

**Compilation of the
Pilot Studies Reports Prepared for
The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems**

November 6, 1995

Compilation Prepared by:

Steven J. Rosenstone
Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Pilot Study Reports Prepared by:

Gábor Tóka
Central European University
Budapest, Hungary

Juan Díez Nicolás
Análisis Sociológicos Económicos y Políticos
Madrid, Spain

Steven J. Rosenstone
Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Pavel Campeanu
Centrul Independent De Studii Sociale Ôi Sondaje
Bucharest, Romania

Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Jurgen Lass
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung
Berlin, Germany

CSES Secretariat:
Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106-1248, USA
Fax: 313-764-3341
Telephone: 313-764-5494
E-mail: cses@umich.edu

PART I. Field Administration of the Questionnaire Modules

I.1. Technical Characteristics of the Pilot Studies

1. Dates of Interviewing

Hungary	23 June - 1 July 1995
Spain	3 July - 8 July 1995
USA	3 August - 10 September 1995
Romania	20 July - 6 August
Belarus	7 June - 20 June

2. Mode of Interviewing

Hungary	Face-to-face
Spain	Face-to-face
USA	Telephone
Romania	Face-to-face
Belarus	Face-to-face

3. Population Sampled

Hungary	18+ years old, non-institutionalized, permanent residents
Spain	18+ years old, living in private households
USA	18+ years old, non-institutionalized, citizens
Romania	18+ years old
Belarus	18+ years old

4. Sampling Procedures

Hungary	Four-stage cluster sample; random route; random selection within household; two callbacks.
Spain	Random selection of sampling points; random routes; random selection within household; substitutions when nobody home, non-eligible person, or refusal.
USA	Random selection of respondents from the 1994 National Election Study. The 1994 NES was a two-stage area probability sample with random selection of primary and secondary sampling units and households; random selection within household.
Romania	Stratified sample of 11 regions x size of cities. Three-stage sampling procedure in each stratus: towns selected; random route selection of dwelling units; first birthday method of selecting person.
Belarus	Random route

5. Response Rate

Hungary	78%
Spain	67% (does not exclude non-eligible persons)
USA	69% (re-interview rate of 1994 respondents)
Romania	N/A
Belarus	N/A

6. Number of Respondents Interviewed

Hungary	1196
Spain	1209
USA	239
Romania	963
Belarus	1000

7. Location of CSES Module in the Pilot Study

Hungary	Module appeared in its entirety several minutes into the survey following a section on media consumption.
Spain	Module appeared in its entirety in the middle of an omnibus questionnaire after questions on political attitudes and behavior.
USA	Module appeared in its entirety as the third section of survey following questions on media consumption and evaluations of political leaders and groups.
Romania	A subset of the module was asked. The questions were interspersed among other items about politics and the economy.
Belarus	A subset of the module was asked. Location of items in the instrument not reported. The order of the questions in CSES module was changed.

8. Integrity of the CSES Module

Hungary	Entire CSES module asked. All questions were asked in the recommended format with the recommended response categories.
Spain	Entire CSES module asked. All questions were asked in the recommended format with the recommended response categories.
USA	Entire CSES module asked. All questions were asked in the recommended format with the recommended response categories.
Romania	Subset of CSES module asked. Not all CSES questions were asked in the recommended format or asked with the recommended response categories.
Belarus	Subset of CSES module asked. Many CSES question wordings and response categories were changed.

NOTE: In the tables that follow, study results are summarized only for those questions that were asked using the recommended CSES question format and response options. Results from use of different question wordings and/or response options are displayed in the original pilot study reports. The question number refers to the order in which the question appeared in the pilot questionnaires.

I.2. Average Length of Interview

Hungary:	18.0 minutes
Spain:	11.9 minutes
USA:	10.5 minutes
Romania:	N/A
Belarus:	N/A

PART II. Analysis of Individual Items

II.1. Party Identification and Leader Evaluation

Q3. Party Identification

Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular political party?

a. (IF YES TO Q3) Which party is that? (RECORD ALL PARTIES)

b. (IF MORE THAN ONE PARTY MENTIONED AT a) Which party do you feel closest to?

c. Do you feel very close to this party, somewhat close, or not very close? GO TO Q4

d. (IF DK/NA TO a) Do you feel yourself a little closer to one of the political parties than the others?

e. (IF YES TO d) Which party is that?

	<u>Don't Know Responses</u>		
	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q3c</u>	<u>Q3d</u>
Hungary	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%
Spain	1.2%	3.9%	3.4%
USA	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%

Note: In the tables below, the parties are ordered by size of vote in the last election.

Hungary

	<u>MSZP</u>	<u>SZDSZ</u>	<u>MDF</u>	<u>FKGP</u>	<u>KDNP</u>	<u>FIDESZ</u>	<u>MP</u>	<u>KP</u>	<u>ASZ</u>	<u>MIEP</u>
Very close to party	2.8	.4	.6	1.0	.5	.6	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat close	5.1	2.4	1.5	2.2	1.3	.6	.6	0.0	.1	0.0
Not very close	1.4	.1	0.0	.2	.1	.1	.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Close, not closest	1.5	2.2	.5	1.4	1.3	2.3	.7	.2	.1	.2
Leaning to party	6.1	4.0	1.9	5.2	1.9	2.8	.5	.1	.4	.1

Total Identifiers	16.9	9.1	3.5	10.0	5.1	6.4	2.5	.3	.6	.3
Non-Identifiers: 45.3%										

Spain

	<u>National Parties</u>					<u>Regional Parties</u>				
	<u>PSOE</u>	<u>PP</u>	<u>IU</u>	<u>Ecol.</u>	<u>CDS</u>	<u>CIU</u>	<u>PNV</u>	<u>EA</u>	<u>PAR</u>	<u>Others</u>
Very close to party	4.2	3.7	1.4	.1	.1	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5
Somewhat close	6.6	6.9	2.0	.4	.1	.8	.2	.1	0.0	.6
Not very close	.5	.3	.1	.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.1
Close, not closest	1.3	.4	1.6	.2	.2	.8	.2	.1	.1	.9
Leaning to party	6.0	6.1	5.9	.4	.4	.7	.5	0.0	.2	1.0

Total Identifiers	18.7	17.5	10.9	1.2	.8	3.0	.8	.2	.3	3.1
Non-Identifiers: 40.9%										

USA

	<u>Republican</u>	<u>Democrat</u>	<u>Libertarian</u>
Very close	1.7	2.5	0.0
Somewhat close	23.9	19.7	2.5
Not very close	0.0	1.3	0.0
Close, not closest	12.2	7.6	0.0

Total Identifiers	37.8	31.1	2.5
Non-Identifiers: 28.6			

Discussion: On the surface, the CSES measure of party identification seems to perform well. Few respondents have trouble answering the question. The patterns of party identification within each country looks sensible. As one would expect from other scholarship, citizens of the USA are more likely to identify with a party than are Europeans. The correlation between CSES measure of party identification and traditional measure of party identification used in the U.S. National Election Studies is a very strong .82. The Hungarian data show that there is a distinct difference between the distribution of responses to the party identification question and a question asking people how they would vote were the election were held *next Sunday*,⁶ suggesting that the question is measuring something distinct from current vote choice. Analysis reported below further suggests that responses to the party identification question are distinct from previous vote choice as well.

Q7. Party Evaluation

I'd like to know what you think about each of our political parties. After I read the name of a political party, please rate it on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you strongly dislike that party and 10 means that you strongly like that party. If I come to a party you haven't hear of or you feel you do not know enough about, just say so. The first party is PARTY A.

Hungary

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know</u>	<u>Party Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
MSZP	6	3.7	2.1
SZDSZ	9	4.3	2.8
MDF	10	3.3	2.7
FKGP	8	3.8	3.3
KDNP	14	3.7	2.8
FIDESZ	10	3.9	2.8
MP	19	2.7	2.9
MIÉP	33	1.9	2.4

Spain

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know</u>	<u>Party Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
PSOE	4	3.9	3.2
PP	6	3.8	3.3
IU	7	3.6	2.7
CDS	24	3.4	2.7

USA

Party	% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Party	Mean	Standard Deviation
Republican	1	5.5	2.4
Democratic	2	5.8	2.6
Libertarian	38	3.3	2.4

Discussion: The effort to code lack of information about each party seems to work: the question successfully picks up don't know responses and the pattern of don't knows is strongly associated with size of party, as one would expect. The smaller parties tend to be less well liked, as one would expect.

Q20. Probability of Ever Voting for Party

We have a number of parties in this country, each of which would like to get your vote. Please tell me for each of the following how probable it is that you will ever vote for this party, using the scale on the card, (where ZERO means not at all probable, and TEN means very probable)?

Hungary

Party	% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Party	Mean	Standard Deviation
MSZP	6	3.3	3.4
SZDSZ	7	3.9	3.3
MDF	6	2.7	2.9
FKGP	6	3.4	3.7
KDNP	8	2.9	3.1
FIDESZ	7	3.3	3.3
MP	11	2.2	3.1
MIÉP	21	1.4	2.3

Spain

Party	% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Party	Mean	Standard Deviation
PSOE	7	3.7	3.8
PP	7	3.8	3.8
IU	9	3.1	3.1
CDS	20	2.3	2.6

USA

Party	% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Party	Mean	Standard Deviation
Republican	1	5.6	3.3
Democratic	2	6.1	3.5
Libertarian	38	2.6	2.8

Discussion: We pick up fewer don't knows here than in Q7, but that is probably due to Q20 appearing later in the questionnaire. The pattern of don't knows is correct: there are more of them for the smaller, less well-known parties. People are more likely to say they would vote for one of the large parties than for one of the more obscure parties, as one would expect.

Q8. Evaluation of Party Leaders

And now, using the same scale, I'd like to ask you how much you like or dislike some political leaders. Again, if I come to a leader you haven't heard of or you feel you do not know enough about, just say so. The first political leader is LEADER A.

Hungary

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Horn	3	3.8	3.2
Bekesi	16	4.2	2.8
Szuos	20	4.0	2.6
Peto	10	4.4	2.7
Tolgyessy	37	4.4	2.7
Szabo	18	3.4	2.6
Boross	8	2.9	2.6
Torgyan	3	4.1	3.5
Giczy	48	3.4	2.7
Orban	7	4.0	2.8
Thurmer	32	2.5	2.7
Csurka	17	2.0	2.4

Spain

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
González	4	4.1	3.4
Aznar	6	3.8	3.3
Anguita	7	3.8	2.7
Ortega	46	3.1	2.5

USA

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Dole	6	5.4	2.8
Clinton	1	5.2	2.3

Belarus

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Poznyak	33	2.7	3.4
Kalyakin	88	3.3	2.5
Dubko	67	4.8	2.9
Karpenko	69	4.6	2.9
Lukashenko (Pres)	23	5.8	3.7
Kebich (PM)	38	3.6	3.1

Discussion: As one would expect, citizens are less likely to recognize the obscure party leaders. It appears that party leaders are less well known in new democracies.

Correlations Among Partisanship, Evaluation of Parties, Evaluation of Party Leaders,
Probability of Voting for Party, and Vote Choice
(cell entry = average Pearson correlation coefficient across the parties and leaders)

Hungary	Q3	Q7 Evaluation <u>Partisanship of Parties</u>	Q8 Evaluation of <u>Party Leaders</u>	Q20 Prob of Voting <u>for Party</u>
Q3. Partisanship	1.0			
Q7. Evaluation of Parties	.36	1.0		
Q8. Evaluation of Party Leaders	.26	.60	1.0	
Q20. Prob. of Voting for Party	.33	.60	.50	1.0
Vote Choice	.41	.30	.27	.23

Spain	Q3	Q7 Evaluation <u>Partisanship of Parties</u>	Q8 Evaluation of <u>Party Leaders</u>	Q20 Prob of Voting <u>for Party</u>
Q3. Partisanship	1.0			
Q7. Evaluation of Parties	.52	1.0		
Q8. Evaluation of Party Leaders	.68	.84	1.0	
Q20. Prob. of Voting for Party	.72	.43	.56	1.0

USA	Q3	Q7 Evaluation <u>Partisanship of Parties</u>	Q8 Evaluation of <u>Party Leaders</u>	Q20 Prob of Voting <u>for Party</u>
Q3. Partisanship	1.0			
Q7. Evaluation of Parties	.56	1.0		
Q8. Evaluation of Party Leaders	.44	.70	1.0	
Q20. Prob. of Voting for Party	.55	.67	.48	1.0
Presidential Vote Choice >92	.50	.43	.43	.43
Congressional Vote Choice >94	.46	.51	.44	.41

Discussion: The four measures (Partisanship, Evaluation of Parties, Evaluation of Party Leaders, and Probability of Voting for Party) are very highly inter-correlated. Analysis in each country suggests that there is a redundancy of information here and that all four questions are probably not needed. Q7 (Party Evaluations) and Q8 (Leader Evaluations) are too highly correlated to suggest that they are measuring different evaluations. Both questions are surely not needed. We also do not need both Q7 (Evaluation of Parties) and Q20 (Probability of Voting for Party). The pilot analyses do not unequivocally demonstrate that one question should be preferred over the other. Q20, though, probably has greater versatility than does Q7.

II.2. Spatial Issue Voting: Left-Right Scale

Q14. Left-Right Scale: Placement of Self and Parties

In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?

Using the same scale, where would you place PARTY A?

Hungary

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Don't</u>	<u>Standard</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Deviation</u>
(Respondent)	17	4.7	2.1
MSZP	23	2.9	2.5
SZDSZ	24	4.4	2.2
MDF	25	6.6	2.3
FKGP	25	6.7	2.7
KDNP	27	6.2	2.1
FIDESZ	27	5.8	2.2
MP	25	2.0	2.5
MIÉP	28	7.7	2.9

Spain

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Don't</u>	<u>Standard</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Deviation</u>
(Respondent)	16	4.5	2.4
PSOE	11	4.4	2.3
PP	10	7.9	2.1
IU	12	2.3	1.9
CDS	31	5.3	1.4

USA

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Don't</u>	<u>Standard</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Deviation</u>
(Respondent)	5	5.7	2.2
Republican	8	5.9	2.5
Democratic	7	4.7	2.5
Libertarian	47	3.9	2.7

Belarus

<u>Party</u>	<u>% Don't</u>	<u>Standard</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Deviation</u>
Adradzennye	47	7.5	3.5
Communist	45	1.8	3.3
Agrarian	74	4.3	3.2
People Consensus	79	3.7	2.6
Nadezda	87	4.3	2.1

Q15. Left-Right Scale: Placement of Leaders

And using the same scale, where 0 means the left and 10 means the right, where would you place leader A?

Hungary

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Horn	24	3.0	2.6
Szuos	28	4.0	2.2
Bekesi	29	3.9	2.3
Peto	25	4.8	2.2
Tolgyessy	17	5.1	2.1
Szabo	8	6.3	2.3
Boross	25	6.3	2.6
Torbyan	1	6.9	3.0
Giczy	27	6.0	2.3
Orban	26	5.9	2.2
Thurmer	15	2.1	2.6
Csurka	27	7.8	3.0

Spain

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
González	12	4.4	2.3
Aznar	10	8.1	2.0
Anguita	11	2.4	2.0
Ortega	32	5.2	1.4

USA

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Dole	9	6.0	2.4
Clinton	7	4.8	2.6

Belarus

<u>Leader</u>	<u>% Haven't Heard of or Don't Know Leader</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Poznyak	46	7.6	3.4
Kalyakin	92	3.3	2.5
Dubko	75	4.3	3.2
Karpenko	75	4.4	2.9
Lukashenko (Pres)	47	3.8	2.9
Kebich (PM)	37	3.4	3.7

Average Correlation Between Education and Don't Know to Left-Right Placements of Self, Parties, and Leaders

<u>Country</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
Hungary	-.25
Spain	-.15
USA	-.06
Romania	-.07 (self only)
Belarus	-.11 (leaders only)

Average Correlation Between Left-Right Placement of Parties and Placement of Leaders Within the Party
(cell entry = average Pearson correlation coefficient between placement of parties and leaders)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
Hungary	.52
Spain	
USA	.68

Discussion: The left-right question produced more don't know responses than the questions that asked respondents to evaluate the parties and candidates. Interviewers in both Hungary and the USA reported that respondents had trouble with these questions, though this did not appear to be problem in Spain. USA interviewers reported that respondents had difficulty thinking in these terms and that many of the respondents who answered this question probably still did not understand the concept. Those respondents with the least amount of formal education had the most difficulty with this question. [Note: some of the cross-national differences in the patterns of don't know responses may stem from differences in whether interviewers accepted an initial response of don't know or probed don't knows. We need to formulate recommendations on a common probing practice that we should all follow.] The patterns of don't knows make sense though. Respondents have a more difficult time placing obscure parties and leaders; parties and leaders are harder to place in the newer democracies than in the consolidated regimes. Despite these problems with the reliability of this measure, the mean responses of respondents within each country produce a left-right array of the parties and leaders that makes substantive sense, suggesting item validity. The very strong correlation between placement of the parties and the leaders within those parties suggests that respondents may not be formulating independent judgements when answering these two questions and that left-right placement of leaders may add little unique information.

Correlation Between Self-Placement of Respondent on Left-Right Scale and Self-Placement on Other Dimensions:

	<u>Other Dimension</u>	<u>Correlation with 11-point Left-Right Scale</u>
Hungary	7-point, left-right scale	.34
Spain	7-point, left-right scale	.76
USA	7-point, liberal-conservative scale	.48
	Gov't should provide jobs and a standard of living	.35
	Equal rights for women	.33
	Federal health insurance	.32
	Federal assistance to blacks	.30
	Defense spending	.26
	Death penalty	.25
	Abortion	.21
	Prayer in the public schools	.12

Discussion: In Hungary and Spain, responses to the 11-point left-right scale are very highly associated with responses to a 7-point version of the scale. Responses to the 11-point left-right scale are strongly associated with responses to the 7-point liberal-conservative scale used in the USA. Within the United States, the left-right scale is associated with a

whole host of issue dimensions, though slightly more correlated with the social welfare dimension than social issues.

One concern about the use of the 11-point (1-10) scale over a 10-point (1-10) version of the scale was that the 11-point scale would produce more missing data and a greater clustering of respondents at the mid-point of the distribution. Neither appears to have happened as demonstrated by the question format experiment conducted in Hungary. The 11-point scale does not produce more don't know responses or a significantly different relationship between education and the propensity to respond don't know. Moreover, for center parties and candidates, there is just as much clustering of respondents at the mid-point of the distribution on the 11-point scale as there is at the mistaken midpoint (5) of the 10-point scale. In short, when presented with a 10-point scale, many respondents mistakenly treat point 5 as if it were the midpoint.

Comparison of 11-Point (1-10) and 10-Point (1-10) Left/Right Scales:

Hungary:

	<u>11-point</u>	<u>10-point</u>
Average % Don't Know	25.4%	25.6%
Average correlation of Don't Know with education	-.25	-.19

Distribution of placement of respondent, and selected parties and leaders on 11-point and 10-point left-right scales (From: Toka, Table II.2/1-D).

scale	object	Placement on the left-right scale										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11 point	SELF	5	3	6	9	11	48	5	5	4	2	3
10 point	SELF	.	10	3	9	14	44	5	5	4	3	3
11 point	SZDSZ	8	4	7	10	17	30	10	7	4	3	1
10 point	SZDSZ	.	9	8	14	15	26	11	8	4	3	3
11 point	KDNP	1	1	2	6	8	22	17	16	15	6	7
10 point	KDNP	.	2	5	4	6	19	16	16	16	8	10
11 point	FIDESZ	1	2	4	8	8	24	19	13	12	5	6
10 point	FIDESZ	.	3	5	6	9	17	15	19	11	7	7
11 point	SZUROS	7	6	11	19	17	21	7	4	3	3	2
10 point	SZUROS	.	10	9	16	17	20	12	7	5	2	4
11 point	BEKESI	6	8	16	19	13	22	5	3	4	3	2
10 point	BEKESI	.	13	10	21	19	24	5	2	2	3	3
11 point	PETO	5	3	5	11	20	23	14	8	7	2	3
10 point	PETO	.	8	7	12	15	26	14	9	4	3	3
11 point	TOLGYESSY	4	1	4	12	13	27	18	11	6	3	2
10 point	TOLGYESSY	.	5	3	9	18	23	16	10	9	4	4
11 point	GICZY	3	1	4	4	6	23	19	15	12	6	8
10 point	GICZY	.	2	1	3	7	20	19	16	16	6	10
11 point	ORBAN	1	3	4	4	8	22	18	15	14	6	5
10 point	ORBAN	.	3	3	6	10	16	18	18	12	8	8

II.3. Candidate Recognition and Interaction with Representatives

Q11. Recall of Parliamentary/Congressional Candidates

*Do you happen to remember the name of any candidates who [ran / stood] in your [Lower house primary electoral district, e.g. constituency, district, riding] in the last [parliamentary / congressional] election?
IF YES TO Q11: (If name not volunteered) What were their names?*

	<u>% responding Don't Know</u>	<u>% Correctly Recalling a Candidate</u>	<u>Correlation Between Correctly Recalling a Candidate and Education</u>
Hungary	2	43	.21
Spain	10	13	.19
USA	2	34	.15
Romania	-	25	.02

Q13. Contact with Representatives

There are many ways in which people can have contact with their representatives in [Parliament / Congress]. They can receive something in the mail, meet them personally, hear them speak at a meeting or rally, or talk to a member of their staff. During the past twelve months, have you had any contact with [a Member of Parliament / a Member of Congress] in any of these ways?

	<u>% responding Don't Know</u>	<u>% who had Contact</u>
Hungary	0	8
Spain	4	9
USA	0	40

Discussion: There is no sign of problems with these items. [Note, however, that it is unclear in the individual pilot study reports whether investigators checked to see whether those respondents who reported that they could recall a candidate correctly did so. We need to ensure that the responses are checked in the production mode study.] The positive correlation between education and recall makes sense. It makes sense that citizens of the United States are much more likely to have come in contact with their representatives than citizens in Hungary or Spain.

II.4. Performance of the National Economy

Q9. Evaluation of the Economy

What do you think about the state of the economy these days in this country? Would you say that the state of the economy is very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad, or very bad?

	% responding <u>Don't Know</u>	Very			<u>Bad</u>	<u>Very Bad</u>
		<u>Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Neither</u>		
Hungary	1	0	0	16	39	44
Spain	3	0	7	35	42	15
USA	2	3	31	36	24	5
Romania	1	1	6	37	31	24

Q10. Economy Over the Past 12 Months

Would you say that over the past twelve months the state of the economy in this country has gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse? (IF BETTER: Would you say much or somewhat better?) (IF WORSE: Would you say much worse or somewhat worse?)

	% Responding <u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Much Better</u>	<u>Some-what Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Some-what Worse</u>	<u>Much Worse</u>
Hungary	2	0	4	17	22	58
Spain	3	2	17	44	24	15
USA	1	2	22	56	16	5
Romania	1	3	17	33	20	28

	Correlation between <u>Q9 and Q10</u>	Correlation with Evaluation of Prime Minister / President of Gov't	
		<u>Current (Q9)</u>	<u>Change (Q10)</u>
Hungary	.32	.25	.31
Spain	.49	.36	.24
USA	.42	.19	.16
Romania	.25		
Belarus	.56	.16	.21

Regression of Evaluations of Prime Minister / President of Government on Q9 and Q10:
(Evaluation of Leader of Government = a + b₁* Q9 + b₂*Q10+ u_t)

	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses)	
	b ₁ [Current (Q9)]	[b ₂ Change (Q10)]
	-----	-----
Hungary	.74 (.13)	.89 (.10)
Spain	.98 (.11)	.82 (.12)
USA	.55 (.25)	.30 (.21)
Belarus	.16 (??)	.21 (??)

Discussion: These items seem to work. Each yields little missing data and good variance. The ordering of the responses across the four polities makes sense. Though the variables are strongly correlated with each other, each variable makes a unique and significant contribution to evaluations of the leader of the government as seen from the ordinary least squares regression coefficients.

II.5. Evaluation of Democratic Electoral Institutions and Processes

Q19. People Usually Say What They Think

When people are asked to express an opinion, do you believe most people in [country] usually say what they think about politics or do you believe most people usually hide what they really think about politics? Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that most people in [country] usually say what they think about politics, and FIVE means that most people usually hide what they really think), where would you place yourself?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	People Hide What they Think			People Say What they Think	
		<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Hungary	2					
Spain	6	18	22	27	17	16
USA	1	9	11	27	23	30

Q2. Last Election Fair?

Do you think that on the whole the last election was a fair one, or did some parties or candidates have an unfair advantage?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	Unfair <u>Advantage</u>	Election <u>Was Fair</u>
Hungary	18	59	41
Spain	19	21	79
USA	5	22	78
Romania	34	35	65
Belarus	48	44	56

Q16. Voting Won't Make Things Better in the Future

Some people say that no matter how they vote, it won't make things any better in the future. Others say that the way they vote could make things better in the future. Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that no matter how people vote, it won't make things any better in the future, and FIVE means that the way people vote could make things better in the future), where would you place yourself?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	Voting Doesn't Matter			Voting Could Make Things Better	
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Hungary	1	31	11	18	17	23
Spain	4	13	11	15	25	36
USA	0	6	8	16	22	47

Q17. Who is in Power Can Make a Difference

Some people say it's important who is in power because it can make a difference to what happens. Others say it doesn't really matter who is in power, because in the end things go on much the same. Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that it's important who is in power because it can make a difference, and FIVE means that it doesn't really matter who is in power, because in the end things go on much the same), where would you place yourself?

	Don't Know	Doesn't Matter Who is in Power			Important Who is in Power	
		5	4	3	2	1
Hungary	1	24	13	15	18	31
Spain	4	12	9	14	24	40
USA	0	11	15	25	21	29

Q12. Representatives Have a Good Idea What Ordinary People Think

Some people say that members of [Congress / Parliament] have a good idea of what ordinary people think. Others think that members of [Congress / Parliament] don't know much about what ordinary people think. Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that the members of [Congress/Parliament] have a good idea of what ordinary people think, and FIVE means that the members of [Congress/Parliament] don't know much about what ordinary people think), where would you place yourself?

	Don't Know	Members Don't Know			Members Know What People Think	
		5	4	3	2	1
Hungary	2					
Spain	6	35	20	21	13	10
USA	0	18	20	38	16	8

Q4. Parties Care What People Want

Some people say that parties in [country] care what people want. Others say that parties in [country] don't care what people want. Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that parties care about what people want, and FIVE means that they don't care what people want), where would you place yourself?

	Don't Know	Parties Don't Care			Parties Care	
		5	4	3	2	1
Hungary	2					
Spain	3	30	22	25	14	8
USA	2	9	19	31	23	18

Q5. Party Necessary to Make Political System Work

Some people say that political parties are necessary to make our political system work in [country]. Others think that political parties are not needed in [country]. Using the scale on the card, (where ONE means that political parties are necessary to make our political system work, and FIVE means that political parties are not needed in [country]), where would you place yourself?

	Don't Know	Parties Not Needed			Parties Are Necessary	
		5	4	3	2	1
Hungary	3					
Spain	5	7	6	15	24	49
USA	0	7	9	25	21	38

Q6. Evaluation of Job Parties are Doing

In general do you think political parties are doing a very good job, a good job, neither a good nor a bad job, a bad job or a very bad job for the people of [country]?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	Very Bad	Bad	Neither	Good	Very Good
Hungary	5	15	28	51	5	0
Spain	3	0	12	42	34	12
USA	0	6	24	39	27	3
Romania	10	13	26	69	17	4

Q1. Satisfaction with Democracy

On the whole, are you satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in [country]?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	Not at all <u>Satisfied</u>	Not Very <u>Satisfied</u>	Fairly <u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>
Hungary	2	38	38	19	4
Spain	3	22	37	29	12
USA	0	6	22	48	24
Belarus	23	40	46	13	1

Q18. Support for Democracy

Sometimes democracy doesn't work. When this happens some people say we need a strong leader to get things done. Others say that even when things don't work democracy is always best. How about you?

	Don't <u>Know</u>	Need Strong <u>Leader</u>	Democracy <u>Always Best</u>
Hungary	7	43	57
Spain	12	32	68
USA	2	56	44

Discussion: The experience from the pilot study conducted in the United States suggests that the five-point scales are very difficult to administer over the telephone.

The Planning Committee proposed several criteria for assessing whether each item is working:

1. The item should produce little missing data and yield good variance in responses.
2. The pattern of responses within and across countries should have face validity.
3. If the items are all indicators of one or two underlying dimensions, then few items should be needed to build reliable scales. If the items are weakly associated, each is measuring a distinct evaluation.
4. The items should be measuring assessments of the political regime, not evaluations of the current state of the economy or affect for the current leader of the government. Items highly associated with evaluations of the current state of the economy or the current leader of the incumbent government are suspect. We would expect the items to be positively associated with voter turnout.

<u>Concern</u>	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Excessive Missing Data or Little Variance		X								
More Disaffection in Consolidated Democracy										X
Very Strongly Correlated With Other Measures										
Strange Relationships With Other Variables								X		
Strong Correlation with Evaluations of Leader of Government		X?						X		
Strong Correlation with Assessments of Economy		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
No Positive Relationship With Turnout	X				X	X	X	X		X

(The data that underlie these conclusions are provided in the matrices below.) Items with the most AXs® in their column are the ones that are most suspect by the criteria laid out above. One thing that is clear from an examination of the correlation matrices among the items within each polity; these items do not load very well onto one or two underlying dimensions. This could be interpreted as good news (they all measure distinct attitudes) or bad news (these distinct evaluations of democratic institutions are not much related to each other).

Correlation with Evaluation of the Leader of the Government	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Hungary		.29	.23	.21				.17	-.24	-.01
Spain	.02	.01	.01	-.05	.05	.07	.01	-.09	.17	.02
USA	-.10	.16	-.01	.03	.12	.09	.05	.18	.06	.07
Belarus		.09						.14		

Evaluation of the Economy	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Hungary		.14	.22	.15				.35	-.30	.00
Spain	.03	.18	.14	.05	.12	.23	.14	-.34	.33	.04
USA	.11	.12	.16	.17	.24	.15	.07	.24	.34	.05
Romania		.24						-.12		
Belarus		.17							.27	

Turnout	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Hungary		.11	.08	.10				.11	-.08	-.01
Spain	.03	.08	.09	.13	.11	.06	.05	-.10	.10	-.04
USA	.06	.05	.17	.09	-.03	-.04	.06	-.07	.14	-.03
Belarus		.18						.01		

Correlations Among Measures of Evaluation of Democratic Electoral Institutions and Processes

Hungary

	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q6	Q1	Q18
Q2	1.00					
Q16	.22	1.00				
Q17	.20	.58	1.00			
Q6	.25	.27	.23	1.00		
Q1	-.23	-.18	-.16	-.31	1.00	
Q18	.13	.14	.11	.05	.03	1.00

Spain

	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Q19	1.00									
Q2	-.01	1.00								
Q16	.02	.10	1.00							
Q17	.04	.09	.12	1.00						
Q12	.02	.11	.03	.04	1.00					
Q4	.05	.12	.11	.15	.30	1.00				
Q5	.10	.15	.22	.28	.10	.16	1.00			
Q6	.00	-.11	-.19	-.08	-.21	-.37	-.20	1.00		
Q1	.01	.22	.16	.06	.13	.16	.14	-.33	1.00	
Q18	.05	.07	.03	-.05	.05	.08	.07	-.08	.13	1.00

USA

	Q19	Q2	Q16	Q17	Q12	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q18
Q19	1.00									
Q2	-.09	1.00								
Q16	-.02	.08	1.00							
Q17	.26	.05	.20	1.00						
Q12	.11	-.05	.04	.21	1.00					
Q4	.06	.10	-.02	.22	.21	1.00				
Q5	.15	-.01	.09	.20	.12	.21	1.00			
Q6	-.01	.06	.18	.05	.23	.24	.28	1.00		
Q1	.03	.25	.20	.20	.21	.11	.14	.39	1.00	
Q18	-.08	-.02	.11	.15	-.02	.17	-.01	.11	.02	1.00