



# **SIRIUS**

Skills and Integration of Migrants,  
Refugees and Asylum Applicants  
in European Labour Markets

## **Codebook for the comparative dataset on socio-cultural, political and legal indicators**

### **WP2: Legal barriers and enablers**

**August 2018**

**Work package Leading Institution: University of  
Florence**

Horizon 2020  
SIRIUS (770515)



Co-funded by the Horizon 2020 programme  
of the European Union

**Reference:** SIRIUS WP 2 Dataset

This research was conducted under the Horizon 2020 project 'SIRIUS' (770515).

The sole responsibility of this publication lies with the author. The European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: [nicola.maggini@unifi.it](mailto:nicola.maggini@unifi.it)

## Contents

Introduction .....	4
1. SOCIO-CULTURAL INDICATORS.....	5
1.1 Trade unions and civil society organizations .....	5
1.2 Political and civic participation .....	7
1.3 Collective well-being .....	9
1.4 Individual well-being.....	14
1.6 Attitudes about institutions and practices .....	15
1.7 Attitudes and practices related to social equality and solidarity .....	17
2. PERCEPTIONS ON MIGRATION ISSUES .....	20
2.1 Attitudes about migration .....	20
2.2 Attitudes towards/by migrants .....	22
3. POLITICAL/INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS .....	24
3.1 Governments .....	24
3.2 Political system .....	26
3.3 Political space.....	28
3.4 Quality of democracy .....	30
4. LEGAL INDICATORS .....	33
References .....	35
Annex .....	38

## Introduction

This codebook is part of a comparative database which has been put together within the framework of Work package 2 ‘Legal barriers and enablers’ of the SIRIUS project (‘Skills and Integration of Migrants, Refugees and Asylum Applicants in European Labour Markets’). The purpose of the database is to provide information of the legal, socio-cultural, political context of Europe at times of refugee crisis. In particular, the comparative database includes a systematic set of indicators measuring the macro-level conditions under which legal frameworks and measures are most effective to integrate migrants, refugees, asylum seekers post-2014 (MRAs) into the labour market of European countries. The database draws on data spanning the time period 2010-2017 and covers 7 countries: Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Italy, Switzerland and UK. Mainly, it contains a pool of variables gathered from other original (i.e. dataset generated in EU funded projects such as TransSOL) or secondary sources. More precisely, we gathered systematic comparative data on: social conditions (e.g. income inequalities, state expenditures for labour market, union membership and density, employment protection, childcare, etc.) using existing sources (e.g., Eurostat, OECD); political, institutional and legal features (e.g. configuration of power, party polarization, the structure of the state and the decentralisation process, fundamental rights, political discrimination of minority groups, etc.) using existing sources (e.g., the Comparative Political Data Set at the University of Bern, Democracy Barometer); citizens’ subjective attitudes and behaviours (e.g. social and political attitudes, social and political behaviours, social life) using existing comparative surveys (e.g., the European Social Survey, Democracy Barometer, IPSOS and the Eurobarometer’s surveys). This data set is suited for cross-national, longitudinal and pooled time series analyses.

The present codebook has information on all the indicators, showing in particular for each indicator a brief description of the variable, time period covered, missing countries and sources. In order to make it easier to use, the indicators are divided into four categories: Socio-cultural indicators (i.e., indicators related to trade unions and civil society organizations, political and civic participation, collective and individual well-being, social capital and religiosity, attitudes about institutions and practices, attitudes and practices related to social equality and solidarity, attitudes towards the European Union), perception indicators on migration issues (i.e., attitudes about migration, attitudes towards/by migrants), political-institutional indicators (i.e., indicators pertaining to configuration of power, political system, political space, quality of democracy) and legal indicators (i.e., indicators on legislative enforcement, indicators assessing the presence of judicial review and mandatory referenda for amendments of the constitution, constitutional provisions on asylum, for direct democracy, popular initiatives). Our classification of the variables into these four categories should be seen as a heuristic, as the more exact causal ordering of one’s variables obviously depends on the research question.

# 1. SOCIO-CULTURAL INDICATORS

## 1.1 Trade unions and civil society organizations

### **grossu**

Total reported union members, in thousands.

Period covered: 2010-2013.

Missing: Greece in 2010, 2012 and 2013; UK in 2010.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from Visser (2016), ICTWSS: Database on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts in 51 countries between 1960 and 2014. Version 5.1 (ICTWSS Database, <http://www.uva-aiaa.net/en/ictwss>).

Note: For detailed information about data sources and breaks in series, see Visser (2015).

### **netu**

Net union membership (gross minus independent workers, students, unemployed or retired members).

Period covered: 2010-2013.

Missing: Greece in 2010 and 2012.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from Visser (2016).

Notes: For detailed information about data sources and breaks in series, see Visser (2015).

### **ud**

Union density (net union membership as a proportion of wage and salary earners in employment).

Period covered: 2010-2013.

Missing: Greece in 2010 and 2012.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from Visser (2016).

Note: For detailed information about data sources and breaks in series, see Visser (2015).

### **adjcov**

Bargaining (or union) coverage, adjusted, following Visser's definition (2013: 23f.): "[E]mployees covered by collective (wage) bargaining agreements as a proportion of all wage and salary earners in employment with the right to bargaining, expressed as percentage, adjusted for the possibility that some sectors or occupations are excluded from the right to bargain (removing such groups from the employment count before dividing the number of covered employees over the total number of dependent workers in employment)."

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Missing: Czech Republic in 2014; Denmark in 2011, 2012 and 2014; Greece in 2014; Italy in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014; Switzerland in 2011 and 2014; UK in 2014.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from Visser (2016).

Note: For detailed information about data sources and breaks in series, see Visser (2015).

### **emprot\_reg**

Employment protection strictness provided through legislation and as a result of enforcement processes (scale of 0-6; higher values indicate stricter employment protection). This indicator measures the strictness of regulation of individual dismissal of employees on regular/indefinite contracts.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Missing: All countries in 2014 except UK.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from OECD Indicators of Employment Protection. Annual time series data 1985-2013.  
<http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/EPL-timeseries.xlsx>.

Note: Specific requirements for collective dismissals are not included.

### **emprot\_temp**

Temporary employment protection strictness provided through legislation and as a result of enforcement processes (scale of 0-6; higher values indicate stricter employment protection). This indicator measures the strictness of regulation on the use of fixed-term and temporary work agency contracts.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Missing: All countries in 2014 except UK.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1960-2015 - Data taken from OECD Indicators of Employment Protection. Annual time series data 1985-2013.  
<http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/EPL-timeseries.xlsx>.

### **memprof**

Membership in professional organizations. Share of survey respondents indicating that they are member in a professional organization.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### **memhum**

Membership in humanitarian organizations. Share of survey respondents indicating that they are member in and/or active for a humanitarian organization.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## 1.2 Political and civic participation

### turnout

Voter turnout in the last parliamentary elections (as a percentage of voting age population).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Source: International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance) database.

Note: For Italy, data in 2017 represent turnout in 2018 general elections.

### votagend

Representative voter turnout in legislative elections in terms of gender and age.

Calculated as follows: (1) Calculation of gaps in terms of gender and in terms of age (3 groups: 15-30; 31-65; 65+): gender gap = mean of share of women in survey – share of female voting respondents and share of men in survey – share of male voting respondents (differences in absolute values); age gap = mean of share of respondents 18-30/31-65/65+ years old – respective share of 18-30/31-65/65+ year old voting respondents (differences in absolute values). (2) Calculation of degree of unrepresentative turnout: sum of gender gap + age gap. (3) The scale was reversed by multiplying its values by -1.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Measurement Notes: (I) Data was weighted by socio-demographic characteristics. (II) Missing are replaced by values from nearest years. (III) Two-step recoding procedure: a) Values averaged across 5 years (1990-1995; 1996-2000, 2001-2005 etc.); b) Calculation of running means between 3 years (1990 = 1990; 1991 = mean (1990, 1991); 1992 = mean (1990, 1991, 1992); 1993 = mean (1991, 1992, 1993), etc.).

Range of values (standardized): minimum = -20.4684; maximum = 100.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### repalt

Representative participation in alternative forms of participation (signing petitions, attending lawful demonstrations) in terms of resources (education and income).

Calculated as follows: (1) Calculation of gaps in terms of education and in terms of income (3 groups each): education gap = mean of share of respondents with high/middle/low education in survey – share of participating respondents (signing petitions / attending demonstrations) with high/middle/low education (differences in absolute values); income gap = mean of share of respondents with high/middle/low income – share of participating respondents (signing petitions / attending demonstrations) with high/middle/low income (differences in absolute values). (2) Calculation of degree of unrepresentative participation: sum of education gap + income gap for both participation forms (signing petitions / attending demonstrations). (3) Overall mean of both indicators (signing petition / attending demonstrations) for unrepresentative participation. (4) The scale was reversed by multiplying its values by -1.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Measurement Notes: (I) Data was weighted by socio-demographic characteristics. (II) Missing are replaced by values from nearest years. (III) Two-step recoding procedure: a) Values averaged across 5 years (e.g. 2001-2005 etc.) for each form of participation (signing

petition / attending demonstrations); b) Calculation of running means for overall mean of both indicators between 3 years (1995 = 1996; 1996 = mean (1995, 1996); 1997 = mean (1995, 1996, 1997); 1998 = mean (1996, 1997, 1998), etc.).

Range of values (standardized): minimum = -46.3039; maximum = 103.3285.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **polint**

Political Interest (percentage of respondents who answered 'Hardly interested and 'Not at all interested').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **contplt**

Contacted politician or government official last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **workpol**

Worked in a political party or action group last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **workorg**

Worked in another organization or association last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **badge**

Worn or displayed campaign badge/sticker last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **signpet**

Signed petition in the last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **demon**

Taken part in lawful public demonstration last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **boycot**

Boycotted certain products last 12 months (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **1.3 Collective well-being**

### **gini**

Gini index (at disposable income, post taxes and transfers)

Coded: 0 = perfect equality; 1 = perfect inequality

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Italy in 2017; Switzerland in 2017; UK in 2017.

Source: Eurostat

### **betlifeind**

Better Life Index as measure of perceived social network support. The indicator is based on the question: “If you were in trouble, do you have relatives or friends you can count on to help you whenever you need them, or not?” and it considers the respondents who respond positively. Percentage of people aged 15 and over.

Period covered: 2011-2016.

Missing: Czech Republic in 2011; Denmark in 2011; Finland in 2011; Greece in 2011; Italy in 2011; Switzerland in 2011; UK in 2012.

Source: OECD calculations based on the Gallup World Poll.

## **lifexp**

Life expectancy (life expectancy in years).

Period covered: 2011-2016.

Source: Eurostat.

## **soexp**

Social protection expenditure (public expenditure on social protection benefits as percentage of GDP).

Period covered: 2011-2015.

Source: Eurostat

## **unempexp**

Public expenditure on unemployment benefit (percentage of public expenditure on unemployment benefit as part of GDP).

Period covered: 2011-2015.

Source: Eurostat

## **labpolexp**

Labour market policy expenditure (public expenditure on labour market policy interventions as percentage of GDP).

Period covered: 2011-2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2012 and 2016; Italy in 2016; Switzerland in all years; UK in all years except 2010.

Source: Eurostat

## **childcare\_pupilsteachers\_020**

Average ratios of pupils to teaching staff in pre-primary education (ISCED 020) services (public and private), based on full-time equivalents

Period covered: 2014.

Source: OECD Family Database.

## **childcare\_pupilsallstaff\_020**

Average ratios of pupils to all contact staff (teachers and teaching aides) in pre-primary education (ISCED 020) services (public and private), based on full-time equivalents

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Finland and Switzerland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_pupilsteachers\_010**

Average ratios of pupils to teaching staff in early childhood educational development (ISCED 010) services (public and private), based on full-time equivalents.

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Italy and Switzerland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_pupilsallstaff\_010**

Average ratios of pupils to all contact staff (teachers and teaching aides) in early childhood educational development (ISCED 010) services (public and private), based on full-time equivalents.

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Italy and Switzerland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_share02**

Proportion (%) of children (0-to-2) using informal childcare arrangements during a typical week.

Period covered: 2014.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_share35**

Proportion (%) of children (3-to-5) using informal childcare arrangements during a typical week.

Period covered: 2014.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_share612**

Proportion (%) of children (6-to-12) using informal childcare arrangements during a typical week.

Period covered: 2014.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_hours02**

Mean average hours of informal childcare per week among those using at least one hour of informal childcare during a typical week, by age group (0-to-2).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Denmark and Finland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_hours35**

Mean average hours of informal childcare per week among those using at least one hour of informal childcare during a typical week, by age group (3-to-5).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Denmark and Finland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_arrangements\_hours612**

Mean average hours of informal childcare per week among those using at least one hour of informal childcare during a typical week, by age group (6-to-12).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Denmark and Finland.

Source: OECD Family Database.

### **childcare\_enrolment\_02**

Participation rates in formal childcare and pre-school services<sup>1</sup>, 0-to-2-year-olds.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Missing: UK in 2012.

Source: OECD Family Database.

Note: Data generally include children using centre-based services (e.g. nurseries or day care centres and pre-schools, both public and private), organised family day care, and care services provided by (paid) professional childminders, and exclude those using unpaid informal services provided by relatives, friends or neighbours. Exact definitions do however differ across countries. For Denmark and Finland, data refer to children enrolled in day care institutions and local authority family day care. Data for Denmark and Finland also include children using publicly-subsidised private and non-profit childcare. See NOSOSCO (2015) Social Protection in the Nordic Countries 2013/14 for further details: <http://nowbase.org/da/publications>

### **childcare\_enrolment\_35**

Proportion (%) of children aged 3-5 enrolled in pre-primary education (ISCED 2011 level 02) or primary education (ISCED 2011 level 1).

Period covered: 2013-2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy in 2012.

Source: OECD Family Database.

Note: Data include children enrolled in pre-primary education (ISCED 2011 level 02) and primary education (ISCED 2011 level 1), only. Potential mismatches between the enrolment data and the coverage of the population data (in terms of geographic coverage and/or the reference dates used) may affect enrolment rates. This can lead to overestimated or underestimated figures (for instance, enrolment rates exceeding 100%) in countries that are net exporters or net importers of students, or where there is a significant increase or decrease over time in any of the variables involved. See the notes to Indicator C2 in OECD Education at a Glance 2016 Annex 3 for more details: <http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/EAG2016-Annex3.pdf>

## **childcare\_enrolment\_hours**

Average hours in formal childcare and pre-school services during a usual week, for children using formal childcare and pre-school services<sup>1</sup>, 0-to-2-year-olds.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Missing: Czech Republic.

Source: OECD Family Database.

Note: Data generally include children using centre-based services (e.g. nurseries or day care centres and pre-schools, both public and private), organised family day care, and care services provided by (paid) professional childminders, and exclude those using unpaid informal services provided by relatives, friends or neighbours. Exact definitions do however differ across countries.

## **childcare\_support\_couplefamily**

Net childcare costs for a two-earner two-child (aged 2 and 3) couple family with full-time earnings at 100+67% of earnings, as a % of average earnings (AW).

Period covered: 2015.

Missing: Italy.

Source: OECD Family Database.

Note: Data reflect the costs of full-time care in a typical childcare centre for a two-earner two-child couple family, where both parents are in full-time employment and the children are aged 2 and 3. Gross earnings for the two earners in the family are set equal to 100% of average earnings for the first earner, and 67% of average earnings for the second earner. 'Full-time' care is defined as care for at least 40 hours per week. Average earnings/the average wage refers to the gross wage earnings paid to average workers, before deductions of any kind (e.g. withholding tax, income tax, private or social security contributions and union dues) (see OECD, 2007: 186-187). Data for Finland and Switzerland are based on estimates for specific cities (Helsinki and Zurich), rather than for the country as a whole. Data for UK are based on estimates for a specific region (England), rather than for the country as a whole. See the OECD Tax and Benefit Systems website (<http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/benefits-and-wages.htm>) for more detail on the methods and assumptions used and information on the policies modelled for each country.

## **childcare\_support\_singlefamily**

Net childcare costs for a two-child (aged 2 and 3) single-parent family with full-time earnings at 50% of earnings, as a % of average earnings (AW).

Period covered: 2015.

Missing: Italy.

Source: OECD Family Database.

Note: Data reflect the costs of full-time care in a typical childcare centre for a two-child single-parent family, where the single parent is in full-time employment and the children are aged 2 and 3. Gross earnings for the single parent are set equal to 50% of average earnings. 'Full-time' care is defined as care for at least 40 hours per week. Average earnings/the average wage refers to the gross wage earnings paid to average workers, before deductions of any kind (e.g. withholding tax, income tax, private or social security contributions and union dues) (see OECD, 2007: 186-187). Data for Finland and Switzerland

are based on estimates for specific cities (Helsinki and Zurich), rather than for the country as a whole. Data for UK are based on estimates for a specific region (England), rather than for the country as a whole. See the OECD Tax and Benefit Systems website (<http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/benefits-and-wages.htm>) for more detail on the methods and assumptions used and information on the policies modelled for each country.

## 1.4 Individual well-being

### satlife

Satisfaction with life as a whole (percentage of respondents, 'Extremely dissatisfied' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Extremely satisfied').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### sateco

Satisfaction with present state of economy in country (percentage of respondents, 'Extremely dissatisfied' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Extremely satisfied').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## 1.5 Social capital and religiosity

### gentru

General Trust (percentage of respondents, 'You can't be too careful' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Most people can be trusted').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### meet

Frequency of social contacts with friends, relatives or colleagues (percentage of respondents who answered 'Never' and 'Less than once a month').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### rlgdgr

Religiosity ("How religious are you?", percentage of respondents between 6 and 10 on a scale from 0 'Not at all religious' to 10 'Very religious').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **rlgatnd**

Church attendance (“How often attend religious services apart from special occasions?”, percentage of respondents who answered 'Every day', 'More than once a week' and 'Once a week').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **1.6 Attitudes about institutions and practices**

### **satdem**

Satisfaction with democracy ('How satisfied are you with the way democracy works in country?'; percentage of respondents, 'Extremely dissatisfied' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Extremely satisfied').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **devbeh**

Deviant behaviour. Share of survey who answer – on a scale from (1) never justifiable to (10) always justifiable – 8, 9 or 10 regarding each of the following activities: (a) avoiding a fare on public transport; (b) cheating on taxes; (c) someone accepting a bribe and (d) claiming government benefits.

Measurement Notes: (I) Data was weighted by socio-demographic characteristics. (II) the indicator was reversed by subtracting values from 100. (III) Missing were replaced by values from nearest. (IV) Two-step recoding procedure: a) Values averaged across 5 years (e.g. 2001-2005 etc.); b) Calculation of running means between 5 years (e.g. 2002-2006 etc.). Imputation: values are imputed on the basis of a linear regression with the indicator Antigovact (Pearsons r is 0.14). The regression coefficients used are  $\alpha = 85.29$ ,  $\beta = 0.77$ .

Range of values (standardized): minimum = -56.6277; maximum = 109.2544.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### **cpi**

The Corruption Perception Index (CPI) measures the overall extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of bribes) in the public and political sectors. Assessments are based on surveys of business people and assessments by country analysts. Values range from 0 to 10 (the higher the values, the less corruption).

Range of values (standardized): minimum = 0; maximum = 100.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### **trupri**

Trust in country's parliament (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **trueupri**

Trust in European parliament (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **truleg**

Trust in the legal system (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **truple**

Trust in the police (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **truplt**

Trust in politicians (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **truprt**

Trust in political parties (percentage of respondents, 'No trust at all' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Complete trust').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **1.7 Attitudes and practices related to social equality and solidarity**

### **incdiff**

Government should reduce differences in income levels (percentage of respondents who answered 'Agree strongly' and 'Agree').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **wgi**

The World Giving Index on charitable giving (an average of three measures of giving behaviour - the percentage of people who in a typical month donate money to charity, volunteer their time, and help a stranger).

Period covered: 2010-2016.

Missing: Switzerland in 2011 and 2013.

Source: Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) – Gallup surveys as part of its World Poll initiative.

## **1.8 Attitudes towards the European Union**

### **eufft**

European unification go further or gone too far (percentage of respondents, 'Unification already gone too far' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Unification go further').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: All countries in 2010; Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **euim**

The image of European Union (percentage of respondents who answered 'Very negative image' and 'fairly negative', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

### **eure**

My voice counts in the European Union (percentage of respondents who answered 'Totally agree' and 'tend to agree', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

### **euro**

Support for the Euro (percentage of respondents who answered 'Against', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2012; 2014-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves (autumn waves for UK in 2012 and 2014).

### **eufrpl**

Support for a common foreign policy (percentage of respondents who answered 'Against', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

### **euctz**

Feeling like a citizen of European Union (percentage of respondents who answered 'No, definitely not' and 'No, not really', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

### **eufut**

The future of European Union: optimistic or pessimistic (percentage of respondents who answered 'Very pessimistic' and 'Fairly pessimistic', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

## **eumemb**

Country's membership of the EU: good or bad thing (percentage of respondents who answered 'Bad thing', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2011.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

## **euben**

Country's benefit from being a member of EU: benefited or not benefited (percentage of respondents who answered 'Not benefited', calculated on a total including DK answers).

Period covered: 2010-2011.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves.

## 2. PERCEPTIONS ON MIGRATION ISSUES

### 2.1 Attitudes about migration

#### **immsalience**

Salience of the immigration issue: percentage of the population that picked immigration as the most important issue facing the EU at the moment (DK answers included).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves (except autumn waves in 2010).

#### **immeupolicy**

A common European policy on migration: percentage of people who are in favour (DK answers included).

Period covered: 2014-2017.

Missing: Switzerland

Source: Standard Eurobarometer, spring waves (except autumn waves in 2014).

#### **immflows**

Attitudes towards migrants' flows: "There are too many immigrants in our country", percentage of people who say "strongly agree/tend to agree"

Period covered: 2011, 2013-2016.

Missing: Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Switzerland.

Source: IPSOS immigration and refugees poll

#### **immskills**

Attitudes towards immigrants' skills: "Priority should be given to immigrants with higher education and qualifications who can fill shortages among certain professions in your country", percentage of people who "strongly agree/tend to agree".

Period covered: 2011, 2013-2016.

Missing: Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Switzerland.

Source: IPSOS immigration and refugees poll

#### **immcoun**

Perceptions on the general effect of migration: immigrants make country worse or better place to live (percentage of respondents, 'Worse place to live' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Better place to live').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **imueclt**

Perceptions on the effects of migration on cultural life: country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants (percentage of respondents, 'Cultural life undermined' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'cultural life enriched').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **immeco**

Perceptions on the effects of migration on economy: immigration bad or good for country's economy (percentage of respondents, 'Bad for the economy' 0 to 4 on a scale until 10 'Good for the economy').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **immjob**

Perceptions on the effects of migration on jobs: immigrants “generally take jobs away from workers in [country], or generally help to create new jobs?” (answers between 0 and 4 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating a negative view of the impact of migration and 10 indicating a positive view).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **immwelfare**

Perceptions on the effects of migration on taxes and welfare services: “Most people who come to live here work and pay taxes. They also use health and welfare services. On balance, do you think people who come here take out more than they put in or put in more than they take out?” (answers between 0 and 4 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating a negative view of the impact of migration and 10 indicating a positive view).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## **immcrime**

Perceptions on the effects of migration on crime: “are [country]’s crime problems made worse or better by people coming to live here from other countries?” (answers between 0 and 4 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating a negative view of the impact of migration and 10 indicating a positive view).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## 2.2 Attitudes towards/by migrants

### **imsmetn**

Allow many/few immigrants of same race/ethnic group as majority (percentage of respondents who answered ‘Allow many’ and ‘allow some’).

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **imdfetn**

Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group (percentage of respondents who answered ‘Allow many’ and ‘allow some’).

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **impctr**

Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe (percentage of respondents who answered ‘Allow none’ and ‘allow a few’).

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **immdeserv\_ws**

Perceptions of deservingness of immigrants based on their work skills: percentage of population that believe it is very important that immigrants have work skills needed in the country (answers between 6 and 10 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating “extremely unimportant” and 10 indicating “extremely important”).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **immdeserv\_edu**

Perceptions of deservingness of immigrants based on their educational skills: percentage of population that believe it is very important that immigrants have good educational qualifications (answers between 6 and 10 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating “extremely unimportant” and 10 indicating “extremely important”).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **immdeserv\_cult**

Cultural assimilation: percentage of population that believe it is very important that migrants are committed to way of life in the country (answers between 6 and 10 on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 indicating “extremely unimportant” and 10 indicating “extremely important”).

Period covered: 2014.

Missing: Greece and Italy.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **blgetmg**

Belonging to minority ethnic group in country (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **dscrgrp**

Member of a group discriminated against in this country (percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

### **dscretn**

Perceived discrimination on ethnic grounds (percentage of respondents who answered 'Marked').

Period covered: 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Missing: Greece in 2012, 2014, 2016; Italy in 2010 and 2014; Denmark in 2016.

Source: European Social Survey – ESS.

## 3. POLITICAL/INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS

### 3.1 Governments

#### gov\_right

Right-wing government composition: cabinet posts of right-wing parties as a percentage of total cabinet posts. Weighted by the number of days in office in a given year.

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS calculations primarily based on the political data published in the European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues).

#### gov\_cent

Centrist government composition: cabinet posts of centre parties as a percentage of total cabinet posts. Weighted by the number of days in office in a given year.

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS calculations primarily based on the political data published in the European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues).

#### gov\_left

Left-wing government composition: cabinet posts of social democratic and other left parties as a percentage of total cabinet posts. Weighted by the number of days in office in a given year.

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS calculations primarily based on the political data published in the European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues).

Notes:

1. Due to independents, the calculations of 'gov\_right', 'gov\_cent' and 'gov\_left' do not always add up to 100 percent.
2. Greece 2011 and Italy 2011 do not add up to 100 percent mainly because of the caretaker governments which were in office.

#### gov\_party

Cabinet composition (Schmidt-Index): (1) hegemony of right-wing (and centre) parties (gov\_left=0), (2) dominance of right-wing (and centre) parties (gov\_left<33.3), (3) balance of power between left and right/centre (33.3<gov\_left<66.6), (4) dominance of social-democratic and other left parties (gov\_left>66.6), (5) hegemony of social-democratic and other left parties (gov\_left=100).

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Missing: Italy 2012 (full technocratic government).

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS calculations according to Schmidt (1992).

Note: Where the sum of 'gov\_left', 'gov\_cent' and 'gov\_right' is not equal to 100 percent due to independents, the boundaries for the three groups were recalculated for the codes (2), (3) and (4) by taking the sum of the given entries as 100 percent.

## govtype

Type of Government. Classification: (1) single party majority government = one party takes all governments seats and has a parliamentary majority [ $>50\%$ ]; (2) minimal winning coalition = all participating parties are necessary to form a majority government [ $>50\%$ ]; (3) surplus coalition = this comprises those coalition governments which exceed the minimal-winning criterion [ $>50.0\%$ ]; (4) single party minority government = the party in government does not possess a majority in Parliament [ $\leq 50\%$ ]; (5) multi party minority government = the parties in government do not possess a majority in Parliament [ $\leq 50\%$ ]; (6) caretaker government = governments which should simply maintain the status quo; (7) technocratic government = led by technocratic prime minister, consists of a majority of technocratic ministers and is in possession of a mandate to change the status quo.

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; post-communist countries: Berglund et al. (2013); CPDS Calculation according to the definition of Woldendorp/Keman/Budge (2000: 17f.) and McDonnell/Valbruzzi (2014: 11) for the last two categories.

Notes:

1. The indicator refers to the type of government that was in office for the longest period during the year.
2. Caretaker governments are governments which should simply maintain the status quo (Golder 2010: 4). Mostly the ministers of such governments, including the prime minister, belong to a specific party. However, in a few cases the governments consist of nonpartisan technocratic ministers. These governments are still coded as caretaker governments as long as their mandate does not exceed the remit "to mind the shop".
3. Based on McDonnell and Valbruzzi (2014: 11), a technocratic government is defined as a government which is led by technocratic prime minister, consists of a majority of technocratic ministers and is in possession of a mandate to change the status quo. In a few cases, only the minority of ministers are technocrats. However, as long as the first and third criterion (technocratic prime minister and mandate to change the status quo) are fulfilled, these governments are still coded as technocratic. Following McDonnell and Valbruzzi (2014: 4) a prime minister is classified as being a technocrat if „at the time of his/her appointment to government, he/she: (1) has never held public office under the banner of a political party; (2) is not a formal member of any party; (3) is said to possess recognized non-party political expertise which is directly relevant to the role occupied in government" (McDonnell and Valbruzzi 2014: 4/5).
4. If a single party's seat share is exactly 50%, the government is coded as a single party minority government. If the two governmental parties possess combined 50% of the seat share, the government is coded as a multi-party minority government. If the government consists of three parties and the two biggest ones hold 50% of the seat shares, then the government is coded as a minimal winning coalition one.
5. Sister parties (e.g. CDU and CSU) count as one party for the classification of the type of government.

## **cabchan**

Government change. Number of changes in government per year [termination of government due to (a) elections, (b) resignation of the Prime Minister, (c) dissension within government (break up of coalition), (d) lack of parliamentary support, or (e) intervention by the head of state (f) broadening of the coalition (inclusion of new parties) (Woldendorp/Keman/Budge 2000: 16-17)].

Period: 2010-2015.

Missing: UK in 2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS calculations based on European Journal of Political Research (Political Data Yearbook, various issues).

## **govstab**

Stability of government. A cabinet is seen as stable if its party composition does not change during a whole legislative period. Relatively short governments, i.e. interim governments (-1/6 of the legislation), are excluded. A government gets 100% (for all years within a legislative period) if it does not change in the respective legislative period. If there is a change, govstab reflects the number of days that the government was stable as a share of the remaining possible period. Measurement Notes: (I) When there were more than two governments within one single election period, and the last government ended due to normal general elections the last government does not receive 100 per cent, but the value of the longest government in the respective period, unless the third or later government, was the only government in the election period which lasted for more than 1/6 of legislation. Missing values from interim governments are completed with closest value of the respective election period (if two values have the same distance, the earlier value is taken). If there are two values in one year the mean is taken. Values are copied to the entire government period. Values above 100 are set to 100. (II) The Swiss government is a cooperative government, and the 'prime minister' (Bundespräsident), who has a mainly representative function, changes every year (but cabinet does not change). Switzerland is therefore always coded 100. (III) All values greater than 100 are set to 100. (IV) Elections between 1 January and 31 January refer to the given year. (V) In presidential systems, government change is measured by president change.

Range of values (standardized): minimum = -2.6311; maximum = 100.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **3.2 Political system**

### **effel**

Effective number of parties on the votes level according to the formula [N2] by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). The effective number of parties carries the same information as the Rae-Index and is calculated from this index as follows:  $effel = 1 / (1 - rae\_ele)$ .

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS Calculation.

## **effleg**

Effective number of parties on the seats level according to the formula [N2] proposed by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). The effective number of parties carries the same information as the Rae-Index and is calculated from this index as follows:  $effleg = 1 / (1 - rae\_leg)$ .

Period covered: 2010-2015.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015; CPDS Calculation.

## **fed**

Federalism as defined by Gerring and Thacker (2004) (indicator was reversed). Categories (standardized): 0 = non-federal; 50 = semi-federal [where there are elective legislatures at the regional level but in which constitutional sovereignty is still reserved to the national government]; and 100 = federal [elective regional legislatures plus constitutional recognition of subnational authority].

Range of values (standardized): minimum= 0, Maximum=100

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **fisccent**

Fiscal centralization, measured as tax revenue of central government as a percentage of total taxation (including revenue of central, state and local government, social security funds and supranational organizations).

Period covered: 2010-2012.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset III - CPDS calculations based on OECD (2014), "Revenue Statistics: Comparative tables", OECD Tax Statistics (database). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00262-en> (Downloaded: 2014-03-25).

## **fiscdec**

Fiscal decentralization, measured as the tax revenue of state and local government as percentage of total taxation (including the revenue of central, state and local governments, social security funds and supranational organizations).

Period covered: 2010-2012.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset III - CPDS calculations based on OECD (2014), "Revenue Statistics: Comparative tables", OECD Tax Statistics (database). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00262-en> (Downloaded: 2014-03-25).

## **lpol\_sys**

Executive-legislative relations according to Lijphart (2012:108ff.). Coded: 0 = parliamentary system; 1 = semi-presidential dominated by parliament; 2 = hybrid system; 3 = semi-presidential dominated by president; 4 = presidential.

Period covered: 2010-2015

Source: Comparative Political Dataset 1965-2015- Lijphart (2012); Huber et al. (2004); Ismayr (2003, 2006 and 2010), national sources and constitutions; EJPR Political Data Yearbook (various issues).

Notes:

1. In addition to a parliamentary prime minister, a semi-presidential system (=2 or 3) also has a popularly elected president (Lijphart 2012: 109).
2. Changes are entered in the year of the subsequent (parliamentary or presidential) elections.
3. Switzerland: Switzerland is the only system classified as hybrid, since the collegial executive elected by the legislative does not depend on legislative confidence.

### 3.3 Political space

#### posparl

Issue congruence: Congruence between distribution of left-right positions among voters and distribution of left-right positions among members of parliament (measured by party positions).

Calculated as follows: (1) Each party was assigned to one of three categories (left/middle/right), which were calculated on the basis of the mean and standard deviation of the distribution of left/right positions of all parties for a given election (e.g. left range: left of 1 standard deviation). The distribution of the three categories within parliaments was then calculated by taking into account the seat shares of the different parties. (2) Voters, i.e. survey respondents, were assigned to one of three categories (left/middle/right) according to their self-placement on a left-right scale. The three categories were determined by subdividing the left-right scale (either ranging from 1-10 or 0-10) on the grounds of mean and standard deviation. The distribution of voters across the three categories was then calculated and the values averaged across 5 years (e.g. 2010-2014 etc.) (3) For each of the categories, the differences between the seat shares in parliament and among voters were calculated. These issue differences for each category are then added and divided by 2. This gives a scale (theoretically) ranging from 0-100, where (0) complete congruence and (100) complete incongruence between voters and parliament. (4) The scale was reversed by subtracting values from 100. Measurement Notes: (1) Missing values for left-right placement of parties and/or voters' self-placement were replaced by values from nearest (preceding) year. Imputation is based on a linear regression with the Gallagher index (Pearsons  $r$  is 0.124). The regression coefficients used are  $\alpha = 78.862$  and  $\beta = 0.589$ .

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy Barometer.

#### pola

Party-system polarization. Dalton (2008) index for parliamentary elections, measured as the following:

Index =  $\text{SQRT}\{\sum(\text{party vote share}_i * ([\text{party Left-Right score}_i - \text{party system average Left-Right score}] / 5)^2)\}$ ,

where  $i$  represents individual parties. This index is comparable to a measure of the standard deviation of a distribution and it has a value of 0 when all parties occupy the same position on the left-right scale and 10 when all the parties are split between the two extremes of the scale.

Period covered: 2010-2017 (Czech Republic 2010, 2013 and 2017; Denmark 2011 and 2015; Finland 2011 and 2015; Greece 2012 and 2015; Italy 2013 and 2017; Switzerland 2011 and 2015; UK 2010, 2015 and 2017).

Source: Parliament and government composition database (ParlGov).

Note: Greece held two early general elections in 2012 and 2015. We considered the polarization index of the latest one. For Italy, data in 2017 is derived from 2018 general election.

## Irecon

Distribution of the left-right economic dimension within the political space: mean of the mean values of parties on a 0–10 economic left-right scale, where 0 means Extreme Left and 10 means Extreme Right.

Parties have been classified in terms of their stance on economic issues. Parties on the economic left want government to play an active role in the economy. Parties on the economic right emphasize a reduced economic role for government: privatization, lower taxes, less regulation, less government spending, and a leaner welfare state.

Period covered: 2010; 2014; 2017.

Missing: Denmark in 2017; Finland in 2017; Switzerland in 2017.

Source: own calculations based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES).

## galtan

Distribution of the libertarian-authoritarian dimension within the political space: mean of the mean values of parties on a 0–10 'libertarian-authoritarian' scale, where 0 means Extreme Left (Libertarian) and 10 means Extreme Right (Authoritarian).

Parties have been classified in terms of their stance on democratic freedoms and rights. "Libertarian" or "post-materialist" parties favour expanded personal freedoms, for example, access to abortion, active euthanasia, same sex marriage, or greater democratic participation. "Traditional" or "authoritarian" parties often reject these ideas; they value order, tradition, and stability, and believe that the government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues.

Period covered: 2010; 2014; 2017.

Missing: Denmark in 2017; Finland in 2017; Switzerland in 2017.

Source: own calculations based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES).

## eupos

Distribution of Anti/pro European integration dimension within the political space: mean of the mean values of parties on a 1–7 'anti-pro EU integration' scale, where 1 means 'Strongly Opposed' and 7 means 'Strongly in Favour'.

Period covered: 2010; 2014; 2017.

Missing: Denmark in 2017; Finland in 2017; Switzerland in 2017.

Source: own calculations based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES).

## 3.4 Quality of democracy

### freerel

Freedom of religion. This variable indicates the extent to which the freedom of citizens to exercise and practice their religious beliefs is subject to actual government restrictions. Categories (standardized): -100 = Yes, there are severe restrictions on religious practices by the government; 0 = restrictions are moderate. 100 = there are no restrictions.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### freemov

Freedom of movement. Mean of two indicators: Freedom of domestic movement, Freedom of foreign movement. Coding is based on US State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Categories (standardized): 0 = freedom of movement is severely restricted; 25 = intermediate category; 50 = freedom of movement is somewhat restricted; 75 = intermediate category; 100 = freedom of movement is unrestricted.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### balpress

Ideological balance of the press system (regional and national newspapers). Calculated as follows: (1) Each newspaper listed by the Banks' Political Handbooks of the World (BPHW) is assigned a value between 1 to 6 indicating its commitment or affiliation to a certain political ideology or party (on the basis of information from BPHW). These are Manifesto codes: 1 to 3 represent the left side of the political spectrum, 4 to 6 the right side. Newspapers listed as "independent" are considered neutral, i.e. internally diverse, and therefore receive the value for the exact centre of the political spectrum: 3.5. Also, newspapers listed in the BPHW without indication of a political orientation are considered as independent. (2) Each code is then multiplied by the respective newspaper's circulation so that smaller newspapers receive less weight (non-dailies' circulation was adjusted accordingly). If information on a paper's circulation is missing, it is replaced by either the paper's circulation of previous or preceding years or by the average circulation of the corresponding country and year. (3) Finally, the weighted codes are aggregated (average) per country and year. The values of this indicator reflect the absolute deviance of these aggregate scores from the neutral value 3.5, multiplied by -1. Range of values (standardized): minimum = -45.5682; maximum = 100.2868

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### neutnews

Share of neutral / independent newspapers' circulation (weighted by frequency of publication) of a country's total newspaper circulation in percentage.

Neutral newspapers = papers with value 3.5 in previous variable. Range of values (standardized): minimum = -45.56; maximum = 113.54

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **newsp**

Number of (paid and free) daily newspaper titles per 1 million inhabitants.

Range of values (standardized): minimum = -.3174; maximum = 101.7916.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **barinfo**

Restriction of freedom of information/barriers for access to official information. Categories (standardized): 0 = No Freedom of Information (FOI) legislation; 33.3 = High restrictions (high fees for information and long delays [more than 2 weeks]); 66.6 = Considerable restrictions (1 restriction only (fee, delay)); 100 = No restrictions (no fee, immediate information [less than 2 weeks]).

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **effinfo**

Effectiveness of Freedom of Information (FOI) laws. FOI is seen as effective if the following conditions are fulfilled: A) FOI does not only cover the executive and administration (0.5) but also further public authorities (1); B) Official documents are accessible (except for common exemptions such as matters of national security or documents that contain personal information, etc.) (1) but not considerable number of exemptions and/or delay for Cabinet documents (0.5); C) Compliance with FOI is supervised by an independent commission (1) or at least a court review (i.e. directly contact the court (1) but not first administrative review (0.5)).  $Foi\_eff = \text{sum of } A+B+C$ ; recoded such as 1.5 = 1; 2 = 2; 2.5 = 3; 3 = 4. A country without any FOI legislation receives the value 0.

Categories (standardized): 0 = No FOI law; 25 = Low effectiveness; 50 = Quite considerable effectiveness; 75 = Considerable effectiveness; 100 = High effectiveness.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **womrep**

Proportion of female representatives in the lower house of parliament in percentage of all seats.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **womgov**

Proportion of female representatives in the government (incl. ministerial positions). Range of values (standardized): minimum = 0; maximum = 109.0909.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **poldismin**

Index of political discrimination of minority groups (average of all groups in a country) (reversed): 'macro coding of the role of public policy and social practice in maintaining or redressing political inequalities'. Categories: 0 = No discrimination; 1 = Neglect/Remedial policies; 2 = Neglect/No remedial policies; 3 = Social exclusion/Neutral policy 4 = Exclusion/Repressive policy. Range of values (standardized): minimum = 0; maximum = 100.

Period covered: 2010-2012.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## **minpow**

Access to central power by ethnic minority groups. Categories: 1 = discriminated; 2 = powerless; 3 = regional or separatist autonomy; 4 = junior partner; 5 = senior partner. Range of values (standardized): minimum = -11.11; maximum = 100 (-11.1) discriminated; (22.2) powerless; (55.55) regional or separatist autonomy; (88.88) junior partner; (100) senior partner.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

## 4. LEGAL INDICATORS

### govdec

Assessment of the effective implementation of government decisions/law enforcement. Measured on a scale ranging from 0 to 10. Range of values (standardized): minimum = -20.56; maximum = 100.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy barometer.

### judrev

Judicial review = existence of an independent body which decides whether laws conform to the constitution. Categories: -1 = constitution gives the power of constitutional review to another branch of government such as the executive or the legislature; 0 = constitution does not provide for judicial (constitutional) review; 1 = constitution provides for judicial review somewhat or provides for it vaguely but not fully; 2 = constitution provides for judicial review fully and explicitly. Range of values (standardized): minimum = -100; maximum = 100.

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy Barometer - Lijphart (1999), Ismayr (2003), constitutions and European Journal of Political Research, various issues.

### req\_ref

Required referendum (also called obligatory or mandatory referendum). According to Hug and Tsebelis (2002) = existence of a mechanism, where specific amendments of the constitution or a law automatically need to be submitted to the people's vote. The amendments will only come into force if the people accept the presented proposals. Coded: 1 = yes; 0 = no.

Period covered: 2010-2012.

Source: Comparative Political Dataset III - Butler and Ranney (1994), Hug and Tsebelis (2002), LeDuc (2003), Research Centre on Direct Democracy, University of Zurich ([www.c2d.ch](http://www.c2d.ch), Download: 2007-02-16), constitutions.

### asylconst

Constitutional provisions on asylum: The right to asylum is recognized by Constitution (Yes=1) or is not recognized (No=0).

Period covered: 2010-2017.

Source: Constitutions

### dirdem

Constitutional provisions for direct democracy. Sum of four direct democratic institutions (1 point for each institution). 1) Mandatory referendum; 2) veto-player referendum: referendum is triggered and question is asked by an existing veto-player; 3) popular veto: non veto-player (part of parliament, citizens...) triggers referendum, but question is asked by an

existing veto player; 4) popular initiative: non veto-player asks question and triggers referendum.

Measurement Notes: 1) only binding referenda are considered; 2) referenda are considered when they exclude certain issues (e.g. budgetary questions) but not if they only include specific questions (e.g. referendum only possible for EU-Accession). Range of values (standardized): minimum=0; maximum=133.33333 (0; 33.3; 66.6; 100; 133.3)

Period covered: 2010-2014.

Source: Democracy Barometer - Hug/Tsebelis (2002); ACE, C2d; Constitutions; Electoral laws; Direct Democracy Navigator; Welp/Serdült 2009.

## pop\_init

Popular initiative as the third and last category of non-required referenda according to Hug and Tsebelis (2002). A given number of electors (non-existing veto-players) have the right to launch an initiative, which later must be submitted to the people. Coded: 1 = yes; 0= no.

Period covered: 2010-2012

Missing: None

Source: Comparative Political Dataset III- Butler and Ranney (1994), Hug and Tsebelis (2002), LeDuc (2003), Research Centre on Direct Democracy, University of Zurich ([www.c2d.ch](http://www.c2d.ch), Download: 2007-02-16), constitutions.

Notes on referenda:

1. Only referenda with binding characteristics are taken into consideration. Consultative or advisory referenda, also called plebiscites, are characterized by generally non-binding results and are therefore excluded. Whether or not a referendum's result is legally binding is generally determined by a country's constitution or basic law.
2. Only referenda at national level are included.
3. Coding does not contain information about the frequency of referenda. For more details on referenda, please refer to the Research Centre on Direct Democracy: [www.c2d.ch](http://www.c2d.ch)

## References

- Armington, K., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D. and Engler, S. (2014), *Comparative Political Dataset III 1990-2012*. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Berne.
- Armington, K., Wenger, V., Wiedemeier, F., Isler, C., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D. and Engler, S. (2017), *Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2015*. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Berne.
- Butler, D. and Ranney, A. (eds.) (1994), *Referendums around the World*. Washington, D.C: The AEI Press.
- Dalton, J. (2008), "The Quantity and Quality of Party Systems". *Comparative Political Studies*, 20(10): 1–22.
- Döring, H. and Manow, P. (2012), *Parliament and government composition database (ParlGov): An infrastructure for empirical information on parties, elections and governments in modern democracies*. Version 12/10 – 15 October 2012.
- EJPR, *European Journal of Political Research*. *Political Data Yearbook*, various issues.
- European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010), Data file edition 3.2. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
- European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012), Data file edition 2.1. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
- European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014), Data file edition 1.0. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
- European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016), Data file edition 1.0. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
- European Social Survey (2016), ESS1-7 cumulative data file. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC.
- Gerring, J. and Thacker, S. C. (2004), "Political institutions and Corruption: The role of unitarism and parliamentarism". *British Journal of Political Science* 34: 295-330.
- Golder, S. N. (2010), "Bargaining Delays in the Government Formation Process". *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(1): 3-32.
- Huber, E., Ragin, C., Stephens, J. D., Brady, D. and Beckfield, J. (2004), *Comparative Welfare States Data Set*. Northwestern University, University of North Carolina, Duke University and Indiana University.
- Hug, S. and Tsebelis, G. (2002), "Veto Players and Referendums around the World". *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 14(4): 465-515.
- Ismayr, W. (ed.) (2003), *Die politischen Systeme Westeuropas*. 3. Auflage. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Ismayr, W. (ed.) (2006), *Die politischen Systeme Osteuropas*. 2., aktualisierte Auflage. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Ismayr, W. (2010), *Die politischen Systeme Osteuropas im Vergleich*, in: W. Ismayr (ed.): *Die politischen Systeme Osteuropas*, Wiesbaden, 3rd ed., 9-78.

- Laakso, M. and Taagepera, R. (1979), "Effective Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe". *Comparative Political Studies* 12(1):3-27.
- LeDuc, L. (2003), *The politics of direct democracy: Referendums in global perspective*. Broadview Press.
- Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six democracies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (2012), *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. 2nd Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McDonnell, D., and Valbruzzi, M. (2014), "Defining and classifying technocrat-led and technocratic governments". *European Journal of Political Research* 53(4): 654-671.
- NOSOSCO (2015), *Social protection in the Nordic countries 2013/2014: scope, expenditure and financing*. Copenhagen: Nordic Social-Statistical Committee.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2007), *Babies and bosses: Reconciling work and family life: A synthesis of findings for OECD countries*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD (2014), *Revenue Statistics: Comparative tables, OECD Tax Statistics*. Paris: OECD.
- Schmidt, M. G. (1992), *Regierungen: Parteipolitische Zusammensetzung*. In *Lexikon der Politik, Band 3. Die westlichen Länder*, (ed.) Manfred G. Schmidt, 393-400. München: C.H. Beck.
- Visser, J. (2013), *ICTWSS: Database on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts in 34 countries between 1960 and 2012, Version 4*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies AIAS.
- Visser, J. (2015), *ICTWSS: Database on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts in 34 countries between 1960 and 2014, Version 5*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies AIAS.
- Visser, J. (2016), *ICTWSS: Database on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts in 51 countries between 1960 and 2014, Version 5.1*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies AIAS.
- Welp, Y. and Serdült, U. (eds.) (2009), *Armas de doble filo: La participación ciudadana en la encrudijada*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros.
- Woldendorp, J., Keman, H. and Budge I. (2000), *Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998). Composition – Duration – Personnel*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

### **Sources (databases):**

- ACE Electoral Knowledge Network (<http://aceproject.org>);
- Centre for Research on Direct Democracy (<http://www.c2d.ch>);
- Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) (<https://www.chesdata.eu/>);
- Charities Aid Foundation (<https://www.cafonline.org/>);
- Comparative Political Dataset (<http://www.cpbs-data.org/index.php/data>);
- Democracy Barometer (<http://www.democracybarometer.org/>);
- Eurobarometers ([http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm));

European Social Survey (<http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>);

Eurostat database (<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database>);

International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), Voter Turnout Database (<https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voter-turnout>);

IPSOS immigration and refugees poll (<https://www.ipsos.com/en/global-views-immigration-and-refugee-crisis>)

Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) – database (<https://data.oecd.org/>);

Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) – Family Database (<http://www.oecd.org/els/family/database.htm>);

Parliaments and governments database (ParlGov) (<http://www.parlgov.org/>);

The Navigator to Direct Democracy (<http://direct-democracy-navigator.org>);

TransSOL database (<http://transsol.eu/outputs/data/>)

# Annex

## General variables

year

year

country

country name

country code

country number: 420 Czech Republic, 45 Denmark, 358 Finland, 30 Greece, 39 Italy, 41 Switzerland, 44 United Kingdom.

isocode

ISO 3166-1 numeric code (numeric-3).

ISO code by country: 203 Czech Republic, 208 Denmark, 246 Finland, 300 Greece, 380 Italy, 756 Switzerland, 826 United Kingdom.

Source: International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Switzerland: Geneva.