
replace A5010 =71.46 if A1004=="GBR_1997"  
replace A5010 =53.29 if A1004=="HKG_1998"  
replace A5010 =43.57 if A1004=="HKG_2000"  
replace A5010 =56.69 if A1004=="HUN_1998"  
replace A5010 =84.07 if A1004=="ISL_1999"  
replace A5010 =79.32 if A1004=="ISR_1996"  
replace A5010 =59.00 if A1004=="JPN_1996"  
replace A5010 =57.21 if A1004=="KOR_2000"  
replace A5010 =71.45 if A1004=="LTU_1997"  
replace A5010 =57.69 if A1004=="MEX_1997"  
replace A5010 =63.64 if A1004=="MEX_2000"  
replace A5010 =73.23 if A1004=="NLD_1998"  
replace A5010 =78.33 if A1004=="NOR_1997"  
replace A5010 =88.28 if A1004=="NZL_1996"  
replace A5010 =81.98 if A1004=="PER_2000"  
replace A5010 =81.37 if A1004=="PER_2001"  
replace A5010 =47.93 if A1004=="POL_1997"  
replace A5010 =62.84 if A1004=="PRT_2002"  
replace A5010 =76.01 if A1004=="ROU_1996"  
replace A5010 =62.33 if A1004=="RUS_1999"  
replace A5010 =68.64 if A1004=="RUS_2000"  
replace A5010 =73.67 if A1004=="SVN_1996"  
replace A5010 =81.39 if A1004=="SWE_1998"  
replace A5010 =69.95 if A1004=="THA_2001"  
replace A5010 =76.21 if A1004=="TWN_1996"  
replace A5010 =70.65 if A1004=="UKR_1998"  
replace A5010 =65.97 if A1004=="USA_1996"
```

CSES Module 2

Codebook remarks

B5006 >>> ELECTORAL TURNOUT

Percentage of official voter turnout.
.....

000.00-100.00. PERCENT OF VOTER TURNOUT

999.00 MISSING

| NOTES: B5006

| Please note that official turnout figures are calculated using
| www.idea.net in general, based on the amount of registered
| voters. In cases, where different databases for calculation are
| used, an additional codebook remark is included.
| Furthermore, given values cover the turnout for the Lower House
| elections of the corresponding country, as long as no other
| information is provided in the following.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - BRAZIL (2002): B5006

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. Turnout at the second round was 79.53%.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FINLAND (2003): B5006

| Turnout value for the elections is taken from the Parline
| database (www.ipu.org).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - FRANCE (2002): B5006

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. Turnout at the second round was 79.71%.
| Information is taken from the official Electoral Commission of
| France (www.interieur.gouv.fr).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - HONG KONG (2004): B5006

| Data are taken from the official Electoral Commission of Hong
| Kong (http://www.eac.gov.hk/en/legco/2004_report.htm).

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - JAPAN (2004): B5006

| This variable reports turnout of the Upper House election.

| ELECTION STUDY NOTES - KYRGYSTAN (2005): B5006

| This variable reports the first round turnout of the
| presidential election. According to the results of the election,
| no second round was held.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PHILIPPINES (2004): B5006

Official results for the Philippines are somehow critical.
The variable refers to the first round of the presidential
elections published by to www.idea.net. According to the
results of the election no second round was held.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - PORTUGAL (2002): B5006

Turnout value for the elections is taken from the Parline
database (www.ipu.org).

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - RUSSIA (2004): B5006

This variable reports the first round turnout of the
presidential election. According to the results of the election,
no second round was held.

ELECTION STUDY NOTES - TAIWAN (2004): B5006

This variable reports the first round turnout of the
presidential election. According to the results of the election,
no second round was held.

SPSS-syntax

```
/*  
* The syntax corrects for the national turnout variable B5006, last *  
* published June, the 27th, 2007, data version "CSES-MODULE-2". *  
*/  
if B1004="KGZ_2005" B5006 = 74.97.  
if B1004="PHL_2004" B5006 = 84.10.  
if B1004="USA_2004" B5006 = 68.75.  
exe.
```

STATA-syntax

```
/*  
* The syntax corrects for the national turnout variable B5006, last *  
* published June, the 27th, 2007, data version "CSES-MODULE-2". *  
*/  
replace B5006 = 74.97 if B1004=="KGZ_2005"  
replace B5006 = 84.10 if B1004=="PHL_2004"  
replace B5006 = 68.75 if B1004=="USA_2004"
```