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Objectives and benefits
The CSES Bibliography project

• The CSES continuously collects information about outputs that use the CSES data (E.g.: Journal articles, conference/working papers, book chapters, PhDs etc…)

• However, we lack detailed information on:
  o What are these articles about?
  o What particular CSES variables do these articles use?
  o What is the most common topic investigated?

• **Objective:** to systematically analyse items in CSES bibliography by extracting the contents of each contribution through a manual content analysis.
Why conduct an audit of the CSES bibliography?

• Allows the PC to know what data are being used and what data are not ➔ Helpful in devising questionnaire.

• Allows the Secretariat to organize the bibliography by topic, journal, keywords ➔ Boon for user community.

• Allows the project to know where we are being published and on what, enabling us to demonstrate knowledge exchange more clearly ➔ Of interest to funders of project.

• Helps to identify research gaps ➔ Useful for the scholarly community at large.
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Data & Methods
Content analysis I

- Manual content analysis of published journal articles in English up to June 2015 by CSES Secretariat.

- Six students from University of Michigan. Mostly graduate students in PoliSci and Communications.

- Male/Female mixture. All native English speakers. Majority had previous experience of content analysis. All received 8h training.

- Trial exercise on 3 articles → checked by a CSES Secretariat coder.
Content analysis II

- Initial pre-test of coding scheme on 20 articles by CSES Secretariat.

- Total N articles=195. Coding took place between 13 July and 31 August 2015.
Reliability tests

- **Intra**: 10% of sample recoded blind by initial coder and scores compared with original coding.
- **Inter**: 10% of sample coded by different coder and scores compared with original coding.
- KALPHA (Hayes & Krippendorff 2007).
  - **Intra**: All variables have min KALPHA of 0.58. Mean is 0.9
  - **Inter**: **Most** variables have minimum KALPHA of 0.50. Mean is 0.6
    - Dependent variable classification: KALPHA=0.38
    - Indep. var Left-Right expert coding: KALPHA=0.24
Drawbacks to our analysis

- English language bias.
- Module 3-4 under representation.
- Journal publications only!
- Frequency of usage might not reflect innovation.
- Content analysis not an exact science. Reliability sufficient.
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Results
Number of journal publications by year

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)

2015: Most successful publication year
Number of journal publications by year

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
N: 195
Use of CSES modules

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015).
N=195.
Usage of CSES data: Dependent variables

- Turnout/pol. participation: 18%
- Vote choice: 17%
- Parties: 15%
- Party ID: 9%
- Satisfaction with Democracy: 7%
- Economic and issue voting: 3%
- Political mobili/campaign involvement: 2%
- Electoral integrity: 2%
- Political efficacy: 2%
- Distributional & Social protection: 1%
- Leaders & candidates: 1%
- Political knowledge: 1%
- Electoral systems: 1%
- Other: 21%

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
N=195.

KALPHA: 0.38
Usage of CSES data:
Independent variables – demographics

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
N=195
Usage of CSES data:
Independent variables – core/theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Usage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resp. Left-Right/Alt position</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party ID</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. Party: Left-Right</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Choice: previous/current elec.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. Party: Like-Dislike</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Issue Voting</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Knowledge</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Democracy</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout: previous/current elec.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Integrity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. Political Leaders: Like-Dislike</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Political Participation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Campaign Mobilization</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Leaders: Left-Right</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributional &amp; Social Protection</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
N=195
Usage of CSES data: Independent variables – macro

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
N=195
Published data using CSES: journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Studies</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJPR</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Politics</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJPS</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRQ</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEPOP</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEP</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJPS</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Studies</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Analysis</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSR</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Behavior</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSR</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOP</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: CSES Bibliography Project (2015)
CSES journal publications and journal rankings using the H5 index

Source of data:
CSES Bibliography Project (2015) and Google Scholar
## Top CSES articles by citation count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CSES Bibliography Project (2016) and Google Scholar. Citation count correct as of 30 June 2016
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Summary

CSES
COMPARATIVE STUDY of ELECTORAL SYSTEMS
Highlights

• 195 journal articles published using CSES: June 2015.
• 2015 the most successful year for CSES publications.
• Modules 1&2 most used in journal publications.
• Dependent variable: mixed bag. Turnout and vote choice most popular.
• Independent variables:
  o Demographics: 4 frequently used variables.
  o Core/Theme: Mixed distribution.
  o Macro: Electoral Structure & results most widely used.
• 4 journals account for 46% of CSES publications.
• USA affiliated authors have most CSES publications.
The CSES Bibliography project
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