

## Report on proposed new CSES module within The Irish National Election Study 2011

Carolina Plescia and Michael Marsh, Trinity College Dublin.  
Contact: mmarsh@tcd.ie

The report presents the results obtained for the new CSES questionnaire run as part of the Irish National Election Study (INES) 2011. The appendix of the report presents all the tables. Appended also is the complete INES questionnaire, which includes a separate drop-off element. CSES items are marked by shading. Items are ordered as placed in the new CSES questionnaire.

- ***Expenditure Preferences***

[Tables 1- 3 in the Appendix]

These questions test the “thermostatic” model that expects a relationship between policy preferences and expenditures: as expenditure goes up, public preferences shift towards reduction and when it goes down, preferences shift in the other direction.

INES 2011 combines the set of items within a single set, saving some space in the questionnaire. Despite the fact that respondents are reminded that expenditure increases may require increased taxes, the results show that most of the respondents wish to increase the spending in all the areas, except for defence (Table 1). Spending in all areas has fallen substantially in Ireland in recent times.

Table 2 shows a factor analysis for the spending items. There seem to be two components: 1) attitude towards social services and education and 2) attitude towards business and economy.

INES 2011 includes a different question to tap attitude towards taxes and spending and results are shown here for comparison. It uses a scale of 0-10 (where “0” means government should cut taxes a lot and spend much less on health and social services, and “10” means government should increase taxes a lot and spend much more on health and social services). The respondent mean is 6.33 with about 39% of the people positioned towards the right hand side of the distribution [though the ideological ‘left’] (government should increase taxes a lot and spend much more on health and social services), 27% of the respondents positioned at the centre of the distribution and about 28% on the left [the ideological ‘right’]. This is a similar pattern to that found in the corresponding CSES items.

- ***The Psychological Dimension***

[Table 4-5 in the Appendix]

The question “over the next ten years or so my family and I have a good chance of improving our standard of living” is proposed to tap attitudes towards economic future.

Table 4 shows that the modal class is “agree” (my family and I have a good chance of improving our standard of living). The distribution is slightly skewed to the left (“disagree”). A pretty high percentage of people (17.5%) say that they do not know: this might be regarded as denoting uncertainty about the future.

INES 2011 provides the possibility of compare the results of this question with an optimism item where respondents were asked to locate themselves on a scale from “1” (Not at all) to “5” (Extremely) regarding the question “How hopeful are you about the way things are going in the country?”. Table 5 offers a cross tabulation between the CSES question on attitude towards the future and the INES optimism item showing that nearly 52% of the respondents who are strongly agree that they can improve their standard of living are very or extremely hopeful. Roughly 49% of

the respondent who strongly disagree that they can improve their standard of living they also feel not at all or a little hopeful while only 19% of the respondent who strongly agree that they can improve their standard of living they also feel not at all or a little hopeful. The two questions are indeed correlated.

- ***Economic Voting***

[Table 6 in the Appendix]

CSES has a three question format on the traditional retrospective “state of the economy” measure: (Q3 – State of economy; Q3a – State of economy-better; Q3b – State of economy - worse). For space reasons INES combines them in a single question using a scale 1 (“Much worse”) to 5 (“Much better”). The mean score summary is 1.70 and not surprisingly the majority of the people (52%) said that the state of economy is much worse. As Table 6 shows, the distribution is heavily skewed to the left (“much worse”, “somewhat worse”).

- ***Government intervention and my vote***

[Tables 7-8 in the Appendix]

On a scale 1 (“the government should act to reduce differences in income and wealth”) and 10 (“the government should not act to reduce the differences in income and wealth”), Table 7 shows that the modal class is 5 denoting the fact that about 23% of the people believe that government intervention should be present but it should not be too strong. The distribution is slightly skewed to the left (government intervention) with merely 2% of the respondents thinking that the government should not act to reduce differences in income and wealth.

Question 5 “Who is in power can make a big difference” and Question 6 “Who people vote for makes a big difference” have not been included in the INES 2011. Factor analysis for INES 2002 and INES 2007 suggests that the following questions:

1. who is in power can make a big difference;
  2. who people vote for makes a big difference and;
  3. my vote does not make any difference;
- all seem to measure the same latent variable.

INES 2011 retains only the item “my vote doesn’t make any difference”. The results are presented in Table 8. The vast majority of the respondents (nearly 70%) strongly disagree, disagree or slightly disagree with this statement. The mean score summary is 2.71 over a 1 (“disagree strongly”) to 7 (“agree strongly”) scale.

- ***Parties and Leaders Liking and L-R placement***

[Tables 9-13 in the Appendix]

Table 9 shows that all parties’ means are inside the interval 2.27 and 5.89 on a scale 0 (“strongly dislike”) to 10 (“strongly like”) with the Green Party being the less liked party (2.27) and Fine Gael (5.89) being the most liked party. The values for all the parties are skewed to the left of the distribution.

Concerning the leaders, they all have a mean below 5 except for Enda Kenny and Eamon Gilmore. Not surprisingly Brian Cowan – outgoing Prime Minister, replaced as leader of his party before the election – is the least liked among the leaders.

A comparison between parties liking and leaders liking shows that leaders and parties display similar mean score except for Micheal Martin, whose mean score is one and a half point higher than that of his party.

On Left-Right placement, Table 11 shows that the Irish voter tends to position himself towards the right hand side of the distribution: on a scale from 0 (Left) to 10 (Right), 48.5% of the respondents have positioned themselves between 6 and 10; 19% between 0 and 4; and 24.3% of the respondents are in the middle of the ideological spectrum at 5. Concerning the parties, Fine Gail and Fianna Fail are the most right wing parties followed in order by Sinn Fein, Labour and Green Party.

INES contains a number of other 0-10 scale items, used to tap the respondents' position on a substantive left-right placement scale. Six items have been used (Business and industry regulation; Business and industry ownership; European unification; Existence of God; Environment versus economic growth and Abortion) and the respondents' position is usually toward the right hand side of the distribution (Table 12). Factor analysis in Table 13 reveals the presence of two major components one most likely measuring business and industry while the other measuring social attitudes.

- ***“Trust” questions and “feeling” questions***

[Tables 14-21 in the Appendix]

On Question 14 “Satisfaction with the democratic process”, a striking comparison is between the results of the INES 2002 / 2007 and INES 2011. The 2002 and 2007 values are skewed towards the left hand side of the distribution (“fairly satisfied with the democratic process”) while the responses for the INES 2011 are for the major part concentrated at the centre of the distribution with nearly 73% of the people claiming that they are “fairly” or “not satisfied” with how democracy works in Ireland.

Information presented in Tables 15-21 looks at feelings toward the political parties. Table 15 shows that only about 21% of the respondents claim to be close to a particular party. This rate is at least 10% lower than the previous INES questionnaire (2007 election). Among the people who claimed to feel close to one political party, about 31% mentioned Fianna Fail, 42% mentioned Fine Gael, 11% mentioned Labour, 15% Sinn Fein and only about 0.3% the Green party.

Among the respondents who claimed not to be close to any political party, only about 15% claim to feel closer to one party than the others. In this regard, Table 17 shows that nearly 60% of the respondents claim that they do not feel closer to any party.

Going further, Table 18 shows that among the respondents who feel a little closer to one political party, more than 40% feel a little closer to Fine Gail and 21% of respondents feel closer to either Fianna Fail or Labour party. About 11% of the people feel closer to Sinn Fein and only about 1.5% to the Green party.

Table 19 shows that the parties to which the respondents feel closest to are Fine Gail (42%) and Fianna Fail (31%). These parties are followed by Sinn Fein (15%) and Labour party (11%). Green party is the lowest rated at about 0.3%.

Table 20 unveils that the majority of the respondents claimed to feel “somewhat close” to the mentioned party while about 32% claimed that they feel “not very close”. Table 21 offers a cross tabulation between political party consider feeling a little closer to and the degree of closeness to this party.

- ***Voting***

[Tables 22-25 in the Appendix]

INES 2011 offered four options for the statement describing voting in the general election. Table 22 shows the results with 90% of the respondents claiming that they have voted at the election, about 7.4% did not vote, less than 2% usually vote but did not vote in this election and only a tiny percentage of less than 1% thought about voting but in the end they did not vote. The level of turnout shown in this question is much higher than the 70.1% actual turnout that characterised the last Irish election.

Table 23 provides the percentages of first preference vote for the 2011 Irish election and Table 24 provides the figures for the 2007 election.

Table 25 gives an idea of the electorate volatility. For example only about 33% of the respondents who cast a vote for Fianna Fail in the 2007 also cast a vote for the same party in the 2011 election. About 82% of the respondents who voted for Fine Gael in the 2007 voted for the same party in the 2011. Corresponding figures are 66% for Labour, 75% for Sinn Fein, 29% for Green party and about 52% for Independent candidates.

- ***Mobilisation Module***

[Tables 26-30 in the Appendix]

The core items in the CSES questionnaire are as follow:

- *Direct/Formal contact by party vs. Indirect/Informal by friends and family*
- *Offline vs. Online contact*

Table A. Typology of Campaign Contact

	<i>Direct (Q17)</i>	<i>Indirect (Q19)</i>
<i>Online</i>	email/Web/Internet	Forwarding email or text
<i>Offline</i>	person/mail/phone	conversation etc

Table 26 provides the results for *Direct* and *Indirect* contact showing that about 55% of the respondents report having been approached directly, but only 28% have been contacted indirectly by friends or family. The majority in both groups were contacted by person; only 35% and 20% respectively by phone or mail. Only 3% of the respondent received either a text or mail by direct or indirect contact.

INES 2011 included more questions in order to investigate campaign contact. One set identifies respondents whose homes had been visited by a candidate and/or by party workers. About 52% of the respondents claimed that a candidate called to their home (Table 27). This percentage is very close to the 55% recorded using the direct contact CSES question: 22% have been contacted by a candidate from Fianna Fail, 32% by a candidate from Fine Gael, 16% by Labour party and nearly 12% by Sinn Fein. Regarding the incidence of contact by party workers, 49% of the respondents claimed that none called to their home (Table 28). Among the respondents who claimed that a representative from a party visited their home, 24% asserted that the party worker was from Fianna Fail party, nearly 30% from Fine Gail, 21% from Labour and 13% from Sinn Fein. In summary Table 29 shows that about 31% of the respondents have been approached by both a candidate and a

party worker, nearly 44% by one of them and only about 25% by none, which exceeds the 55% identified by the CSES question.

Concerning Question 19 “Mobilization: sign up for online or alerts”, Table 30 shows that about 96% of the respondents did not signed up to receive online information on the internet.

INES 2011 included several questions to tap the use of social media during the recent Irish general election. These were added to provide indicators of whether traditional sources of information such as newspapers and radio news have been replaced by more modern sources, for example social networking sites and online blogs. About 80% of the respondents did not use these new sources of information showing that the traditional sources such as newspaper and television are still the main means of information for the majority of the respondents. However, deeper investigation of the use of these new sources shows that the younger generation tends to make a bigger use of this means.

- ***Political Information Items***

[Tables 31-53 in the Appendix]

INES 2011 tested the four CSES political knowledge questions and it also included other knowledge questions. This paragraph provides an analysis of the CSES questions and of the INES questions in turn. The tables are presented in the appendix. Our own view was that the set of knowledge questions should include at least one that is easy (i.e. about 66% will answer it correctly), one that is slightly more difficult (about 50% will answer it correctly) and one that is difficult (i.e. about 33% will answer it correctly).

#### *CSES political knowledge questions*

As Table 31 shows, among the CSES questions there seem to be two very easy questions and two easy/medium questions. Tables 32- 35 display the percentages of correct answer for each CSES question in turn and they relate the correct answer to the voting behaviour at the election (voted/did not vote) and to the level of interest in politics (disinterested/interested). From the tables it is possible to detect that the respondents who asserted to have voted and the respondents claiming to be interested in politics display a level of correct answer of at least 15-20 points higher than the respective opposite group.

An additive knowledge index was created from all the CSES questions. Table 36 shows that the index ranges from 0 (no correct answer) to 4 (all correct answers) with a mean of 2.41. This index is very weakly correlated with both the level of education (.075) and the level of interest in politics (.252). Tables 38-39 provide details of the relationship between the interest in politics and the knowledge level and the level of education and the level of knowledge.

Table 40 displays the results of a Mokken scale test for the CSES political knowledge questions. The four items (previous Finance Minister; election terms; main opposition in the last election and first president in South Africa after apartheid) have a scalability coefficient above the cut point 0.30 and since  $0.40 < H < 0.50$  can be seen as a medium quality Guttman scale. The Mokken test does not reveal a randomised answer pattern.

#### *INES political knowledge questions*

Table 41 shows the percentages of correct and incorrect answers for all the four INES political knowledge questions. There seem to be two difficult questions, one medium and one very easy question. Note that the Don't Know percentage is very high here.

Tables 42-45 relate the correct percentages to voting behaviour and interest in politics showing again that the respondents claiming to have voted and the respondents reporting an interest in politics display an average of correct answer of at least 10 points higher than the respective opposite group.

Table 46 shows the additive index for the Irish questions, with a mean score is 2.10. Table 47 provides the correlation of the index with the level of education ( $r=.184$ ) and the level of interest in politics ( $r=.322$ ) and Tables 48 and 49 provide details for these relationships. Finally Table 50 displays the results of the Mokken analysis for the INES 2011 political knowledge questions and it shows that the four items (number of seats in the current Dail; current Irish commissioner of the EU; previous minister for Health and current first minister of NI) have a scalability coefficient well above the cut point 0.30 and since  $H>0.60$ , it is a strong Guttman scale. Again no randomised answer pattern is detected.

In summary the CSES political knowledge questions performed quite poorly in the Irish case regarding both their level of difficulty and their relationships with both the level of education and the level of interest in politics. However the Mokken test reveals that the answer pattern is not randomised and that the items scale. Surely, there is here some room for improvement.

Table 51 shows the Mokken scale results for all the INES and CSES political knowledge questions and it shows that all the items scale. Interestingly the Northern Ireland INES question scales closely to the CSES than it does with the other INES questions.

INES 2011 also asked the interviewer to record how knowledgeable the respondent was about politics. The results are presented in Table 52 where they are also related to the voting behaviour of the respondents and the level of interest in politics. Finally, Table 53 presents the correlation values among the level of the interviewer recording about how knowledgeable the respondent was, the CSES and the INES knowledge questions.

- ***Job Security***

[Tables 54-56 in the Appendix]

This section provides the results for the job security questions. Table 54 in the Appendix shows that overall the responses to Question 21 “Income or job loss in the next year” are skewed towards the “not at all likely” and “not very likely” side. The rate of the “did not answer” is quite low. A deeper investigation of the Irish case outlines that there are no differences with respect to gender; there are small differences between age groups (such as that younger people tend to think that their job is less secure than older people); no differences regarding social class; and small differences among employment sector (such as that public employers might feel more secure than private). Regarding voting, the people who did not vote tend to be slightly more negative on their feelings.

On the difficulty of finding another job, Table 55 shows that the responses are heavily skewed towards the “very difficult” and “fairly difficult” side and there seem not to be any differences among gender, social classes, age and area of employment. The rate of the “did not answer” is quite low. Finally, Table 56 offers a cross tabulation between the two previous questions.

Even if the majority of the respondents think that it is not very likely that their job might be loss in the next year, the majority of them think that it will be very difficult to find another job if the previous one is lost.

- ***Patrimonial battery***

[Tables 57-58 in the Appendix]

This last section examines the ownership questions. While in the CSES they are presented as separate questions in the INES 2011 they are all incorporated into a single battery. The wording remains the same.

Table 57 presents the ownership's situation in Ireland: overall the proportion of "don't know/not sure" is quite low and there is enough variation within the country.

An index of ownership has been created to test the correlation with the income variable. The index of ownership has a potential score varying from 0 (no ownership) to 7 (all ownerships). Table 58 provides the central tendency and dispersion of the index. The average (mean) score of the index is 2.2. The component correlating most heavily with the index is "Property (other than primary residence)". The income variable correlates with the index at only 0.23. This analysis confirms that the income variables and the ownership variable measure two different aspects presumably wealth and class.

## Appendix

- Q1a. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: HEALTHCARE**  
**Q1b. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: EDUCATION**  
**Q1c. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: THE UNEMPLOYED**  
**Q1d. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: DEFENSE**  
**Q1e. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: PENSIONS**  
**Q1f. >>> GOVERNMENT SPENDING: BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY**

Table 1. More (rating 5)/less (rating 1) government spending in each of the main areas: mean score summary (INES 2011)

	INES 2011	INES 2011 (RATING 4-5) %
1. Health	3.98 (0.857)	73
2. Education	3.94 (0.785)	72
3. Support for the unemployed	3.37 (1.088)	44
4. Defence	2.54 (1.027)	14
5. Old age pensions	3.45 (0.918)	41
4. Business & Industry	3.69 (0.950)	60

Table 2. Factor analysis among spending items

MORE/LESS GOVERNMENT SPENDING IN:	Rotated Component Matrix <sup>a</sup>	
	1	2
1. Health	.150	.869
2. Education	.120	.856
3. Support for the unemployed	.572	.367
4. Defence	.608	.165
5. Old age pensions	.736	.272
4. Business & Industry	.711	-.118

Table 3. Rating of: government should cut taxes and spend much less on health and social services (%)

	<i>Government should CUT TAXES A LOT and SPEND MUCH LESS on health and social services</i>											<i>Government should INCREASE TAXES A LOT and SPEND MUCH MORE on health and social services</i>			DK X
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
Mean (SD)															
6.33 (2.16)	1.2	3.6	4.6	8.1	10.2	26.9	13.3	9.5	10.1	3.3	3.2	5.8			

## Q2. >>> IMPROVING OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Table 4. Rating of: over the next ten years or so my family and I have a good chance of improving our standard of living (%)

Mean (SD)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly agree (4)	Don't know (5)	Did not answer (6)
2.64 (0.87)	9.4	22.8	37.5	12.2	17.5	0.5



Table 5. Cross tabulation between Rating of over the next ten years or so my family and I have a good chance of improving our standard of living and Rating of emotions of how things are going in the country these days

		RATING OF : OVER THE NEXT TEN YEARS OR SO MY FAMILY AND I HAVE A GOOD CHANCE OF IMPROVING OUR STANDARD OF LIVING						Total
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Did not answer	
RATING OF EMOTIONS OF HOW THINGS ARE GOING IN THE COUNTRY THESE DAYS :	Not At All	23.4%	9.1%	4.9%	7.3%	11.5%	11.1%	9.1%
	A Little	25.3%	28.6%	15.9%	12.1%	34.6%	11.1%	22.5%
	Moderately	30.4%	37.5%	33.5%	25.7%	31.9%	33.3%	32.9%
	Very	13.3%	19.0%	34.4%	39.8%	15.3%	22.2%	26.2%
	Extremely	6.3%	4.4%	9.0%	12.1%	4.1%	11.1%	7.3%
	Don't know/No reply	1.3%	1.3%	2.2%	2.9%	2.7%	11.1%	2.1%
<b>HOPEFUL</b>								
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- Q3. >>> STATE OF ECONOMY**  
**Q3a. >>> STATE OF ECONOMY - BETTER**  
**Q3b. >>> STATE OF ECONOMY - WORSE**

Table 6. Rating of: state of the economy in Ireland over the past 12 months (%)

Mean (SD)	Much worse (1)	Somewhat worse (2)	Stayed the same (3)	Somewhat better (4)	Much better (5)	Did not answer (6)
1.70 (0.87)	52.1	27.2	15.5	3.7	0.9	0.7

- Q4. >>> GOVERNMENT ACTION - DIFFERENCES IN INCOME AND WEALTH**

Table 7. Rating regarding differences in income and wealth (%)

<i>The Government SHOULD ACT to reduce differences in income and wealth</i>							<i>The Government SHOULD NOT ACT to reduce the differences in income and wealth</i>				DK
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	X
5.4	7.4	9.6	11.2	10.3	22.9	11.5	7.6	5.5	2.4	1.7	4.6

- Q5. >>> WHO IS IN POWER CAN MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE**  
**Q6. >>> WHO PEOPLE VOTE FOR MAKES A BIG DIFFERENCE**

Table 8. Rating of agreement with statements: so many people vote, my vote does not make much difference to who is in government (%)

Mean (SD)	Disagree Strongly (1)	Disagree (2)	Disagree Slightly (3)	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (4)	Agree Slightly (5)	Agree (6)	Agree Strongly (7)	DK (8)
2.71 (1.79)	33.6	24.1	11.8	10.1	8.6	6.7	3.8	1.3

**Q7. >>> LIKE-DISLIKE - PARTY**

Table 9. Party liking (%)

	Mean (SD)	Strongly Dislike - 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Strongly Like - 10	DK
<b>Fianna Fail</b>	3.40 (2.87)	20.4	13.0	10.0	9.7	9.0	12.5	5.9	5.8	5.1	2.3	3.1	3.1
<b>Fine Gael</b>	5.89 (2.62)	4.5	3.1	4.0	6.2	6.6	17.3	12.0	11.9	16.2	7.6	7.6	3.0
<b>Labour</b>	5.33 (2.39)	3.7	3.6	5.5	7.8	10.4	20.3	14.8	11.7	10.5	5.9	2.9	3.1
<b>Sinn Féin</b>	3.36 (2.98)	23.0	11.4	11.1	8.5	8.0	10.8	5.8	6.0	4.9	2.6	3.8	4.0
<b>Green Party</b>	2.27 (2.27)	29.9	15.1	12.7	11.7	7.7	9.4	3.8	2.7	1.6	0.5	0.3	4.5
<b>ULA</b>	4.80 (2.81)	40.8	12.7	9.6	6.3	4.5	7.4	2.6	1.9	0.7	0.2	0.3	13.1

**Q8. >>> LIKE-DISLIKE - LEADER**

Table 10. Leader liking (%)

	Mean (SD)	Strongly Dislike - 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Strongly Like - 10	DK
<b>Micheal Martin</b>	4.80 (2.81)	10.1	5.5	6.5	7.7	9.1	16.4	10.3	11.3	9.4	4.1	4.0	5.7
<b>Enda Kenny</b>	5.90 (2.49)	3.9	2.2	4.5	5.5	7.6	15.9	13.3	14.8	15.4	7.1	5.9	3.9
<b>Eammon Gilmore</b>	5.49 (2.17)	2.9	2.1	5.1	5.5	9.8	20.4	17.5	13.5	12.5	3.6	1.7	5.5
<b>Gerry Adams</b>	3.35 (2.81)	20.8	10.2	11.1	11.1	9.0	12.1	6.5	4.8	3.8	2.8	2.8	5.0
<b>John Gormley</b>	2.75 (2.33)	23.2	11.2	12.0	11.5	9.9	12.7	6.3	3.1	2.1	0.5	0.1	7.3
<b>Brian Cowan</b>	2.25 (2.35)	33.6	12.8	11.8	9.3	8.8	9.7	3.9	2.8	2.0	0.5	0.4	4.4

**Q9. >>> LEFT-RIGHT - PARTY****Q10. >>> LEFT-RIGHT - SELF**

Table 11. Left-right placement (Self and Party) (%)

	Mean (SD)	Left - 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Right - 10	DK
<b>Self</b>	6.00 (1.92)	0.6	0.8	1.9	4.3	5.7	24.3	17.3	11.2	11.3	5.0	3.7	14.0
<b>Fianna Fail</b>	5.95 (2.98)	5.6	4.0	5.1	5.6	4.0	8.8	7.8	11.8	14.4	8.4	9.3	15.2
<b>Fine Gael</b>	6.80 (2.25)	1.4	1.4	1.5	2.0	4.7	11.1	12.4	13.5	18.5	8.6	10.0	20.0
<b>Labour</b>	4.15 (2.46)	3.4	4.2	8.6	13.0	13.6	16.7	7.2	7.9	6.9	2.5	0.7	15.4
<b>Sinn Féin</b>	4.50 (2.26)	19.1	13.0	11.6	9.6	8.7	9.0	4.1	3.3	1.9	1.2	1.5	16.8
<b>Green Party</b>	2.82 (2.54)	10.4	4.3	6.2	7.4	11.6	18.8	9.5	6.0	4.2	1.5	1.1	18.9

**Q11. >>> OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCALE - PARTY**  
**Q12. >>> OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCALE - SELF**

Table 12. Optional scale (Self and Party): mean score summary

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
YOURSELF	6.00	1.922
BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY REGULATION	4.98	2.872
BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY OWERNERSHIP	6.19	2.869
EUROPEAN UNIFICATION	4.32	2.594
EXISTENCE OF GOD	7.00	2.769
ENVIRONMENT VERSUS ECONOMIC GROWTH	4.95	2.389
ABORTION	5.70	2.874

Table 13. Factor analysis for optional scale.

	<b>Component</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
RATING OF : BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY REGULATION	.763	-.032
RATING OF : BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY OWERNERSHIP	.754	-.038
RATING OF : EUROPEAN UNIFICATION	.601	.021
RATING OF : EXISTENCE OF GOD	.386	-.702
RATING OF : ENVIRONMENT VERSUS ECONOMIC GROWTH	.417	.286
RATING OF : ABORTION	.258	.774

**Q13. >>> SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRATIC PROCESS**

Table 14. Rating of satisfaction with the way democracy works in Ireland (%)

<b>RATING</b>	<b>INES 2002</b>	<b>INES 2007</b>	<b>INES 2011</b>
Very Satisfied	11.1	12.0	7.4
Fairly Satisfied	70.6	68.9	41.5
Not Very Satisfied	15.2	14.8	30.7
Not at all Satisfied	3.0	4.2	11.2

**Q14. >>> ARE YOU CLOSE TO ANY POLITICAL PARTY**

Table 15. Incidence of considering being close to any political party (%)

	<b>INES 2011</b>
YES	20.8
NO	76.8
DK	2.4

Table 16. Incidence of considering being close to any political party and party consider being close to (%)

		<b>PARTY CONSIDER BEING CLOSE TO : 1ST MENTION</b>						<b>Total</b>
		<b>Fianna Fáil</b>	<b>Fine Gael</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Sinn Féin</b>	<b>Green party</b>	<b>Other party</b>	
<b>INCIDENCE OF CONSIDERING BEING CLOSE TO ANY POLITICAL PARTY</b>	<b>Yes</b>	31.3	41.7	10.9	14.5	0.3	1.3	100.0

**Q14a. >>> DO YOU FEEL CLOSER TO ONE PARTY**

Table 17. Rating of feeling closer to one party (%)

Valid		Total
	Yes	14.9
	No	59.1
	Don't know/No reply	5.1
	Total	79.2
	NA	20.8

Table 18. Crosstabulation: Incidence of feeling a little closer to one of the political parties than another and political party consider feeling a little closer to (%)

		POLITICAL PARTY CONSIDER FEELING A LITTLE CLOSER TO						DK	Total
		Fianna Fáil	Fine Gael	Labour	Sinn Féin	Green party	Other party		
INCIDENCE OF FEELING A LITTLE CLOSER TO ONE OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES THAN ANOTHER	Yes	21.0	42.0	21.0	10.9	1.4	1.8	1.8	100.0

**Q14b. >>> WHICH PARTY DO YOU FEEL CLOSEST TO**

**Q14c. >>> DEGREE OF CLOSENESS TO THIS PARTY**

Table 19. Party feels closest to (%)

	INES 2011
Fianna Fail	30.8
Fine Gael	41.5
Green Party	0.3
Labour	11.4
Sinn Fein	14.8
Other Party	1.3

Table 20. Rating of closeness to party (%)

	INES 2011
Very Close	2.9
Somewhat Close	63.4
Not Very Close	31.5
DK	2.2

Table 21. Crosstabulation: Political party consider feeling a little closer to and rating of closeness to party (%)

		RATING OF CLOSENESS TO PARTY				Total
		Not the very close	Somewhat close	Very close	Don't know/No reply	
POLITICAL PARTY CONSIDER FEELING A LITTLE CLOSER TO	Fianna Fáil	22.4	72.4	3.4	1.7	100.0
	Fine Gael	31.0	63.8	2.6	2.6	100.0
	Labour	36.2	60.3	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Sinn Féin	36.7	60.0	3.3		100.0
	Green party	50.0	50.0			100.0
	Other party	40.0	40.0	20.0		100.0
	Don't know/Refused	40.0	40.0		20.0	100.0
Total		31.5	63.4	2.9	2.2	100.0

- Q15. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT
- Q15a. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: IF YOU HAD VOTED - MULTIPLE MENTIONS
- Q15b. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT
- Q15c. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PARTY LIST
- Q15d. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - DISTRICT CANDIDATE
- Q15e. >>> CURRENT ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE

Table 22. Current election (%)

STATEMENT DESCRIBING VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION				
I am sure I voted in the election	I did not vote in the election	I thought about voting in the election but in the end I didn't	I usually vote but didn't this time	Total
89.9	7.4	0.9	1.8	100.0

Table 23. Vote current election (%)

PARTY GAVE FIRST PREFERENCE VOTE TO (2011)										
Fianna Fáil	Fine Gael	Labour	Sinn Féin	Green Party	Socialist Party	Indep.	Other party	Refused	DK	Total
13.8	40.8	17.5	10.3	1.2	1.7	9.3	1.1	2.7	1.7	100.0

- Q16. >>> PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID RESPONDENT CAST A BALLOT
- Q16a. >>> PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PRESIDENT
- Q16b. >>> PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - PARTY LIST
- Q16c. >>> PREVIOUS ELECTION: VOTE CHOICE - DISTRICT CANDIDATE
- Q16d. >>> PREVIOUS ELECTION: DID R CAST CANDIDATE PREFERENCE VOTE

Table 24. Vote previous election (%)

PARTY GAVE FIRST PREFERENCE VOTE TO (2007)												
Fianna Fáil	Fine Gael	Labour	Sinn Féin	Green Party	PDs	Independent Candidate	Socialist Party	Other Party	Did not vote	Refused	DK	Total
33.7	22.3	9.9	5.7	1.6	0.3	2.9	0.2	0.2	12.2	1.9	9.0	100.0

Table 25. Crosstabulation between Vote in 2007 election and Vote in 2011 election (%)

		VOTE 2007												
		FF	FG	Labour	PDs	SF	GP	Indep	SP	Other	Did not vote	Refused	DK	Tot
VOTE 2011	FF	33.2	1.5	1.2	40.0	3.6	1.9				5.9	8.8	9.2	13.8
	FG	34.7	82.1	13.5	60.0	4.0	28.6	17.3			39.9	11.8	30.3	40.8
	Labour	13.6	6.1	66.1		7.1	21.4	7.7		25.0	20.3	2.9	18.3	17.5
	SF	5.2	2.6	5.8		74.7	3.6	1.9			16.3	2.9	13.4	10.3
	GP	0.5		2.9		2.0	28.6	1.9			0.7			1.2
	SP	0.9		2.9		2.0	3.6	11.5	100		2.0		1.4	1.7
	Indep	9.6	4.8	5.3		6.1	7.1	51.9		25.0	8.5	5.9	14.1	9.3
	Other	0.9		1.8		1.0	3.6	3.8		25.0	2.6		0.7	1.1
	Refused	0.7	1.5					1.9			2.0	61.8	7.0	2.7
	DK	0.9	1.3	0.6		3.0				25.0	2.0	5.9	5.6	1.7
Total		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

- Q17. >>> MOBILIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL CONTACT  
 Q17a. >>> MOBILIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL CONTACT - IN PERSON  
 Q17b. >>> MOBILIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL CONTACT - BY MAIL OR PHONE  
 Q17c. >>> MOBILIZATION: INSTITUTIONAL CONTACT - BY TEXT OR INTERNET
- Q18. >>> MOBILIZATION: PERSONAL CONTACT  
 Q18a. >>> MOBILIZATION: PERSONAL CONTACT - IN PERSON OR BY MAIL OR PHONE  
 Q18b. >>> MOBILIZATION: PERSONAL CONTACT - BY TEXT OR INTERNET

Table 26. Mobilization questions (INES 2011) (%)

	Direct (official campaign)			Indirect (friends/family)		
	Contact	Voted	Not voted	Contact	Voted	Not voted
Yes	55	56	41	28	30	11
No	45	44	58	71	70	88
NA	-	-	-	1	-	1
In person	88	88	88	90	90	87
Mail/phone	35	34	38	20	20	41
Text	3	3	2	4	4	-
Email/internet	3	3	-	3	3	-
NA	1	1	-	1	1	-

Table 27. Party who called to respondents home in the recent general election campaign (%)

Incidence	Total	Party	Total
Yes	51.8	Fianna Fail	22.1
No	42.9	Fine Gael	31.9
DK	5.3	Labour	16.3
Total	100.0	Sinn Fein	10.6
		Green	1.5
		Socialist Party	1.5
		Independent	10.9
		Other	2.5
		TD not running	0.2
		Don't remember name of TD	2.5
		Total	100.0

Table 28. Party workers/representatives of independent candidates called to respondents home (%)

Party	Total
Fianna Fail	23.9
Fine Gael	29.5
Labour	21.4
Sinn Fein	12.7
Green	3.2
United Left Alliance	1.0
Other Party	2.5
Independent Candidate	14.9
NONE	49.3

Table 29. Additive index of being contacted by candidate and party worker (0- no contact; 1- either candidate or party worker and 2 both of them)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	438	23.6	25.0	25.0
	1.00	767	41.4	43.7	68.7
	2.00	549	29.6	31.3	100.0
	Total	1754	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	99	5.3		
Total		1853	100.0		

**Q19. >>> MOBILIZATION: SIGN UP FOR ONLINE INFORMATION OR ALERTS**

Table 30. Online information or alerts (%)

PARTY SIGNED UP TO RECEIVE ONLINE INFORMATION/ALERTS ON THE INTERNET										
Fianna Fáil	Fine Gael	Labour	Sinn Féin	Green Party	ULA	Independent Candidate	Other Party	None	DK	Total
1.1	2.3	1.7	0.9	0.5	0.1	1.3	0.2	95.5	0.3	100.0

**Q20a. >>> POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 1ST**

TEXT: Which of these persons was the Finance Minister before the recent election?

**Q20b. >>> POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 2ND**

TEXT: What is the longest time permitted between one election and the next?

**Q20c. >>> POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 3RD**

TEXT: Which [PARTY, ALLIANCE, OR COALITION] came in second in the last election?

**Q20d. >>> POLITICAL INFORMATION ITEM - 4TH**

TEXT: Who was the first president of South Africa after apartheid ended? Desmond Tutu, Robert Mugabe, Nelson Mandela, or Rupiah Banda?

*Analysis of political knowledge questions (CSES questions)*

Table 31. Rating of political knowledge (CSES questions) (%)

Political Knowledge Question (CSES)	Correct	Incorrect	DK
Previous Finance Minister	86.7	6.0	7.4
Election term	63.9	23.1	13.0
Main opposition in the last election	83.8	12.0	4.2
First president in South Africa after apartheid	64.7	15.1	20.3

Table 32. Previous Finance Minister (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
Brian Lenihan	86	88	68	68	91
Other	6	5	9	9	6
DK	8	6	23	23	4

Table 33. Election term (%)

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Voted</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Disinterested</b>	<b>Interested</b>
5 years	64	66	37	50	71
Other	22	21	34	25	21
DK	13	12	30	24	7

Table 34. Main opposition in the last election (%)

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Voted</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Disinterested</b>	<b>Interested</b>
FG	84	86	65	78	87
Other	12	11	19	14	10
DK	4	3	15	8	2

Table 35. First president in South Africa after apartheid (%)

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Voted</b>	<b>Did not vote</b>	<b>Disinterested</b>	<b>Interested</b>
Nelson Mandela	64	67	42	49	73
Other	15	15	18	17	14
DK	21	19	40	32	14

Table 36. Summary of the additive knowledge index (CSES questions)

	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
CSES knowledge	1682	.00	4.00	2.4126	.90331
Valid N (listwise)	1682				

Table 37. INES 2011 Political knowledge \* Correlation with interest in politics and education (CSES questions)

		<b>RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS</b>	<b>EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE</b>	<b>CSES knowledge</b>
<b>RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	.173**	.252**
<b>EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE</b>	Pearson Correlation	.173**	1	.075**
<b>CSES knowledge</b>	Pearson Correlation	.252**	.075**	1

Table 38. Crosstabulation between Additive scale and Interest in politics (CSES questions) (%)

		<b>CSES knowledge</b>					
		.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	Total
<b>RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS</b>	Not at all interested	31.5	34.9	10.2	6.8	2.9	11.4
	Not very interested	32.6	24.0	28.7	22.4	26.1	25.1
	Quite interested	30.3	29.5	50.4	51.9	53.6	48.5
	Very interested	3.4	11.6	10.4	18.6	15.9	14.7
	Don't know/No reply	2.2		0.2	0.2	1.4	0.4
<b>Total</b>		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0



Table 39. Crosstabulation between Additive scale and Education (CSES questions) (%)

		CSES knowledge					Total
		.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	
EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE	Primary	11.2	10.3	6.2	7.8	8.7	7.8
	Junior cert or equivalent	23.6	23.3	16.5	14.0	18.8	16.2
	Leaving cert or equivalent	36.0	34.2	33.7	32.4	31.9	33.1
	Diploma or Certificate	16.9	13.0	20.3	20.6	26.1	19.9
	University degree or equivalent (completed)	12.4	13.0	20.1	23.2	13.0	20.4
	University degree or equivalent (incomplete)		6.2	3.2	2.0	1.4	2.6
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 40. Mokken analysis for the political knowledge questions (CSES questions) (%)

Significance level: 0.008333								
The two first items selected in the scale 1 are q23 and q22 (Hjk=0.4772)								
Significance level: 0.006250								
The item q25 is selected in the scale 1								
Hj=0.3991 H=0.4276								
Significance level: 0.005556								
The item q24 is selected in the scale 1								
Hj=0.3619 H=0.3954								
Significance level: 0.005556								
There is no more items remaining.								
Item	Obs	Mean Score	Observed Guttman errors	Expected Guttman errors	Loevinger H coeff	z-stat.	H0: Hj<=0 p-value	Number of NS Hjk
q24	1682	1.5446	5331	8354.80	0.36192	21.2760	0.0000	0
q25	1682	3.5416	4956	7750.63	0.36057	18.5481	0.00000	0
q23	1682	2.0874	5969	10047.71	0.40593	24.0847	0.00000	0
q22	1682	1.4804	4314	7866.73	0.45161	24.0709	0.00000	0
Scale	1682		10285	17009.94	0.39535	31.1254	0.00000	

### Analysis of political knowledge questions (INES 2011)

Table 41. Rating of political knowledge (%)

Political Knowledge Question (INES 2011)	Correct	Incorrect	DK
Number of seats in the current Dail	37.2	19.8	43.0
Current Irish commissioner of the EU	35.7	7.1	57.2
Previous Minister for Health	92.8	1.8	5.4
Current First minister of NI	44.8	9.2	46.0

Table 42. Number of seats in the current Dail (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
166 exactly	36	39	16	22	45
160-170	12	12	8	7	15
Other	8	8	7	7	9
DK	43	40	69	64	31

Table 43. Current Irish commissioner of the EU (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
Marie Geoghegan-Quinn	35	37	19	22	44

Other	7	7	7	5	8
DK	58	56	73	73	49

Table 44. Previous Minister for Health (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
Mary Harney	93	94	80	88	96
Other	2	2	3	2	2
DK	5	4	17	10	3

Table 45. Current First minister of NI (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
Peter Robinson	44	46	26	28	53
Other	9	10	7	7	11
DK	47	45	67	64	36

Table 46. Summary of the additive knowledge index (INES questions) (%)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
INES knowledge	1853	.00	4.00	2.1052	1.22043
Valid N (listwise)	1853				

Table 47. INES 2011 Political knowledge \* Correlation with interest in politics and education (INES questions)

		RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS	EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE	INES knowledge
RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS	Pearson Correlation	1	.173**	.322**
EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE	Pearson Correlation	.173**	1	.184**
INES knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.322**	.184**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 48. Cross tabulation between Additive scale and Interest in politics (INES questions) (%)

		INES knowledge					Total
		.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	
RATING OF INTEREST IN POLITICS	Not at all interested	37.2	16.8	7.7	5.8	4.2	11.4
	Not very interested	36.2	34.2	25.3	20.0	13.3	25.7
	Quite interested	22.3	40.4	53.3	53.5	57.9	48.1
	Very interested	3.2	8.0	13.7	20.3	24.4	14.4
	Don't know/No reply	1.1	.6		.3	.3	.4
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 49. Cross tabulation between Additive scale and Education (INES questions) (%)

		INES knowledge					Total
		.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	
EDUCATION LEVEL ACHIEVED TO DATE	Primary	7.4	11.6	8.4	6.5	2.2	7.9
	Junior cert or equivalent	27.7	18.8	15.9	12.9	14.1	16.7
	Leaving cert or equivalent	41.5	34.7	30.5	31.3	31.9	32.9
	Diploma or Certificate	13.8	18.3	23.5	19.7	18.3	19.5
	University degree or equivalent (completed)	5.3	13.6	18.2	27.4	31.3	20.0

	University degree or equivalent (incomplete)	4.3	3.1	3.4	2.3	2.2	2.9
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 50. Mokken analysis for the political knowledge questions (INES questions)

Significance level: 0.008333  
 The two first items selected in the scale 1 are qe9 and qe7 (Hjk=0.6490)  
 Significance level: 0.006250  
 The item qe8 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.6012                      H=0.6072  
 Significance level: 0.005556  
 The item qe10 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.4844                      H=0.5336  
 Significance level: 0.005556  
 There is no more items remaining.

Observed	Expected	Number						
Item	Obs	Mean Score	Guttman errors	Guttman errors	Loevinger H coeff	z-stat.	H0: Hj<=0 of NS p-value	Hjk
qe10	1853	2.0119	2077	4027.98	0.48436	27.6909	0.00000	0
qe8	1853	2.2148	1627	3834.63	0.57571	31.6330	0.00000	0
qe9	1853	1.1257	299	746.53	0.59948	11.6717	0.00000	0
qe7	1853	2.5693	2269	4838.22	0.53103	30.9614	0.00000	0
Scale	1853		3136	6723.68	0.53359	37.6189	0.00000	

Table 51. Mokken analysis for all political knowledge questions

Significance level: 0.001786  
 The two first items selected in the scale 1 are qe7 and qe9 (Hjk=0.6279)  
 Significance level: 0.001471  
 The item qe8 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.6005                      H=0.6037  
 Significance level: 0.001282  
 The item q22 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.4764                      H=0.5369  
 Significance level: 0.001163  
 The item qe10 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.4900                      H=0.5151  
 Significance level: 0.001087  
 The item q23 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.4319                      H=0.4730  
 Significance level: 0.001042  
 The item q25 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.4026                      H=0.4478  
 Significance level: 0.001020  
 The item q24 is selected in the scale 1                      Hj=0.3288                      H=0.4140  
 Significance level: 0.001020  
 There is no more items remaining.

Observed	Expected	Number						
Item	Obs	Mean Score	Guttman errors	Guttman errors	Loevinger H coeff	z-stat.	H0: Hj<=0 of NS p-value	Hjk
q24	1682	1.5446	8154	12148.27	0.32879	22.5293	0.00000	0
q25	1682	3.5416	8188	13192.24	0.37933	26.4110	0.00000	0
q23	1682	2.0874	9969	16836.14	0.40788	31.2716	0.00000	0
qe10	1682	1.9929	5261	8741.86	0.39818	26.1182	0.00000	0
q22	1682	1.4804	6134	11415.52	0.46266	28.5447	0.00000	0
qe8	1682	2.1766	3988	7798.59	0.48863	28.6735	0.00000	0
qe7	1682	2.5404	6203	11781.04	0.47348	30.5579	0.00000	0
qe9	1682	1.1171	2199	3573.32	0.38461	21.1537	0.00000	0
Scale	1682		25048	42743.50	0.41399	53.0229	0.00000	

Table 52. Rating of how knowledgeable the respondent is about politics (%)

	Total	Voted	Did not vote	Disinterested	Interested
<b>Very little or no knowledge</b>	6	5	19	15	1
<b>2</b>	18	17	24	30	11
<b>3</b>	32	32	34	33	32
<b>4</b>	29	31	16	17	37
<b>Very knowledgeable indeed</b>	14	14	6	6	18
<b>No reply</b>	-	-	1	1	-
<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100	100

Table 53. Rating of how knowledgeable the respondent is about politics \* Correlation with INES 2011 and CSES political knowledge

		RATING OF HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE THE RESPONDENT IS ABOUT POLITICS		
			CSES knowledge	INES knowledge
RATING OF HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE THE RESPONDENT IS ABOUT POLITICS	Pearson Correlation	1	.257**	.459**
	CSES knowledge	.257**	1	.266**
	INES knowledge	.459**	.266**	1

**Q21. >>> INCOME OR JOB LOSS IN THE NEXT YEAR**

Table 54. Likelihood job loss (%)

Not at all likely	Not very likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	DK	Tot
30.3	31.9	22.1	10.2	5.5	100.0

**Q22. >>> FIND ANOTHER JOB OR SOURCE OF INCOME**

Table 55. Difficulty finding another job (%)

Very difficult	Fairly difficult	Fairly easy	Very easy	DK	Tot
60.6	28.6	4.3	1.5	4.9	100.0

Table 56. Cross-tabulation between Likelihood Job loss and Difficulty finding another job (%)

		LIKELIHOOD THAT INCOME OR JOB MIGHT BE LOST IN THE NEXT YEAR					Total
		Not at all likely	Not very likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	DK	Total
HOW EASY/DIFFICULT IT WOULD BE TO FIND ANOTHER JOB/SOURCE OF INCOME SHOULD YOU LOOSE YOU JOB/SOURCE OF INCOME IN THE NEXT YEAR	Very difficult	20.1	16.5	12.8	8.9	2.4	60.6
	Fairly difficult	5.6	13.2	8.5	1.1	.2	28.6
	Fairly easy	2.0	1.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	4.3
	Very easy	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.1		1.5
	DK	1.5	0.5	0.1		2.9	4.9

		LIKELIHOOD THAT INCOME OR JOB MIGHT BE LOST IN THE NEXT YEAR						
		Not at all likely	Not very likely	Fairly likely	Very likely	DK	Total	
HOW EASY/DIFFICULT IT WOULD BE TO FIND ANOTHER JOB/SOURCE OF INCOME SHOULD YOU LOOSE YOU JOB/SOURCE OF INCOME IN THE NEXT YEAR	Very difficult	20.1	16.5	12.8	8.9	2.4	60.6	
	Fairly difficult	5.6	13.2	8.5	1.1	.2	28.6	
	Fairly easy	2.0	1.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	4.3	
	Very easy	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.1		1.5	
	DK	1.5	0.5	0.1		2.9	4.9	
Total		30.3	31.9	22.1	10.2	5.5	100.0	

- Q23a. >>> OWNERSHIP: RESIDENCE
- Q23b. >>> OWNERSHIP: BUSINESS OR PROPERTY OR FARM OR LIVESTOCK
- Q23c. >>> OWNERSHIP: STOCKS OR BONDS
- Q23d. >>> OWNERSHIP: CHECKING OR SAVINGS ACCOUNT

Table 57. Asset Ownership in Ireland (%)

Assets	Ireland 2011
Your own residence	79.3
A current or savings account	82.8
Stocks or shares	15.8
Piece of property (other than primary residence)	10.2
A business	10.0
A farm	7.4
Livestock	6.7
Did not answer	5.6

Table 58. Summary of the ownership index (%)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
IndexOwn	1853	.00	7.00	2.1225	1.17313
Valid N (listwise)	1853				