
demscore

Thematic Datasets

Codebook

Economic Development



November 2026

Copyright © Demscore
All rights reserved

Based on Demscore
Version 8.0

Funders: Demscore is funded by the Swedish Research Council, University of Gothenburg, Stockholm University, Uppsala University, and Umeå University. For more information, please visit: `https://demscore.se`

For data enquiries: contact@demscore.se

Summary of Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **50**

1.1 Release Notes v8 . . . 50
1.2 New in Demscore version 8 . . . 50
1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 51
1.4 Methodology . . . 51
1.5 Citations . . . 51
1.6 Missing Data . . . 51
1.7 Download ID . . . 52
1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 52
1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 52
1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 52

2 COMPLAB **53**

2.1 COMPLAB GRACE - Governing the Anthropocene . . . 53
2.1.1 Policy Implementation . . . 54
2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL GLOBALCIT Country-Year . . . 55
2.2.1 Acquisition of Citizenship . . . 55
2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database . . . 57
2.3.1 Historical Policy . . . 58
2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM . . . 60
2.4.1 Emigration Policies Documentation . . . 61
2.4.2 Emigration Policies Quotas and Restrictions . . . 61
2.4.3 Emigration Policies Incentives . . . 62
2.4.4 Emigration Economic Policies . . . 63
2.4.5 Emigration Cultural Policies . . . 64
2.4.6 Emigration Obligations . . . 64
2.4.7 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration . . . 65
2.4.8 Immigration Policies Permanent Residence . . . 68
2.4.9 Immigration Economic Policies . . . 71
2.4.10 Immigration Social Policies . . . 97
2.4.11 Immigration Policies Obligations . . . 100
2.4.12 Immigration Nationality . . . 103
2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL Migrant Social Policy Dataset . . . 104
2.5.1 Preventative Measures Welfare Burden . . . 105
2.5.2 Access Welfare Benefits . . . 110
2.6 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC . . . 111
2.6.1 Regulations Field A (Family reunification) . . . 112
2.6.2 Regulations Field B (Labour) . . . 113
2.6.3 Regulations Field C (Asylum) . . . 114
2.6.4 Regulations Field D (Co-Ethnics) . . . 115
2.6.5 Data Source . . . 116
2.7 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC Political Rights . . . 116
2.7.1 Identifiers . . . 117
2.7.2 Political Rights . . . 117
2.8 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX . . . 121
2.8.1 Labour Market Mobility . . . 122
2.8.2 Family Reunification . . . 125

2.8.3 Education . . . 126
2.8.4 Permanent Residence . . . 127
2.8.5 Acquisition of Citizenship . . . 127
2.8.6 Antidiscrimination . . . 128
2.8.7 Health . . . 129
2.9 COMPLAB SPIN The Child Benefit Dataset (CBD) . . . 131
2.9.1 Child Benefits . . . 132
2.10 COMPLAB SPIN The Housing Benefit Dataset (HBEN) . . . 133
2.10.1 Housing Benefits . . . 134
2.11 COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB) . . . 200
2.11.1 Unemployment . . . 201
2.12 COMPLAB SPIN The Parental Leave Benefit Dataset (PLB) . . . 240
2.12.1 Parental Benefits . . . 241
2.13 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Assistance and Minimum Income Protection Interim Dataset (SAMIP) . . . 264
2.13.1 Minimum Income Protection . . . 265
2.13.2 Housing Benefits . . . 266
2.14 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP) . . . 267
2.14.1 Pensions . . . 267
2.14.2 Unemployment . . . 268
2.14.3 Sick Leave . . . 278
2.14.4 Worker's Compensation . . . 280
2.15 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Insurance Entitlements Dataset (SIED) . . . 281
2.15.1 Pensions . . . 282
2.15.2 Unemployment . . . 283
2.15.3 Sick Leave . . . 293
2.15.4 Worker's Compensation . . . 294

3 H-DATA 297
3.1 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset . . . 297
3.1.1 Personal Background . . . 297
3.1.2 Educational Background . . . 298
3.1.3 Occupational Background . . . 298
3.1.4 Political Background . . . 299
3.2 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789) . . . 299
3.2.1 Territory Variables . . . 300
3.2.2 Leadership Variables . . . 301

4 QOG 303
4.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset . . . 303
4.1.1 Accountable Climate Targets . . . 303
4.1.2 Aquastat . . . 304
4.1.3 Bertelsmann Transformation Index . . . 304
4.1.4 Cooperation in International Climate Change Regime . . . 305
4.1.5 Climate Change Laws of the World . . . 306
4.1.6 EDGAR - Fossil CO2 Emissions of All World Countries . . . 307
4.1.7 The Environmental Democracy Index . . . 307
4.1.8 ENVIPOLCON . . . 309
4.1.9 ENVIPOLCONCHANGE . . . 316

4.1.10 Environmental Performance Index Data 2020 . . . 317
4.1.11 Green Growth . . . 324
4.1.12 The International Social Survey Programme. Environment Module . . . 326
4.1.13 Policy Instruments for the Environment . . . 327
4.1.14 oecd_multi . . . 328
4.1.15 The Ocean Health Index Data . . . 328
4.1.16 Oil and Gas Data, 1932-2014 . . . 332
4.1.17 Sustainable Governance Indicators . . . 333
4.1.18 World Development Indicators . . . 334
4.1.19 World Values Survey . . . 336
4.2 QoG EQI Regional Level 2021 (with all NUTS2 regions) . . . 336
4.2.1 Identification Variables . . . 337
4.3 QoG European Quality of Government Index CATI - Country Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024) . . . 338
4.3.1 Country Level Variables . . . 338
4.4 QoG European Quality of Government Index Regional Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024) . . . 339
4.4.1 Identification Variables . . . 339
4.5 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data . . . 340
4.5.1 Identification . . . 341
4.5.2 Demographics . . . 341
4.5.3 Education . . . 343
4.5.4 Health . . . 344
4.5.5 Science and Technology . . . 346
4.5.6 Poverty and Social Exclusion . . . 366
4.5.7 Digital Society and Economy . . . 367
4.5.8 Labour Market Statistics . . . 367
4.5.9 Economy . . . 385
4.5.10 Tourism . . . 391
4.6 QoG Swedish Agency Database Formal Instruction Data . . . 392
4.6.1 Aggregated Variables . . . 392
4.7 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series . . . 393
4.7.1 Judicial . . . 393
4.7.2 Quality of Government . . . 400
4.7.3 Media . . . 408
4.7.4 Conflict and Military Service . . . 411
4.7.5 Political System . . . 414
4.7.6 Public Economy . . . 420
4.7.7 Gender Equality . . . 460
4.7.8 Private Economy . . . 464
4.7.9 Welfare . . . 475
4.7.10 Education . . . 477
4.7.11 Labour Market . . . 480
4.7.12 Civil Society, Population and Culture . . . 532
4.7.13 Environment . . . 536
4.7.14 Political Parties and Elections . . . 540
4.7.15 History . . . 541
4.7.16 Energy and Infrastructure . . . 542

4.7.17 Health . . . 544

5 REPDEM **545**
5.1 REPDEM Basic . . . 545
5.1.1 Cabinet Information . . . 546
5.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe . . . 546
5.2.1 Information on the Cabinets . . . 547

6 V-DEM **549**
6.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 . . . 549
6.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices . . . 550
6.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections . . . 557
6.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties . . . 563
6.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 564
6.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 575
6.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Deliberation . . . 579
6.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary . . . 584
6.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty . . . 585
6.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Sovereignty and State . . . 592
6.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Political Equality . . . 597
6.1.11 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion . . . 600
6.1.12 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation . . . 612
6.1.13 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space . . . 614
6.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties . . . 620
6.1.15 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Exclusion . . . 621
6.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Women's Empowerment . . . 625
6.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Direct Democracy . . . 626
6.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Society . . . 634
6.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections . . . 635
6.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages . . . 636
6.1.21 Varieties of Indoctrination . . . 638
6.1.22 Party Systems . . . 647
6.2 V-Dem V-Party v2 . . . 653
6.2.1 Party Identity . . . 654
6.2.2 Party Organisation . . . 656

7 Bibliography **659**

Table of Contents

1 Explanatory Notes **50**

1.1 Release Notes v8 . . . 50
1.2 New in Demscore version 8 . . . 50
1.3 The Demscore Codebook . . . 51
1.4 Methodology . . . 51
1.5 Citations . . . 51
1.6 Missing Data . . . 51
1.7 Download ID . . . 52
1.8 Unit Identifier Variables . . . 52
1.9 Thematic Dataset . . . 52
1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit . . . 52

2 COMPLAB **53**

2.1 COMPLAB GRACE - Governing the Anthropocene . . . 53
2.1.1 Policy Implementation . . . 54
2.1.1.1 Hazardous substance in detergents (detergents) . . . 54
2.1.1.2 Contaminated site policy (sites) . . . 54
2.1.1.3 Recycling of construction waste (constructionwaste) . . . 54
2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL GLOBALCIT Country-Year . . . 55
2.2.1 Acquisition of Citizenship . . . 55
2.2.1.1 Residence-based acquisition – economic resources condition (a06f_bin) 56
2.2.1.2 Residence-based acquisition – economic resources condition (a06f_cat) 56
2.2.1.3 Investments (a26_bin) . . . 56
2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database . . . 57
2.3.1 Historical Policy . . . 58
2.3.1.1 National Restrictions (natcode) . . . 58
2.3.1.2 Skill Restrictions (skillcode) . . . 58
2.3.1.3 Asylum Provisions (asylcode) . . . 59
2.3.1.4 Recruitment (reccode) . . . 59
2.3.1.5 Labor Prohibitions (labcode) . . . 60
2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM . . . 60
2.4.1 Emigration Policies Documentation . . . 61
2.4.1.1 Emigration Documentation Income (etiondoc_income) . . . 61
2.4.2 Emigration Policies Quotas and Restrictions . . . 61
2.4.2.1 Emigration Quotas Income Categorical (etionquota_incomecat) . . . 61
2.4.2.2 Emigration Quotas Income Numeric (etionquota_incomenum) . . . 62
2.4.3 Emigration Policies Incentives . . . 62
2.4.3.1 Emigration Policy Incentives Benefits (etionincentives_benefits) . . . 62
2.4.4 Emigration Economic Policies . . . 63
2.4.4.1 Emigrant Economic Policies Remittances Bank Channels (egranteco_remittances_bankchannels) . . . 63
2.4.4.2 Emigrant Economic Policies Remittances Co-development (egranteco_remittances_codevelopment) . . . 63
2.4.4.3 Emigrant Economic Policies Investment (egranteco_investment) . . . 64
2.4.5 Emigration Cultural Policies . . . 64
2.4.5.1 Emigrant Cultural Policies Language Courses for Emigrants (egrantcul_courses) . . . 64

2.4.6 Emigration Obligations . . . 64
2.4.6.1 Emigrant Obligations Taxes Income (egrantobl_taxes_income) . . . 64
2.4.7 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration . . . 65
2.4.7.1 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Existence (itionlabor_existence) 65
2.4.7.2 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Test (itionlabor_test_domestic) . . . 65
2.4.7.3 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Loss (itionlabor_loss_domestic) . . . 66
2.4.7.4 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Test (itionlabor_test_agricultural) . . . 66
2.4.7.5 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Loss (itionlabor_loss_agricultural) . . . 67
2.4.7.6 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Test (itionlabor_test_medical) . . . 67
2.4.7.7 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Loss (itionlabor_loss_medical) . . . 67
2.4.8 Immigration Policies Permanent Residence . . . 68
2.4.8.1 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Seekers (igrantpermanent_resources_seekers) . . . 68
2.4.8.2 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Refugees (igrantpermanent_resources_refugees) . . . 68
2.4.8.3 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Co-Ethnics (igrantpermanent_resources_coethnic) . . . 69
2.4.8.4 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Domestic (igrantpermanent_resources_domestic) . . . 69
2.4.8.5 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Agricultural (igrantpermanent_resources_agricultural) . . . 70
2.4.8.6 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Medical (igrantpermanent_resources_medical) . . . 70
2.4.9 Immigration Economic Policies . . . 71
2.4.9.1 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_seekers) . . . 71
2.4.9.2 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_refugee) . . . 71
2.4.9.3 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_coethnic) . . . 71
2.4.9.4 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_domestic) . . . 72
2.4.9.5 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_agricultural) . . . 72
2.4.9.6 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_medical) . . . 73
2.4.9.7 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_permanent) . . . 73
2.4.9.8 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_seekers) . . . 73
2.4.9.9 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_refugee) . . . 74
2.4.9.10 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_coethnic) . . . 74
2.4.9.11 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_domestic) . . . 75

2.4.9.12 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_agricultural) . . . 75
2.4.9.13 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_medical) . . . 75
2.4.9.14 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_permanent) . . . 76
2.4.9.15 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_seekers) . . . 76
2.4.9.16 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_refugee) . . . 77
2.4.9.17 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_coethnic) . . . 77
2.4.9.18 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_domestic) . . . 78
2.4.9.19 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_agricultural) . . . 78
2.4.9.20 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_medical) . . . 78
2.4.9.21 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_permanent) . . . 79
2.4.9.22 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_seekers) . . . 79
2.4.9.23 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_refugee) . . . 80
2.4.9.24 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_coethnic) . . . 80
2.4.9.25 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_domestic) . . . 80
2.4.9.26 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_agricultural) . . . 81
2.4.9.27 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_medical) . . . 81
2.4.9.28 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_permanent) . . . 82
2.4.9.29 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Seekers (igranteco_police_seekers) . . . 82
2.4.9.30 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Refugee (igranteco_police_refugee) . . . 82
2.4.9.31 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Co-Ethnic (igranteco_police_coethnic) . . . 83
2.4.9.32 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Domestic (igranteco_police_domestic) . . . 83
2.4.9.33 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Agricultural (igranteco_police_agricultural) . . . 84
2.4.9.34 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Medical (igranteco_police_medical) . . . 84
2.4.9.35 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Permanent (igranteco_police_permanent) . . . 85
2.4.9.36 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Seekers (igranteco_military_seekers) . . . 85
2.4.9.37 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Refugee (igranteco_military_refugee) . . . 85

2.4.9.38 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Co-Ethnic (igranteco_military_coethnic) . . . 86
2.4.9.39 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Domestic (igranteco_military_domestic) . . . 86
2.4.9.40 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Agricultural (igranteco_military_agricultural) . . . 87
2.4.9.41 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Medical (igranteco_military_medical) . . . 87
2.4.9.42 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Permanent (igranteco_military_permanent) . . . 87
2.4.9.43 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Seekers (igranteco_support_seekers) . . . 88
2.4.9.44 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Refugees (igranteco_support_refugees) . . . 88
2.4.9.45 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Co-Ethnics (igranteco_support_coethnic) . . . 89
2.4.9.46 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Domestic (igranteco_support_domestic) . . . 89
2.4.9.47 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Agricultural (igranteco_support_agricultural) . . . 90
2.4.9.48 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Medical (igranteco_support_medical) . . . 90
2.4.9.49 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Permanent (igranteco_support_permanent) . . . 90
2.4.9.50 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Seekers (igranteco_unions_seekers) . . . 91
2.4.9.51 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Refugee (igranteco_unions_refugee) . . . 91
2.4.9.52 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Co-Ethnic (igranteco_unions_coethnic) . . . 92
2.4.9.53 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Domestic (igranteco_unions_domestic) . . . 92
2.4.9.54 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Agricultural (igranteco_unions_agricultural) . . . 93
2.4.9.55 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Medical (igranteco_unions_medical) . . . 93
2.4.9.56 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Permanent (igranteco_unions_permanent) . . . 93
2.4.9.57 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Seekers (igranteco_redress_seekers) . . . 94
2.4.9.58 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Refugee (igranteco_redress_refugee) . . . 94
2.4.9.59 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Co-Ethnic (igranteco_redress_coethnic) . . . 95
2.4.9.60 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Domestic (igranteco_redress_domestic) . . . 95
2.4.9.61 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Agricultural (igranteco_redress_agricultural) . . . 95
2.4.9.62 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Medical (igranteco_redress_medical) . . . 96
2.4.9.63 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Permanent (igranteco_redress_permanent) . . . 96
2.4.10 Immigration Social Policies . . . 97

2.4.10.1 Immigrant Social Policies Education Integration (igrantsoc_educationintegration) . . . 97
2.4.10.2 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Seekers (igrantsoc_unemployment_seekers) . . . 97
2.4.10.3 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Refugee (igrantsoc_unemployment_refugee) . . . 98
2.4.10.4 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Co-Ethnic (igrantsoc_unemployment_coethnic) . . . 98
2.4.10.5 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Domestic (igrantsoc_unemployment_domestic) . . . 99
2.4.10.6 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Agricultural (igrantsoc_unemployment_agricultural) . . . 99
2.4.10.7 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Medical (igrantsoc_unemployment_medical) . . . 99
2.4.10.8 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Permanent (igrantsoc_unemployment_permanent) . . . 100
2.4.11 Immigration Policies Obligations . . . 100
2.4.11.1 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Seekers (igrantobligation_taxes_seekers) . . . 100
2.4.11.2 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Refugee (igrantobligation_taxes_refugee) . . . 101
2.4.11.3 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Co-Ethnic (igrantobligation_taxes_coethnic) . . . 101
2.4.11.4 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Domestic (igrantobligation_taxes_domestic) . . . 102
2.4.11.5 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Agricultural (igrantobligation_taxes_agricultural) . . . 102
2.4.11.6 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Medical (igrantobligation_taxes_medical) . . . 102
2.4.11.7 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Permanent (igrantobligation_taxes_permanent) . . . 103
2.4.12 Immigration Nationality . . . 103
2.4.12.1 Immigrant Nationality Standard Naturalization Procedure for Immigrants due to Residence in the Country Economic (icit_ordinary_economic) . . . 103
2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL Migrant Social Policy Dataset . . . 104
2.5.1 Preventative Measures Welfare Burden . . . 105
2.5.1.1 Income Criterion for Family Reunification for Citizens (a4xcit) . . . 105
2.5.1.2 Income Criterion for Family Reunification for Third-country National (a4xtcn) . . . 105
2.5.1.3 Consequences of Loss of Employment First Permanent Residency Entry (b12_perm_1) . . . 105
2.5.1.4 Consequences of Loss of Employment Second Permanent Residency Entry (b12_perm_2) . . . 106
2.5.1.5 Consequences of Loss of Employment First Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_1) . . . 106
2.5.1.6 Consequences of Loss of Employment Second Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_2) . . . 106
2.5.1.7 Consequences of Loss of Employment Third Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_3) . . . 107
2.5.1.8 Consequences of Loss of Employment Fourth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_4) . . . 107

2.5.1.9 Consequences of Loss of Employment Fifth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_5) . . . 108
2.5.1.10 Consequences of Loss of Employment Sixth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_6) . . . 108
2.5.1.11 Consequences of Loss of Employment EUblue Residency Entry (b12_eublue) . . . 108
2.5.1.12 Preventative measures Family Reunification (a4x) . . . 109
2.5.1.13 Consequences of Loss of Employment mean (b12mean) . . . 109
2.5.1.14 Preventative measures (prevmeas) . . . 109
2.5.2 Access Welfare Benefits . . . 110
2.5.2.1 Unemployment insurance benefits for permanent migrant workers (f61b) 110
2.5.2.2 Unemployment insurance benefits for temporary migrant workers (f61c) 110
2.5.2.3 Length of unemployment insurance benefits for permanent migrant workers (f62b) . . . 111
2.5.2.4 Length of unemployment insurance benefits for temporary migrant workers (f62c) . . . 111
2.6 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC . . . 111
2.6.1 Regulations Field A (Family reunification) . . . 112
2.6.1.1 (Self)employment - Aggregated (avgs_a10) . . . 112
2.6.2 Regulations Field B (Labour) . . . 113
2.6.2.1 Quotas labor - Aggregated (avgs_b02) . . . 113
2.6.2.2 Financial self-sustainability - Aggregated (avgs_b04) . . . 113
2.6.2.3 Specific income per month - Aggregated (avgs_b04_a) . . . 113
2.6.2.4 Labor market test - Aggregated (avgs_b09_2) . . . 114
2.6.2.5 Loss of employment - Aggregated (avgs_b12) . . . 114
2.6.3 Regulations Field C (Asylum) . . . 114
2.6.3.1 (Self)employment - Aggregated (avgs_c12) . . . 114
2.6.4 Regulations Field D (Co-Ethnics) . . . 115
2.6.4.1 Employment program - Aggregated (avgs_d11) . . . 115
2.6.4.2 Integration measures - Aggregated (avgs_d12) . . . 115
2.6.5 Data Source . . . 116
2.6.5.1 Expert (expert) . . . 116
2.7 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC Political Rights . . . 116
2.7.1 Identifiers . . . 117
2.7.1.1 track (track) . . . 117
2.7.2 Political Rights . . . 117
2.7.2.1 Voting rights, national election - Discriminatory right (r_f01_b) . . . 118
2.7.2.2 Voting rights, regional election - Universal right (r_f02_a) . . . 118
2.7.2.3 Voting rights, regional election - Discriminatory right (r_f02_b) . . . 118
2.7.2.4 Voting rights, local election - Universal right (r_f03_a) . . . 119
2.7.2.5 Voting rights, local election - Discriminatory right (r_f03_b) . . . 119
2.7.2.6 Voting rights, national election - Scored (s_f01) . . . 120
2.7.2.7 Voting rights, regional election - Scored (s_f02) . . . 120
2.7.2.8 Voting rights, local election - Scored (s_f03) . . . 121
2.8 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX . . . 121
2.8.1 Labour Market Mobility . . . 122
2.8.1.1 Labour market mobility (a) . . . 122
2.8.1.2 Immediate access to labour market (aa1) . . . 122
2.8.1.3 Access to public sector (aa3) . . . 123

2.8.1.4 Access to self employment (aa5) . . . 123
2.8.1.5 Public employment services (ab6) . . . 123
2.8.1.6 Economic integration measures of youth and women (ac14) . . . 124
2.8.1.7 Access to social security and assistance (ad18) . . . 124
2.8.2 Family Reunification . . . 125
2.8.2.1 Dependent relatives (ba26ba27) . . . 125
2.8.2.2 Economic resources (bb31) . . . 125
2.8.2.3 Grounds for rejection, withdrawal, refusal (bc35) . . . 126
2.8.3 Education . . . 126
2.8.3.1 Teacher training to reflect diversity (cd64) . . . 126
2.8.4 Permanent Residence . . . 127
2.8.4.1 Economic resources (eb85) . . . 127
2.8.4.2 Accesso to social security and assistance (ed96) . . . 127
2.8.5 Acquisition of Citizenship . . . 127
2.8.5.1 Economic resources (fb106) . . . 128
2.8.6 Antidiscrimination . . . 128
2.8.6.1 Fields of applications (gb) . . . 128
2.8.6.2 Employment and vocational training (gb123) . . . 128
2.8.7 Health . . . 129
2.8.7.1 Administrative discretion and documentation for legal migrants (h148) 129
2.8.7.2 Administrative discretion and documentation for asylum-seekers (h149) 129
2.8.7.3 Administrative discretion and documentation for undocumented migrants (h150) . . . 130
2.8.7.4 Involvement of migrants in information provision, service design and delivery (h159) . . . 131
2.9 COMPLAB SPIN The Child Benefit Dataset (CBD) . . . 131
2.9.1 Child Benefits . . . 132
2.9.1.1 Net apw family (netapwfa) . . . 132
2.9.1.2 Rr Employment-based child benefit (apw) (rr_cb_eb_apw) . . . 132
2.9.1.3 Rr Income-tested child benefit (apw) (rr_cb_it_apw) . . . 132
2.9.1.4 Net 0.5apw family (netapwfa_z) . . . 132
2.9.1.5 Rr Employment-based child benefit (0.5apw) (rr_cb_eb_z) . . . 133
2.9.1.6 Rr Income-tested child benefit (0.5apw) (rr_cb_it_z) . . . 133
2.10 COMPLAB SPIN The Housing Benefit Dataset (HBEN) . . . 133
2.10.1 Housing Benefits . . . 134
2.10.1.1 Mean 5-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_g_e) . . . 134
2.10.1.2 Mean 50-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_g_e) . . . 135
2.10.1.3 Mean 50-150 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_g_e) . . . 135
2.10.1.4 Mean 5-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_n_e) . . . 136
2.10.1.5 Mean 50-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_n_e) . . . 136
2.10.1.6 Mean 50-150 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_n_e) . . . 137
2.10.1.7 Concentration 5-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_g_e) . . . 137

2.10.1.8 Concentration 50-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_g_e) . . . 138
2.10.1.9 Concentration 50-150 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_g_e) . . . 138
2.10.1.10 Concentration 5-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_n_e) . . . 139
2.10.1.11 Concentration 50-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_n_e) . . . 140
2.10.1.12 Concentration 50-150 Couple Net Income Esimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_n_e) . . . 140
2.10.1.13 Mean 5-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_e) . . . 141
2.10.1.14 Mean 50-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_e) . . . 141
2.10.1.15 Mean 50-150 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_e) . . . 142
2.10.1.16 Mean 5-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_e) . . . 142
2.10.1.17 Mean 50-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_e) . . . 143
2.10.1.18 Mean 50-150 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_e) . . . 143
2.10.1.19 Concentration 5-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_e) . . . 144
2.10.1.20 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_e) . . . 144
2.10.1.21 Concentration 50-150 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_e) . . . 145
2.10.1.22 Concentration 5-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_e) . . . 146
2.10.1.23 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_e) . . . 146
2.10.1.24 Concentration 50-150 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_e) . . . 147
2.10.1.25 Mean 5-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_g_e) . . . 147
2.10.1.26 Mean 50-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_g_e) . . . 148
2.10.1.27 Mean 50-150 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_g_e) . . . 148
2.10.1.28 Mean 5-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_n_e) . . . 149
2.10.1.29 Mean 50-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_n_e) . . . 149
2.10.1.30 Mean 50-150 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_n_e) . . . 150
2.10.1.31 Concentration 5-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_g_e) . . . 151
2.10.1.32 Concentration 50-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_g_e) . . . 151
2.10.1.33 Concentration 50-150 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_g_e) . . . 152

2.10.1.34 Concentration 5-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_n_e) . . . 152
2.10.1.35 Concentration 50-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_n_e) . . . 153
2.10.1.36 Concentration 50-150 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_n_e) . . . 153
2.10.1.37 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_e) . . . 154
2.10.1.38 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_e) . . . 154
2.10.1.39 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_e) . . . 155
2.10.1.40 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_e) . . . 155
2.10.1.41 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_e) . . . 156
2.10.1.42 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_e) . . . 157
2.10.1.43 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_e) . . . 157
2.10.1.44 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_e) . . . 158
2.10.1.45 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_e) . . . 158
2.10.1.46 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_e) . . . 159
2.10.1.47 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_e) . . . 159
2.10.1.48 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_e) . . . 160
2.10.1.49 Mean 5-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_g_f) . . . 160
2.10.1.50 Mean 50-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_g_f) . . . 161
2.10.1.51 Mean 50-150 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_g_f) . . . 162
2.10.1.52 Mean 5-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_n_f) . . . 162
2.10.1.53 Mean 50-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_n_f) . . . 163
2.10.1.54 Mean 50-150 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_n_f) . . . 163
2.10.1.55 Concentration 5-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_g_f) . . . 164
2.10.1.56 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_g_f) . . . 164
2.10.1.57 Concentration 50-150 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_g_f) . . . 165
2.10.1.58 Concentration 5-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_n_f) . . . 165
2.10.1.59 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_n_f) . . . 166

2.10.1.60 Concentration 50-150 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_n_f) . . . 166
2.10.1.61 Mean 5-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_f) . . . 167
2.10.1.62 Mean 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_f) . . . 168
2.10.1.63 Mean 50-150 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_f) . . . 168
2.10.1.64 Mean 5-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_f) 169
2.10.1.65 Mean 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_f) . . . 169
2.10.1.66 Mean 50-150 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_f) . . . 170
2.10.1.67 Concentration 5-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_f) . . . 170
2.10.1.68 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_f) . . . 171
2.10.1.69 Concentration 50-150 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_f) . . . 171
2.10.1.70 Concentration 5-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_f) . . . 172
2.10.1.71 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_f) . . . 172
2.10.1.72 Concentration 50-150 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_f) . . . 173
2.10.1.73 Mean 5-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_g_f) . . . 174
2.10.1.74 Mean 50-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_g_f) . . . 174
2.10.1.75 Mean 50-150 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_g_f) . . . 175
2.10.1.76 Mean 5-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_n_f) 175
2.10.1.77 Mean 50-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_n_f) . . . 176
2.10.1.78 Mean 50-150 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_n_f) . . . 176
2.10.1.79 Concentration 5-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_g_f) . . . 177
2.10.1.80 Concentration 50-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_g_f) . . . 177
2.10.1.81 Concentration 50-150 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_g_f) . . . 178
2.10.1.82 Concentration 5-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_n_f) . . . 178
2.10.1.83 Concentration 50-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_n_f) . . . 179
2.10.1.84 Concentration 50-150 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_n_f) . . . 180
2.10.1.85 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_f) . . . 180
2.10.1.86 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_f) . . . 181

2.10.1.87 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_f) . . . 181
2.10.1.88 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_f) . . . 182
2.10.1.89 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_f) . . . 182
2.10.1.90 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_f) . . . 183
2.10.1.91 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_f) . . . 183
2.10.1.92 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_f) . . . 184
2.10.1.93 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_f) . . . 185
2.10.1.94 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_f) . . . 185
2.10.1.95 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_f) . . . 186
2.10.1.96 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_f) . . . 186
2.10.1.97 Mean 5-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_g_e) . . . 187
2.10.1.98 Mean 50-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_g_e) . . . 187
2.10.1.99 Mean 50-150 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_g_e) . . . 188
2.10.1.100 Concentration 5-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_g_e) . . . 188
2.10.1.101 Concentration 50-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_g_e) . . . 189
2.10.1.102 Concentration 50-150 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_g_e) . . . 189
2.10.1.103 Mean 5-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_n_e) . . . 190
2.10.1.104 Mean 50-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_n_e) . . . 191
2.10.1.105 Mean 50-150 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_n_e) . . . 191
2.10.1.106 Concentration 5-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_n_e) . . . 192
2.10.1.107 Concentration 50-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_n_e) . . . 192
2.10.1.108 Concentration 50-150 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_n_e) . . . 193
2.10.1.109 Mean 5-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_g_f) . . . 193
2.10.1.110 Mean 50-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_g_f) . . . 194
2.10.1.111 Mean 50-150 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_g_f) . . . 194
2.10.1.112 Concentration 5-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_g_f) . . . 195

2.10.1.113 Concentration 50-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_g_f) . . . 196
2.10.1.114 Concentration 50-150 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_g_f) . . . 196
2.10.1.115 Mean 5-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_n_f) . . . 197
2.10.1.116 Mean 50-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_n_f) . . . 197
2.10.1.117 Mean 50-150 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_n_f) . . . 198
2.10.1.118 Concentration 5-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_n_f) . . . 198
2.10.1.119 Concentration 50-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_n_f) . . . 199
2.10.1.120 Concentration 50-150 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_n_f) . . . 199
2.11 COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB) . . . 200
2.11.1 Unemployment . . . 201
2.11.1.1 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr_u_33_si) . . . 201
2.11.1.2 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr_us_33_si) . . . 201
2.11.1.3 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr_ush_33_si) . . . 202
2.11.1.4 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr_u_33_fa) . . . 202
2.11.1.5 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_33_fa) . . . 203
2.11.1.6 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_33_fa) . . . 203
2.11.1.7 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_33_lp) . . . 204
2.11.1.8 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_33_lp) . . . 205
2.11.1.9 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_33_lp) . . . 205
2.11.1.10 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr_u_50_si) . . . 206
2.11.1.11 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr_us_50_si) . . . 206
2.11.1.12 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr_ush_50_si) . . . 207
2.11.1.13 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr_u_50_fa) . . . 207
2.11.1.14 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_50_fa) . . . 208
2.11.1.15 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_50_fa) . . . 208
2.11.1.16 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_50_lp) . . . 209
2.11.1.17 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_50_lp) . . . 210

2.11.1.18 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_50_lp) . . . 210
2.11.1.19 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_u_67_si) . . . 211
2.11.1.20 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_us_67_si) . . . 211
2.11.1.21 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_ush_67_si) . . . 212
2.11.1.22 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_u_67_fa) . . . 212
2.11.1.23 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_67_fa) . . . 213
2.11.1.24 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_67_fa) . . . 213
2.11.1.25 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_67_lp) . . . 214
2.11.1.26 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_67_lp) . . . 214
2.11.1.27 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_67_lp) . . . 215
2.11.1.28 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_u_33_si) . . . 216
2.11.1.29 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_us_33_si) . . . 216
2.11.1.30 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_ush_33_si) . . . 217
2.11.1.31 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_u_33_fa) . . . 217
2.11.1.32 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_us_33_fa) . . . 218
2.11.1.33 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_ush_33_fa) . . . 218
2.11.1.34 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_33_lp) . . . 219
2.11.1.35 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_33_lp) . . . 219
2.11.1.36 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_ush_33_lp) . . . 220
2.11.1.37 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg_u_50_si) . . . 221
2.11.1.38 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg_us_50_si) . . . 221
2.11.1.39 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg_ush_50_si) . . . 222
2.11.1.40 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg_u_50_fa) . . . 222
2.11.1.41 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg_us_50_fa) . . . 223
2.11.1.42 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg_ush_50_fa) . . . 223
2.11.1.43 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_50_lp) . . . 224

2.11.1.44 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_50_lp) . . . 224
2.11.1.45 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_ush_50_lp) . . . 225
2.11.1.46 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg_u_67_si) . . . 225
2.11.1.47 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg_us_67_si) . . . 226
2.11.1.48 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg_ush_67_si) . . . 227
2.11.1.49 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg_u_67_fa) . . . 227
2.11.1.50 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg_us_67_fa) . . . 228
2.11.1.51 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg_ush_67_fa) . . . 228
2.11.1.52 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_67_lp) . . . 229
2.11.1.53 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_67_lp) . . . 229
2.11.1.54 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_ush_67_lp) . . . 230
2.11.1.55 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_33) . . . 230
2.11.1.56 Average progressiveness unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_33) . . . 231
2.11.1.57 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_33) . . . 232
2.11.1.58 Average progressiveness unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_33) . . . 232
2.11.1.59 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_33) . . . 233
2.11.1.60 Average progressivenees unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_33) . . . 233
2.11.1.61 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_50) . . . 234
2.11.1.62 Average progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_50) . . . 234
2.11.1.63 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_50) . . . 235
2.11.1.64 Average progressiveness unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_50) . . . 235
2.11.1.65 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_50) . . . 236
2.11.1.66 Average progressivenees unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_50) . . . 236
2.11.1.67 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_67) . . . 237
2.11.1.68 Average progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_67) . . . 238
2.11.1.69 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_67) . . . 238

2.11.1.70 Average progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_67) . . . 239
2.11.1.71 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_67) . . . 239
2.11.1.72 Average progressivenees unemplomentsocial housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_67) . . . 240
2.12 COMPLAB SPIN The Parental Leave Benefit Dataset (PLB) . . . 240
2.12.1 Parental Benefits . . . 241
2.12.1.1 Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks (family C) (pidrpre_c) . 241
2.12.1.2 Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks (family D) (pidrpre_d) . 241
2.12.1.3 Duration, daddy days, in weeks (family C) (pidrdd_c) . . . 242
2.12.1.4 Duration, daddy days, in weeks (family D) (pidrdd_d) . . . 242
2.12.1.5 Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrmatpo_c) . . . 242
2.12.1.6 Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrmatpo_d) . . . 242
2.12.1.7 Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrpatpo_c) . . . 243
2.12.1.8 Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrpatpo_d) . . . 243
2.12.1.9 Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrdupo_c) . . . 243
2.12.1.10 Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrdupo_d) . . . 243
2.12.1.11 Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrtopo_c) . . . 244
2.12.1.12 Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrtopo_d) . . . 244
2.12.1.13 Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrmatfu_c) . . . 244
2.12.1.14 Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrmatfu_d) . . . 244
2.12.1.15 Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrpatfu_c) . . . 245
2.12.1.16 Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrpatfu_d) . . . 245
2.12.1.17 Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrdufu_c) . 245
2.12.1.18 Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrdufu_d) . 245
2.12.1.19 Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrtofu_c) . 246
2.12.1.20 Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrtofu_d) . 246
2.12.1.21 Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family C) (pibengwk_c) 246
2.12.1.22 Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family D) (pibengwk_d) 246
2.12.1.23 Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (pibengyr_c) 247
2.12.1.24 Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (pibengyr_d) 247
2.12.1.25 Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family C) (pibennwk_c) 247
2.12.1.26 Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family D) (pibennwk_d) 247
2.12.1.27 Benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (pibennyr_c) 248
2.12.1.28 Benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (pibennyr_d) 248
2.12.1.29 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family C) (pigrrwk_c) . . . 248

2.12.1.30 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family D) (pigrrwk_d) . . . 248
2.12.1.31 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family C) (pigrryr_c) . . . 249
2.12.1.32 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family D) (pigrryr_d) . . . 249
2.12.1.33 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family C) (pinrrwk_c) 249
2.12.1.34 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family D) (pinrrwk_d) . . . 249
2.12.1.35 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family C) (pinrryr_c) . . . 250
2.12.1.36 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family D) (pinrryr_d) . . . 250
2.12.1.37 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross (family C) (mgg_c) . . . 250
2.12.1.38 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross (family D) (mgg_d) . . . 250
2.12.1.39 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net (family C) (mgn_c) 251
2.12.1.40 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net (family D) (mgn_d) 251
2.12.1.41 Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW) (family C) (mggrr_c) . . . 251
2.12.1.42 Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW) (family D) (mggrr_d) . . . 251
2.12.1.43 Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW) (family C) (mgnrr_c) . . . 252
2.12.1.44 Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW) (family D) (mgnrr_d) . . . 252
2.12.1.45 Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year (family C) (cldrpo_c) . . . 252
2.12.1.46 Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year (family D) (cldrpo_d) . . . 253
2.12.1.47 Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks (family C) (cldrfu_c) 253
2.12.1.48 Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks (family D) (cldrfu_d) 253
2.12.1.49 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family C) (clbengwk_c) . . . 253
2.12.1.50 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family D) (clbengwk_d) . . . 254
2.12.1.51 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (clbengyr_c) . . . 254
2.12.1.52 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (clbengyr_d) . . . 254
2.12.1.53 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family C) (clbennwk_c) . . . 254
2.12.1.54 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family D) (clbennwk_d) . . . 255
2.12.1.55 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (clbennyr_c) . . . 255
2.12.1.56 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (clbennyr_d) . . . 255
2.12.1.57 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly (family C) (clgrrwk_c) . . . 255

2.12.1.58 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly (family D) (clgrrwk_d) . . . 256
2.12.1.59 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year (family C) (clgrryr_c) . . . 256
2.12.1.60 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year (family D) (clgrryr_d) . . . 256
2.12.1.61 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly (family C) (clnrrwk_c) . . . 257
2.12.1.62 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly (family D) (clnrrwk_d) . . . 257
2.12.1.63 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year (family C) (clnrryr_c) . . . 257
2.12.1.64 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year (family D) (clnrryr_d) . . . 257
2.12.1.65 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks (family C) (tbg26w_c) . . . 258
2.12.1.66 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks (family D) (tbg26w_d) . . . 258
2.12.1.67 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (tbg1y_c) . . . 258
2.12.1.68 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (tbg1y_d) . . . 258
2.12.1.69 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years (family C) (tbgry_c) . . . 259
2.12.1.70 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years (family D) (tbgry_d) . . . 259
2.12.1.71 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks (family C) (tbn26w_c) . . . 259
2.12.1.72 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks (family D) (tbn26w_d) . . . 259
2.12.1.73 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (tbn1y_c) 260
2.12.1.74 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (tbn1y_d) 260
2.12.1.75 Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years (family C) (tbnry_c) . . . 260
2.12.1.76 Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years (family D) (tbnry_d) . . . 260
2.12.1.77 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family C) (tgrr26w_c) . . . 261
2.12.1.78 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family D) (tgrr26w_d) . . . 261
2.12.1.79 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year (family C) (tgrr1y_c) . . . 261
2.12.1.80 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year (family D) (tgrr1y_d) . . . 262
2.12.1.81 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family C) (tgrrry_c) . . . 262
2.12.1.82 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family D) (tgrrry_d) . . . 262
2.12.1.83 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family C) (tnrr26w_c) . . . 262
2.12.1.84 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family D) (tnrr26w_d) . . . 263

2.12.1.85 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year (family C) (tnrr1y_c) . . . 263
2.12.1.86 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year (family D) (tnrr1y_d) . . . 263
2.12.1.87 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family C) (tnrrry_c) . . . 263
2.12.1.88 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family D) (tnrrry_d) . . . 264
2.13 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Assistance and Minimum Income Protection Interim Dataset (SAMIP) . . . 264
2.13.1 Minimum Income Protection . . . 265
2.13.1.1 minincpsim (mipsi) . . . 265
2.13.1.2 minincplpm (miplp) . . . 265
2.13.1.3 minincpfam (mipfa) . . . 265
2.13.1.4 minincpsiy (mipsiy) . . . 266
2.13.1.5 minincplpy (miplpy) . . . 266
2.13.1.6 minincpfay (mipfay) . . . 266
2.13.2 Housing Benefits . . . 266
2.13.2.1 minincpavy (mipavey) . . . 266
2.14 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP) . . . 267
2.14.1 Pensions . . . 267
2.14.1.1 Pension, income ceiling (pinceil) . . . 267
2.14.1.2 Pension, financing by other (pfinothr) . . . 268
2.14.1.3 Pension, maximum gross, single (pbenmaxs) . . . 268
2.14.1.4 Pension, maximum gross, couple (pbemaxco) . . . 268
2.14.2 Unemployment . . . 268
2.14.2.1 Unemployment, number of insured (unoinsur) . . . 268
2.14.2.2 Unemployment, labour force coverage rate (ucovratl) . . . 269
2.14.2.3 Unemployment, employee coverage rate (ucovrate) . . . 269
2.14.2.4 Unemployment, waiting days (uwaiting) . . . 269
2.14.2.5 Unemployment, duration (uduratio) . . . 269
2.14.2.6 Unemployment, reference period (urefrper) . . . 270
2.14.2.7 Unemployment, contribution period (ucontper) . . . 270
2.14.2.8 Unemployment, income ceiling (uinceil) . . . 270
2.14.2.9 Unemployment, means-test (umeantst) . . . 270
2.14.2.10 Unemployment, financing by insured (ufininsr) . . . 270
2.14.2.11 Unemployment, financing by state (ufinstat) . . . 271
2.14.2.12 Unemployment, financing by employer (ufinempr) . . . 271
2.14.2.13 Unemployment, financing by other (ufinothr) . . . 271
2.14.2.14 Unemployment, first week gross benefit, single APW (ubestw1s) . . . 271
2.14.2.15 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, single APW (ubesw26s) 272
2.14.2.16 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmins) . . . 272
2.14.2.17 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenfuls) 272
2.14.2.18 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmaxs) . . . 272
2.14.2.19 Unemployment, first week gross benefit (26w), family APW (ubestw1f) 273
2.14.2.20 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, family APW (ubesw26f) 273
2.14.2.21 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenminf) . . . 273

2.14.2.22 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), family (ubenfulf) . . 273
2.14.2.23 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenmaxf) 274
2.14.2.24 Unemployment, gross first week RR, single APW (urtstw1s) 274
2.14.2.25 Unemployment, gross 26-week RR, single APW (urtsw26s) 274
2.14.2.26 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmins) 274
2.14.2.27 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), single worker (uratfuls) 274
2.14.2.28 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmaxs) 275
2.14.2.29 Unemployment, standard gross first week RR, family APW (urtstw1f) 275
2.14.2.30 Unemployment, standard gross 26-week RR, family APW (urtsw26f) 275
2.14.2.31 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), family (uratminf) 275
2.14.2.32 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), family (uratfulf) 276
2.14.2.33 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), family (uratmaxf) 276
2.14.2.34 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (unmsinet) . 276
2.14.2.35 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (unmfanet) . 276
2.14.2.36 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, single (u1stners) 277
2.14.2.37 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, family (u1stnerf) 277
2.14.2.38 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (uzrr26si) . 277
2.14.2.39 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (uzrr26fa) . 277
2.14.2.40 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks (uz4ind) . . . 278
2.14.2.41 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, single (uz2inds) 278
2.14.2.42 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, family (uz2indf) 278
2.14.3 Sick Leave 278
2.14.3.1 Sickness, income ceiling (sinceil) 278
2.14.3.2 Sickness, financing by other (sfinothr) 279
2.14.3.3 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (sicsinet) 279
2.14.3.4 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (sicfanet) 279
2.14.3.5 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (szrr26si) 279
2.14.3.6 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (szrr26fa) 280
2.14.4 Worker's Compensation 280
2.14.4.1 Accident, income ceiling (ainceil) 280
2.14.4.2 Accident, financing by other (afinothr) 280
2.14.4.3 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (accsinet) 280
2.14.4.4 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (accfanet) 281
2.14.4.5 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (azrr26si) 281
2.14.4.6 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (azrr26fa) 281
2.15 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Insurance Entitlements Dataset (SIED) 281
2.15.1 Pensions 282
2.15.1.1 Pension, income ceiling (pinceil) 282
2.15.1.2 Pension, financing by other (pfinothr) 282
2.15.1.3 Pension, maximum gross, single (pbenmaxs) 282
2.15.1.4 Pension, maximum gross, couple (pbemaxco) 283
2.15.2 Unemployment 283
2.15.2.1 Unemployment, number of insured (unoinsur) 283
2.15.2.2 Unemployment, labour force coverage rate (ucovratl) 283
2.15.2.3 Unemployment, employee coverage rate (ucovrate) 283
2.15.2.4 Unemployment, waiting days (uwaiting) 284
2.15.2.5 Unemployment, duration (uduratio) 284

2.15.2.6 Unemployment, reference period (urefrper) . . . 284
2.15.2.7 Unemployment, contribution period (ucontper) . . . 284
2.15.2.8 Unemployment, income ceiling (uinceil) . . . 285
2.15.2.9 Unemployment, means-test (umeantst) . . . 285
2.15.2.10 Unemployment, financing by insured (ufininsr) . . . 285
2.15.2.11 Unemployment, financing by state (ufinstat) . . . 285
2.15.2.12 Unemployment, financing by employer (ufinempr) . . . 286
2.15.2.13 Unemployment, financing by other (ufinothr) . . . 286
2.15.2.14 Unemployment, first week gross benefit, single APW (ubestw1s) . . . 286
2.15.2.15 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, single APW (ubesw26s) 286
2.15.2.16 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmins) . . . 287
2.15.2.17 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenfuls) 287
2.15.2.18 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmaxs) . . . 287
2.15.2.19 Unemployment, first week gross benefit (26w), family APW (ubestw1f) 287
2.15.2.20 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, family APW (ubesw26f) 288
2.15.2.21 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenminf) . . . 288
2.15.2.22 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), family (ubenfulf) . . 288
2.15.2.23 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenmaxf) . . . 288
2.15.2.24 Unemployment, gross first week RR, single APW (urtstw1s) . . . 289
2.15.2.25 Unemployment, gross 26-week RR, single APW (urtsw26s) . . . 289
2.15.2.26 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmins) 289
2.15.2.27 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), single worker (uratfuls) . . . 289
2.15.2.28 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmaxs) 289
2.15.2.29 Unemployment, standard gross first week RR, family APW (urtstw1f) 290
2.15.2.30 Unemployment, standard gross 26-week RR, family APW (urtsw26f) 290
2.15.2.31 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), family (uratminf) . . . 290
2.15.2.32 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), family (uratfulf) . . . 290
2.15.2.33 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), family (uratmaxf) . . . 291
2.15.2.34 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (unmsinet) . 291
2.15.2.35 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (unmfanet) . 291
2.15.2.36 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, single (u1stners) . . . 291
2.15.2.37 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, family (u1stnerf) . . . 291
2.15.2.38 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (uzrr26si) . 292
2.15.2.39 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (uzrr26fa) . 292
2.15.2.40 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks (uz4ind) . . . 292
2.15.2.41 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, single (uz2inds) 292
2.15.2.42 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, family (uz2indf) 293
2.15.3 Sick Leave . . . 293
2.15.3.1 Sickness, income ceiling (sinceil) . . . 293
2.15.3.2 Sickness, financing by other (sfinothr) . . . 293
2.15.3.3 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (sicsinet) . . . 293
2.15.3.4 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (sicfanet) . . . 294
2.15.3.5 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (szrr26si) . . . 294
2.15.3.6 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (szrr26fa) . . . 294
2.15.4 Worker's Compensation . . . 294

2.15.4.1 Accident, income ceiling (ainceil) . . . 295
2.15.4.2 Accident, financing by other (afinothr) . . . 295
2.15.4.3 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (accsinet) . . . 295
2.15.4.4 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (accfanet) . . . 295
2.15.4.5 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (azrr26si) . . . 295
2.15.4.6 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (azrr26fa) . . . 296

3 H-DATA 297
3.1 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset . . . 297
3.1.1 Personal Background . . . 297
3.1.1.1 Family: profession (fambgprof) . . . 297
3.1.2 Educational Background . . . 298
3.1.2.1 Education: Field of education (edufield) . . . 298
3.1.3 Occupational Background . . . 298
3.1.3.1 Occupation: Businessman (business) . . . 298
3.1.3.2 Occupation: Politics (politics) . . . 299
3.1.4 Political Background . . . 299
3.1.4.1 Politics: Interest organizations (org_connections) . . . 299
3.2 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789) . . . 299
3.2.1 Territory Variables . . . 300
3.2.1.1 Territory type (territorytype) . . . 300
3.2.2 Leadership Variables . . . 301
3.2.2.1 Office type (officetype) . . . 301

4 QOG 303
4.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset . . . 303
4.1.1 Accountable Climate Targets . . . 303
4.1.1.1 Accountable Climate Target (act_act) . . . 304
4.1.2 Aquastat . . . 304
4.1.2.1 Water stress: freshwater withdrawal, proportion of available freshwater (as_ws) . . . 304
4.1.3 Bertelsmann Transformation Index . . . 304
4.1.3.1 Environmental concerns taken into account (bti_envc) . . . 305
4.1.4 Cooperation in International Climate Change Regime . . . 305
4.1.4.1 Emission Indicator (ccci_em) . . . 305
4.1.5 Climate Change Laws of the World . . . 306
4.1.5.1 Climate change mitigation law or policy in place (ccl_mitlpp) . . . 306
4.1.5.2 Number of climate change mitigation laws and policies (ccl_nmitlp) 306
4.1.6 EDGAR - Fossil CO2 Emissions of All World Countries . . . 307
4.1.6.1 CO2 emissions per GDP (edgar_co2gdp) . . . 307
4.1.7 The Environmental Democracy Index . . . 307
4.1.7.1 Alternative dispute resolution for environmental issues (Guideline 26) (edi_gadrei) . . . 307
4.1.7.2 Due account of public comments (Guideline 11) (edi_gapc) . . . 308
4.1.7.3 Early public participation (Guideline 8) (edi_gepp) . . . 308
4.1.7.4 Informed participation (Guideline 10) (edi_gip) . . . 309
4.1.8 ENVIPOLCON . . . 309
4.1.8.1 Policy instruments for quality of bathing water (epc_bath) . . . 310
4.1.8.2 Policy instruments for exhaust emissions from cars (epc_car) . . . 310

4.1.8.3 Policy instruments for reduction of CO2 emissions from heavy industry (epc_co2) . . . 311
4.1.8.4 Policy instruments for hazardous substances in detergents (epc_dete) 311
4.1.8.5 Policy instruments for energy efficiency of refrigerators (epc_enef) . 312
4.1.8.6 Policy instruments for electricity from renewable sources (epc_ener) 312
4.1.8.7 Policy instruments for forest protection policy (epc_fors) . . . 313
4.1.8.8 Policy instruments for lead emissions from vehicles (epc_lead) . . . 313
4.1.8.9 Policy instruments for noise emissions from lorries (epc_nois) . . . 314
4.1.8.10 Policy instruments to promote refillable beverage containers (epc_pawa) . . . 314
4.1.8.11 Policy instruments for contaminated sites (epc_soil) . . . 315
4.1.8.12 Policy instruments for water protection related to industrial discharges (epc_watp) . . . 315
4.1.9 ENVIPOLCONCHANGE . . . 316
4.1.9.1 Change in National environmental policy/Sustainable development plan (epcc_susp_ch2) . . . 316
4.1.9.2 National environmental policy/Sustainable development plan introduction (epcc_susp_in2) . . . 316
4.1.9.3 Change in efficient use of water in industry policy (epcc_waef_ch2) 316
4.1.9.4 Efficient use of water in industry policy introduction (epcc_waef_in2) 317
4.1.10 Environmental Performance Index Data 2020 . . . 317
4.1.10.1 Pollution Emissions Issue Category (epi_ape) . . . 317
4.1.10.2 Black carbon growth rate (epi_bca) . . . 318
4.1.10.3 Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category (epi_bdh) . . . 318
4.1.10.4 Biodiversity habitat index (epi_bhv) . . . 319
4.1.10.5 Climate Change Issue Category (epi_cch) . . . 320
4.1.10.6 CO2 growth rate (epi_cda) . . . 321
4.1.10.7 CH4 growth rate (epi_cha) . . . 321
4.1.10.8 F-gas growth rate (epi_fga) . . . 321
4.1.10.9 GHG intensity trend (epi_gib) . . . 322
4.1.10.10 Marine protected areas (epi_mpa) . . . 322
4.1.10.11 N2O growth rate (epi_noa) . . . 322
4.1.10.12 NOx growth rate (epi_nxa) . . . 323
4.1.10.13 Protected areas representativeness index (epi_par) . . . 323
4.1.10.14 SO2 growth rate (epi_sda) . . . 324
4.1.11 Green Growth . . . 324
4.1.11.1 Environmentally related government R and D budget, percent total government R and D (gg_envrd_gbaord) . . . 324
4.1.11.2 Environmentally related R and D expenditure, percent GDP (gg_envrd_gdp) . . . 325
4.1.11.3 Energy public RD and D budget, percent GDP (gg_erdgdp) . . . 325
4.1.11.4 Development of environment-related technologies, percent all technologies (gg_etp) . . . 325
4.1.11.5 Development of environment-related technologies, percent inventions worldwide (gg_etpw) . . . 325
4.1.11.6 Fossil fuel public RD and D budget (excluding CCS), percent total energy public RD and D (gg_ffrd) . . . 326
4.1.11.7 Renewable energy public RD and D budget, percent total energy public RD and D (gg_rerd_erd) . . . 326
4.1.12 The International Social Survey Programme. Environment Module . . . 326

4.1.12.1 Environment is most or next most important issue (percent) (issp_1ap) 327
4.1.13 Policy Instruments for the Environment . . . 327
4.1.13.1 Climate change related tax revenue (percent of GDP) (oecd_cctr_gdp) 327
4.1.13.2 Environmentally related tax revenue (percent of GDP) (oecd_etr_gdp) 328
4.1.14 oecd_multi . . . 328
4.1.14.1 Environmentally adjusted multifactor productivity growth (oecd_eampg) . . . 328
4.1.14.2 Pollution adjusted GDP growth (oecd_polagdpg) . . . 328
4.1.15 The Ocean Health Index Data . . . 328
4.1.15.1 Coastal human population as a proxy for trend in trash (ohi_chp) . 329
4.1.15.2 Coastal population density as a proxy for intertidal habitat destruction (ohi_hdinter) . . . 329
4.1.15.3 CBD Survey: Mariculture (ohi_maricul) . . . 330
4.1.15.4 Percent direct employment in tourism (ohi_tjpt) . . . 330
4.1.15.5 CBD Survey: Tourism (ohi_tour) . . . 331
4.1.16 Oil and Gas Data, 1932-2014 . . . 332
4.1.16.1 Net gas exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_gas_netexp) . . . 332
4.1.16.2 Gas production value in 2014 dollars (ross_gas_value_2014) . . . 332
4.1.16.3 Net oil exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_oil_netexp) . . . 332
4.1.16.4 Oil production value in 2014 dollars (ross_oil_value_2014) . . . 333
4.1.17 Sustainable Governance Indicators . . . 333
4.1.17.1 Environmental policy effectiveness (sgi_epe) . . . 333
4.1.17.2 Participation in global environmental regimes (sgi_ger) . . . 334
4.1.18 World Development Indicators . . . 334
4.1.18.1 Agricultural irrigated land (percent of total agricultural land) (wdi_agrland) . . . 334
4.1.18.2 Arable land (percent of land area) (wdi_araland) . . . 335
4.1.18.3 Land area (sq. km) (wdi_area) . . . 335
4.1.18.4 Terrestrial protected areas (percent of total land area) (wdi_tpa) . . 335
4.1.19 World Values Survey . . . 336
4.1.19.1 Protecting environment vs economic growth (percent) (wvs_epmip) . 336
4.2 QoG EQI Regional Level 2021 (with all NUTS2 regions) . . . 336
4.2.1 Identification Variables . . . 337
4.2.1.1 NUTS Level (nuts_level) . . . 337
4.2.1.2 NUTS1 abbreviation code (nuts1) . . . 337
4.3 QoG European Quality of Government Index CATI - Country Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024) . . . 338
4.3.1 Country Level Variables . . . 338
4.3.1.1 Corruption in my area is used to get access to special unfair privileges and wealth. (greed_cor) . . . 338
4.4 QoG European Quality of Government Index Regional Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024) . . . 339
4.4.1 Identification Variables . . . 339
4.4.1.1 NUTS Level (nuts_level) . . . 339
4.5 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data . . . 340
4.5.1 Identification . . . 341
4.5.1.1 The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) level (level) . . . 341
4.5.1.2 Code of NUTS1 level region (nuts1) . . . 341

4.5.2 Demographics . . . 341
4.5.2.1 Population at 1st January, Female (eu_d2jan_f) . . . 341
4.5.2.2 Population at 1st January, Male (eu_d2jan_m) . . . 342
4.5.2.3 Population at 1st January, Total (eu_d2jan_t) . . . 342
4.5.3 Education . . . 343
4.5.3.1 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, female (eu_neet_y1524f) . . . 343
4.5.3.2 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, male (eu_neet_y1524m) . . . 343
4.5.3.3 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, total (eu_neet_y1524t) . . . 344
4.5.3.4 Employment rate for people between 15-34 years, all education levels (eu_empl_edltotal) . . . 344
4.5.4 Health . . . 344
4.5.4.1 Dentists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_dent) . . . 344
4.5.4.2 Medical doctors per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_mdoc) . 345
4.5.4.3 Nurses and midwives per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_nurs) 345
4.5.4.4 Pharmacists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_pharm) . . 345
4.5.4.5 Physiotherapists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_phys) . 346
4.5.5 Science and Technology . . . 346
4.5.5.1 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_ab_f) . . . 346
4.5.5.2 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_ab_m) . . . 347
4.5.5.3 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_ab_t) . . . 347
4.5.5.4 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_c_f) . . . 347
4.5.5.5 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_c_m) . . . 348
4.5.5.6 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_c_t) . . . 348
4.5.5.7 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_chtc_f) . . . 348
4.5.5.8 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_chtc_m) . . . 349
4.5.5.9 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_chtc_t) . . . 349
4.5.5.10 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_df_f) . . . 350
4.5.5.11 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_df_m) . . . 350
4.5.5.12 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_df_t) . . . 350
4.5.5.13 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_gu_f) . . . 351
4.5.5.14 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_gu_m) . . . 351
4.5.5.15 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_gu_t) . . . 351
4.5.5.16 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_htc_f) . . . 352

4.5.5.17 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_htc_m) . . . 352
4.5.5.18 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_htc_t) . . . 353
4.5.5.19 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_j_f) . . . 353
4.5.5.20 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_j_m) . . . 353
4.5.5.21 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_j_t) . . . 354
4.5.5.22 Employment in financial and insurance activities, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_k_f) . . . 354
4.5.5.23 Employment in financial and insurance activities of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_k_m) . . . 354
4.5.5.24 Employment in financial and insurance activities, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_k_t) . . . 355
4.5.5.25 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_kis_f) . . . 355
4.5.5.26 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_kis_m) . . . 355
4.5.5.27 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_kis_t) . . . 356
4.5.5.28 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_kl_f) . . . 356
4.5.5.29 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_kl_m) . . . 357
4.5.5.30 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_kl_t) . . . 357
4.5.5.31 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_m_f) . . . 357
4.5.5.32 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_m_m) . . . 358
4.5.5.33 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_m_t) . . . 358
4.5.5.34 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_n_f) . . . 358
4.5.5.35 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_n_m) . . . 359
4.5.5.36 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_n_t) . . . 359
4.5.5.37 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_ou_f) . . . 359
4.5.5.38 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_ou_m) . . . 360
4.5.5.39 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_ou_t) . . . 360
4.5.5.40 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_p_f) . . . 361
4.5.5.41 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_p_m) . . . 361
4.5.5.42 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_p_t) . . . 361

4.5.5.43 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_q_f) . . . 362
4.5.5.44 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_q_m) . . . 362
4.5.5.45 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_q_t) . . . 362
4.5.5.46 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_r_f) . . . 363
4.5.5.47 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_r_m) . . . 363
4.5.5.48 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_r_t) . . . 363
4.5.5.49 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_s_f) . . . 364
4.5.5.50 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_s_m) . . . 364
4.5.5.51 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_s_t) . . . 365
4.5.5.52 Total R and D employees in business enterprise sector, female, full-time equivalent (eu_prd_bes_f) . . . 365
4.5.5.53 Total R and D employees in business enterprise sector, total, full-time equivalent (eu_prd_bes_t) . . . 365
4.5.6 Poverty and Social Exclusion . . . 366
4.5.6.1 At-risk-of-poverty rate by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_povrisk_pc) 366
4.5.6.2 Severe material deprivation rate by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_matdep_pc) . . . 366
4.5.6.3 People at risk of poverty or social exclusion by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_povr_pc) . . . 366
4.5.7 Digital Society and Economy . . . 367
4.5.7.1 Internet use: Internet banking (eu_iu_iubk) . . . 367
4.5.8 Labour Market Statistics . . . 367
4.5.8.1 Full-time employment, female, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_f) . . . 367
4.5.8.2 Full-time employment, male, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_m) . . . 368
4.5.8.3 Full-time employment, total, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_t) . . . 368
4.5.8.4 Part-time employment, female, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_f) . . . 368
4.5.8.5 Part-time employment, male, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_m) . . . 369
4.5.8.6 Part-time employment, total, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_t) . . . 369
4.5.8.7 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, female (eu_emp_1524f) . . . 369
4.5.8.8 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, male (eu_emp_1524m) . . . 370
4.5.8.9 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, total (eu_emp_1524t) . . . 370
4.5.8.10 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, female (eu_emp_2064f) . . . 370
4.5.8.11 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, male (eu_emp_2064m) . . . 371
4.5.8.12 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, total (eu_emp_2064t) . . . 371
4.5.8.13 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, female (eu_emp_2534f) . . . 371
4.5.8.14 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, male (eu_emp_2534m) . . . 372
4.5.8.15 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, total (eu_emp_2534t) . . . 372
4.5.8.16 Employment rate for +25 years, Female (eu_emp_ge25f) . . . 372
4.5.8.17 Employment rate for +25 years, Male (eu_emp_ge25m) . . . 373
4.5.8.18 Employment rate for +25 years, Total (eu_emp_ge25t) . . . 373
4.5.8.19 Employment rate for +65 years, Female (eu_emp_ge65f) . . . 373

4.5.8.20 Employment rate for +65 years, Male (eu_emp_ge65m) 374
4.5.8.21 Employment rate for +65 years, Total (eu_emp_ge65t) 374
4.5.8.22 Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing, in thousands (eu_emp_a) 374
4.5.8.23 Employment in industry (except construction), in thousands (eu_emp_be) 375
4.5.8.24 Employment in construction, in thousands (eu_emp_f) 375
4.5.8.25 Employment in wholesale and retail trade, and service activities, in thousands (eu_emp_gi) 375
4.5.8.26 Employment in information and communication, in thousands (eu_emp_j) 376
4.5.8.27 Employment in financial and insurance activities, in thousands (eu_emp_k) 376
4.5.8.28 Employment in real estate activities, in thousands (eu_emp_l) . . . 376
4.5.8.29 Employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, in thousands (eu_emp_m_n) 377
4.5.8.30 Employment in public admin., defence, education and health, in thousands (eu_emp_oq) 377
4.5.8.31 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, in thousands (eu_emp_ru) 377
4.5.8.32 Employment in all NACE activities, in thousands (eu_emp_total) . 378
4.5.8.33 Long-term unemployment as percentage of active population (eu_ltu_pc_act) 378
4.5.8.34 Long-term unemployment as percentage of unemployment (eu_ltu_pc_une) 378
4.5.8.35 Long-term unemployment in thousands (eu_ltu_ths) 379
4.5.8.36 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, female (eu_unemp_1524f) . 379
4.5.8.37 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, male (eu_unemp_1524m) . 380
4.5.8.38 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, total (eu_unemp_1524t) . . 380
4.5.8.39 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, female (eu_unemp_1574f) . 380
4.5.8.40 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, male (eu_unemp_1574m) . 381
4.5.8.41 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, total (eu_unemp_1574t) . . 381
4.5.8.42 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, female (eu_unemp_2064f) . 381
4.5.8.43 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, male (eu_unemp_2064m) . 382
4.5.8.44 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, total (eu_unemp_2064t) . . 382
4.5.8.45 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, female (eu_unemp_ge15f) . . . 383
4.5.8.46 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, male (eu_unemp_ge15m) 383
4.5.8.47 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, total (eu_unemp_ge15t) 383
4.5.8.48 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, female (eu_unemp_ge25f) . . . 384
4.5.8.49 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, male (eu_unemp_ge25m) 384
4.5.8.50 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, total (eu_unemp_ge25t) 384
4.5.9 Economy 385
4.5.9.1 Income of households (Balance) in euro per inhabitant (eu_b5n_eur_hab) 385
4.5.9.2 Income of households (Balance) in million euro (eu_b5n_mio_eur) . 385
4.5.9.3 Income of households (Balance) in million national currency (eu_b5n_mio_nac) 386
4.5.9.4 Income of households (Balance) in million PPS (eu_b5n_mio_pps) . 386
4.5.9.5 Income of households (Disposable income) in euro per inhabitant (eu_b6n_eur_hab) 386

4.5.9.6 Income of households (Disposable income) in million euro (eu_b6n_mio_eur) . . . 387
4.5.9.7 Income of households (Disposable income) in million national currency (eu_b6n_mio_nac) . . . 387
4.5.9.8 Income of households (Disposable income) in million PPS (eu_b6n_mio_pps) . . . 387
4.5.9.9 Income of households (Adjusted disposable income) in million euro (eu_b7n_mio_eur) . . . 388
4.5.9.10 Income of households (Adjusted disposable income) in million national currency (eu_b7n_mio_nac) . . . 388
4.5.9.11 Regional gross domestic product by NUTS 2 regions, million EUR (eu_mio_eur) . . . 388
4.5.9.12 Regional gross domestic product (million PPS) by NUTS 2 regions (eu_gdp_mio_pps) . . . 389
4.5.9.13 Regional gross domestic product (PPS per inhabitant) by NUTS 2 regions (eu_gdp_pps_hab) . . . 389
4.5.9.14 Regional gross domestic product. PPS per inhabitant in percentage of EU27 (eu_gdp_pps_hab_eu27_2020) . . . 390
4.5.9.15 Disposable income of private households by NUTS 2 regions (eu_dinc_pps_hab) . . . 390
4.5.9.16 Primary income of private households by NUTS 2 regions (eu_pinc_pps_hab) . . . 390
4.5.9.17 Real growth rate of regional gross value added (GVA) at basic prices (eu_rgva_pch_pre) . . . 391
4.5.10 Tourism . . . 391
4.5.10.1 Number of establishments in hotels, camping places and other (eu_tour_nstour_estbl) . . . 391
4.6 QoG Swedish Agency Database Formal Instruction Data . . . 392
4.6.1 Aggregated Variables . . . 392
4.6.1.1 Sum of Collaboration (agency_collab_sum) . . . 392
4.7 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series . . . 393
4.7.1 Judicial . . . 393
4.7.1.1 Law: companies guilty of procurement violations can't participate in future bid (aii_q27) . . . 393
4.7.1.2 Practice: companies guilty of violations cannot participate in future bids (aii_q28) . . . 394
4.7.1.3 Law: senior officials of government are required to disclose records of assets (aii_q44) . . . 395
4.7.1.4 Law: civil service members are required to disclose assets and these are public (aii_q46) . . . 396
4.7.1.5 Duty of the People is to Build Country in Constitution (ccp_buildsoc) 396
4.7.1.6 Status of Slavery in Constitution (ccp_slave) . . . 397
4.7.1.7 Associational and Organizational Rights (fh_aor) . . . 397
4.7.1.8 Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights (fh_pair) . . . 398
4.7.1.9 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (panel data) (fi_legprop_pd) . . . 398
4.7.1.10 Judicial corruption decision (vdem_jucorrdc) . . . 398
4.7.1.11 Rule of Law, Estimate (wbgi_rle) . . . 399
4.7.1.12 CPIA property rights and rule-based governance rating (wdi_prrbgr) 399
4.7.1.13 Civil Justice is Free of Discrimination (wjp_cj_discr) . . . 400
4.7.1.14 Criminal System is Impartial (wjp_crsys_discr) . . . 400

4.7.2 Quality of Government . . . 400
4.7.2.1 Practice: asset disclosure process of senior officials branches is effective (aii_q45) . . . 400
4.7.2.2 Practice: the asset disclosure process for civil service members is effective (aii_q47) . . . 401
4.7.2.3 State Fragility Index (cspf_sfi) . . . 402
4.7.2.4 E-Government Index (egov_egov) . . . 403
4.7.2.5 ICRG Indicator of Quality of Government (icrg_qog) . . . 403
4.7.2.6 Policy Performance (sgi_pp) . . . 404
4.7.2.7 Legislature corrupt activities (vdem_gcrrpt) . . . 405
4.7.2.8 Control of Corruption, Estimate (wbgi_cce) . . . 406
4.7.2.9 CPIA building human resources rating (wdi_bhr) . . . 406
4.7.2.10 CPIA gender equality rating (wdi_gendeqr) . . . 407
4.7.2.11 Economic Public Goods Sub-index (bgi_epgs) . . . 407
4.7.2.12 Fiscal Capacity Sub-index (bgi_fcs) . . . 407
4.7.2.13 Public Goods Provision Index (bgi_pgpi) . . . 408
4.7.3 Media . . . 408
4.7.3.1 Law: it's legal to report accurate news even if it damages pub. figures' reput. (aii_q54) . . . 408
4.7.3.2 Freedom on the Net: Obstacles to Access (fhn_fotnota) . . . 409
4.7.3.3 Economic Influences over Media Content (2001-2016) (fhp_mcei5) . . . 409
4.7.3.4 Economic Influences over Broadcast Media Content (1993-1995) (fhp_mceib3) . . . 409
4.7.3.5 Economic Influences over Broadcast Media Content (1996-2000) (fhp_mceib4) . . . 410
4.7.3.6 Economic Influences over Print Media Content (1993-1995) (fhp_mceip3) . . . 410
4.7.3.7 Economic Influences over Print Media Content (1996-2000) (fhp_mceip4) . . . 410
4.7.3.8 Press Freedom Index: Economic Context Component (rsf_eci) . . . 411
4.7.4 Conflict and Military Service . . . 411
4.7.4.1 Global Militarization Index (bicc_gmi) . . . 412
4.7.4.2 Military Expenditure Index (bicc_milexp) . . . 412
4.7.4.3 Armed forces personnel (percent of total labor force) (wdi_afp) . . . 413
4.7.4.4 Military expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_expmil) . . . 413
4.7.4.5 Military expenditure (percent of general government expenditure) (wdi_expmilge) . . . 414
4.7.5 Political System . . . 414
4.7.5.1 Is the country in the Commonwealth (br_cw) . . . 414
4.7.5.2 International Cooperation (bti_ic) . . . 415
4.7.5.3 Private Property (bti_prp) . . . 415
4.7.5.4 Component 3: Policy formulation (cbi_cpol) . . . 415
4.7.5.5 Accountability Transparency (diat_ati) . . . 416
4.7.5.6 Information Transparency (diat_iti) . . . 416
4.7.5.7 Index of Globalization (dr_ig) . . . 416
4.7.5.8 Online Service Index (egov_osi) . . . 417
4.7.5.9 Independent Sub-Federal Unit (h_f) . . . 417
4.7.5.10 2nd Legislative Chamber (h_l2) . . . 417
4.7.5.11 Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3) . . . 417
4.7.5.12 Political Constraints Index V (h_polcon5) . . . 418

4.7.5.13 HRV Index (hrv_index) . . . 418
4.7.5.14 Good Governance (sgi_go) . . . 419
4.7.5.15 Egalitarian component index (vdem_egal) . . . 420
4.7.6 Public Economy . . . 420
4.7.6.1 Monetary and fiscal stability (bti_cps) . . . 420
4.7.6.2 Economic Output Strength (bti_eos) . . . 421
4.7.6.3 Economic Performance (bti_ep) . . . 421
4.7.6.4 Economy Status (bti_mes) . . . 422
4.7.6.5 Organization of the Market and Competition (bti_mo) . . . 422
4.7.6.6 Socio-Economic Level (bti_sel) . . . 422
4.7.6.7 Component 4: Limitations on lending to the government (cbi_cll) . . . 422
4.7.6.8 Central Bank's Financial independence (cbie_finances) . . . 423
4.7.6.9 Central Bank Independence Extended Index (cbie_index) . . . 423
4.7.6.10 Central Bank's Limitations on lending to the government (cbie_lending) . . . 424
4.7.6.11 Central Bank's Monetary policy and conflicts resolution (cbie_policy) 425
4.7.6.12 Reference in Constitution to Capitalism (ccp_market) . . . 425
4.7.6.13 Economic Globalization (dr_eg) . . . 426
4.7.6.14 GDP at current market prices, Euro per inhabitant (eu_eco2gdpeurhab) . . . 426
4.7.6.15 GDP at current market prices, Million euro (eu_eco2gdpmioeur) . . . 426
4.7.6.16 Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes and Enterprises (current) (fi_sog) . . . 426
4.7.6.17 Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes and Enterprises (panel data) (fi_sog_pd) . . . 427
4.7.6.18 Expenditure on economic affairs (percent of total gen. gov. exp.) (gfs_ecaf) . . . 427
4.7.6.19 GDP per Capita (Current Prices) (gle_cgdpc) . . . 427
4.7.6.20 Real GDP (2005) (gle_gdp) . . . 428
4.7.6.21 Real GDP per Capita (2005) (gle_rgdpc) . . . 428
4.7.6.22 Economic Complexity Index (SITC product classification) (gpcr_eci) 428
4.7.6.23 Forecasted annualized rate of growth for following decade (gpcr_growth) . . . 429
4.7.6.24 Revenue Forgone (percent of GDP) (gted_rfgdp) . . . 430
4.7.6.25 Share Direct Taxes (gtr_centaxdir) . . . 430
4.7.6.26 Share Direct Taxes in 1800 (gtr_centaxdir1800) . . . 430
4.7.6.27 Share Direct Taxes in 1850 (gtr_centaxdir1850) . . . 431
4.7.6.28 Share Direct Taxes in 1900 (gtr_centaxdir1900) . . . 431
4.7.6.29 Share Government Revenue of GDP (gtr_centaxgdp) . . . 431
4.7.6.30 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1800 (gtr_centaxgdp1800) . . . 432
4.7.6.31 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1850 (gtr_centaxgdp1850) . . . 432
4.7.6.32 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1900 (gtr_centaxgdp1900) . . . 432
4.7.6.33 Share Indirect Taxes (gtr_centaxind) . . . 432
4.7.6.34 Share Indirect Taxes in 1800 (gtr_centaxind1800) . . . 433
4.7.6.35 Share Indirect Taxes in 1850 (gtr_centaxind1850) . . . 433
4.7.6.36 Share Indirect Taxes in 1900 (gtr_centaxind1900) . . . 433
4.7.6.37 Total Resource Revenue (ictd_revres) . . . 433
4.7.6.38 Taxes on Corporations and Other Enterprises (ictd_taxcorp) . . . 434
4.7.6.39 Taxes on Income, Profits, and Capital Gains (ictd_taxinc) . . . 434

4.7.6.40 Taxes on Individuals (ictd_taxind) . . . 434
4.7.6.41 Indirect Taxes (ictd_taxindirect) . . . 435
4.7.6.42 Resource Taxes (ictd_taxres) . . . 435
4.7.6.43 Taxes on International Trade and Transactions (ictd_taxtrade) . . . 435
4.7.6.44 Absolute economic institutional quality(simple averages) (kun_ecoabs) 435
4.7.6.45 Atkinson Coefficient (epsilon=0.5) (lis_atk05) . . . 436
4.7.6.46 Atkinson Coefficient (epsilon=1) (lis_atk1) . . . 436
4.7.6.47 Gini Coefficient (lis_gini) . . . 436
4.7.6.48 Percentile Ratio (80/20) (lis_pr8020) . . . 437
4.7.6.49 Percentile Ratio (90/10) (lis_pr9010) . . . 437
4.7.6.50 Percentile Ratio (90/50) (lis_pr9050) . . . 437
4.7.6.51 Real GDP per Capita (mad_gdppc) . . . 438
4.7.6.52 Real GDP per Capita (year 1000) (mad_gdppc1000) . . . 438
4.7.6.53 Real GDP per Capita (year 1300) (mad_gdppc1300) . . . 438
4.7.6.54 Real GDP per Capita (year 1400) (mad_gdppc1400) . . . 438
4.7.6.55 Real GDP per Capita (year 1800) (mad_gdppc1800) . . . 439
4.7.6.56 Capital services at constant 2017 national prices (2017=1) (pwt_cs) 439
4.7.6.57 Price level of capital formation, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plcf) . . . 439
4.7.6.58 Price level of exports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_ple) 440
4.7.6.59 Price level of government consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plgc) . . . 440
4.7.6.60 Price level of household consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plhc) . . . 441
4.7.6.61 Price level of imports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_pli) 441
4.7.6.62 Real GDP at constant 2017 national prices (in million US$) (pwt_rgdp) 441
4.7.6.63 Share of residual trade and GDP statistical discrepancy at current PPPs (pwt_rt) . . . 442
4.7.6.64 Share of labour compensation in GDP at current national prices (pwt_slcgdp) . . . 442
4.7.6.65 TFP at constant national prices (2017=1) (pwt_tfp) . . . 442
4.7.6.66 TFP level at current PPPs (USA=1) (pwt_tfpppp) . . . 443
4.7.6.67 Exchange rate, national currency/USD (market+estimated) (pwt_xr) 443
4.7.6.68 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Budgets (sgi_ecbg) . . . 443
4.7.6.69 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Economy (sgi_ecec) . . . 444
4.7.6.70 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Labor Markets (sgi_eclm) . 444
4.7.6.71 Top 10percent income share (top_top10_income_share) . . . 444
4.7.6.72 Top 1percent income share (top_top1_income_share) . . . 445
4.7.6.73 Regulatory Quality, Estimate (wbgi_rqe) . . . 445
4.7.6.74 Central government debt, total (percent of GDP) (wdi_debt) . . . 446
4.7.6.75 Domestic general government health expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_dgovhexp) . . . 446
4.7.6.76 CPIA equity of public resource use rating (1=low to 6=high) (wdi_eqpubres) . . . 446
4.7.6.77 Exports of goods and services (percent of GDP) (wdi_export) . . . 446
4.7.6.78 Foreign direct investment, net inflows (percent of GDP) (wdi_fdiin) 447
4.7.6.79 Foreign direct investment, net outflows (percent of GDP) (wdi_fdiout) 447
4.7.6.80 Agriculture, forestry, and fishing, value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_gdpagr) . . . 447
4.7.6.81 GDP per capita (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gdpcapcon2015) . . 448

4.7.6.82 GDP per capita (current US dollar) (wdi_gdpcapcur) 448
4.7.6.83 GDP per capita growth (annual percent) (wdi_gdpcapgr) 448
4.7.6.84 GDP per capita, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gdpcappppcur) 449
4.7.6.85 GDP growth (annual percent) (wdi_gdpgr) 449
4.7.6.86 Industry (including construction), value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_gdpind) 449
4.7.6.87 GDP, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gdppppcur) 450
4.7.6.88 Gini index (wdi_gini) 450
4.7.6.89 GNI, Atlas method (current US dollar) (wdi_gniatlcur) 451
4.7.6.90 GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US dollar) (wdi_gnicapatlcur) 451
4.7.6.91 GNI per capita (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gnicapcon2015) . . . 451
4.7.6.92 GNI per capita growth (annual percent) (wdi_gnicapgr) 452
4.7.6.93 GNI per capita, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gnicappppcur) 452
4.7.6.94 GNI (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gnicon2015) 452
4.7.6.95 GNI (current US dollar) (wdi_gnicur) 453
4.7.6.96 GNI growth (annual percent) (wdi_gnigr) 453
4.7.6.97 GNI, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gnipppcur) 453
4.7.6.98 Imports of goods and services (percent of GDP) (wdi_import) . . . 454
4.7.6.99 Income share held by highest 10percent (wdi_incsh10h) 454
4.7.6.100 Income share held by lowest 10percent (wdi_incsh10l) 454
4.7.6.101 Income share held by second 20percent (wdi_incsh202) 455
4.7.6.102 Income share held by third 20percent (wdi_incsh203) 455
4.7.6.103 Income share held by fourth 20percent (wdi_incsh204) 455
4.7.6.104 Income share held by highest 20percent (wdi_incsh20h) 455
4.7.6.105 Income share held by lowest 20percent (wdi_incsh20l) 456
4.7.6.106 Real interest rate (percent) (wdi_intrate) 456
4.7.6.107 Oil rents (percent of GDP) (wdi_oilrent) 456
4.7.6.108 Services, value added (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_sva2015) . . . 457
4.7.6.109 Services, value added (annual percent growth) (wdi_svapg) 457
4.7.6.110 Services, value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_svapgdp) 457
4.7.6.111 Tax revenue (percent of GDP) (wdi_taxrev) 458
4.7.6.112 Trade (percent of GDP) (wdi_trade) 458
4.7.6.113 Trade in services (percent of GDP) (wdi_tradeserv) 458
4.7.6.114 World Trade Uncertainty Index (wui_wtui) 459
4.7.6.115 Completed loans, vague official finance, adjusted (USD 2021) (gcdf_lnvof) 459
4.7.6.116 Completed vague flows, vague official finance, adjusted (USD 2021) (gcdf_vgvof) 459
4.7.7 Gender Equality 460
4.7.7.1 Equal Opportunity (bti_eo) 460
4.7.7.2 Comparative Abortion Index 1 (0 to 7) (cai_cai1) 460
4.7.7.3 Social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_social) 461
4.7.7.4 Women's Economic Rights (ciri_wecon) 461
4.7.7.5 Global Gender Gap Economic Participation and Opportunity Subindex (gggi_pos) 463
4.7.7.6 Employers, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empf) 463

4.7.7.7 Women Business and the Law Index Score (scale 1-100) (wdi_wombuslawi) . . . 464
4.7.8 Private Economy . . . 464
4.7.8.1 Socio-Economic Barriers (bti_seb) . . . 464
4.7.8.2 Freedom to Trade Internationally (current) (fi_ftradeint) . . . 465
4.7.8.3 Freedom to Trade Internationally (panel data) (fi_ftradeint_pd) . . . 465
4.7.8.4 Economic Freedom of the World Index (current) (fi_index) . . . 465
4.7.8.5 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (current) (fi_legprop) 466
4.7.8.6 Regulation of Credit, Labor and Business (current) (fi_reg) . . . 466
4.7.8.7 Regulation of Credit, Labor and Business (panel data) (fi_reg_pd) . . . 467
4.7.8.8 Access to Sound Money (current) (fi_sm) . . . 467
4.7.8.9 Access to Sound Money (chain_linked) (fi_sm_pd) . . . 467
4.7.8.10 Children Poverty Rates among Single-Mother (50percent) (lis_cprsmf) 468
4.7.8.11 Children Poverty Rates among Two-Parent Families (50percent) (lis_cprtpf) . . . 468
4.7.8.12 Distribution of Children by Income Group (above 150percent) (lis_dc150) . . . 468
4.7.8.13 Distribution of Children by Income Group (50-75percent) (lis_dc5075) 469
4.7.8.14 Distribution of Children by Income Group (75-150percent) (lis_dc75150) . . . 469
4.7.8.15 Mean Equivalized Income (lis_meaneqi) . . . 470
4.7.8.16 Median Equivalized Income (lis_medeqi) . . . 470
4.7.8.17 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (40percent) (lis_rprc40) . . . 471
4.7.8.18 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (50percent) (lis_rprc50) . . . 471
4.7.8.19 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (60percent) (lis_rprc60) . . . 471
4.7.8.20 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (50percent) (lis_rpre50) . . . 472
4.7.8.21 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (60percent) (lis_rpre60) . . . 472
4.7.8.22 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (40percent) (lis_rprt40) . . . 472
4.7.8.23 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (50percent) (lis_rprt50) . . . 473
4.7.8.24 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (60percent) (lis_rprt60) . . . 473
4.7.8.25 Proportion of people living below 50 percent of median income (percent) (wdi_belmedinc) . . . 473
4.7.8.26 New business density (new registrations per 1,000 people ages 15-64) (wdi_busden) . . . 474
4.7.8.27 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (40percent) (lis_rpre40) . . . 474
4.7.8.28 Poverty gap at USD 3.00 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap300) 474
4.7.8.29 Poverty gap at USD 4.20 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap420) 474
4.7.8.30 Poverty gap at USD 8.30 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap830) 475
4.7.9 Welfare . . . 475
4.7.9.1 Social Safety Nets (bti_ssn) . . . 475
4.7.9.2 Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Education (sgi_soed) . . . 476
4.7.9.3 Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Integration Policy (sgi_soin) . . . 476
4.7.9.4 CPIA social protection rating (wdi_spr) . . . 476
4.7.10 Education . . . 477
4.7.10.1 Sustainability (bti_su) . . . 477
4.7.10.2 Human Development Index (undp_hdi) . . . 477
4.7.10.3 Government expenditure on education, total (percent of GDP) (wdi_expedu) . . . 478
4.7.10.4 Government expenditure per student, primary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstup) . . . 478

4.7.10.5 Government expenditure per student, secondary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstus) . . . 478
4.7.10.6 Government expenditure per student, tertiary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstut) . . . 479
4.7.10.7 School enrollment, secondary (percent net) (wdi_ners) . . . 479
4.7.10.8 School enrollment, secondary, female (percent net) (wdi_nersf) . . . 479
4.7.10.9 School enrollment, secondary, male (percent net) (wdi_nersm) . . . 480
4.7.11 Labour Market . . . 480
4.7.11.1 Limits on Child Work in Constitution (ccp_childwrk) . . . 480
4.7.11.2 Employed ICT specialists (percent of total employment) (eu_empict) 480
4.7.11.3 Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resallf) . . . 481
4.7.11.4 Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resallt) . . . 481
4.7.11.5 Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resbusf) . . . 481
4.7.11.6 Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resbust) . . . 482
4.7.11.7 Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_reseduf) . . . 482
4.7.11.8 Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resedut) . . . 482
4.7.11.9 Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resgovf) . . . 482
4.7.11.10 Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resgovt) . . . 483
4.7.11.11 Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resnonpf) . . . 483
4.7.11.12 Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resnonpt) . . . 483
4.7.11.13 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctabf) . . . 483
4.7.11.14 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctabm) . . . 484
4.7.11.15 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctabt) . . . 484
4.7.11.16 Employment in Manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcff) . . . 484
4.7.11.17 Employment in Manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcfm) . . . 484
4.7.11.18 Employment in Manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcft) . . . 485
4.7.11.19 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcf) . . . 485
4.7.11.20 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcm) . . . 485
4.7.11.21 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmf) . . . 486
4.7.11.22 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmhf) . . . 486
4.7.11.23 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmhm) . . . 486

4.7.11.24 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmht) . . . 486
4.7.11.25 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmm) . . . 487
4.7.11.26 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmt) . . . 487
4.7.11.27 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtct) . . . 487
4.7.11.28 Employment in Low-technology manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcf) . . . 487
4.7.11.29 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmf) . . . 488
4.7.11.30 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmm) . . . 488
4.7.11.31 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmt) . . . 488
4.7.11.32 Employment in Low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcm) . . . 488
4.7.11.33 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmf) . . . 489
4.7.11.34 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmm) . . . 489
4.7.11.35 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmt) . . . 489
4.7.11.36 Employment in Low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltct) . . . 490
4.7.11.37 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctgitf) . . . 490
4.7.11.38 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctgitm) . . . 490
4.7.11.39 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctgitt) . . . 490
4.7.11.40 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79f) . . . 491
4.7.11.41 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Male) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79m) . . . 491
4.7.11.42 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79t) . . . 491
4.7.11.43 Employment in high-tech sectors (Female) percent total employment (eu_scthtcf) . . . 491
4.7.11.44 Employment in high-tech sectors (Male) percent total employment (eu_scthtcm) . . . 492
4.7.11.45 Employment in high-tech sectors (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_scthtct) . . . 492
4.7.11.46 Employment in Information and communication (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctjf) . . . 492
4.7.11.47 Employment in Information and communication (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctjm) . . . 492
4.7.11.48 Employment in Information and communication (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctjt) . . . 493
4.7.11.49 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkf) . . . 493

4.7.11.50 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkisf) . . . 493
4.7.11.51 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtcf) . . . 494
4.7.11.52 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtcm) . . . 494
4.7.11.53 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtct) . . . 494
4.7.11.54 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkism) . . . 494
4.7.11.55 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktothf) . . . 495
4.7.11.56 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktothm) . . . 495
4.7.11.57 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktotht) . . . 495
4.7.11.58 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkisothf) . . . 495
4.7.11.59 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkisothm) . . . 496
4.7.11.60 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkisotht) . . . 496
4.7.11.61 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkist) . . . 496
4.7.11.62 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkm) . . . 496
4.7.11.63 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkt) . . . 497
4.7.11.64 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisf) . . . 497
4.7.11.65 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkism) . . . 497
4.7.11.66 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktf) . . . 497
4.7.11.67 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktm) . . . 498
4.7.11.68 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktt) . . . 498
4.7.11.69 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisothf) . . . 498
4.7.11.70 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisothm) . . . 499
4.7.11.71 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisotht) . . . 499
4.7.11.72 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkist) . . . 499
4.7.11.73 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctmf) . . . 499
4.7.11.74 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctmm) . . . 500
4.7.11.75 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctmt) . . . 500

4.7.11.76 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctnf) . . . 500
4.7.11.77 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctnm) . . . 500
4.7.11.78 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctnt) . . . 501
4.7.11.79 Employment in Education (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctpaf) . . . 501
4.7.11.80 Employment in Education (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctpam) . . . 501
4.7.11.81 Employment in Education (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctpat) . . . 501
4.7.11.82 Employment in Education (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctpf) . . . 502
4.7.11.83 Employment in Education (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctpm) . . . 502
4.7.11.84 Employment in Education (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctpt) . . . 502
4.7.11.85 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctqf) . . . 502
4.7.11.86 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctqm) . . . 503
4.7.11.87 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctqt) . . . 503
4.7.11.88 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctrf) . . . 503
4.7.11.89 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctrm) . . . 504
4.7.11.90 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctrt) . . . 504
4.7.11.91 Employment in Other service activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctsf) . . . 504
4.7.11.92 Employment in Other service activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctsm) . . . 504
4.7.11.93 Employment in Other service activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctst) . . . 505
4.7.11.94 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Female (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunef) . . . 505
4.7.11.95 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Male (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunem) . . . 505
4.7.11.96 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Total (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunet) . . . 505
4.7.11.97 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524f) . . . 506
4.7.11.98 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524m) . . . 506
4.7.11.99 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Total (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524t) . . . 506
4.7.11.100 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574f) . . . 506
4.7.11.101 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574m) . . . 507

4.7.11.102 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Total (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574t) . . . 507
4.7.11.103 Unemployment rates: Total, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempytotf) . . . 507
4.7.11.104 Unemployment rates: Total, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempytotm) . . . 507
4.7.11.105 Unemployment rates: Total, Female and Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempytott) . . . 508
4.7.11.106 Employers, total (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_emp) . . . 508
4.7.11.107 Employment in agriculture (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagr) . . . 508
4.7.11.108 Employment in agriculture, female (percent female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagrf) . . . 509
4.7.11.109 Employment in agriculture, male (percent male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagrm) . . . 509
4.7.11.110 Children in employment, total (percent of children ages 7-14) (wdi_empch) . . . 509
4.7.11.111 Children in employment, female (percent of female children ages 7-14) (wdi_empchf) . . . 510
4.7.11.112 Children in employment, male (percent of male children ages 7-14) (wdi_empchm) . . . 510
4.7.11.113 Employment in industry (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empind) . . . 510
4.7.11.114 Employment in industry, female (percent female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empindf) . . . 511
4.7.11.115 Employment in industry, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empindm) . . . 511
4.7.11.116 Employers, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empm) . . . 511
4.7.11.117 Employment in services (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empser) . . . 512
4.7.11.118 Employment in services, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empserf) . . . 512
4.7.11.119 Employment in services, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empserm) . . . 512
4.7.11.120 Labor force with advanced education percent of total working-age pop. (wdi_lfpedua) . . . 513
4.7.11.121 Labor force with advanced education percent of female working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduaf) . . . 513
4.7.11.122 Labor force with advanced education percent of male working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduam) . . . 513
4.7.11.123 Labor force with basic education percent of total working-age pop. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedub) . . . 514
4.7.11.124 Labor force with basic education percent of female working-age pop. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedubf) . . . 514
4.7.11.125 Labor force with basic education percent of male working-age pop. w. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedubm) . . . 514
4.7.11.126 Labor force with intermediate education percent of total working-age pop. (wdi_lfpedui) . . . 515
4.7.11.127 Labor force with intermediate education percent of female working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduif) . . . 515

4.7.11.128 Labor force with intermediate education percent of male working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduim) . . . 515
4.7.11.129 Labor force, female (percent of total labor force) (wdi_lfpf) . . . 516
4.7.11.130 Labor force participation rate (percent female ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpfilo15) . . . 516
4.7.11.131 Labor force participation rate (percent of female ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpfne15) . . . 516
4.7.11.132 Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpilo15) . . . 516
4.7.11.133 Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpmilo15) . . . 517
4.7.11.134 Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpmne15) . . . 517
4.7.11.135 Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpne15) . . . 517
4.7.11.136 Labor force participation rate, total (percent of total pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfpr) . . . 518
4.7.11.137 Labor force participation rate, female (percent of female pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfprf) . . . 518
4.7.11.138 Labor force participation rate, male (percent of male pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfprm) . . . 518
4.7.11.139 Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpyfilo) . . . 519
4.7.11.140 Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpyfne) . . . 519
4.7.11.141 Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpyilo) . . . 519
4.7.11.142 Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpymilo) . . . 520
4.7.11.143 Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpymne) . . . 520
4.7.11.144 Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpyne) . . . 520
4.7.11.145 Part time employment, total (percent of total employment) (wdi_pte) 521
4.7.11.146 Part time employment, female (percent of total female employment) (wdi_ptef) . . . 521
4.7.11.147 Part time employment, male (percent of total male employment) (wdi_ptem) . . . 521
4.7.11.148 Self-employed, total (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_semp) . . . 521
4.7.11.149 Self-employed, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_sempf) . . . 522
4.7.11.150 Self-employed, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_sempm) . . . 522
4.7.11.151 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedua) . . . 522
4.7.11.152 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempeduaf) . . . 523
4.7.11.153 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempeduam) . . . 523
4.7.11.154 Unemployment with basic education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedub) . . . 523

4.7.11.155 Unemployment with basic education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempedubf) . . . 524
4.7.11.156 Unemployment with basic education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempedubm) . . . 524
4.7.11.157 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedui) . . . 524
4.7.11.158 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempeduif) . . . 525
4.7.11.159 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempeduim) . . . 525
4.7.11.160 Unemployment, female (percent of female labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempfilo) . . . 525
4.7.11.161 Unemployment, female (percent of female labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempfne) . . . 526
4.7.11.162 Unemployment, total (percent of total labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempilo) . . . 526
4.7.11.163 Unemployment, male (percent of male labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempmilo) . . . 526
4.7.11.164 Unemployment, male (percent of male labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempmne) . . . 526
4.7.11.165 Unemployment, total (percent of total labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempne) . . . 527
4.7.11.166 Unemployment, youth female (percent of female labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempyfilo) . . . 527
4.7.11.167 Unemployment, youth female (percent of female labor force 15-24)(nation est.) (wdi_unempyfne) . . . 527
4.7.11.168 Unemployment, youth total (percent of total labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempyilo) . . . 527
4.7.11.169 Unemployment, youth male (percent of male labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempymilo) . . . 528
4.7.11.170 Unemployment, youth male (percent of male labor force 15-24)(national est.) (wdi_unempymne) . . . 528
4.7.11.171 Unemployment, youth total (percent of total labor force 15-24)(national est.) (wdi_unempyne) . . . 528
4.7.11.172 Public sector employment as a share of formal employment (wwbi_psefemp) . . . 529
4.7.11.173 Public sector employment as a share of total employment (wwbi_psemptot) . . . 529
4.7.11.174 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Female) (wwbi_psemptotf) . . . 529
4.7.11.175 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Male) (wwbi_psemptotm) . . . 529
4.7.11.176 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Rural) (wwbi_psemptotr) . . . 530
4.7.11.177 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Urban) (wwbi_psemptotu) . . . 530
4.7.11.178 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment (wwbi_psepemp) . . . 530
4.7.11.179 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Female) (wwbi_psepempf) . . . 530
4.7.11.180 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Male) (wwbi_psepempm) . . . 531

4.7.11.181 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Rural) (wwbi_psepempr) . . . 531
4.7.11.182 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Urban) (wwbi_psepempu) . . . 531
4.7.11.183 Worker Rights Laws (ciri_work_l_s) . . . 531
4.7.11.184 Worker Rights Practices (ciri_work_p_s) . . . 532
4.7.12 Civil Society, Population and Culture . . . 532
4.7.12.1 Freedom of Assembly and Association (ciri_assn) . . . 533
4.7.12.2 Social Globalization (dr_sg) . . . 533
4.7.12.3 Internet use: internet banking (eu_isiubk) . . . 534
4.7.12.4 Global Peace Index (gpi_gpi) . . . 534
4.7.12.5 Births attended by skilled health staff (percent of total) (wdi_birthskill) 534
4.7.12.6 Population density (people per sq. km of land area) (wdi_popden) . 535
4.7.12.7 Population growth (annual percent) (wdi_popgr) . . . 535
4.7.12.8 Rural population growth (annual percent) (wdi_poprulgr) . . . 535
4.7.12.9 Urban population growth (annual percent) (wdi_popurbagr) . . . 536
4.7.13 Environment . . . 536
4.7.13.1 Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category (epi_bdh) . . . 536
4.7.13.2 Climate Change Issue Category (epi_cch) . . . 537
4.7.13.3 Agricultural irrigated land (percent of total agricultural land) (wdi_agrland) . . . 539
4.7.13.4 Arable land (percent of land area) (wdi_araland) . . . 539
4.7.13.5 Land area (sq. km) (wdi_area) . . . 540
4.7.13.6 Would give part of my income for the environment (wvs_envinc) . . 540
4.7.13.7 Count of environmental and legislative research and development policies (aepd_rd) . . . 540
4.7.14 Political Parties and Elections . . . 540
4.7.14.1 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Demarcation Bloc (EP) (evep_dembloc) . . . 540
4.7.14.2 Was More Than One Party Legal (nelda_mtop) . . . 541
4.7.15 History . . . 541
4.7.15.1 Real GDP per Capita (year 1500) (mad_gdppc1500) . . . 541
4.7.15.2 Real GDP per Capita (year 1600) (mad_gdppc1600) . . . 542
4.7.15.3 Real GDP per Capita (year 1700) (mad_gdppc1700) . . . 542
4.7.15.4 Real GDP per Capita (year 1900) (mad_gdppc1900) . . . 542
4.7.16 Energy and Infrastructure . . . 542
4.7.16.1 Net gas exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_gas_netexp) . . . 542
4.7.16.2 Gas production value in 2014 dollars (ross_gas_value_2014) . . . 543
4.7.16.3 Net oil exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_oil_netexp) . . . 543
4.7.16.4 Oil production value in 2014 dollars (ross_oil_value_2014) . . . 543
4.7.16.5 Access to electricity (percent of population) (wdi_acel) . . . 543
4.7.17 Health . . . 544
4.7.17.1 Current health expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_chexppgdp) . . . 544

5 REPDEM **545**
5.1 REPDEM Basic . . . 545
5.1.1 Cabinet Information . . . 546
5.1.1.1 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected) . . . 546

5.1.1.2 Party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_1st) . . . 546
5.1.1.3 Second party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_2nd) . . . 546
5.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe . . . 546
5.2.1 Information on the Cabinets . . . 547
5.2.1.1 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected) . . . 547

6 V-DEM **549**
6.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16 . . . 549
6.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices . . . 550
6.1.1.1 Share of population with suffrage (v2x_suffr) . . . 550
6.1.1.2 Equality before the law and individual liberty index (v2xcl_rol) . . . 551
6.1.1.3 Civil society participation index (v2x_cspart) . . . 552
6.1.1.4 Direct Popular Vote Index (v2xdd_dd) . . . 553
6.1.1.5 Egalitarian Component Index (v2x_egal) . . . 555
6.1.1.6 Equal access index (v2xeg_eqaccess) . . . 555
6.1.1.7 Equal distribution of resources index (v2xeg_eqdr) . . . 556
6.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections . . . 557
6.1.2.1 Percent of population with suffrage (v2elsuffrage) . . . 558
6.1.2.2 Public campaign finance (v2elpubfin) . . . 559
6.1.2.3 Election free campaign media (v2elfrcamp) . . . 560
6.1.2.4 Subnational election area less free and fair characteristics (v2elsnlfc) 561
6.1.2.5 Subnational election area more free and fair characteristics (v2elsnmrfc) 562
6.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties . . . 563
6.1.3.1 Party linkages (v2psprlnks) . . . 563
6.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive . . . 564
6.1.4.1 Regime most important support group (v2regimpgroup) . . . 565
6.1.4.2 Regime support groups size (v2regsupgroupssize) . . . 566
6.1.4.3 Regime most important opposition group (v2regimpoppgroup) . . . 567
6.1.4.4 Strongest pro-regime preferences (v2regproreg) . . . 568
6.1.4.5 Strongest anti-regime preferences (v2regantireg) . . . 570
6.1.4.6 Most powerful group in affecting regime duration and change (v2regpower) . . . 571
6.1.4.7 Regime opposition groups (v2regoppgroups) . . . 572
6.1.4.8 Explicit and active regime opposition groups (v2regoppgroupsact) . . . 573
6.1.4.9 Regime support groups (v2regsupgroups) . . . 574
6.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature . . . 575
6.1.5.1 Legislature corrupt activities (v2lgcrrpt) . . . 576
6.1.5.2 Legislature controls resources (v2lgfunds) . . . 577
6.1.5.3 Representation of disadvantaged social groups (v2lgdsadlo) . . . 578
6.1.5.4 Representation of disadvantaged groups binary (v2lgdsadlobin) . . . 579
6.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Deliberation . . . 579
6.1.6.1 Reasoned justification (v2dlreason) . . . 580
6.1.6.2 Common good (v2dlcommon) . . . 581
6.1.6.3 Range of consultation (v2dlconslt) . . . 582
6.1.6.4 Means-tested vs. universalistic (v2dlunivl) . . . 582
6.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary . . . 584

6.1.7.1 Judicial corruption decision (v2jucorrdc) . . . 584
6.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty . . . 585
6.1.8.1 Freedom from forced labor for men (v2clslavem) . . . 585
6.1.8.2 Freedom from forced labor for women (v2clslavef) . . . 586
6.1.8.3 Social class equality in respect for civil liberty (v2clacjust) . . . 587
6.1.8.4 Social group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clsocgrp) . . . 588
6.1.8.5 Stronger civil liberties characteristics (v2clrgstch) . . . 589
6.1.8.6 Weaker civil liberties characteristics (v2clrgwkch) . . . 590
6.1.8.7 State ownership of economy (v2clstown) . . . 591
6.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Sovereignty and State . . . 592
6.1.9.1 Domestic Autonomy (v2svdomaut) . . . 593
6.1.9.2 State fiscal source of revenue (v2stfisccap) . . . 594
6.1.9.3 Bureaucratic remuneration (v2strenadm) . . . 595
6.1.9.4 Remuneration in the Armed Forces (v2strenarm) . . . 596
6.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Political Equality . . . 597
6.1.10.1 Power distributed by socioeconomic position (v2pepwrses) . . . 597
6.1.10.2 Power distributed by social group (v2pepwrsoc) . . . 598
6.1.10.3 Power distributed by sexual orientation (v2pepwrort) . . . 599
6.1.11 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion . . . 600
6.1.11.1 Access to public services distributed by socio-economic position (v2peapsecon) . . . 601
6.1.11.2 Access to state jobs by socio-economic position (v2peasjsoecon) . . . 602
6.1.11.3 Access to state business opportunities by socio-economic position (v2peasbecon) . . . 603
6.1.11.4 Gender equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgencl) . . . 604
6.1.11.5 Access to state business opportunities by gender (v2peasbgen) . . . 605
6.1.11.6 Urban-rural location equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgeocl) 606
6.1.11.7 Access to state business opportunities by urban-rural location (v2peasbegeo) . . . 607
6.1.11.8 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl) . . . 608
6.1.11.9 Access to state business opportunities by political group (v2peasbepol) 609
6.1.11.10 Access to state jobs by social group (v2peasjsoc) . . . 610
6.1.11.11 Access to state business opportunities by social group (v2peasbsoc) . 611
6.1.12 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation . . . 612
6.1.12.1 Ideology (v2exl_legitideol) . . . 612
6.1.12.2 Performance legitimation (v2exl_legitperf) . . . 613
6.1.13 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space . . . 614
6.1.13.1 Engagement in state-administered mass organizations (v2castate) . . 614
6.1.13.2 Engagement in independent trade unions (v2catrauni) . . . 615
6.1.13.3 Engagement in independent political associations (v2capolit) . . . 616
6.1.13.4 Engagement in independent non-political associations (v2canonpol) . 617
6.1.13.5 Freedom to research and teach (v2cafres) . . . 618
6.1.13.6 Institutional autonomy (v2cainsaut) . . . 619
6.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties . . . 620
6.1.14.1 Private liberties index (v2x_clpriv) . . . 620
6.1.15 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Exclusion . . . 621
6.1.15.1 Exclusion by Socio-Economic Group (v2xpe_exlecon) . . . 621
6.1.15.2 Exclusion by Gender (v2xpe_exlgender) . . . 622
6.1.15.3 Exclusion by Urban-Rural Location (v2xpe_exlgeo) . . . 623

6.1.15.4 Exclusion by Political Group (v2xpe_exlpol) . . . 624
6.1.15.5 Exclusion by Social Group (v2xpe_exlsocgr) . . . 624
6.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Women's Empowerment . . . 625
6.1.16.1 Women civil liberties index (v2x_gencl) . . . 626
6.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Direct Democracy . . . 626
6.1.17.1 Popular initiative index (v2xdd_i_ci) . . . 626
6.1.17.2 Popular referendum index (v2xdd_i_rf) . . . 628
6.1.17.3 Obligatory referendum index (v2xdd_i_or) . . . 630
6.1.17.4 Plebiscite index (v2xdd_i_pl) . . . 631
6.1.17.5 Citizen-initiated component of direct popular vote index (v2xdd_cic) 632
6.1.17.6 Top-Down component of direct popular vote index (v2xdd_toc) . . . 633
6.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Society . . . 634
6.1.18.1 Core Civil Society Index (v2xcs_ccsi) . . . 634
6.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections . . . 635
6.1.19.1 Freedom from forced labor (v2xcl_slave) . . . 635
6.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages . . . 636
6.1.20.1 Types of organization through social media (v2smorgtypes) . . . 637
6.1.21 Varieties of Indoctrination . . . 638
6.1.21.1 Political education, primary school (v2edpoledprim) . . . 638
6.1.21.2 Political education, secondary school (v2edpoledsec) . . . 639
6.1.21.3 Political rights and duties in the curriculum (v2edpoledrights) . . . 640
6.1.21.4 Patriotic education in the curriculum (v2edpatriot) . . . 641
6.1.21.5 Patriotism in the media (v2medpatriot) . . . 642
6.1.21.6 Extracurricular activities (v2edscextracurr) . . . 643
6.1.21.7 Education requirements for primary school teachers (v2edtequal) . . . 643
6.1.21.8 Presence of teacher unions (v2edteunion) . . . 644
6.1.21.9 Presence of teacher unions (v2edteunion_mode) . . . 645
6.1.21.10 Independent teacher unions (v2edteunionindp) . . . 646
6.1.22 Party Systems . . . 647
6.1.22.1 Government Coalition Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_government) . . . 648
6.1.22.2 Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_opposition) 648
6.1.22.3 Party-System Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion) . . . 649
6.1.22.4 Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_opposition) 650
6.1.22.5 Government Coalition Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_government) . . . 651
6.1.22.6 Party-System Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic) . . . 652
6.2 V-Dem V-Party v2 . . . 653
6.2.1 Party Identity . . . 654
6.2.1.1 Anti-elitism (v2paanteli) . . . 654
6.2.1.2 Cultural Superiority (v2paculsup) . . . 655
6.2.1.3 Working Women (v2pawomlab) . . . 655
6.2.1.4 Economic Left-Right Scale (v2pariglef) . . . 656
6.2.2 Party Organisation . . . 656
6.2.2.1 Affiliate Organizations (v2pasoctie) . . . 657
6.2.2.2 Party Resources (v2pafunds_nr) . . . 657
6.2.2.3 Party Support Group (v2pagroup_nr) . . . 658

7 Bibliography **659**

1 Explanatory Notes

1.1 Release Notes v8

Demscore provides worldwide free access to harmonized data on Democracy, Environment, Migration, Social Policy, Conflict and Representation from several of the world's most prominent social science research institutes. The interdisciplinary nature of Demscore data facilitates large-scale comparative analyses. This is essential to advance adequate policy responses to complex societal challenges associated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and beyond, facing Sweden, Europe, and the world today.

With a firm commitment to transparency and openness, Demscore v8 enables users to gain comprehensive insights into various topics across the social sciences. The joint infrastructure ensures data integrity and quality at the highest international standards and maximizes usability in the measurement of contextual data with over 26.000 variables across nearly all countries in the world, from 1750 to the present.

This creates critical time- and cost saving advantages in data collection, management, distribution, and not the least for end-users in the scientific community. Demscore's unique approach to translating and merging data scales up to more than 420.000 variable versions available in the infrastructure, storing more than 10 billion non-missing observations.

This collaborative effort between leading Swedish universities pushes the scale of social science data to a new level and offers unprecedented possibilities for interdisciplinary research and knowledge advancement.

These are the key features of Demscore:

1. **Customized Download:** A fully normalized, joint PostgreSQL database, sophisticated programming, and a user-friendly web-based interface for users to generate custom-designed datasets and codebooks for download.
2. **Translations and Data Merges:** Demscore currently offers more than 1300 merge options between datasets.
3. **Metadata:** Demscore takes information on and organization of metadata to new heights with the inclusion of customized codebooks, a detailed methodology document, and a comprehensive handbook.
4. **Handling of Missing Data:** Demscore pioneers in developing an innovative approach to tackle missing data. Researchers can now account for missing values with increased precision, leading to more robust and reliable analyses.
5. **Merge Scores:** Demscore introduces a unique merge mechanism. This powerful tool enables researchers to combine datasets effortlessly, uncovering connections and patterns that were previously hidden in isolated data silos.
6. **Thematic Datasets:** Demscore provides researchers with curated thematic datasets, each focused on a specific topic. These datasets bring together relevant variables from across the Demscore partners, facilitating in-depth investigations and comprehensive analyses of specific domains.
7. **Interactive Web Portal:** In addition to all the above, Demscore's web portal offers interactive visualization tools, user support and additional information on all partners and data sources.

For more information, please visit `https://www.demscore.se/` or contact contact@demscore.se.

1.2 New in Demscore version 8

A detailed description of changes and additions made for version 8 compared to version 7 can be found in the Methodology Document.

1.3 The Demscore Codebook

The autogenerated Demscore Codebook lists variable entries for those variables chosen by the user along with citation guidelines and licenses per variable.

The meta data is extracted from the codebooks per dataset stored in a table in the Demscore PostgreSQL database with one row per variable for all datasets. This table includes codebook entries, variable tags, labels, and other variable information in LaTeX format used to generate an automated codebook.
Demscore maintains a single set of standard entries for metadata across all datasets, to which all project members contribute their information. Additionally, variables within different datasets may have varying sets of additional information requirements specific to each dataset. These dataset-specific entries are also included, but they are presented as variable-specific metadata beneath the standard entries.
At the outset of the harmonization process, Demscore underwent a thorough variable name cleanup. This involved tasks such as replacing spaces or dots in variable names with underscores and converting all letters to lowercase. Notably, the original tags remain preserved and stored in the PostgreSQL table. Each variable in Demscore is accessible in both short and long forms. The short form comprises the cleaned version of the original variable tag, while the long form starts with the dataset name from which it originates, followed by the cleaned variable name.

For instance, the original name of the variable *MinisterPersonalID* from the H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset is included as *ministerpersonalid* (short form) and *hdata_fomin_ministerpersonalid* (long form) in Demscore.

In addition, each dataset includes Demscore unit-identifier variables which are named according to the following naming scheme: Beginning with u_, followed by the name of the primary unit and finally the variable tag. The *year-* variable from the COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB), which is part of the primary unit u_complab_country_year has the Demscore unit identifier name *u_complab_country_year_year*.

1.4 Methodology

For details on our methodology please see the Demscore Methodology document available for download on the Demscore website.

1.5 Citations

The Demscore project does not have a formal citation of its own. Hence, when using Demscore, we suggest that you cite the respective projects and datasets. We indicate how every dataset is to be cited in the autogenerated codebook you retreive with your data download, both in the dataset description and the codebook entry for each variable. Most often it is sufficient to cite the dataset a variable originates from, but sometimes there is a variable specific citation listed in the codebook entry in addition to that. For these cases, please also add the variable specific citation to the reference list of your publication. Full references are linked in the codebook entries of the variables and listed in the codebook's bibliography. We suggest you to also cite the Demscore Methodology Document when using data retrieved through Demscore.

1.6 Missing Data

Demscore indicates different types of missingness for observations in the customized datasets:
Missing in original data = Whenever an observation in the original variable is a missing (NA, missing code such as 7777, blank cell), we preserve this missing value. When the original source has special codes for various types of missing, those are preserved.
Missing code: -11111 = Demscore code for observation is missing due to the translation/merge, i.e., missing data due to no data being included for this combination of identifiers in the end Output Unit.
Missing code: -22222 = No observation is merged/translated, but the original data contains information for these identifier combinations elsewhere. For these cases, we use a different code. The

user needs to consult the reference documents (Methodology Document Section 5.1. or the Demscore Handbook) to clarify why the translation to the identifier combinations in the end Output Unit was not possible.

Please note that an observation that is missing in its original output unit does no take the value -11111, but appears as NA/blank cell in the customized dataset.

1.7 Download ID

The download ID can be shared with other users for replication purposes. A user can type the download ID into the Demscore website and retrieve the same download selection and files as the original user. This ID is autogenerated for each download from the Demscore website and will always retrieve the same data, even if the Demscore version was updated in the meantime.

Download ID:

1.8 Unit Identifier Variables

An Output Unit is defined as an output format in which variables can be retrieved from one or more datasets through a strictly defined output grid. A unit table defining this output grid contains unit identifier columns with u_ prefixes and the table is sorted based on these unit identifier columns and has a fixed number of rows. Unit columns are based on the columns that constitute the unit of analysis in a dataset. They are added to the original dataset and marked by a unit prefix (consisting of a u_ and the dataset unit name) before the original variable name. Unit columns can contain slightly modified data, e.g., missing values are replaced by a default value. Sometimes we add additional columns to the unit table, for instance if a dataset includes both a country_id column with a numeric country code, we add the variable storing the full country name to the unit table as well for better readability.

1.9 Thematic Dataset

The Thematic Dataset on Economic Development offers a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners interested in analyzing the drivers, patterns, and impacts of economic growth and development. Download here: when we'll have it This dataset covers a broad range of economic indicators, including GDP growth, income distribution, labor market trends, infrastructure development, and financial inclusion. It also includes variables related to economic stability, innovation capacity, human capital development, and international trade. By providing structured and high-quality data, this dataset supports evidence-based research and a tool for policy analysis on economic development worldwide.

1.10 Output Unit Identifier Variables in the Chosen Unit

u_demscore_country_year_country: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

u_demscore_country_year_code: NA

u_demscore_country_year_year: The column is created based on V-Dem, H-DATA AND GW. It is based on the following datasets: H-DATA Information Capacity Dataset H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset V-Dem Episodes of Regime Transformation Dataset V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others

2 COMPLAB

Based at Stockholm University, the **Comparative Policy Laboratory (COMPLAB)**, provides vital policy data across three areas: environmental, social, and migration policy. The **Social Policy Indicators (SPIN)** database provides the foundations for new comparative and longitudinal research on causes and consequences of welfare states. Building on T.H. Marshall's ideas about social citizenship, SPIN makes available comparative data on social rights and duties of citizens, thereby moving research beyond analyses of welfare state expenditures. The SPIN database is instead oriented towards analyses of institutions as manifested in social policy legislation. Data are carefully collected in a coherent and consistent methodological manner to facilitate quantitative research of social policy across time and space. To date, SPIN covers 36 countries, of which several have data on core social policy programs from 1930 to 2019. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/spin-1.644259` **GRACE, Governing the Anthropocene – Environmental Policy and Outcomes in a Comparative Perspective**, is a longitudinal and comparative study on environmental governance has created a dataset of national policy responses for environmental management and protection in 37 countries for the period 1970-2022. `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/grace-1.645779` **The Migration Policy Database (MIGPOL)** consists of a range of indicators compiled on behalf of leading data projects in the field of comparative migration policy research. It also contains original data on the rights of irregular migrants which will soon be added to Demscore. `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/migpol-1.645783` Read more about COMPLAB here: `https://www.su.se/comparative-policy-laboratory/`

2.1 COMPLAB GRACE - Governing the Anthropocene

Dataset tag: complab_grace

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The GRACE data set was originally intended to provide a measure of the extent of state involvement in addressing environmental problems, but can be used for other more generic purposes as well. The rational for the GRACE data is to base coding on a set of pre-defined environmental policy problems and then search for national-level policy responses addressing those problems.

Dataset citation: Duit, Andreas, Sommerer, Thomas and Lim, Sijeong (2023) "The GRACE v.2.0 Data Set" Department of Political Science, Stockholm University. Funding for GRACE data was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (Dnr 2012-05514, 2021-00162_VR) and the Marcus and Marianne Wallenberg Foundation (Dnr 2017-0087).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.16e68fb219937120b11b62b/1758186768484/GRACE%20Codebook%20v2.0%20Jan%202023GRACE%20Codebook%20v2.0%20Jan%202023.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of GRACE shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/comparative-policy-laboratory/data/grace`

2.1.1 Policy Implementation

Variables in this section indicate whether a certain policy was implemented or not. A policy is defined as a legally binding regulation that has been enacted by the highest law-making body in a given country. Policies are applicable to the entire national jurisdiction. Government reports, statements of intent, policy programs, campaigns, discussion papers, and private forms of regulation are not considered to be policies. Dates refer to when the policy came into force. All policies were coded as either absent (= 0) or implemented (=1) for a given country-year.

2.1.1.1 Hazardous substance in detergents (detergents)

Long tag: complab_grace_detergents

Original tag: detergents

Dataset citation: Duit et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 11.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 6.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The variable records the first introduction of policies aimed at regulating toxic substances in household and business detergents. Policies may include bans of toxic substances, limit values, and /or labelling schemes.

2.1.1.2 Contaminated site policy (sites)

Long tag: complab_grace_sites

Original tag: sites

Dataset citation: Duit et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 11.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 6.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The variable records the first introduction of policies aimed at regulating liability for sites contaminated by industrial production. In most countries, liability schemes are developed to clarify the obligations of present and previous owners of a polluting industry. Another option is construct a fund to finance cleaning expenditures (a.k.a. superfunds). Other instruments relate to insurance policy, tax rebates or refunds for cleaning efforts, voluntary agreements for cleaning contaminated sites, etc.

2.1.1.3 Recycling of construction waste (constructionwaste)

Long tag: complab_grace_constructionwaste

Original tag: constructionwaste

Dataset citation: Duit et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 11.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1937, Percent: 6.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The variable records the first introduction of policies aimed at establishing a recycling system for waste from construction projects. The separation of hazardous wastes such as asbestos, lead, mercury and other heavy metals; hydrocarbons; paint adhesives, solvents, preservatives; contaminated soil and various materials containing PCBs usually plays a decisive role for the recycling of construction waste. Policies include prescriptions for on-site separation and

recycling, promoting the development of easy-to-disassemble products, or 'flanking' instruments like financial incentives (landfill taxes) and landfill bans.

2.2 COMPLAB MIGPOL GLOBALCIT Country-Year

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_gc_cy

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset integrates, systematizes and updates information previously included in two online GLOBALCIT databases: the Global Databases on Modes of Acquisition and Loss of Citizenship. Both were compiled by a team of experts at the Global Citizenship Observatory of the European University Institute (EUI). The current dataset (version 2) includes information on the different ways in which citizenship can be acquired and lost around the world. The GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset is organized around a comprehensive typology of modes of acquisition and loss of citizenship, which outlines, in a systematic way, the various ways in which citizenship can be acquired and lost. For each 'mode of acquisition' and 'mode of loss' of citizenship the typology outlines a standardized 'target person' which allows comparing rules applicable to similar groups across countries. The Dataset covers information on citizenship laws in force in 191 states on 1 January 2020, 2021 and 2022. For selected provisions regarding dual citizenship acceptance (modes A06b, L01, L054) the Dataset also includes longitudinal data back to 1960. The dataset is primarily based on information from datasheets provided by GLOBALCIT country experts that provide a concise representation of relevant legislative provisions for each mode of acquisition and loss and indicate whether changes took place within a particular timeframe. If no GLOBALCIT country expert has been assigned for a particular country, data are primarily retrieved from available country reports and (translations of) national legislation available in the GLOBALCIT repository. In addition, external sources can be deployed if this is deemed necessary, such as national legislation or official translations thereof available from governmental sources or other reliable sources.

Dataset citation: Vink, Marteen and van der Baaren, Luuk and Bauböck, Rainer and Džankić, Jelena and Honohan, Iseult and Manby, Bronwen (2023) "GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset, v2.0, Country-Year-Mode Data (Acquisition)" Published: Global Citizenship Observatory. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The codebook of the GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY 4.0) International license. If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the series and number, the year and the publisher. The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the GLOBALCIT project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://globalcit.eu/databases/globalcit-citizenship-law-dataset/`

2.2.1 Acquisition of Citizenship

The Acquisition of Citizenship section in the GLOBALCIT_Country_Year dataset outlines in a systematic way the various ways in which citizenship can be acquired. For each mode of acquisition of citizenship the typology outlines a standardized target person, which allows comparing rules applicable to similar groups across countries.

2.2.1.1 Residence-based acquisition – economic resources condition (a06f_bin)

Long tag: complab_migpol_gc_cy_a06f_bin

Original tag: globalcit_a06f_bin

Dataset citation: Vink et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 3.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 507, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 66 Percent: 11.52

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country impose a requirement related to economic resources for residence-based acquisition, such as demonstrating income level, engagement in employment or the absence of welfare dependency?
VALUES:
0 = residence-based acquisition and economic resources condition
1 = residence-based acquisition and economic resources condition
MISSINGS:
99 = No residence-based acquisition
COVERAGE:
2020-2022

2.2.1.2 Residence-based acquisition – economic resources condition (a06f_cat)

Long tag: complab_migpol_gc_cy_a06f_cat

Original tag: globalcit_a06f_cat

Dataset citation: Vink et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 3.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 507, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 66 Percent: 11.52

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country impose a requirement related to economic resources for residence-based acquisition, such as demonstrating income level, engagement in employment or the absence of welfare dependency?
VALUES:
0 = requirement
1 = Requirement (conditions not further specified in database)
MISSINGS:
99 = No provision for residence-based acquisition
COVERAGE:
2020-2022

2.2.1.3 Investments (a26_bin)

Long tag: complab_migpol_gc_cy_a26_bin

Original tag: globalcit_a26_bin

Dataset citation: Vink et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 3.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 507, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 66 Percent: 11.52

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country provide for acquisition of citizenship by a person who makes a specific payment or invests a substantial sum of money in the country and, if so, under which conditions?

VALUES:
1 = Acquisition of citizenship for financial assets or investment
0 = No acquisition of citizenship for financial assets or investment
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2020-2022

2.3 COMPLAB MIGPOL Historical Immigration Policies Database

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_antidisc

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Historical Immigration Policies Database (HIP) covers 31 countries from either 1789 or their independence until the 2010s. These countries include: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela. HIP enables scholars to reassess long-established views on the historical development of immigration policies, test new arguments with longitudinal data, and explore the relationship between immigration policies and slow-changing domestic and international variables. The dataset spans a wide range of variables important to political scientists, such as regime type, wealth (including natural resource wealth), and economic structure. Immigration policy dimensions—such as entry rules, rights, and enforcement—are coded separately, allowing researchers to analyze their long-term co-evolution. HIP is relevant to a broad audience in international relations and can be used to investigate immigration policy's connection to topics like North-South relations, democratization and autocratization trends, and the rise of far-right ideologies and populism. It holds particular promise for the growing subfield of historical international relations, with its focus on the evolution of states, state systems, and international ties. More information is available on: `https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL#`

Dataset citation: PETERS, MARGARET and Borang, Frida and Kalm, Sara; Lindvall, Johannes and Shin, Adrian, 2024, *Historical Immigration Policy dataset (HIP)*, https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL, Harvard Dataverse, V2. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://dataverse.harvard.edu/file.xhtml?fileId=10143944&version=2.0`

License: The Historical Immigration Policy Dataset is in the public domain. It is licensed under CC by 1.0. The persons associated with this work have waived all their rights to the work worldwide under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights, to the extent allowed by the law. The data can be copied, modified, and distributed, even for commercial purposes, all without asking permission.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL#`

2.3.1 Historical Policy

Variables in this section provides coding of immigration policies of 31 states from 1789/ independence to 2010.

2.3.1.1 National Restrictions (natcode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_natcode

Original tag: hip_natcode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4747, Percent: 27.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4531, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the law pertain to specic nationalities? Are exclusions based on national origin? Did the state sign a bilateral labor migration treaty or another international agreement on immigration?
VALUES:
1 = Only descedents of natives allowed in.
2 = A few nationalities allowed entrance but not many.
3 = Many nationalities allowed in but not all or migrants from some regions excluded.
4 = Almost all nationalities allowed in.
5 = No exclusions based on nationality.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.3.1.2 Skill Restrictions (skillcode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_skillcode

Original tag: hip_skillcode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4747, Percent: 27.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4531, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the law restrict by the skills or income an immigrant possesses? Does it use a point system with points given for education or special skills? Are people excluded based on profession (i.e., no prostitutes), illness (e.g., no epileptics), or likelihood of becoming a public charge?
VALUES:
1 = Only highly educated, high-income earners allowed in; many excludable classes.
2 = Mostly high educated, high earners, but some allowances for low-skilled workers; some excludable classes.
3 = Preference for high-skill workers but many opportunities for low-skilled workers; some excludable classes.
4 = Few slots reserved for high-skill/high-income workers; most visas open for anyone; few excludable classes.
5 = No skill restrictions for any visas; no excludable classes.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.3.1.3 Asylum Provisions (asylcode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_asylcode

Original tag: hip_asylcode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4747, Percent: 27.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4531, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the law discuss asylum seekers? That is, migrants who are at the border or in the state claiming refugee status? How easy is it to gain asylum? What rights do asylum seekers and asylees have? Are they kept in detention centers? Are they repatriated? Is there only one asylum status or is there temporary protected status as well? What are the procedures and are there legal safeguards?
VALUES:
1 = No asylum.
2 = Extremely dicult process; asylum granted only in a few cases; little ability to work or access welfare state while awaiting determination; little recourse if not granted asylum; no temporary protected status; limited access for political refugees.
3 = Difficult process; asylum granted for more cases; some access to the welfare state or labor market; more recourse including ability to access courts if denied; some temporary protected status allowed.
4 = Fairly easy process; asylum granted to many groups; access to labor market and welfare system; access to courts and other procedures if denied; temporary protected status given to many groups.
5 = Easy process; asylum granted for most cases; access to labor markets and welfare state; constitutionally protected procedure; no need for temporary protected status because almost everyone gets asylum.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.3.1.4 Recruitment (reccode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_reccode

Original tag: hip_reccode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4746, Percent: 27.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4530, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Are there special visas or procedures to recruit labor or settlers? To recruit workers, do employers have to advertise first or otherwise seek approval from a government ministry? Can all industries recruit? Do firms have to pay levies or other taxes for foreign workers? Does the government pay for passage or give settlers or workers other benefits to induce them to come?
VALUES:
1 = No special procedure or visa, come in under the same system of regulation as everyone else; labor recruitment prohibited.
2 = Small set of visas for special groups of workers (i.e., agricultural workers); trigger to reduce numbers based on employment data; employers are not allowed to pay for moving expenses; many restrictions including no unemployed natives in the industry.
3 = Moderate number of visas for all groups or many groups obtain visas; employers allowed

to pay for moving expenses; some procedures for recruiting workers.
4 = Few or no restrictions on visas for any type of worker; employers are allowed to pay moving expenses; few restrictions or procedures for obtaining work visas.
5 = Government program to recruit workers or settlers; government pays for the workers' transportation cost and helps pay for rms or government officials to recruit workers.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.3.1.5 Labor Prohibitions (labcode)

Long tag: complab_migpol_hip_labcode

Original tag: hip_labcode

Dataset citation: PETERS et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4745, Percent: 27.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4529, Percent: 14.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 216 Percent: 4.55

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can immigrants work in all occupations? Are there requirements to have a certain number of native workers in an occupation/firm or that foreign workers can make up only a certain percentage of workers? Do the rules cover all occupations? Just certain industries? Are there racially based policies?
VALUES:
1 = Immigrants completely blocked from the labor market.
2 = Immigrants restricted from many occupations; less than 30percent of the workers in a given occupation/firm can be immigrants.
3 = Immigrants restricted from some occupations; 30-50percent of workers in given occupation/firm can be immigrants.
4 = Immigrants cannot hold public sector positions; 50percent or more of the workers in a given occupation/firm can be immigrants.
5 = Immigrants can hold any position (except for highly sensitive national security positions); no restrictions on the number of immigrant workers in a given occupation/firm.
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1783-2010

2.4 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMISEM

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_imisem

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMISEM dataset contains 828 indicators on the migration policies of 32 polities from Europe, South East Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. The IMISEM project adopts a comprehensive view of migration policy that includes both its emigrant/ emigration and immigrant/ immigration sides, bridging for the first time the two sides of migration policy. Thus, the dataset includes indicators that measure emigration policies (exit policies and control of outflows), immigration policies (entry policies and control of inflows), emigrant policies (rights granted, services offered and obligations imposed on non-resident citizens), immigrant policies

(mainly, rights granted to non-citizen residents) and citizenship policies (mainly, access to naturalization for immigrants and retention of citizenship by emigrants). The main sources used to complete the IMISEM questionnaires are legal sources (i.e., laws, regulations). Legal sources are complemented with secondary sources (for instance, policy reports) and interviews with experts. The IMISEM Dataset is one of the main outputs of the "The very Immigrant is an Emigrant Project (IMISEM)" funded by the Leibniz Gemeinschaft and carried out at the GIGA German Institute for Global and Area Studies between 2017 and 2020. IMISEM data was collected for the years 2017 to 2019 during this time. It is coded for 2018 in DEMSCORE to align with the country-year format of other datasets.

Dataset citation: Pedroza, Luicy (2022) "IMISEM Dataset" GESIS Data Archive DOI: 10.7802/2380
`https://search.gesis.org/research_data/SDN-10.7802-2380?doi=10.7802/2380`. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The IMISEM CODEBOOK is an Open Access publication licensed under CC BY 4.0. The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMISEM project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/publications/research-datasets/imisem-dataset`

2.4.1 Emigration Policies Documentation

The Emigration Policies Documentation section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on passports and other requirements to emigrate.

2.4.1.1 Emigration Documentation Income (etiondoc_income)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_etiondoc_income

Original tag: imisem_etiondoc_income

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Proof of income necessary to emigrate.
VALUES:
No = 1
Generally no, but required for certain groups = 0.75
Generally yes, but there are exemptions for certain groups = 0.25
Yes = 0
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.2 Emigration Policies Quotas and Restrictions

The Emigration Quotas and Restrictions section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on quotas and restrictions for emigrants.

2.4.2.1 Emigration Quotas Income Categorical (etionquota_incomecat)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_etionquota_incomecat

Original tag: imisem_etionquota_incomecat

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Quotas to emigrate based on income exist in the country.
VALUES:
No = 1
Yes = 0
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.2.2 Emigration Quotas Income Numeric (etionquota_incomenum)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_etionquota_incomenum

Original tag: imisem_etionquota_incomenum

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Quota to emigrate based on income for 2017. Only if 0 in EtionQuota_IncomeCat.
VALUES:
Numeric variable
MISSINGS:
NA = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.3 Emigration Policies Incentives

The Emigration Policy Incentives section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on polcity incentives to encourage or discourage emigration.

2.4.3.1 Emigration Policy Incentives Benefits (etionincentives_benefits)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_etionincentives_benefits

Original tag: imisem_etionincentives_benefits

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: State of origin allows citizens willing to emigrate the withdrawal of accumulated social benefits (e.g. unemployment benefits) in a single transfer.
VALUES:

No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
NA = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.4 Emigration Economic Policies

The Emigration Economic Policies section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on remittances, investment, brain ciculation networks and return policies for emigrants.

2.4.4.1 Emigrant Economic Policies Remittances Bank Channels (egranteco_remittances_bankchannels)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_egranteco_remittances_bankchannels

Original tag: imisem_egranteco_remittances_bankchannels

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Measures to improve banking channels for remittances.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.4.2 Emigrant Economic Policies Remittances Co-development (egranteco_remittances_codevelopment)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_egranteco_remittances_codevelopment

Original tag: imisem_egranteco_remittances_codevelopment

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Remittances used for a co-development scheme (if remittances are used by the state of origin to fund development policies).
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.4.3 Emigrant Economic Policies Investment (egranteco_investment)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_egranteco_investment

Original tag: imisem_egranteco_investment

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Existence of a government program to attract investments from emigrants (i.e. investment in housing, local enterprises, etc.).
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.5 Emigration Cultural Policies

The Emigration Cultural Policies section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on cultural policies for emigrants, such as visits to the country of origin and language courses for emigrants.

2.4.5.1 Emigrant Cultural Policies Language Courses for Emigrants (egrantcul_courses)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_egrantcul_courses

Original tag: imisem_egrantcul_courses

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: State of origin finances cultural courses for learning the culture and traditions of the country of origin (this could include language courses to learn the language of origin).
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.6 Emigration Obligations

The Emigration Obligations section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on obligations for emigrants, such as military service, social service, and taxes.

2.4.6.1 Emigrant Obligations Taxes Income (egrantobl_taxes_income)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_egrantobl_taxes_income

Original tag: imisem_egrantobl_taxes_income

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Emigrant must pay income taxes in state of origin.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7 Immigration Proxy Labor Migration

The ImmigratioProxy Labor Migration section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on high- and low-skilled migrants, with specific attention to domestic workers, agricultural workers, and medical doctors.

2.4.7.1 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Existence (itionlabor_existence)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_existence

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_existence

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there a labor migration scheme that allows immigrants to enter the country to work in any capacity?
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7.2 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Test (itionlabor_test_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_test_domestic

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_test_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country use a national labor market test for covering posts under the domestic worker proxy (i.e. employers seeking to hire an immigrant had to prove no native worker could do the job)?
VALUES:

No = 1
Yes = 0.5
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7.3 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Domestic Workers Loss (itionlabor_loss_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_loss_domestic

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_loss_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant domestic worker's resident permit under this track?
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, right away = 1
Yes, after 1-3 months = 2
Yes, after 4-6 months = 3
Yes, after 7-11 months = 4
Yes, more or equal 12 months = 5
Yes, unspecified = 6
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7.4 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Test (itionlabor_test_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_test_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_test_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country use a national labor market test for covering posts under the agricultural worker proxy (i.e. employers seeking to hire an immigrant had to prove no native worker could do the job)?
VALUES:
No = 1
Yes = 0.5
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:

2018

2.4.7.5 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Agricultural Workers Loss (itionlabor_loss_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_loss_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_loss_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant agricultural worker's resident permit under this track?
VALUES:
No = 1
Yes, right away = 1
Yes, after 1-3 months = 2
Yes, after 4-6 months = 3
Yes, after 7-11 months = 4
Yes, more or equal 12 months = 5
Yes, unspecified = 6
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7.6 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Test (itionlabor_test_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_test_medical

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_test_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does the country use a national labor market test for covering posts under the medical doctor proxy (i.e. employers seeking to hire an immigrant had to prove no native worker could do the job)? Only if 1 in ItionLabor_Visa_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 1
Yes = 0.5
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.7.7 Immigration Proxy: Labor Migration Medical Doctors Loss (itionlabor_loss_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_itionlabor_loss_medical

Original tag: imisem_itionlabor_loss_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Does loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's resident permit under the medical doctor track? Only if 1 in ItionLabor_Visa_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, right away = 1
Yes, after 1-3 months = 2
Yes, after 4-6 months = 3
Yes, after 7-11 months = 4
Yes, more or equal 12 months = 5
Yes, unspecified = 6
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8 Immigration Policies Permanent Residence

The Immigration Policies Permanent Residence section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on permanent residence scemes, eligibility and the security of status.

2.4.8.1 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Seekers (igrantpermanent_resources_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence for asylum seekers? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Seekers.
VALUES:
Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8.2 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Refugees (igrantpermanent_resources_refugees)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_refugees

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_refugees

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence refugees? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Refugee.
VALUES:
Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8.3 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Co-Ethnics (igrantpermanent_resources_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence for co-ethnics? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Coethnic.
VALUES:
Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8.4 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Domestic (igrantpermanent_resources_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence for domestic workers? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Domestic.
VALUES:

Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8.5 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Agricultural (igrantpermanent_resources_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence for agricultural workers? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Agricultural.
VALUES:
Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.8.6 Immigrant Policies Permanent Residence Eligibility Medical (igrantpermanent_resources_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_medical

Original tag: imisem_igrantpermanent_resources_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Is there an economic resources requirement for applying to permanent residence for medical doctors? Only if 1 in IgrantPermanent_Existence_Medical.
VALUES:
Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance = 0
Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded = 0.5
None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9 Immigration Economic Policies

The Immigration Economic Policies section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on economic policies, such as access tp the labor market, access to support, worker's right, and property rights.

2.4.9.1 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.2 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.3 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.4 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.5 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5

Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.6 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.7 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Access (igranteco_access_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_access_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_access_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can permanent residents access the labor market? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.8 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.9 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.10 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0

Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.11 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.12 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.13 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.14 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Self (igranteco_self_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_self_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_self_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can permanent residents access self-employment? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.15 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access employment in schools (primary and secondary)?

Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.16 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.17 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.18 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.19 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.20 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.21 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Teacher (igranteco_teacher_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_teacher_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_teacher_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in schools (primary and secondary)? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.22 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99

COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.23 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.24 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.25 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.26 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.27 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5

Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.28 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Administration (igranteco_administration_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_administration_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_administration_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in public administrations? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.29 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Seekers (igranteco_police_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.30 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Refugee (igranteco_police_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.31 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Co-Ethnic (igranteco_police_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.32 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Domestic (igranteco_police_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.

VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.33 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Agricultural (igranteco_police_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.34 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Medical (igranteco_police_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.35 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Police Permanent (igranteco_police_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_police_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_police_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in the police? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.36 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Seekers (igranteco_military_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.37 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Refugee (igranteco_military_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.38 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Co-Ethnic (igranteco_military_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.39 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Domestic (igranteco_military_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99

COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.40 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Agricultural (igranteco_military_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.41 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Medical (igranteco_military_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.42 Immigrant Economic Policies Acces to Labor Market Military Permanent (igranteco_military_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_military_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_military_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access employment in the armed forces? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.43 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Seekers (igranteco_support_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.44 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Refugees (igranteco_support_refugees)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_refugees

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_refugees

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0

Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.45 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Co-Ethnics (igranteco_support_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.46 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Domestic (igranteco_support_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.47 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Agricultural (igranteco_support_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.48 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Medical (igranteco_support_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.49 Immigrant Economic Policies Access to Support Permanent (igranteco_support_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_support_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_support_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can permanent residents access public employment services? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No public employment services in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.50 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Seekers (igranteco_unions_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can asylum seekers be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.51 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Refugee (igranteco_unions_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can refugees be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5

Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.52 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Co-Ethnic (igranteco_unions_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can co-ethnics be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.53 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Domestic (igranteco_unions_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can domestic workers be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.54 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Agricultural (igranteco_unions_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can agricultural workers be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.55 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Medical (igranteco_unions_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can medical doctors be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.56 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Unions Permanent (igranteco_unions_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_unions_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_unions_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Can permanent residents be members and participate in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions (conditions that are not applied to national residents) = 0.5
Yes, equal access as nationals = 1
MISSINGS:
No unions or other work related negotiation bodies in country of reception = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.57 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Seekers (igranteco_redress_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do asylum seekers have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.58 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Refugee (igranteco_redress_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do refugees have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1

MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.59 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Co-Ethnic (igranteco_redress_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do co-ethnics have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.60 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Domestic (igranteco_redress_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do domestic workers have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.61 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Agricultural (igranteco_redress_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do agricultural workers have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.62 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Medical (igranteco_redress_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_medical

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do medical doctors have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.9.63 Immigrant Economic Policies Worker's Right Redress Permanent (igranteco_redress_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igranteco_redress_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igranteco_redress_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do permanent residents have the right to redress if the terms of their employment contracts have been violated? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.

VALUES:
No = 0
Yes, but under certain conditions = 0.5
Yes, without restrictions = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10 Immigration Social Policies

The Immigration Social Policies section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on social policies for immigrants, such as family reunification, education, health care, unemployment benefits and retirement benefits.

2.4.10.1 Immigrant Social Policies Education Integration (igrantsoc_educationintegration)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_educationintegration

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_educationintegration

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Migration and integration are obligatory topics in professional development training. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers/Refugee/Coethnic/Domestic/Agricultural/Doctor/Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.2 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Seekers (igrantsoc_unemployment_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of asylum seekers to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1

MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.3 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Refugee (igrantsoc_unemployment_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of refugees to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.4 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Co-Ethnic (igrantsoc_unemployment_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of co-ethnics to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.5 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Domestic (igrantsoc_unemployment_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of domestic workers to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.6 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Agricultural (igrantsoc_unemployment_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of agricultural workers to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.7 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Medical (igrantsoc_unemployment_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_medical

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of medical doctors to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.10.8 Immigrant Social Policies Unemployment Benefits Permanent (igrantsoc_unemployment_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igrantsoc_unemployment_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access of permanent residents to unemployment benefits as compared with citizen residents. Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No access = 0
Limited access = 0.5
Equal access = 1
MISSINGS:
No unemployment benefits = 97
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11 Immigration Policies Obligations

The Immigration Policies Obligations section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on the obligations which immigrants have, such as military service, social service, and taxes.

2.4.11.1 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Seekers (igrantobligation_taxes_seekers)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_seekers

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_seekers

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do seekers have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Seekers.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.2 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Refugee (igrantobligation_taxes_refugee)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_refugee

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_refugee

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do refugees have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Refugee.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.3 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Co-Ethnic (igrantobligation_taxes_coethnic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_coethnic

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_coethnic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do co-ethnics have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Coethnic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.4 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Domestic (igrantobligation_taxes_domestic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_domestic

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_domestic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do domestic workers have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Domestic.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.5 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Agricultural (igrantobligation_taxes_agricultural)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_agricultural

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_agricultural

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do agricultural workers have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Agricultural.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.6 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Medical (igrantobligation_taxes_medical)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_medical

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_medical

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do medical doctors have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Medical.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.11.7 Immigrant Policies Obligations Taxes Permanent (igrantobligation_taxes_permanent)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_permanent

Original tag: imisem_igrantobligation_taxes_permanent

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 61, Percent: 0.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 6.56

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Do permanent residents have to pay income taxes in state of reception? Only if 1 in IgrantProxy_Permanent.
VALUES:
No = 0
Yes = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.4.12 Immigration Nationality

The Immigration Nationality section in the IMISEM dataset contains variables on acquisition and loss of nationalities of immigrants and their relatives.

2.4.12.1 Immigrant Nationality Standard Naturalization Procedure for Immigrants due to Residence in the Country Economic (icit_ordinary_economic)

Long tag: complab_migpol_imisem_icit_ordinary_economic

Original tag: imisem_icit_ordinary_economic

Dataset citation: Pedroza et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 0.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 29, Percent: 0.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 9.38

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Economic resources as requisite for naturalization. Only if 1 in Icit_Ordinary_General.
VALUES:
No requirement on income, employment, or welfare dependency= 0
Income requirement at level of minimum wage or official poverty line : no exclusion for past welfare dependency or unemployment= 0.25
Income requirement at level higher than minimum wage or poverty line: no exclusion for past

welfare dependency or unemployment= 0.5
Includes employment condition or no welfare dependency ONLY at time of application= 0.75
Includes employment condition or no welfare dependency for SEVERAL years before application = 1
MISSINGS:
Not applicable = 98
No answer = 99
COVERAGE:
2018

2.5 COMPLAB MIGPOL Migrant Social Policy Dataset

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_immirsr

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Migrant Social Policy (ImmigSR) dataset is a comprehensive tool designed to evaluate and compare social rights and welfare access for migrants across 39 countries in Europe, Latin America, North America, Oceania and Southeast Asia. It systematically assesses policies in multiple domains, including social assistance, unemployment insurance, residence permits, family reunification, and consequences of job loss, offering a detailed perspective on the extent to which migrants are integrated into national welfare systems. ImmigSR distinguishes between different migrant groups, such as asylum seekers, refugees, temporary workers, and long-term residents, capturing variations in entitlements and restrictions. The dataset is built using publicly available laws, policies, and regulations, ensuring transparency and comparability across countries and time. It draws on contributions from independent researchers and migration policy experts, with rigorous peer review processes to maintain consistency. By offering a structured approach to measuring migrant access to social policies, ImmigSR enables researchers and policymakers to analyze trends, disparities, and the broader implications of welfare inclusion for migrant integration. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.socialpolicydynamics.de/projekte/projektbereich-b-transregionale-entwicklungsdynamiken/teilprojekt-b04-2022-25-/immigsr/download-immigsr-data`

Dataset citation:
References to the data should be made as:
Römer, F., Harris, E., Henninger, J., Missler, F. (2021). The Immigrant Social Rights Data Set (ImmigSR). Version 2023. SFB 1342. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

References to the codebook should be made as:
Römer, F., Harris, E., Henninger, J., Missler, F. (2021). The Migrant Social Protection Data Set (MigSP). Technical report (SFB 1342 Technical Paper Series). Version 2022. SFB 1342.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.socialpolicydynamics.de/f/fcedb0990c.pdf`

License: The data is publicly accessible for research and academic use and should be appropriately cited in related publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.socialpolicydynamics.de/projekte/projektbereich-b-transregionale-entwicklungsdynamiken/teilprojekt-b04-2022-25-/immigsr/download-immigsr-data`

2.5.1 Preventative Measures Welfare Burden

Variables in this section relate to preventative measures and welfare burden.

2.5.1.1 Income Criterion for Family Reunification for Citizens (a4xcit)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_a4xcit

Original tag: a4xcit

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980-2018, were sponsors who were citizens required to have a specific income per month or fulfil an income criterion?
VALUES: 0 =No family reunification 0.4 = Unspecified funds or assistance 0.5 = Income higher than minimum wage 0.6 = Income equal to minimum wage 0.7 = Income higher than social assistance 0.8 = Income equal to social assistance 0.9 = Specific Funds 1 = No Requirements
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.2 Income Criterion for Family Reunification for Third-country National (a4xtcn)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_a4xtcn

Original tag: a4xtcn

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980-2018, were sponsors who were third-country nationals required to have a specific income per month or fulfil an income criterion?
VALUES: 0 =No family reunification 0.4 = Unspecified funds or assistance 0.5 = Income higher than minimum wage 0.6 = Income equal to minimum wage 0.7 = Income higher than social assistance 0.8 = Income equal to social assistance 0.9 = Specific Funds 1 = No Requirements
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.3 Consequences of Loss of Employment First Permanent Residency Entry (b12_perm_1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_perm_1

Original tag: b12_perm_1

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (First permanent entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.4 Consequences of Loss of Employment Second Permanent Residency Entry (b12_perm_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_perm_2

Original tag: b12_perm_2

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Second permanent entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.5 Consequences of Loss of Employment First Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_1

Original tag: b12_temp_1

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (First temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.6 Consequences of Loss of Employment Second Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_2

Original tag: b12_temp_2

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Second temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.7 Consequences of Loss of Employment Third Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_3)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_3

Original tag: b12_temp_3

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Third temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.8 Consequences of Loss of Employment Fourth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_4)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_4

Original tag: b12_temp_4

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Fourth

temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.9 Consequences of Loss of Employment Fifth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_5)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_5

Original tag: b12_temp_5

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Fifth temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.10 Consequences of Loss of Employment Sixth Temporary Residency Entry (b12_temp_6)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_temp_6

Original tag: b12_temp_6

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (Sixth temporary entry route)
VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.11 Consequences of Loss of Employment EUblue Residency Entry (b12_eublue)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12_eublue

Original tag: b12_eublue

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Experts were asked to specify this question for up to six different entry routes for migrant workers of their own choice. Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (EU Blue Card schemes) VALUES: 0 = Immediate withdrawal (expulsion) 0.5 = After some time | non-renewal 1 = No consequences
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.12 Preventative measures Family Reunification (a4x)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_a4x

Original tag: a4x

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Citizens or third-country nationals are often asked to fulfil either income and/or funds criteria to prevent family migrants from posing a welfare burden. This index measures income criterions for Family Reunification for Third-country Nationals and Citizens.
VALUES: 0 (least rights) - 1 (most rights)
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.13 Consequences of Loss of Employment mean (b12mean)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_b12mean

Original tag: b12mean

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980-2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit? (mean)
VALUES: 0 (least rights) - 1 (most rights)
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.1.14 Preventative measures (prevmeas)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_prevmeas

Original tag: prevmeas

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Citizens or third-country nationals are often asked to fulfil either income and/or funds criteria to prevent family migrants from posing a welfare burden. This measure includes family reunification requirements and consequences of job loss. VALUES: 0 (least rights) - 1 (most rights)
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.2 Access Welfare Benefits

Variables in this section relate to immigrants' access to welfare benefits.

2.5.2.1 Unemployment insurance benefits for permanent migrant workers (f61b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_f61b

Original tag: f61b

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980-2018, did permanent migrant workers have a legal claim to contribution-based unemployment insurance benefits?
VALUES: 0 = No access to contributory benefits OR no permanent labour migration 0.5 = Longer contribution period/ additional requirements 1 = Same contribution period as citizens
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.2.2 Unemployment insurance benefits for temporary migrant workers (f61c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_f61c

Original tag: f61c

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980-2018, did temporary migrant workers have a legal claim to contribution-based unemployment insurance benefits?
VALUES: 0 = No access to contributory benefits OR no permanent labour migration 0.5 = Longer contribution period/ additional requirements 1 = Same contribution period as citizens
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if

benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.2.3 Length of unemployment insurance benefits for permanent migrant workers (f62b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_f62b

Original tag: f62b

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980 – 2018, please indicate for how long permanent migrant workers received unemployment insurance benefits before they were downgraded to unemployment assistance benefits or social assistance benefits.
VALUES: 0 = No access to unemployment benefits 0.5 = Same duration but worse downgrade | Shorter duration 1 = Same as citizens
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.5.2.4 Length of unemployment insurance benefits for temporary migrant workers (f62c)

Long tag: complab_migpol_immigsr_f62c

Original tag: f62c

Dataset citation: Römer et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1521, Percent: 8.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1430, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 91 Percent: 5.98

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Question: For the years 1980 – 2018, please indicate for how long temporary migrant workers received unemployment insurance benefits before they were downgraded to unemployment assistance benefits or social assistance benefits.
VALUES: 0 = No access to unemployment benefits 0.5 = Same duration but worse downgrade | Shorter duration 1 = Same as citizens
MISSINGS: . = regular missing .d = don't know .c = former communist countries .b = if benefit did not exist for all, including citizens .m = type of immigrant did not exist .x = neither benefit nor type of immigrant exist
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_2024

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMPIC Project offers sophisticated quantitative indices to assess immigration policies across time, countries, and policy fields, focusing on 33 OECD countries from 1980 to 2018. The current IMPIC datasets (version 2) cover immigration policies, which encompass government intentions and actions concerning the selection, admission, settlement, and deportation of foreign citizens within a country. IMPIC is structured by entry categories or "tracks" covering four immigration policy fields: labour migration (economic), family reunification (social), asylum/refugees (humanitarian), and co-ethnics (cultural). The dataset specifically covers legal regulations, excluding implementation details. The data is further disaggregated into two dimensions. The first dimension looks at states' regulations, or binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights for immigration, and also controls, or mechanisms that monitor whether immigration policies are followed. The group of control mechanisms includes various aspects relating to irregular migration such as requirements for airlines to control visa or sanctions for employing irregular migrants. The second dimension looks at states' regulations and controls for immigration not only at their borders (external regulations and controls), but also within their territories (internal regulations and controls). As a last differentiation, the IMPIC dataset disaggregates external and internal regulations into four sub-dimensions related to immigrant eligibility requirements, conditions, security of status and rights. The IMPIC 2024 dataset consists of the aggregated scores of all tracks covered separately in the IMPIC RawData. More information is available on the project's website: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`.

Dataset citation: Helbling, Marc and Bjerre, Liv and Römer, Friederike and Zobel, Malisa (2017) "Measuring Immigration Policies: The IMPIC Database" European Political Science 16(1), pp. 79-98. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMPIC project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`

2.6.1 Regulations Field A (Family reunification)

The Regulations Field A section of the IMPIC_2016 dataset contains questions on the regulations with regards to family reunification. Regulations are defined as binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights.

2.6.1.1 (Self)employment - Aggregated (avgs_a10)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_a10

Original tag: impic_AvgS_a10

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1213, Percent: 6.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1171, Percent: 3.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 42 Percent: 3.46

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 - 2018, did the sponsored spouse have the right to undertake paid work and/or become self-employed? VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive) MISSINGS: Empty Cell COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.2 Regulations Field B (Labour)

The Regulations Field B section of the IMPIC_2016 dataset contains questions on the regulations with regards to labour. Regulations are defined as binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights.

2.6.2.1 Quotas labor - Aggregated (avgs_b02)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_b02

Original tag: impic_AvgS_b02

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1272, Percent: 7.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1210, Percent: 3.99

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 4.87

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 - 2018, were there quotas (numerical limits) on the number of migrant workers admitted? The score is based on the quotient being the quota divided by the population size of the respective country (relquota). The information on whom the quota applied to does not enter in the score. If you are however interested in this information you can still find it in the R_b02_b variable.
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.2.2 Financial self-sustainability - Aggregated (avgs_b04)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_b04

Original tag: impic_AvgS_b04

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1146, Percent: 6.56

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1084, Percent: 3.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 5.41

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2018, did migrant workers need to prove the ability to support themselves? Such a proof might concern the fact that a specific income per month or a certain amount of financial funds is required. Variable S_b04 represents the average of S_b04_a and S_b04_b. Since the requirements for income and financial funds are considered equally restrictive, the average is not weighted. Consequently, S_b04 does not follow the step 0 to 0.5 but contains intermediate steps. Income and financial funds are in constant 2010 USD (PPP) rounded to the next whole number.
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.2.3 Specific income per month - Aggregated (avgs_b04_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_b04_a

Original tag: impic_AvgS_b04_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1234, Percent: 7.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1172, Percent: 3.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 5.02

Description:
DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2018, did migrant workers need to prove the ability to support themselves? Specific income per month. Income and financial funds are in constant 2010 USD (PPP) rounded to the next whole number.
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.2.4 Labor market test - Aggregated (avgs_b09_2)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_b09_2

Original tag: impic_AvgS_b09_2

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1271, Percent: 7.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1209, Percent: 3.99

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 4.88

Description:
DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2018, did your country use a labor market test (i.e. job applications are tested against the available pool of eligible workers for the job opening to make sure no settled worker could do the job)?
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.2.5 Loss of employment - Aggregated (avgs_b12)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_b12

Original tag: impic_AvgS_b12

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1210, Percent: 6.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1148, Percent: 3.78

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 5.12

Description:
DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2018, did loss of employment result in the withdrawal of a migrant worker's residence permit?
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.3 Regulations Field C (Asylum)

The Regulations Field C section of the IMPIC_2016 dataset contains questions on the regulations with regards to asylum seekers. Regulations are defined as binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights.

2.6.3.1 (Self)employment - Aggregated (avgs_c12)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_c12

Original tag: impic_AvgS_c12

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1279, Percent: 7.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1217, Percent: 4.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 4.85

Description:

DESCRIPTION: In the years 1980 - 2018, did asylum seekers have the right to undertake paid work and/or become self-employed? If yes, was there a waiting time from the time of application (e.g. only 6 months after having claimed asylum)? In the years 1980 - 2018, did recognized refugees and persons with subsidiary/humanitarian protection, respectively, have the right to undertake paid work and/or become self-employed? S_c12 is composed of variables S_c12_1 and S_c12_2 (S_c12_1 as track 8 and S_c12_2 as tracks 7 and 9). S_c12_1 and S_c12_2 represent the averages of S_c12_1_a and S_c12_1_b, and S_c12_2_a and S_c12_2_b respectively. Consequently, S_c12 does not follow the step 0 to 0.5 but contains intermediate steps.
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.4 Regulations Field D (Co-Ethnics)

The Regulations Field D section of the IMPIC_2016 dataset contains questions on the regulations with regards to co-ethnics. Regulations are defined as binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights.

2.6.4.1 Employment program - Aggregated (avgs_d11)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_d11

Original tag: impic_AvgS_d11

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 834, Percent: 4.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 772, Percent: 2.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 7.43

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 - 2018 were there employment programs for Co-ethnics, (i.e. special programs that were designed to help Co-ethnics integrate into the labor market)?
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.4.2 Integration measures - Aggregated (avgs_d12)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_avgs_d12

Original tag: impic_AvgS_d12

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 793, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 731, Percent: 2.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 7.82

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 - 2018 were there any other integration measures tailored especially for Co-ethnics, (e.g. language classes, help in finding accommodation, additional financial support, tax exemptions)? Integration measures are counted within the following five categories: language classes, help finding accommodation, financial support, help on the labor market and others.
VALUES: 0 (open) - 1 (restrictive)
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.6.5 Data Source

Data Sources

2.6.5.1 Expert (expert)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_expert

Original tag: impic_expert

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1279, Percent: 7.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1217, Percent: 4.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 4.85

Description:

DESCRIPTION: The expert variable indicates whether or not we collaborated with a new expert for the 2011-18 dataset update.
VALUES:
0 = same expert
1 = new expert
MISSINGS: Empty Cell
COVERAGE: 1980-2018

2.7 COMPLAB MIGPOL IMPIC Political Rights

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The IMPIC Project offers sophisticated quantitative indices to assess immigration policies across time, countries, and policy fields, focusing on 33 OECD countries from 1980 to 2010. The current IMPIC datasets (version 1) cover immigration policies, which encompass government intentions and actions concerning the selection, admission, settlement, and deportation of foreign citizens within a country. IMPIC includes four immigration policy fields related to why states accept immigrants: labour migration (economic), family reunification (social), asylum/refugees (humanitarian), and co-ethnics (cultural). The dataset specifically covers legal regulations, excluding implementation details. The data is further disaggregated into two dimensions. The first dimension looks at states' regulations, or binding legal provisions that create or constrain rights for immigration, and also controls, or mechanisms that monitor whether immigration policies are followed (Schmid and Helbling 2016). The group of control mechanisms includes various aspects relating to irregular migration such as requirements for airlines to control visa or sanctions for employing irregular migrants. The second dimension looks at states' regulations and controls for immigration not only at their borders (external regulations and controls), but also within their territories (internal regulations and controls). As a last differentiation, the IMPIC dataset disaggregates external and internal regulations into four sub-dimensions related to immigrant eligibility requirements, conditions, security of status and rights. The Political Rights dataset specifically covers political rights of immigrants across different tracks.

Dataset citation: Helbling, Marc and Bjerre, Liv and Römer, Friederike and Zobel, Malisa (2017) "Measuring Immigration Policies: The IMPIC Database" European Political Science 16(1), pp. 79-98. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the IMPIC project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `http://www.impic-project.eu/data/`

2.7.1 Identifiers

Combinations of variables in this section uniquely identify rows in the dataset.

2.7.1.1 track (track)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_track

Original tag: impic_track

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1085, Percent: 6.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1000, Percent: 3.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 85 Percent: 7.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Since the unit of analysis in the questionnaire are entry routes (which can be understood in most cases as different visa and residence categories), there is a track variable indicating the type of entry route. Using the variable cntry, year and track uniquely identifies each observation. Within the dataset the following tracks can be found.
VALUES:
1 = Citizen (Family)
2 = TCN (Family)
3 = (1-6) Low-skilled labor (Number of track)
4 = (1-6) High-skilled labor (Number of track)
5 = (1-6) Self-employed labor (Number of track)
6 = (1-6) Unspecified labor (Number of track)
7 = Recognized Refugee
8 = Asylum seeker
9 = Subsidiary/Humanitarian protection
10 = Co-Ethnics 1
11 = Co-Ethnics 2
12 = Co-Ethnics 3
13 = Co-Ethnics 4
14 = Citizen (Control)
15 = Immigrant (Control)
16 = Nation as a whole (Political rights)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1980-2010
NOTE:
For instance, if a country has four entry routes for unskilled labor, they have the track numbers 31, 32, 33 and 34.

2.7.2 Political Rights

The Political Rights section of the IMPIC_Political_Rights dataset contain questions which measure the political rights of immigrants.

2.7.2.1 Voting rights, national election - Discriminatory right (r_f01_b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_r_f01_b

Original tag: impic_r_f01_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1085, Percent: 6.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1000, Percent: 3.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 85 Percent: 7.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in national elections, and if yes, was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
-2 = No
-95 = Yes, unspecified
; = Yes, specified
MISSINGS:
-9 = DK
-8 = NA
COVERAGE:
1980-2010

2.7.2.2 Voting rights, regional election - Universal right (r_f02_a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_r_f02_a

Original tag: impic_r_f02_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1054, Percent: 6.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 982, Percent: 3.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 72 Percent: 6.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in regional elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
-2 = No
-95 = Yes, unspecified
; = Yes, specified
MISSINGS:
-9 = DK
-8 = NA
COVERAGE:
1980-2010

2.7.2.3 Voting rights, regional election - Discriminatory right (r_f02_b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_r_f02_b

Original tag: impic_r_f02_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1054, Percent: 6.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 982, Percent: 3.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 72 Percent: 6.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in regional elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
-2 = No
-95 = Yes, unspecified
; = Yes, specified
MISSINGS:
-9 = DK
-8 = NA
COVERAGE:
1980-2010

2.7.2.4 Voting rights, local election - Universal right (r__f03__a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_r_f03_a

Original tag: impic_r_f03_a

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1085, Percent: 6.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1000, Percent: 3.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 85 Percent: 7.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in local elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
-2 = No
-95 = Yes, unspecified
; = Yes, specified
MISSINGS:
-9 = DK
-8 = NA
COVERAGE:
1980-2010

2.7.2.5 Voting rights, local election - Discriminatory right (r__f03__b)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_r_f03_b

Original tag: impic_r_f03_b

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1085, Percent: 6.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1000, Percent: 3.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 85 Percent: 7.83

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in local elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
-2 = No

-95 = Yes, unspecified
; = Yes, specified
MISSINGS:
-9 = DK
-8 = NA
COVERAGE:
1980-2010

2.7.2.6 Voting rights, national election - Scored (s_f01)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_s_f01

Original tag: impic_s_f01

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1012, Percent: 5.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 937, Percent: 3.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75 Percent: 7.41

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in national elections, and if yes, was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
0 = Yes, universal right
0.5 = Yes, discriminatory right
1 = No right
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1980-2010
NOTE:
The information on the required residence is not scored, but is available in the raw variables R_f01_a and R_f01_b.

2.7.2.7 Voting rights, regional election - Scored (s_f02)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_s_f02

Original tag: impic_s_f02

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 708, Percent: 4.05

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 646, Percent: 2.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 62 Percent: 8.76

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in regional elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
0 = Yes, universal right
0.5 = Yes, discriminatory right
1 = No right

MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:

1980-2010
NOTE:
The information on the required residence is not scored, but is available in the raw variables R_f02_a and R_f02_b.

2.7.2.8 Voting rights, local election - Scored (s_f03)

Long tag: complab_migpol_impic_pr_s_f03

Original tag: impic_s_f03

Dataset citation: Helbling et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1045, Percent: 5.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 970, Percent: 3.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75 Percent: 7.18

Description:

DESCRIPTION: For the years 1980 – 2010, did non-citizens have the right to vote in local elections, and if applicable was this right universal (i.e. applying to all foreign residents) or discriminatory (i.e. only applying to specific groups such as EU or Commonwealth citizens)? Please also indicate how many years of residence were required in order to qualify?
VALUES:
0 = Yes, universal right
0.5 = Yes, discriminatory right
1 = No right
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
1980-2010
NOTE:
The information on the required residence is not scored, but is available in the raw variables R_f03_a and R_f03_b.

2.8 COMPLAB MIGPOL MIPEX

Dataset tag: complab_migpol_mipex

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a comprehensive tool used to evaluate, compare, and enhance integration policies in 31 countries across Europe and North America. It employs 148 policy indicators across 7 policy areas (labour market mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination) to offer a multifaceted view of migrants' societal participation opportunities while assessing government commitment to integration. MIPEX helps determine whether all residents are afforded equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities. The project is conducted by the British Council, the Migration Policy Group in Brussels and the Center for International Affairs in Barcelona with the involvement of 37 national-level organizations, including think-tanks, non-governmental organisations, foundations, universities, research institutes and equality bodies. Unlike indexes relying on expert opinions, MIPEX is based on public laws, policies, and research. It utilizes data from independent scholars and practitioners in migration law, education, and anti-discrimination who assess each indicator based on publicly available documents. These scores are peer-reviewed and moderated for consistency across countries and time, with national experts contributing insights into policy changes and their rationales.

Dataset citation: Solano, Giacomo and Huddelston, Thomas (2020) "Migrant Integration Policy Index". Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Link to original codebook
`https://migpol.org/data/`

License: The data can be used without restrictions as long as that the MIPEX project is cited accordingly in corresponding publications.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.mipex.eu/`

2.8.1 Labour Market Mobility

The Labour Market Mobility section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: Do immigrants have equal rights and opportunities to access jobs and improve their skills?

2.8.1.1 Labour market mobility (a)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_a

Original tag: mipex_a

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Average of the strand
VALUES:
0 (lowest) - 100 (highest)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.2 Immediate access to labour market (aa1)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_aa1

Original tag: mipex_aa1

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Immediate access to labour market:
What categories of foreign residents have equal access to employment as nationals?
a. Permanent residents
b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal) within period of 1 year
c. Residents on family reunion permits (same as sponsor)
VALUES:
100 - All of them
50 - A and (C or certain categories of B)

0 - Only A or none
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.3 Access to public sector (aa3)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_aa3

Original tag: mipex_aa3

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access to public sector (activities serving the needs of the public. Not restricted to certain types of employment or private or public law):
Are foreign residents able to accept any public-sector employment under equal conditions as nationals? (excluding exercise of public authority e.g. police, defence, heads of units/divisions but not excluding civil servants and permanent staff)
VALUES:
100 - Yes. There are no additional restrictions than those based on type of permit mentioned in 1
50 - Other limiting conditions that apply to foreign residents, e.g.
0 - Certain sectors and activities solely for nationals (please specify)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.4 Access to self employment (aa5)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_aa5

Original tag: mipex_aa5

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access to self-employment
VALUES:
100 - Yes. There are no additional restrictions than those based on type of permit mentioned in 1
50 - Other limiting conditions that apply to foreign residents, e.g. linguistic testing (please specify)
0 - Certain sectors and activities solely for nationals (please specify)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.5 Public employment services (ab6)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ab6

Original tag: mipex_ab6

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Are foreign residents able to take up self-employed activity under equal conditions as nationals?
VALUES:
100 - All of them
50 - A and (C or certain categories of B)
0 - Only A or none
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.6 Economic integration measures of youth and women (ac14)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ac14

Original tag: mipex_ac14

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Targeted measures to further the integration of TCNs into the labour market
a. National programmes to address labour market situation of migrant youth
b. National programmes to address labour market situation of migrant women
VALUES:
100 - Both (please specify content)
50 -One of these (please specify content)
0 - Only ad hoc (mainly through projects implemented by NGOs)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.1.7 Access to social security and assistance (ad18)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ad18

Original tag: mipex_ad18

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: What categories of TCNs have equal access to social security? (unemployment benefits, old age pension, invalidity benefits, maternity leave, family benefits, social assistance)
a. Long-term residents
b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal)

c. Residents on family reunion permits (same as sponsor)
VALUES:
100 - All of them
50 - A and (C or certain categories of B)
0 - Only A or none
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.2 Family Reunification

The Family Reunification section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: How easily can immigrants reunite with family?

2.8.2.1 Dependent relatives (ba26ba27)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ba26ba27

Original tag: mipex_ba26ba27

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Eligibility for dependent relatives:
a) parents/grandparents
b) adult children
VALUES:
100 - Allowed for both a) and b)
75 - Allowed for either a) or b)
50 - Restrictive definition of dependency (e.g. only one ground e.g. poor health or income or no access to social benefits) for both a) and b)
25 - Restrictive definition of dependency (e.g. only one ground e.g. poor health or income or no access to social benefits) for either a) or b)
0 - Not allowed or by discretion/exception for both a) and b)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.2.2 Economic resources (bb31)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_bb31

Original tag: mipex_bb31

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Economic resources requirement
VALUES:
100 - None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded (please specify)
50 - Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded

0 - Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.2.3 Grounds for rejection, withdrawal, refusal (bc35)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_bc35

Original tag: mipex_bc35

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Grounds for rejecting, withdrawing or refusing to renew status:
a. Actual and serious threat to public policy or national security,
b. Proven fraud in the acquisition of permit (inexistent relationship or misleading information).
c. Break-up of family relationship (before three years)
d. Original conditions are no longer satisfied (e.g. unemployment or economic resources)
VALUES:
100 - No other than b
50 - Grounds include a,b,c
0 - Includes others like d (please specify)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.3 Education

The Education section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: Are education systems responsive to the needs of immigrant children?

2.8.3.1 Teacher training to reflect diversity (cd64)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_cd64

Original tag: mipex_cd64

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 608, Percent: 3.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 593, Percent: 1.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 2.47

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Teacher training and professional development programmes require intercultural education and the appreciation of cultural diversity for all teachers:
a. Topic required in pre-service training in order to qualify as a teacher

b. Topic required in obligatory in-service professional development training.
VALUES:
100 - A or B required
50- A or B offered extensively to teachers
0 - A or B only ad hoc / project basis
MISSINGS:
Empty cell

COVERAGE:
2010-2019

2.8.4 Permanent Residence

The Permanent Residence section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: How easily can immigrants become permanent residents?

2.8.4.1 Economic resources (eb85)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_eb85

Original tag: mipex_eb85

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Economic resources requirement
VALUES:
100 - None or at/below level of social assistance and no income source is excluded (please specify)
50 - Higher than social assistance and no income source is excluded
0 - Income source linked to employment or no use of social assistance
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.4.2 Accesso to social security and assistance (ed96)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_ed96

Original tag: mipex_ed96

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Access to social security (unemployment benefits, old age pension, invalidity benefits, maternity leave, family benefits, social assistance)
VALUES:
100 - Equal access with nationals
50 - Priority to nationals
0 - Other limiting conditions apply
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.5 Acquisition of Citizenship

The Acquisition of Citizenship section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: How easily can immigrants become citizens?

2.8.5.1 Economic resources (fb106)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_fb106

Original tag: mipex_fb106

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Economic resources requirement
VALUES:
100 - None
50 - Minimum income (e.g. acknowledged level of poverty threshold)/no income source is excluded
0 - Additional requirements (e.g. employment, stable and sufficient resources, higher levels of income)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.6 Antidiscrimination

The Antidiscrimination section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: Is everyone effectively protected from racial/ethnic, religious, and nationality discrimination in all areas of life?

2.8.6.1 Fields of applications (gb)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_gb

Original tag: mipex_gb

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:

DESCRIPTION: Average of gb123-gb126, measuring whether the law covers employment in different fields of application.
VALUES:
0 (lowest) - 100 (highest)
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.6.2 Employment and vocational training (gb123)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_gb123

Original tag: mipex_gb123

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 689, Percent: 3.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 671, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 2.61

Description:
DESCRIPTION: Law covers employment and vocational training:
a) race and ethnicity
b) religion and belief
c) nationality
VALUES:
100 - All three grounds
50 - Two grounds
0 - Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2007-2019

2.8.7 Health

The Health section of the MIPEX dataset contain variables which try to answer the following question: Is the health system responsive to immigrants needs?

2.8.7.1 Administrative discretion and documentation for legal migrants (h148)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_h148

Original tag: mipex_h148

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 1.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 262, Percent: 0.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 2.6

Description:
DESCRIPTION: A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce
B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome.

examples of A: proof of low income on the basis of tax returns
identity documents available only from the police
proof of address from local authority records.

Example of B: Decision made for example by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as 'urgency', financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc.
VALUES:
100 - Neither
50 - A or B (please specify)
0 - A and B
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2014
2019

2.8.7.2 Administrative discretion and documentation for asylum-seekers (h149)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_h149

Original tag: mipex_h149

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 1.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 262, Percent: 0.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 2.6

Description:

DESCRIPTION: A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce
B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome.

examples of A: proof of low income on the basis of tax returns
identity documents available only from the police
proof of address from local authority records.

Example of B: Decision made for example by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as 'urgency', financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc.
VALUES:
100 - Neither
50 - A or B (please specify)
0 - A and B
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2014
2019

2.8.7.3 Administrative discretion and documentation for undocumented migrants (h150)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_h150

Original tag: mipex_h150

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 1.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 262, Percent: 0.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 2.6

Description:

DESCRIPTION: A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce
B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome.

examples of A: proof of low income on the basis of tax returns
identity documents available only from the police
proof of address from local authority records.

Example of B: Decision made for example by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as 'urgency', financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc.
VALUES:
100 - Neither
50 - A or B (please specify)
0 - A and B
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2014
2019

2.8.7.4 Involvement of migrants in information provision, service design and delivery (h159)

Long tag: complab_migpol_mipex_h159

Original tag: mipex_h159

Dataset citation: Solano & Huddelston (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 1.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 262, Percent: 0.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7 Percent: 2.6

Description:

DESCRIPTION: A. Migrants are involved in service delivery (e.g. through the employment of 'cultural mediators')
B. Migrants are involved in the development and dissemination of information
C. Migrants are involved in research (not only as respondents)
D. Migrant patients or ex-patients are involved in the evaluation, planning and running of services.
E. Migrants in the community are involved in the design of services.
Mention only forms of migrant involvement that are explicitly encouraged by policy measures (at any level)
VALUES:
100 - 3-5 of these (please specify)
50 - 1-2 of these (please specify)
0 - None of these
MISSINGS:
Empty cell
COVERAGE:
2014
2019

2.9 COMPLAB SPIN The Child Benefit Dataset (CBD)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_cbd

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Child Benefit Dataset (CBD) covers various forms of child benefit programs, including universal and employment related child benefits, income-related child allowances, child tax rebates on social security contributions, child tax allowances and child tax credits for 18 countries 1960-2015. Focus is on the level of benefits, expressed in absolute amounts and as percentages of average wages.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb93850/1773749330906/CBD_2023-06_codebook.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data`

2.9.1 Child Benefits

This section includes variables measuring benefits related to child care such as child tax credits, among others.

2.9.1.1 Net apw family (netapwfa)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_netapwfa

Original tag: netapwfa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

> After tax income (earnings plus child benefits less taxes and social security contributions) of a model family earning an average production worker's Wage.

2.9.1.2 Rr Employment-based child benefit (apw) (rr_cb_eb_apw)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_rr_cb_eb_apw

Original tag: rr_cb_eb_apw

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

> Net replacement rate of employment-based child benefits for a model family earning an average production worker's wage.

2.9.1.3 Rr Income-tested child benefit (apw) (rr_cb_it_apw)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_rr_cb_it_apw

Original tag: rr_cb_it_apw

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

> Net replacement rate of income-tested child benefits for a model family earning an average production worker's wage.

2.9.1.4 Net 0.5apw family (netapwfa_z)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_netapwfa_z

Original tag: netapwfa_z

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

After tax income (earnings plus child benefits less taxes and social security contributions) of a model family earning half an average production worker's wage.

2.9.1.5 Rr Employment-based child benefit (0.5apw) (rr_cb_eb_z)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_rr_cb_eb_z

Original tag: rr_cb_eb_z

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

Net replacement rate of employment-based child benefits for a model family earning half an average production worker's wage.

2.9.1.6 Rr Income-tested child benefit (0.5apw) (rr_cb_it_z)

Long tag: complab_spin_cbd_rr_cb_it_z

Original tag: rr_cb_it_z

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 318, Percent: 1.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4 Percent: 1.24

Description:

Net replacement rate of income-tested child benefits for a model family earning half an average production worker's wage.

2.10 COMPLAB SPIN The Housing Benefit Dataset (HBEN)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_hben

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns
country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year.

An additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier.

Please note that we renamed the original country variables to synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore.

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If

necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare 29(3), 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb93860/1773749874718/HBEN_2023-04_codebook.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data`

2.10.1 Housing Benefits

This section includes 120 different variables reflecting the levels and concentration of housing benefits across countries and years.

2.10.1.1 Mean 5-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average

wage

2.10.1.2 Mean 50-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.3 Mean 50-150 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels

f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.4 Mean 5-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.5 Mean 50-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person

co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.6 Mean 50-150 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.7 Concentration 5-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 506, Percent: 2.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 486, Percent: 1.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 3.95

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.8 Concentration 50-200 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 377, Percent: 2.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 357, Percent: 1.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.31

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.9 Concentration 50-150 Couple Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_co_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_co_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 377, Percent: 2.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 357, Percent: 1.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.31

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.10 Concentration 5-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 506, Percent: 2.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 486, Percent: 1.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 3.95

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.11 Concentration 50-200 Couple Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 377, Percent: 2.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 357, Percent: 1.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.31

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.12 Concentration 50-150 Couple Net Income Esimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_co_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_co_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 377, Percent: 2.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 357, Percent: 1.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.31

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average

wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.13 Mean 5-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.14 Mean 50-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children

fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.15 Mean 50-150 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.16 Mean 5-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.17 Mean 50-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.18 Mean 50-150 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.19 Concentration 5-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 504, Percent: 2.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 484, Percent: 1.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 3.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.20 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 2.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 437, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 3.96

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.21 Concentration 50-150 Family Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 2.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 437, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 3.96

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage

50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.22 Concentration 5-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 504, Percent: 2.88

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 484, Percent: 1.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 3.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.23 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 2.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 437, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 3.96

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits

e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.24 Concentration 50-150 Family Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 2.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 437, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 3.96

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.25 Mean 5-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution

si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.26 Mean 50-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.27 Mean 50-150 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.28 Mean 5-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_si_n_e
Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_si_n_e
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97
Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.29 Mean 50-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_si_n_e
Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_si_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.30 Mean 50-150 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_si_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_si_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.31 Concentration 5-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 494, Percent: 2.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 474, Percent: 1.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.05

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.32 Concentration 50-200 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 9.44

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average

wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.33 Concentration 50-150 Single Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_si_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_si_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 9.44

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.34 Concentration 5-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_si_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_si_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 494, Percent: 2.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 474, Percent: 1.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.05

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children

fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.35 Concentration 50-200 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_si_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_si_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 9.44

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.36 Concentration 50-150 Single Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_si_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_si_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 9.44

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.37 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.38 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.39 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.40 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.41 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage

50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.42 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.43 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 492, Percent: 2.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 472, Percent: 1.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.07

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits

e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.44 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 2.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 4.53

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.45 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 2.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 4.53

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution

si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.46 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 492, Percent: 2.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 472, Percent: 1.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.07

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.47 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 2.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 4.53

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.48 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 397, Percent: 2.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379, Percent: 1.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18 Percent: 4.53

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.49 Mean 5-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.50 Mean 50-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.51 Mean 50-150 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.52 Mean 5-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage

50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.53 Mean 50-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.54 Mean 50-150 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children

g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.55 Concentration 5-200 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 2.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 1.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.56 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 387, Percent: 2.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 367, Percent: 1.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.17

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.57 Concentration 50-150 Couple Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_co_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_co_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 387, Percent: 2.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 367, Percent: 1.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.17

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.58 Concentration 5-200 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 2.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 1.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.59 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 387, Percent: 2.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 367, Percent: 1.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.17

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.60 Concentration 50-150 Couple Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_co_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_co_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_co_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 387, Percent: 2.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 367, Percent: 1.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 5.17

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.61 Mean 5-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.62 Mean 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.63 Mean 50-150 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average

wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.64 Mean 5-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.65 Mean 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children

g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.66 Mean 50-150 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.67 Concentration 5-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 2.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 1.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.68 Concentration 50-200 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 458, Percent: 2.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 438, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.37

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.69 Concentration 50-150 Family Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_fa_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 458, Percent: 2.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 438, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.37

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.70 Concentration 5-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 500, Percent: 2.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 480, Percent: 1.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.71 Concentration 50-200 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 458, Percent: 2.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 438, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.37

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.72 Concentration 50-150 Family Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_fa_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 458, Percent: 2.62

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 438, Percent: 1.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.37

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average

wage

2.10.1.73 Mean 5-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_si_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_si_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.74 Mean 50-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_si_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_si_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)

5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.75 Mean 50-150 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_si_g_f
Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_si_g_f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9
Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.76 Mean 5-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_si_n_f
Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_si_n_f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9
Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children

fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.77 Mean 50-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_si_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_si_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.78 Mean 50-150 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_si_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_si_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)

cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.79 Concentration 5-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_si_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_si_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 488, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 468, Percent: 1.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.1

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.80 Concentration 50-200 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_si_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_si_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 202, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 185, Percent: 0.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.42

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.81 Concentration 50-150 Single Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_si_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_si_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 202, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 185, Percent: 0.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.42

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.82 Concentration 5-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_si_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_si_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 488, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 468, Percent: 1.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.1

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.83 Concentration 50-200 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_si_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_si_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 202, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 185, Percent: 0.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.42

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average

wage

2.10.1.84 Concentration 50-150 Single Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_si_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_si_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_si_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 202, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 185, Percent: 0.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.42

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.85 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels

f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.86 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.87 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person

co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.88 Mean 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.89 Mean 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.90 Mean 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.91 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 488, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 468, Percent: 1.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.1

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.92 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 391, Percent: 1.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.87

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.93 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_lp_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 391, Percent: 1.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.87

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.94 Concentration 5-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 488, Percent: 2.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 468, Percent: 1.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.1

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average

wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.95 Concentration 50-200 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 391, Percent: 1.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.87

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.96 Concentration 50-150 Lone Parent Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_lp_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 411, Percent: 2.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 391, Percent: 1.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.87

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children

fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.97 Mean 5-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.98 Mean 50-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.99 Mean 50-150 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.100 Concentration 5-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 475, Percent: 2.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 1.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.21

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.101 Concentration 50-200 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.102 Concentration 50-150 Average Gross Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_g_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_av_g_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_av_g_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.103 Mean 5-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage

50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.104 Mean 50-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.105 Mean 50-150 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 3.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 654, Percent: 2.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.97

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits

e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.106 Concentration 5-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 475, Percent: 2.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 455, Percent: 1.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.21

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.107 Concentration 50-200 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution

si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.108 Concentration 50-150 Average Net Income Estimated Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_n_e)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_av_n_e

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_av_n_e

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.109 Mean 5-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.110 Mean 50-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.111 Mean 50-150 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.112 Concentration 5-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 473, Percent: 2.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 453, Percent: 1.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.23

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.113 Concentration 50-200 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 0.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.59

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.114 Concentration 50-150 Average Gross Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_g_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_av_g_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_av_g_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 0.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.59

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average

wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.115 Mean 5-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_5_200_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_5_200_av_n_f
Original tag: hb_mean_5_200_av_n_f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9
Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.116 Mean 50-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_200_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_200_av_n_f
Original tag: hb_mean_50_200_av_n_f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9
Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children

fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.117 Mean 50-150 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_mean_50_150_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_mean_50_150_av_n_f

Original tag: hb_mean_50_150_av_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 690, Percent: 3.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 670, Percent: 2.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 2.9

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.118 Concentration 5-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_5_200_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_5_200_av_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_5_200_av_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 473, Percent: 2.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 453, Percent: 1.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 4.23

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.119 Concentration 50-200 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_200_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_200_av_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_200_av_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 0.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.59

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.10.1.120 Concentration 50-150 Average Net Income Fixed Rent (hb_cons_50_150_av_n_f)

Long tag: complab_spin_hben_hb_cons_50_150_av_n_f

Original tag: hb_cons_50_150_av_n_f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 198, Percent: 1.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 181, Percent: 0.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 17 Percent: 8.59

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the type of indicator, household type, income range, and so forth. These are the keys to these abbreviations:

mean = Average level (as percentage of wage)
cons = Concentration of housing benefits across the wage distribution
si = Single person
co = Couple
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family with two children
g = Gross income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
n = Net income used as denominator for calculating the rate of benefits
e = Estimated actual rent levels
f = Fixed rent levels (20percent of average wage)
5-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 5 to 200 percent of an average wage
50-150 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 150 percent of an average wage
50-200 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11 COMPLAB SPIN The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_outwb

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Out-of-Work Benefits Dataset (OUTWB) dataset covers various types of out-of-work benefits in a large number of countries. Variables in the dataset are calculated based on information provided by the OECD (Benefit and Wages project), http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/benefits-and-wages.htm.The dataset does not only include net replacement rates across a great number of earnings-levels, but includes also various measures capturing the progressivity of income replacement. Besides unemployment insurance, the various benefits packages in the dataset includes information on unemployment assistance, social assistance, child benefits, fiscal benefits and housing allowances. In the current version, the dataset includes 39 countries covering the years 2001-2022.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb93868/1773750096747/OUTWB_2023-04_codebook.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through

the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data`

2.11.1 Unemployment

This section includes variables measuring unemployment benefits.

2.11.1.1 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr__u__33__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_33_si

Original tag: rr_u_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.2 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr__us__33__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_33_si

Original tag: rr_us_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator

pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.3 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (rr__ush__33__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_33_si

Original tag: rr_ush_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.4 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr__u__33__fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_33_fa

Original tag: rr_u_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.5 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_33_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_33_fa

Original tag: rr_us_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.6 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_33_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_33_fa

Original tag: rr_ush_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.7 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_33_lp

Original tag: rr_u_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage

67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.8 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_33_lp

Original tag: rr_us_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.9 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_33_lp

Original tag: rr_ush_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person

lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.10 Overall net replacement rate unemplomentbenefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr__u__50__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_50_si

Original tag: rr_u_50_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.11 Overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr__us__50__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_50_si

Original tag: rr_us_50_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate

Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.12 Overall net replacement rate unemplomont social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (rr__ush__50__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr__ush__50__si

Original tag: rr__ush__50__si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.13 Overall net replacement rate unemplomont benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr__u__50__fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr__u__50__fa

Original tag: rr__u__50__fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.14 Overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_50_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_50_fa

Original tag: rr_us_50_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.15 Overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_50_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_50_fa

Original tag: rr_ush_50_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.16 Overall net replacement rate unemplomentbenefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_50_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_50_lp

Original tag: rr_u_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.17 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_50_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_50_lp

Original tag: rr_us_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.18 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_50_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_50_lp

Original tag: rr_ush_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family

*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.19 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_u_67_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_67_si

Original tag: rr_u_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.20 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_us_67_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_67_si

Original tag: rr_us_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits

s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.21 Overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (rr_ush_67_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_67_si

Original tag: rr_ush_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.22 Overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_u_67_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_67_fa

Original tag: rr_u_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these

abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.23 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_us_67_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_67_fa

Original tag: rr_us_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.24 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (rr_ush_67_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_67_fa

Original tag: rr_ush_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.25 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_u_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_67_lp

Original tag: rr_u_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.26 Overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_us_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_67_lp

Original tag: rr_us_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.27 Overall net replacement rate unemplomont social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (rr_ush_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_67_lp

Original tag: rr_ush_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage

50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.28 Progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_u_33_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_33_si

Original tag: pg_u_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.29 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_us_33_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_33_si

Original tag: pg_us_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type

si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.30 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage single (pg_ush_33_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_33_si

Original tag: pg_ush_33_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.31 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_u_33_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_33_fa

Original tag: pg_u_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness

rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.32 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_us_33_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_33_fa

Original tag: pg_us_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.33 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage family (pg_ush_33_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_33_fa

Original tag: pg_ush_33_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.34 Progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_33_lp

Original tag: pg_u_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.35 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_33_lp

Original tag: pg_us_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.36 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_ush_33_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_33_lp

Original tag: pg_ush_33_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.37 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg__u__50__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_50_si

Original tag: pg_u_50_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.38 Progressiveness unemploment social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg__us__50__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_50_si

Original tag: pg_us_50_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family

*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.39 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage single (pg_ush_50_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_50_si

Original tag: pg_ush_50_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.40 Progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg_u_50_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_50_fa

Original tag: pg_u_50_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits

s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.41 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg__us__50__fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_50_fa

Original tag: pg_us_50_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.42 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage family (pg__ush__50__fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_50_fa

Original tag: pg_ush_50_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these

abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.43 Progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_50_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_50_lp

Original tag: pg_u_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.44 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_50_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_50_lp

Original tag: pg_us_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.45 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage lone (pg__ush__50__lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_50_lp

Original tag: pg_ush_50_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.46 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg__u__67__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_67_si

Original tag: pg_u_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.47 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg_us_67_si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_67_si

Original tag: pg_us_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage

50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.48 Progressiveness unemploment social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage single (pg__ush__67__si)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_67_si

Original tag: pg_ush_67_si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.49 Progressiveness unemploment benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg__u__67__fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_67_fa

Original tag: pg_u_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type

si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.50 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg_us_67_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_67_fa

Original tag: pg_us_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.51 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage family (pg_ush_67_fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_67_fa

Original tag: pg_ush_67_fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness

rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.52 Progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_u_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_67_lp

Original tag: pg_u_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.53 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_us_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_67_lp

Original tag: pg_us_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.54 Progressiveness unemplomentsocial housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage lone (pg_ush_67_lp)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_67_lp

Original tag: pg_ush_67_lp

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:
Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.55 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentbenefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_33

Original tag: rr_u_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.56 Average progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_33

Original tag: pg_u_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.57 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_33

Original tag: rr_us_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.58 Average progressiveness unemploment social benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_33

Original tag: pg_us_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family

*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.59 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_33

Original tag: rr_ush_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.60 Average progressivenees unemplomentsocial housing benefits 33 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_33)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_33

Original tag: pg_ush_33

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits

s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.61 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_50

Original tag: rr_u_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.62 Average progressiveness unemploment benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_50

Original tag: pg_u_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these

abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.63 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomet social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_50

Original tag: rr_us_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.64 Average progressiveness unemplomet social benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_50

Original tag: pg_us_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.65 Average overall net replacement rate unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_50

Original tag: rr_ush_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.66 Average progressivenees unemploment social housing benefits 50 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_50)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_50

Original tag: pg_ush_50

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.67 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentbenefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_u_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_u_67

Original tag: rr_u_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage

50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.68 Average progressiveness unemplomentbenefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_u_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_u_67

Original tag: pg_u_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.69 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_us_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_us_67

Original tag: rr_us_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type

si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.70 Average progressiveness unemplomentsocial benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_us_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_us_67

Original tag: pg_us_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.71 Average overall net replacement rate unemplomentsocial housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (rr_ush_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_rr_ush_67

Original tag: rr_ush_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness

rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.11.1.72 Average progressivenees unemplomont social housing benefits 67 to 200 of average wage (pg_ush_67)

Long tag: complab_spin_outwb_pg_ush_67

Original tag: pg_ush_67

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 785, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 2.8

Description:

Variables are named using abbreviations that reflect the 3 type of indicator, benefit package, household type and income range to which each variable make reference. A key to these abbreviations is provided here:
Indicator
pg = Progressiveness
rr = Overall net replacement rate
Benefit package
u = Unemployment benefits
s = Social assistance and other minimum income benefits
h = Housing benefits
Household type
si = Single person
lp = Lone parent with two children
fa = Two parent family
*** Variables without abbreviations 'si', 'lp' or 'fa' are averages of the three model family types
Earnings interval
33 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 33 to 200 percent of an average wage
50 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 50 to 200 percent of an average wage
67 = Benefits calculated for model families earning from 67 to 200 percent of an average wage

2.12 COMPLAB SPIN The Parental Leave Benefit Dataset (PLB)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_plb

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Parental Leave Benefit (PLB) dataset is a SPIN data module that provides indicators on parental leave benefits and related family policy programmes. The PLB aims to facilitate systematic, comparative and longitudinal institutional analyses of the causes and consequences of family policy development. The latest update contains information on various types of leave benefits for four different family types in 37 countries between 1950 and 2024.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb9386c/1773750214461/PLB_2026-03_dataset.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data`

2.12.1 Parental Benefits

This section includes variables measuring benefits related to parental leave including maternity/paternity leave, among others.

2.12.1.1 Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks (family C) (pidrpre_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpre_c

Original tag: pidrpre_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.2 Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks (family D) (pidrpre_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpre_d

Original tag: pidrpre_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, maternity, pre-delivery, in weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.3 Duration, daddy days, in weeks (family C) (pidrdd_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdd_c

Original tag: pidrdd_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, daddy days, in weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.4 Duration, daddy days, in weeks (family D) (pidrdd_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdd_d

Original tag: pidrdd_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, daddy days, in weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.5 Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrmatpo_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrmatpo_c

Original tag: pidrmatpo_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.6 Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrmatpo_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrmatpo_d

Original tag: pidrmatpo_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, maternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same

income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.7 Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrpatpo_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpatpo_c

Original tag: pidrpatpo_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.8 Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrpatpo_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpatpo_d

Original tag: pidrpatpo_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, paternity post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.9 Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrdupo_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdupo_c

Original tag: pidrdupo_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.10 Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrdupo_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdupo_d

Original tag: pidrdupo_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, dual post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.11 Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family C) (pidrtopo_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrtopo_c

Original tag: pidrtopo_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.12 Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year (family D) (pidrtopo_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrtopo_d

Original tag: pidrtopo_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, total post-delivery, in weeks, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.13 Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrmatfu_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrmatfu_c

Original tag: pidrmatfu_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.14 Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrmatfu_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrmatfu_d

Original tag: pidrmatfu_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, maternity full post-delivery, all weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.15 Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrpatfu_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpatfu_c

Original tag: pidrpatfu_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.16 Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrpatfu_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrpatfu_d

Original tag: pidrpatfu_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, paternity full post-delivery, all weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.17 Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrdufu_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdufu_c

Original tag: pidrdufu_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 908, Percent: 5.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 883, Percent: 2.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:
Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.18 Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrdufu_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrdufu_d

Original tag: pidrdufu_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 908, Percent: 5.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 883, Percent: 2.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:
Duration, dual full post-delivery, all weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.19 Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks (family C) (pidrtofu_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrtofu_c

Original tag: pidrtofu_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.20 Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks (family D) (pidrtofu_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pidrtofu_d

Original tag: pidrtofu_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Duration, total full post-delivery, all weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.21 Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family C) (pibengwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibengwk_c

Original tag: pibengwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.22 Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family D) (pibengwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibengwk_d

Original tag: pibengwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.23 Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (pibengyr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibengyr_c

Original tag: pibengyr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.24 Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (pibengyr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibengyr_d

Original tag: pibengyr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.25 Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family C) (pibennwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibennwk_c

Original tag: pibennwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.26 Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family D) (pibennwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibennwk_d

Original tag: pibennwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), net, weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.27 Benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (pibennyr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibennyr_c

Original tag: pibennyr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.28 Benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (pibennyr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pibennyr_d

Original tag: pibennyr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.29 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family C) (pigrrwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pigrrwk_c

Original tag: pigrrwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.30 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family D) (pigrrwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pigrrwk_d

Original tag: pigrrwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.31 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family C) (pigrryr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pigrryr_c

Original tag: pigrryr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.32 Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family D) (pigrryr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pigrryr_d

Original tag: pigrryr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.33 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family C) (pinrrwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pinrrwk_c

Original tag: pinrrwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.34 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly (family D) (pinrrwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pinrrwk_d

Original tag: pinrrwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.35 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family C) (pinrryr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pinrryr_c

Original tag: pinrryr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.36 Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year (family D) (pinrryr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_pinrryr_d

Original tag: pinrryr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate, (benefit/APWW), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.37 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross (family C) (mgg_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgg_c

Original tag: mgg_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.38 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross (family D) (mgg_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgg_d

Original tag: mgg_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), gross. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.39 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net (family C) (mgn_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgn_c

Original tag: mgn_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.40 Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net (family D) (mgn_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgn_d

Original tag: mgn_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant benefit (in national currency), net. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.41 Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW) (family C) (mggrr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mggrr_c

Original tag: mggrr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW). Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.42 Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW) (family D) (mggrr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mggrr_d

Original tag: mggrr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant gross replacement rate (gross grant/gross APWW). Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.43 Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW) (family C) (mgnrr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgnrr_c

Original tag: mgnrr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW). Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.44 Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW) (family D) (mgnrr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_mgnrr_d

Original tag: mgnrr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maternity grant net replacement rate (net grant/net APWW). Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.45 Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year (family C) (cldrpo_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_cldrpo_c

Original tag: cldrpo_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.46 Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year (family D) (cldrpo_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_cldrpo_d

Original tag: cldrpo_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave duration, post parental insurance, in weeks, first Year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.47 Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks (family C) (cldrfu_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_cldrfu_c

Original tag: cldrfu_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.48 Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks (family D) (cldrfu_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_cldrfu_d

Original tag: cldrfu_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave duration, post parental, all weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.49 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family C) (clbengwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbengwk_c

Original tag: clbengwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly. Family C: the same leave-use

pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.50 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly (family D) (clbengwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbengwk_d

Original tag: clbengwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.51 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (clbengyr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbengyr_c

Original tag: clbengyr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.52 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (clbengyr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbengyr_d

Original tag: clbengyr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.53 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family C) (clbennwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbennwk_c

Original tag: clbennwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.54 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly (family D) (clbennwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbennwk_d

Original tag: clbennwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.55 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (clbennyr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbennyr_c

Original tag: clbennyr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.56 Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (clbennyr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clbennyr_d

Original tag: clbennyr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.57 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly (family C) (clgrrwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clgrrwk_c

Original tag: clgrrwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.58 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly (family D) (clgrrwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clgrrwk_d

Original tag: clgrrwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.59 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year (family C) (clgrryr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clgrryr_c

Original tag: clgrryr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.60 Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year (family D) (clgrryr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clgrryr_d

Original tag: clgrryr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave gross replacement rate (gross benefit/gross APWW), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.61 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly (family C) (clnrrwk_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clnrrwk_c

Original tag: clnrrwk_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.62 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly (family D) (clnrrwk_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clnrrwk_d

Original tag: clnrrwk_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.63 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year (family C) (clnrryr_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clnrryr_c

Original tag: clnrryr_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.64 Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year (family D) (clnrryr_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_clnrryr_d

Original tag: clnrryr_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Child care leave net replacement rate (net benefit/net APWW), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.65 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks (family C) (tbg26w_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbg26w_c

Original tag: tbg26w_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.66 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks (family D) (tbg26w_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbg26w_d

Original tag: tbg26w_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first 26 weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.67 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family C) (tbg1y_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbg1y_c

Original tag: tbg1y_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.68 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year (family D) (tbg1y_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbg1y_d

Original tag: tbg1y_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), gross, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.69 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years (family C) (tbgry_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbgry_c

Original tag: tbgry_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.70 Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years (family D) (tbgry_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbgry_d

Original tag: tbgry_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), gross, remaining years. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.71 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks (family C) (tbn26w_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbn26w_c

Original tag: tbn26w_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.72 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks (family D) (tbn26w_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbn26w_d

Original tag: tbn26w_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, first 26 weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.73 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family C) (tbn1y_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbn1y_c

Original tag: tbn1y_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.74 Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year (family D) (tbn1y_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbn1y_d

Original tag: tbn1y_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.75 Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years (family C) (tbnry_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbnry_c

Original tag: tbnry_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.76 Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years (family D) (tbnry_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tbnry_d

Original tag: tbnry_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Total benefit (in national currency), net, remaining years. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.77 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family C) (tgrr26w_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrr26w_c

Original tag: tgrr26w_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.78 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family D) (tgrr26w_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrr26w_d

Original tag: tgrr26w_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first 26 weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.79 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year (family C) (tgrr1y_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrr1y_c

Original tag: tgrr1y_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance

and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.80 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year (family D) (tgrr1y_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrr1y_d

Original tag: tgrr1y_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.81 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family C) (tgrrry_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrrry_c

Original tag: tgrrry_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.82 Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family D) (tgrrry_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tgrrry_d

Original tag: tgrrry_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Gross replacement rate (gross benefit/(gross APWW/2)), remaining years weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.83 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family C) (tnrr26w_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrr26w_c

Original tag: tnrr26w_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.84 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks (family D) (tnrr26w_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrr26w_d

Original tag: tnrr26w_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first 26 weeks. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.85 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year (family C) (tnrr1y_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrr1y_c

Original tag: tnrr1y_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.86 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year (family D) (tnrr1y_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrr1y_d

Original tag: tnrr1y_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 910, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 885, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.75

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), first year. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.12.1.87 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family C) (tnrrry_c)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrrry_c

Original tag: tnrrry_c

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly. Family C: the same leave-use pattern as family A, but the parents are assumed to lack work history. Social assistance and related minimum income benefits are not considered.

2.12.1.88 Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly (family D) (tnrrry_d)

Long tag: complab_spin_plb_tnrrry_d

Original tag: tnrrry_d

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Net replacement rate (net benefit/(net APWW/2)), remaining years weekly. Family D: a single parent with the same income level as family types A and B, assumed to use as much paid leave as possible.

2.13 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Assistance and Minimum Income Protection Interim Dataset (SAMIP)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_samip

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier.
Please note that we renamed the original country variables to synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore. In this dataset, observations for Norway and Italy need to be treated with caution. Demscore does not translate cases from the alternative series for those two countries. Please refer to the original refernece document for these cases.

Description: The Social Assistance and Minimum Income Protection Interim dataset (SAMIP) includes detailed information on the benefit position of low-income households in industrialized welfare democracies. In the current version SAMIP includes 34 countries and observations are for every year 1990-2023. The variables in the dataset are based on a type-case approach, where benefit levels have been calculated for three typical households; a single person, a lone parent, and a two parent family.

Please treat the data for Norway and Italy from this dataset with caution, as alternative data series are provided in the orignal dataset. Refer to the original reference document for these cases. In these cases, we have chosen to match to the unadjusted data series, however the alternative data series are available in the original dataset as Norway_adjusted and Italy_adjusted.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb93872/1773750296239/SAMIP_2024-10_codebook.pdf

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data

2.13.1 Minimum Income Protection

This section includes variables measuring minimum income protection.

2.13.1.1 minincpsim (mipsi)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_mipsi
Original tag: MIPsi
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79
Description:
Minimum income protection, single person without children, average monthly amounts

2.13.1.2 minincplpm (miplp)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_miplp
Original tag: MIPlp
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79
Description:
Minimum income protection, lone parent with two children, average monthly amounts

2.13.1.3 minincpfam (mipfa)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_mipfa
Original tag: MIPfa
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79

Description:

Minimum income protection, two parents with two children, average monthly amounts

2.13.1.4 minincpsiy (mipsiy)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_mipsiy

Original tag: MIPsiy

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79

Description:

Minimum income protection, single person without children, yearly amounts

2.13.1.5 minincplpy (miplpy)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_miplpy

Original tag: MIPlpy

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79

Description:

Minimum income protection, lone parent with two children, yearly amounts

2.13.1.6 minincpfay (mipfay)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_mipfay

Original tag: MIPfay

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79

Description:

Minimum income protection, two parents with two children, yearly amounts

2.13.2 Housing Benefits

This section includes variables measuring housing benefits such as housing supplements among others.

2.13.2.1 minincpavy (mipavey)

Long tag: complab_spin_samip_mipavey

Original tag: MIPavey

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1335, Percent: 7.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1231, Percent: 4.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 104 Percent: 7.79

Description:
Minimum income protection, all model families, average, yearly amounts

2.14 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_scip

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we add country_code and country_nr to this dataset to have synchronized country variables across all Complab datasets in Demscore. This is a change to the original dataset that uses a Complab-internal numeric country code.

Description: The Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP) covers institutional structures of core social insurance programs. Detailed information are provided on citizens' rights and duties based on legislation related to five major programs, including old age pensions and benefits in cases of sickness, unemployment and work accidents. SCIP includes 18 affluent countries with uninterrupted political democracy during the postwar period. Information refers to fourteen time points: 1930, 1933, 1939, 1947, 1950, and thereafter every fifth year up to 2005.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.267b79ce19c9877fbb9387f/1773750545307/SCIP_2017-10_codebook.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/divisions/social-policy-indicators-database/data`

2.14.1 Pensions

This section includes variables measuring pensions and retirement benefits.

2.14.1.1 Pension, income ceiling (pinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_pinceil
Original tag: pinceil
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 1.63
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 0.94
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.14.1.2 Pension, financing by other (pfinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_pfinothr

Original tag: pfinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 0.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 144, Percent: 0.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.14.1.3 Pension, maximum gross, single (pbenmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_pbenmaxs

Original tag: pbenmaxs

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 281, Percent: 1.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 281, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Maximum benefit for a single person per year (refers to the income-related benefits above that of an APW wage)

2.14.1.4 Pension, maximum gross, couple (pbemaxco)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_pbemaxco

Original tag: pbemaxco

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 281, Percent: 1.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 281, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Maximum benefit for a married couple where only one spouse have been a wage earner per year (refers to the income-related benefits above that of an APW wage)

2.14.2 Unemployment

This section includes variables measuring unemployment benefits.

2.14.2.1 Unemployment, number of insured (unoinsur)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_unoinsur

Original tag: unoinsur

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Total number of people formally entitled to unemployment insurance benefits (in hundreds of

thousands)

2.14.2.2 Unemployment, labour force coverage rate (ucovratl)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ucovratl

Original tag: ucovratl

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Unemployment insurance coverage ratio as proportion of labour force (UNOINSUR / ULABFORC)

2.14.2.3 Unemployment, employee coverage rate (ucovrate)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ucovrate

Original tag: ucovrate

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Unemployment insurance coverage ratio as proportion of employees (UNOINSUR / EMPLOYES)

2.14.2.4 Unemployment, waiting days (uwaiting)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uwaiting

Original tag: uwaiting

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Number of legislated administrative “waiting days” of unemployment at beginning of unemployment spell when no benefits are paid out

2.14.2.5 Unemployment, duration (uduratio)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uduratio

Original tag: uduratio

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Amount of weeks during which unemployment benefit is payable to single industrial worker with work record as detailed in general information (indefinite duration maximised at 156 weeks, or three years

2.14.2.6 Unemployment, reference period (urefrper)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_urefrper

Original tag: urefrper

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Amount of weeks within which contribution record must have been fulfilled in order to qualify for benefit

2.14.2.7 Unemployment, contribution period (ucontper)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ucontper

Original tag: ucontper

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Amount of weeks of contribution required to qualify for benefit, made in course of reference period

2.14.2.8 Unemployment, income ceiling (uinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uinceil

Original tag: uinceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 1.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 281, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.14.2.9 Unemployment, means-test (umeantst)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_umeantst

Original tag: umeantst

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Dummy variable indicating whether individual and/or household means test is applied to determine male worker's qualification for benefit (1=means test, 0=none)

2.14.2.10 Unemployment, financing by insured (ufininsr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ufininsr

Original tag: ufininsr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from contributions by the individuals insured

2.14.2.11 Unemployment, financing by state (ufinstat)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ufinstat

Original tag: ufinstat

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from state general revenue

2.14.2.12 Unemployment, financing by employer (ufinempr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ufinempr

Original tag: ufinempr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from employer contributions

2.14.2.13 Unemployment, financing by other (ufinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ufinothr

Original tag: ufinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 131, Percent: 0.75

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131, Percent: 0.43

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.14.2.14 Unemployment, first week gross benefit, single APW (ubestw1s)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubestw1s

Original tag: ubestw1s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Standard amount of gross benefit paid to single worker in first week of unemployment spell

2.14.2.15 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, single APW (ubesw26s)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubesw26s

Original tag: ubesw26s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Standard amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week unemployment spell

2.14.2.16 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmins)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenmins

Original tag: ubenmins

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 275, Percent: 1.57

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 275, Percent: 0.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Minimum amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell (as calculated on basis of earnings of worker in lowest insured wage class specified in legislation; or, in some countries, on the basis of legislated minimum absolute levels of daily insurance or assistance benefit)

2.14.2.17 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenfuls)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenfuls

Original tag: ubenfuls

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Full amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.14.2.18 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenmaxs

Original tag: ubenmaxs

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 1.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Maximum amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.14.2.19 Unemployment, first week gross benefit (26w), family APW (ubestw1f)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubestw1f

Original tag: ubestw1f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Standard amount of average weekly gross benefit paid to familied worker in first week of unemployment spell

2.14.2.20 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, family APW (ubesw26f)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubesw26f

Original tag: ubesw26f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Standard amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.14.2.21 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenminf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenminf

Original tag: ubenminf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 276, Percent: 1.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 276, Percent: 0.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Minimum amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on assumptions parallel to those above)

2.14.2.22 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), family (ubenfulf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenfulf

Original tag: ubenfulf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Full amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on

assumptions parallel to those above)

2.14.2.23 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenmaxf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ubenmaxf

Original tag: ubenmaxf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 1.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Maximum amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on assumptions parallel to those above)

2.14.2.24 Unemployment, gross first week RR, single APW (urtstw1s)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_urtstw1s

Original tag: urtstw1s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Standard gross first week replacement rate, single worker (UBESTW1S / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.25 Unemployment, gross 26-week RR, single APW (urtsw26s)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_urtsw26s

Original tag: urtsw26s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Standard gross 26-week replacement rate, single worker (UBESW26S / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.26 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmins)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratmins

Original tag: uratmins

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 271, Percent: 1.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 270, Percent: 0.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.37

Description:

Minimum gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENMINS / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.27 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), single worker (uratfuls)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratfuls

Original tag: uratfuls
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69
Description:
Full gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENFULS / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.28 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratmaxs
Original tag: uratmaxs
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 0.93
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.7
Description:
Maximum gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENMAXS / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.29 Unemployment, standard gross first week RR, family APW (urtstw1f)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_urtstw1f
Original tag: urtstw1f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69
Description:
Standard gross first week replacement rate, familied worker (UBESTW1F / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.30 Unemployment, standard gross 26-week RR, family APW (urtsw26f)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_urtsw26f
Original tag: urtsw26f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69
Description:
Standard gross 26-week replacement rate, familied worker (UBESW26F / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.31 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), family (uratminf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratminf
Original tag: uratminf
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 270, Percent: 1.55
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 0.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.37

Description:

Minimum gross replacement rate, familied worker (UBENMINF / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.32 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), family (uratfulf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratfulf

Original tag: uratfulf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Full gross replacement rate, familied worker (URATMINF / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.33 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), family (uratmaxf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uratmaxf

Original tag: uratmaxf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 282, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.7

Description:

Maximum gross replacement rate, familied worker (URATMAXF / UGAPWEEK)

2.14.2.34 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (unmsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_unmsinet

Original tag: unmsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with unemployment insurance benefits

2.14.2.35 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (unmfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_unmfanet

Original tag: unmfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with unemployment insurance benefits

2.14.2.36 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, single (u1stners)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_u1stners

Original tag: u1stners

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Net single worker replacement rate in first week of unemployment spell: (UBESTW1S / NAPWEKSI) for years and in countries when benefit not taxable, and (UBESTW1S / UGAPWEEK) for years and in countries when benefit taxable

2.14.2.37 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, family (u1stnerf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_u1stnerf

Original tag: u1stnerf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 288, Percent: 1.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.69

Description:

Net familied worker replacement rate in first week of unemployment spell: (UBESTW1F / NAPWEKFA) for years and in countries when benefit not taxable, and (UBESTW1F / UGAPWEEK) for years and in countries when benefit taxable

2.14.2.38 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (uzrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uzrr26si

Original tag: uzrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of unemployment spell, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.14.2.39 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (uzrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uzrr26fa

Original tag: uzrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of unemployment spell, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.14.2.40 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks (uz4ind)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uz4ind

Original tag: uz4ind

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

(u1stners+u1stnerf+uzrr26si+uzrr26fa)/4. Average of four components: a single person and a four-person family, for first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.14.2.41 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, single (uz2inds)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uz2inds

Original tag: uz2inds

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

(u1stners+uzrr26si)/2. Average of two components: a single person, first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.14.2.42 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, family (uz2indf)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_uz2indf

Original tag: uz2indf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

(u1stnerf+uzrr26fa)/2. Average of two components: a four-person family, first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.14.3 Sick Leave

This section includes variables measuring compensation, leave duration, and benefits related to illness.

2.14.3.1 Sickness, income ceiling (sinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_sinceil

Original tag: sinceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 285, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:
Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.14.3.2 Sickness, financing by other (sfinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_sfinothr

Original tag: sfinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 160, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.14.3.3 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (sicsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_sicsinet

Original tag: sicsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:
Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with sickness insurance benefits

2.14.3.4 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (sicfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_sicfanet

Original tag: sicfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:
Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with sickness insurance benefits

2.14.3.5 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (szrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_szrr26si

Original tag: szrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:
Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of sickness benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.14.3.6 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (szrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_szrr26fa

Original tag: szrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of sickness benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.14.4 Worker's Compensation

This section includes variables measuring compensation, leave duration, and benefits related to workplace injury.

2.14.4.1 Accident, income ceiling (ainceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_ainceil

Original tag: ainceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 284, Percent: 1.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.14.4.2 Accident, financing by other (afinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_afinothr

Original tag: afinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 71, Percent: 0.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.41

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.14.4.3 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (accsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_accsinet

Original tag: accsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with work accident insurance

benefits

2.14.4.4 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (accfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_accfanet

Original tag: accfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with work accident insurance benefits

2.14.4.5 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (azrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_azrr26si

Original tag: azrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of work accident benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.14.4.6 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (azrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_scip_azrr26fa

Original tag: azrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 287, Percent: 1.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 286, Percent: 0.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.35

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of work accident benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15 COMPLAB SPIN The Social Insurance Entitlements Dataset (SIED)

Dataset tag: complab_spin_sied

Output Unit: COMPLAB Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_code (ISO 3-letter-code) and year or country_nr (ISO numeric code) and year. If necessary, an additional country column storing the countries' full names is created as a unit identifier. Please note that we synchronize Complab country variable names in Demscore to country_full_name, country_nr and country_id.

Description: The Social Insurance Entitlements Dataset (SIED) builds on the SCIP project, offering an expanded geographical and temporal scope. The latest SIED update covers annual data for 37 countries from 2000 to 2024. The dataset covers the same social insurance programmes as

SCIP and uses the same variable names. Earlier SIED versions cover five-year intervals from 1930 to 2020 and can be accessed upon request. Future updates to SIED will continue to include annual data up to the most recent year and will extend coverage back to the 1960s.

Dataset citation: Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. and O. Sjöberg. 2020. The Social Policy Indicators (SPIN) database. International Journal of Social Welfare. 29 (3). 285-289. `https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12418`. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Link to original codebook
`https://www.su.se/download/18.6856063019d24ef3ecbe35/1782737938646/SSFD%20Documentation%202026_03.pdf`

License: Complab datasets are free to use. Although variables have been carefully extracted, processed and analyzed, no warranty is given that the information supplied is free from error. Researchers involved in the establishment of SPIN shall not be liable for any loss suffered through the use of any of this information. References to data should acknowledge the SPIN research infrastructure (see reference below) and the specific data module.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.spin.su.se/datasets/sied`

2.15.1 Pensions

This section includes variables measuring pensions and retirement benefits.

2.15.1.1 Pension, income ceiling (pinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_pinceil

Original tag: pinceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.15.1.2 Pension, financing by other (pfinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_pfinothr

Original tag: pfinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.15.1.3 Pension, maximum gross, single (pbenmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_pbenmaxs

Original tag: pbenmaxs

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maximum benefit for a single person per year (refers to the income-related benefits above that of an APW wage)

2.15.1.4 Pension, maximum gross, couple (pbemaxco)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_pbemaxco

Original tag: pbemaxco

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 5.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 886, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maximum benefit for a married couple where only one spouse have been a wage earner per year (refers to the income-related benefits above that of an APW wage)

2.15.2 Unemployment

This section includes variables measuring unemployment benefits.

2.15.2.1 Unemployment, number of insured (unoinsur)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_unoinsur

Original tag: unoinsur

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 924, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 899, Percent: 2.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.71

Description:

Total number of people formally entitled to unemployment insurance benefits (in hundreds of thousands)

2.15.2.2 Unemployment, labour force coverage rate (ucovratl)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ucovratl

Original tag: ucovratl

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Unemployment insurance coverage ratio as proportion of labour force (UNOINSUR / ULABFORC)

2.15.2.3 Unemployment, employee coverage rate (ucovrate)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ucovrate

Original tag: ucovrate

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 5.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 891, Percent: 2.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.73

Description:

Unemployment insurance coverage ratio as proportion of employees (UNOINSUR / EMPLOYES)

2.15.2.4 Unemployment, waiting days (uwaiting)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uwaiting

Original tag: uwaiting

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Number of legislated administrative "waiting days" of unemployment at beginning of unemployment spell when no benefits are paid out

2.15.2.5 Unemployment, duration (uduratio)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uduratio

Original tag: uduratio

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Amount of weeks during which unemployment benefit is payable to single industrial worker with work record as detailed in general information (indefinite duration maximised at 156 weeks, or three years

2.15.2.6 Unemployment, reference period (urefrper)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_urefrper

Original tag: urefrper

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Amount of weeks within which contribution record must have been fulfilled in order to qualify for benefit

2.15.2.7 Unemployment, contribution period (ucontper)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ucontper

Original tag: ucontper

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Amount of weeks of contribution required to qualify for benefit, made in course of reference period

2.15.2.8 Unemployment, income ceiling (uinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uinceil

Original tag: uinceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.15.2.9 Unemployment, means-test (umeantst)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_umeantst

Original tag: umeantst

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Dummy variable indicating whether individual and/or household means test is applied to determine male worker's qualification for benefit (1=means test, 0=none)

2.15.2.10 Unemployment, financing by insured (ufininsr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ufininsr

Original tag: ufininsr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from contributions by the individuals insured

2.15.2.11 Unemployment, financing by state (ufinstat)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ufinstat

Original tag: ufinstat

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from state general revenue

2.15.2.12 Unemployment, financing by employer (ufinempr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ufinempr

Original tag: ufinempr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from employer contributions

2.15.2.13 Unemployment, financing by other (ufinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ufinothr

Original tag: ufinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.15.2.14 Unemployment, first week gross benefit, single APW (ubestw1s)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubestw1s

Original tag: ubestw1s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard amount of gross benefit paid to single worker in first week of unemployment spell

2.15.2.15 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, single APW (ubesw26s)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubesw26s

Original tag: ubesw26s

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week unemployment spell

2.15.2.16 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmins)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenmins

Original tag: ubenmins

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Minimum amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell (as calculated on basis of earnings of worker in lowest insured wage class specified in legislation; or, in some countries, on the basis of legislated minimum absolute levels of daily insurance or assistance benefit)

2.15.2.17 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenfuls)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenfuls

Original tag: ubenfuls

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Full amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.15.2.18 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), single worker (ubenmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenmaxs

Original tag: ubenmaxs

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Maximum amount of average weekly gross single worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.15.2.19 Unemployment, first week gross benefit (26w), family APW (ubestw1f)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubestw1f

Original tag: ubestw1f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Standard amount of average weekly gross benefit paid to familied worker in first week of unemployment spell

2.15.2.20 Unemployment, 26 weeks average gross benefit, family APW (ubesw26f)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubesw26f

Original tag: ubesw26f

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Standard amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell

2.15.2.21 Unemployment, weekly minimum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenminf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenminf

Original tag: ubenminf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Minimum amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on assumptions parallel to those above)

2.15.2.22 Unemployment, weekly full gross benefit (26w), family (ubenfulf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenfulf

Original tag: ubenfulf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Full amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on assumptions parallel to those above)

2.15.2.23 Unemployment, weekly maximum gross benefit (26w), family (ubenmaxf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ubenmaxf

Original tag: ubenmaxf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:
Maximum amount of average weekly gross familied worker benefit over 26-week spell (calculated on assumptions parallel to those above)

2.15.2.24 Unemployment, gross first week RR, single APW (urtstw1s)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_urtstw1s
Original tag: urtstw1s
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Standard gross first week replacement rate, single worker (UBESTW1S / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.25 Unemployment, gross 26-week RR, single APW (urtsw26s)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_urtsw26s
Original tag: urtsw26s
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Standard gross 26-week replacement rate, single worker (UBESW26S / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.26 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmins)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratmins
Original tag: uratmins
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Minimum gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENMINS / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.27 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), single worker (uratfuls)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratfuls
Original tag: uratfuls
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Full gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENFULS / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.28 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), single worker (uratmaxs)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratmaxs
Original tag: uratmaxs
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Maximum gross replacement rate, single worker (UBENMAXS / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.29 Unemployment, standard gross first week RR, family APW (urtstw1f)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_urtstw1f
Original tag: urtstw1f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Standard gross first week replacement rate, familied worker (UBESTW1F / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.30 Unemployment, standard gross 26-week RR, family APW (urtsw26f)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_urtsw26f
Original tag: urtsw26f
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Standard gross 26-week replacement rate, familied worker (UBESW26F / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.31 Unemployment, minimum gross RR (26w), family (uratminf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratminf
Original tag: uratminf
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Minimum gross replacement rate, familied worker (UBENMINF / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.32 Unemployment, full gross RR (26w), family (uratfulf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratfulf
Original tag: uratfulf
Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7
Description:
Full gross replacement rate, familied worker (URATMINF / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.33 Unemployment, maximum gross RR (26w), family (uratmaxf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uratmaxf

Original tag: uratmaxf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Maximum gross replacement rate, familied worker (URATMAXF / UGAPWEEK)

2.15.2.34 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (unmsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_unmsinet

Original tag: unmsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with unemployment insurance benefits

2.15.2.35 Unemployment, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (unmfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_unmfanet

Original tag: unmfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with unemployment insurance benefits

2.15.2.36 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, single (u1stners)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_u1stners

Original tag: u1stners

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net single worker replacement rate in first week of unemployment spell: (UBESTW1S / NAPWEKSI) for years and in countries when benefit not taxable, and (UBESTW1S / UGAPWEEK) for years and in countries when benefit taxable

2.15.2.37 Unemployment, first week net APW RR, family (u1stnerf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_u1stnerf

Original tag: s1stnerf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net familied worker replacement rate in first week of unemployment spell: (UBESTW1F / NAPWEKFA) for years and in countries when benefit not taxable, and (UBESTW1F / UGAPWEEK) for years and in countries when benefit taxable

2.15.2.38 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (uzrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uzrr26si

Original tag: uzrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of unemployment spell, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15.2.39 Unemployment, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (uzrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uzrr26fa

Original tag: uzrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of unemployment spell, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15.2.40 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks (uz4ind)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uz4ind

Original tag: px2indst

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

(u1stners+u1stnerf+uzrr26si+uzrr26fa)/4. Average of four components: a single person and a four-person family, for first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.15.2.41 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, single (uz2inds)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uz2inds

Original tag: uz2inds

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

(u1stners+uzrr26si)/2. Average of two components: a single person, first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.15.2.42 Unemployment, net APW RR average 1 and 26 weeks, family (uz2indf)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_uz2indf

Original tag: uz2indf

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

(u1stnerf+uzrr26fa)/2. Average of two components: a four-person family, first week after waiting days and 26 weeks with benefits

2.15.3 Sick Leave

This section includes variables measuring compensation, leave duration, and benefits related to illness.

2.15.3.1 Sickness, income ceiling (sinceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_sinceil

Original tag: sinceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.15.3.2 Sickness, financing by other (sfinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_sfinothr

Original tag: sfinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.15.3.3 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (sicsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_sicsinet

Original tag: sicsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with sickness insurance benefits

2.15.3.4 Sickness, net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (sicfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_sicfanet

Original tag: sicfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with sickness insurance benefits

2.15.3.5 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (szrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_szrr26si

Original tag: szrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of sickness benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15.3.6 Sickness, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (szrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_szrr26fa

Original tag: szrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of sickness benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15.4 Worker's Compensation

This section includes variables measuring compensation, leave duration, and benefits related to workplace injury.

2.15.4.1 Accident, income ceiling (ainceil)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_ainceil

Original tag: ainceil

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Maximum annual income which workers may earn and still be qualified for benefits

2.15.4.2 Accident, financing by other (afinothr)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_afinothr

Original tag: afinothr

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Total proportion of insurance fund receipts derived from other financing sources (e.g. municipalities, interest income accruing from fund reserves, etc.)

2.15.4.3 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, single (accsinet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_accsinet

Original tag: accsinet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for single person with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with work accident insurance benefits

2.15.4.4 Accident net benefit 26w + APWW 26w, family (accfanet)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_accfanet

Original tag: accfanet

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 925, Percent: 5.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 900, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.7

Description:

Net income for a family with one wage earner with 26-weeks of APW and 26-weeks with work accident insurance benefits

2.15.4.5 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, single (azrr26si)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_azrr26si

Original tag: azrr26si

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net single worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of work accident benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

2.15.4.6 Accident, 26 weeks net APW RR exclusive, family (azrr26fa)

Long tag: complab_spin_sied_azrr26fa

Original tag: azrr26fa

Dataset citation: Nelson et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 912, Percent: 5.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25 Percent: 2.74

Description:

Standard net familied worker replacement rate for total 26-week period of work accident benefit, excluding prior half-year's wage income from numerator and denominator

3 H-DATA

The Historical Data Archive (H-DATA) is a hub of historical country-level data running as far back as the French revolution (1789) and offers unparalleled depth of data and temporality, enabling researchers to answer critical questions about the past but to also understand the origins of, and find historical parallels to, present-day problems. H-DATA works to collect, integrate, and curate historical data from Demscore's other modules. By adding this long-term historical dimension, H-DATA makes it possible for researchers to study the path dependency of political institutions where changes are incremental or rare thus making long time-series essential to understanding their causes and consequences. By extending data back into time, H-DATA helps deepen and further our understanding of the conditions of the complex global challenges that we face today. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data`

3.1 H-DATA Foreign Minister Dataset

Dataset tag: hdata_fomin

Output Unit: H-DATA Minister-Year, i.e., data is collected per foreign minister and the date they got into office. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one minister in combination with a date, using the columns foreignminister and date_in. The date_in column does nor exist in the original dataset but is a concatenation of the columns fminyear, fminmonth and fminday. Several other columns, such as date_out, country_name, etc. are added to the unit table in order to aggregate and later translate to other Output Units.

Description: For their article "War, Performance, and the Survival of Foreign Ministers", Hanna Bäck, Jan Teorell, Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar and Alejandro Quiroz Flores created The Foreign Minister Dataset. The Foreign Minister Dataset consists of comparative historical data on foreign ministers' background and reasons for leaving office in the world's 13 former and current great powers from 1789 to the present. The data covers 1155 regular (non-acting) foreign ministers, as well as partial information on 173 acting foreign ministers, for the following 13 great powers: Austria (the Habsburg Empire/Austria-Hungary), Britain, China (Qing Empire/Republic/People's Republic of China), France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Prussia/Germany, the Ottoman Empire/Turkey, Russia, Spain, Sweden and the United States.

Dataset citiation: When using this dataset, please cite the following paper:

Hanna Bäck, Jan Teorell, Alexander Von Hagen-Jamar, Alejandro Quiroz Flores, War, Performance, and the Survival of Foreign Ministers, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Volume 17, Issue 2, April 2021, oraa024, `https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/oraa024`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data/datasets-1.610144`

3.1.1 Personal Background

Variables providing information on the personal background of the foreign minister.

3.1.1.1 Family: profession (fambgprof)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_fambgprof
Original tag: fambgprof
Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:

The family (father's) main profession (during FM's childhood)

1. Farming (incl. landowner)
2. Business (trader, merchant, crafts)
3. Worker (blue collar employees)
4. Clerical, religious
5. Military
6. Politics/state (employed and elected, within the country)
7. Other white collar employee
8. International organisations
9. Other

3.1.2 Educational Background

Variables providing information on the educational background of the foreign minister.

3.1.2.1 Education: Field of education (edufield)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_edufield

Original tag: edufield

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2612, Percent: 8.61

Description:

Field of education (if more than one field, use the two first digits to indicate the first field of higher education and the two last to indicate the other field of higher education, e.g. 0405 if mathematics and chemistry, 0708 if social sciences and law)

01. Agronomy
02. Economics, business, management
03. Engineering
04. Mathematics, computer science
05. Biology, chemistry, physics
06. Humanities
07. Social sciences
08. Law
09. Medicine
10. Military
11. Theology
12. Other

3.1.3 Occupational Background

Variables providing information on the occupational background of the foreign minister.

3.1.3.1 Occupation: Businessman (business)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_business

Original tag: Business

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:
Did the FM have experience as a trader/merchant or other businessman before appointment as FM?
1. No
2. Yes

3.1.3.2 Occupation: Politics (politics)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_politics

Original tag: Politics

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:
Did the FM have experience from domestic politics, as employed or elected, before becoming FM? Not that either employment/work as minister, civil servant or as a legislative deputy counts.
1. No
2. Yes

3.1.4 Political Background

Variables providing information on the political background of the foreign minister.

3.1.4.1 Politics: Interest organizations (org_connections)

Long tag: hdata_fomin_org_connections

Original tag: org_connections

Dataset citation: Bäck et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2582, Percent: 8.51

Description:
Did the FM hold office within any interest organisations other than political parties (such as trade unions or business organisations) prior to appointment?
1. No
2. Yes

3.2 H-DATA Leader Survival Dataset (PLT post-1789)

Dataset tag: hdata_plt

Output Unit: H-DATA Leader-Date, i.e., data is collected per leader and the day they got into power.

Description:
Timespan: 1789-2022
Coverage: 10,662 leader spells in 186 countries
The Leader Survival Dataset is the post-1789 part of the “Political Leaders through Time” (PLT) dataset, and provides data on entry and exit dates, type of leader position held, biographical background information, as well as appointment and exit reasons for 10,662 individual leaders in 186 countries (or territories) from 1789-2022. The dataset was used by Per Andersson Jan Teorell in their article "The Double-Edged Sword: How State Capacity Prolongs Autocratic Tenure but Hastens Democratization".

Dataset citation:
Gerring John, Nong Xin, Chatterton Ben, Cojocaru Lee, Dalli Cem Mert, Knutsen Carl Henrik, Kokkonen Andrej, Smith Daniel Steven, Teorell Jan, Selsky Sam, Ward Daisy, Jeon Ji Yeon. "Leader Tenure through the Ages: The Growth of Constraints." Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin, 2024.

Link to original codebook:
`https://www.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.803891.1740574267!/menu/standard/file/Codebook%20Leader%20Survival%20Data_last%20update%2020250225.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.su.se/english/research/research-projects/h-data/datasets-1.610144`

3.2.1 Territory Variables

In this section, we introduce the set of variables that describe each territory – its name (and alternate names), numeric code, GIS polygon, type (local unit, regional unit, country, colony, empire, confederation, dynastic conglomerate, stateless, tribe/chiefdom), relationship to other territories (if it is part of a superordinate entity), and region (Europe, Africa,...). Before beginning, several general clarifications are in order. All sorts of territories are contained in the PLT. Evidently, we are more concerned with larger, more enduring, and more powerful units. But there was no point in establishing a lower threshold for inclusion, as this would be difficult to define and to enforce. Instead, we differentiate among different types of territories with the Territory type variable (below). These territorial designations evidently overlap: cities lie within regions, regions lie within countries, and so forth. However, territories of the same type should be discrete (non-overlapping). For example, a latitude/longitude point ought to lie within one and only one country at a particular point in time. A basic principle is that political entities with different territorial jurisdictions (or effective control) receive different territorial ID codes. Jurisdictions may overlap, or they may be layered (as cities lie within regions and regions lie within countries), but they are nonetheless unique. We do not assign the same ID to differently sized territories. This means that in situations of civil war, camps controlling different territory must receive separate territory IDs, if they are coded at all. For example, if the US Confederacy is coded it must have a unique ID, separate from the United States. We recognize that there are plenty of disputed territories and poorly mapped territories, especially as one moves backward in time. Our project does not attempt to sort out these controversies; we simply follow conventional wisdom among historians. Within/without relationships are established with GIS polygons (for sizeable entities) and points (for small entities). Of course, we do not have comprehensive GIS codes for every territory. But we do have them for large entities and we hope to add to our collection so that coverage is comprehensive at some point in the future. Superordinate/subordinate relationships can be ascertained by indicating, for each territory, all superordinate territories that it is a part of. For a typical city, this might be (a) region, (b) country, and (c) world region. For a colony, it might be (a) empire, (b) world region. (Because subordinate relationships can be inferred from superordinate relationships, the former do not need to be noted separately.)

3.2.1.1 Territory type (territorytype)

Long tag: hdata_plt_territorytype

Original tag: territorytype

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9294, Percent: 87.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21608, Percent: 71.24

Description:

Question: What type of territory is this?

Clarification: Classify the territory into one of the following categories. Note that this field

captures de facto status, and that a unit's classification may change over time. Note also that the same proper noun may refer to different units. E.g., "Britain (country)" and "Britain (empire)."
We recognize that these are not airtight categories and that there are borderline cases that are not easy to classify. However, some sort of ontology is required in order to sort the data in a preliminary fashion. Additional classifications may be added at a later date, or by end-users. We may also wish to retain the classifications provided by GeaCron and EurAtlas as separate variables...
0. City/county (aka village, town, municipality, bishopric): A small, nonsovereign territory that serves as an administrative unit, is centered on an urban area (e.g.„ city or county seat), and does not constitute a region. (Eventually, we may want to distinguish cities and counties. But for now, this should be sufficient.)
1. Region (aka province, Type 1 admin unit): A first-order administrative unit within a country or colony.
2. Country (aka Type 2 admin unit): Sovereign unit whose component units are administered in a fairly uniform fashion and are not regarded as subordinate or inferior to the metropole. Leaders are not imposed or controlled by foreign entities and the polity is free to conduct foreign policy (within the scope of freely contracted agreements).
3. Colony (aka protectorate, dependency, aka Type 3 admin unit): Partially sovereign and partially incorporated into a larger unit (empire) that it did not (generally) freely join and (generally) cannot freely exit. A colony is not incorporated on an equal basis with other units within a larger entity. Leaders may be appointed by the metropole or chosen internally but subject to approval (de jure or de facto) of metropole. The metropole controls foreign policy. Does not include tributary states if they are essentially self-governing.
4. Empire: Sovereign polity, some of whose components are forcibly integrated and treated as different and subordinate to the metropole. Composed of colonies and perhaps also a country (the metropole).
5. Confederation: Composite unit composed of multiple countries who voluntarily join, and may exit freely. E.g., Holy Roman Empire, British Commonwealth, European Union.
6. Dynastic Conglomerate: An aggregate unit composed of multiple countries (type 2) that coordinate and compete on the basis of shared dynastic affiliation. E.g., Kiev-Rus, Mongols, Poland, Lithuania. Often a result of partible inheritance.
7. Stateless: No state form of political organization exists, or no evidence of such has been found.
8. Tribe/Chiefdom: A polity that is not subject to another entity (not a colony or dependency) but does not have a state-like form of organization and may not have a stable territory.
9. Misc: A residual category covering entities not falling into any of the previous categories, e.g., trading outposts, companies, castles.

3.2.2 Leadership Variables

This set of variables describes each leader, or in some cases an interregnum between leaders. A leader is defined loosely as someone who occupies a position at or near the apex of political power in a territory. Separate observations (rows) for the same leader are required if that person's status changes along one of these dimensions: (a) Office type, (b) Office typology, or (c) Spell (dates of entry and exit). If a leader occupies the same office sequentially it is understood as the same spell and hence does not require a new observation.

3.2.2.1 Office type (officetype)

Long tag: hdata_plt_officetype

Original tag: officetype

Dataset citation: Gerring et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10592, Percent: 99.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 24334, Percent: 80.23

Description:

Question: What type of office is this?
Clarification: Consider the office as it is usually employed (not the particular strengths/weaknesses of particular leaders). We are primarily concerned with influence over policy decisions, e.g., fiscal policy and foreign policy. If influence differs across policy areas, the de facto leader is identified by considering decisions over foreign policy. If influence differs across geographical areas of the polity, we consider as the leader the person that is most influential in parts of the country that make up about half, or more, of the population. If no single person is the most influential in such an area of the country, we consider as the leader the person that is the most influential in the capital of the polity.
0: The only Head of State in the polity, who also functions as the de facto leader of the polity
1: The only Head of State in the polity, but who does not function as the de facto leader of the polity
2: One of several Heads of State in the polity, who also functions as the de facto leader of the polity
3: One of several Heads of State in the polity, but who does not function as the de facto leader of the polity
4: The person is not a Head of State, but still functions as the de facto leader of the polity, i.e., Head of Government
5: The person is not a Head of State, but still functions as one of several de facto leaders of the polity, e.g. one of several Heads of Government
6: One of several Heads of State in the polity, but still functions as one of several de facto leaders of the polity, i.e. Joint monarchs
7: The only Head of State in the polity, who also functions as one of several de facto leaders of the polity, i.e. one of several Heads of Government
8: The person is not a Head of State and does not function as the de facto leader of the polity (e.g., chief advisor, chief of staff)
Instructions: If Office type is coded 0-7, please code all the following questions in the codebook. If Leader type is coded 8, please code only name, title, year of birth, year of death and female for this individual.
Note: Regents should be coded as Head of Government.

4 QOG

The **Quality of Government (QoG)** Institute was founded in 2004 by Professor Bo Rothstein and Professor Sören Holmberg. It is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. QoG is comprised of about 30 researchers who conduct and promote research on the causes, consequences and nature of Good Governance and the Quality of Government (QoG) - that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted and competent government institutions. QoG's award-winning datasets focus on concepts related to quality of government, transparency, and public administration. The main objective of QoG's research is to address the theoretical and empirical problem of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained. A second objective is to study the effects of Quality of Government on a number of policy areas, such as health, the environment, social policy, and poverty. The QoG datasets draw on a number of freely available datasources. More information on how the variables are complied for different QoG datasets can be found in the respective QoG codebooks available on their website. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government`

4.1 QoG Environmental Indicators Dataset

Dataset tag: qog_ei

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset (QoG-EI) is a compilation of major freely available indicators measuring environmental performance of countries over time.

Dataset citation: Povitkina, Marina, Natalia Alvarado Pachon Cem Mert Dalli. 2021. The Quality of Government Environmental Indicators Dataset, version Sep21. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_ei_sept21_august2023.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/environmental-indicators-dataset`

4.1.1 Accountable Climate Targets

Dataset by: Frida Borang, Simon Felgendreher, Niklas Harring, and Asa Lofgren. The authors assess and compare the accountability of climate targets as outlined in the nationally determined contributions (NDC) of the Paris Agreement. Link to the original source: `https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/7/1861/htm`

4.1.1.1 Accountable Climate Target (act_act)

Long tag: qog_ei_act_act

Original tag: act_act

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Boräng et al. (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 183, Percent: 1.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 161, Percent: 0.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 12.02

Description:

A binary measure of whether a country has an accountable climate target (ACT) or not. An ACT is a precise emissions target for which other countries can hold a country - and only that country - accountable. A country has an ACT if it fulfills two criteria: 1) the country's nationally determined contribution (NDC) must state an economy-wide target in reference to emission levels from a past year, a target compared to the business-as-usual scenario, or a target in terms of the CO2 emissions per unit of gross domestic product (GDP); 2) the commitment must not be conditional upon receiving financial support from third parties. The measure is for 2015, at the time of the first NDCs.

4.1.2 Aquastat

Dataset by: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO). AQUASTAT is the FAO global information system on water resources and agricultural water management. Link to the original source: `http://www.fao.org/aquastat/en/`

4.1.2.1 Water stress: freshwater withdrawal, proportion of available freshwater (as_ws)

Long tag: qog_ei_as_ws

Original tag: as_ws

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 187, Percent: 1.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 175, Percent: 0.58

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 12 Percent: 6.42

Description:

The level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of available freshwater resources is the ratio between total freshwater withdrawn by all major sectors and total renewable freshwater resources, after taking into account environmental flow requirements. Main sectors include agriculture, forestry and fishing, manufacturing, electricity industry, and services. This indicator is also known as water withdrawal intensity.

4.1.3 Bertelsmann Transformation Index

Dataset by: Bertelsmann Stiftung The Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index (BTI) analyzes and evaluates the quality of democracy, a market economy, and political management in 137 developing and transition countries. It measures successes and setbacks on the path towards democracy based on the rule of law and a socially responsible market economy. In-depth country reports provide the basis for assessing the state of transformation and persistent challenges and for evaluating the ability of policymakers to carry out consistent and targeted reforms. The BTI is the first cross-national comparative index that collects data to comprehensively measure the quality of governance during processes of transition. Link to the original source: `http://www.bti-project.org/en/index/`

4.1.3.1 Environmental concerns taken into account (bti_envc)

Long tag: qog_ei_bti_envc

Original tag: bti_envc

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1018, Percent: 8.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 983, Percent: 3.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 35 Percent: 3.44

Description:

> Expert answer to the question 'To what extent are environmental concerns effectively taken into account?"

The variable ranges from 1 to 10, where 1 is 'Environmental concerns receive no consideration and are entirely subordinated to growth efforts. There is no environmental regulation', 4 is 'Environmental concerns receive only sporadic consideration and are often subordinated to growth efforts. Environmental regulation is weak and hardly enforced', 7 is 'Environmental concerns are taken into account but are occasionally subordinated to growth efforts. Environmental regulation and incentives are in place, but their enforcement at times is deficient', and 10 is 'Environmental concerns are effectively taken into account and are carefully balanced with growth efforts. Environmental regulation and incentives are in place and enforced'.

4.1.4 Cooperation in International Climate Change Regime

Dataset by: Michèle B. Baettig, Simone Brander, Dieter M. Imboden The index and its components measure countries' cooperation within the international climate change regime. The Cooperation in International Climate Change Regime Index is an aggregate of five indicators: The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Kyoto Protocol Indicators, which measure countries' commitment to common international goals, and the Reporting, Finance, and Emission Indicators, which measure the degree to which countries follow up on the respective commitments within the international regime. Link to the original source: `https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1462901108000440`

4.1.4.1 Emission Indicator (ccci_em)

Long tag: qog_ei_ccci_em

Original tag: ccci_em

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Bättig et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 186, Percent: 1.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 165, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 21 Percent: 11.29

Description:

> The indicator measures the status of CO2 emissions while accounting for differences in national population and different paths of economic development. Countries are assessed according to the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), which indicates that the relationship between per capita CO2 emissions and per capita GDP is positive only up to a certain point of development, after which the relationship becomes negative. A +/- 50 percent interval is created for the EKC, and a trend is measured for each country from 1990 to 2002. If a country's trend is greater than the +50 percent band, the country scores 0. If a country's trend is less than the band, it scores 1.

4.1.5 Climate Change Laws of the World

Dataset by: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment Climate change-related laws and policies refer to legal documents related to reducing energy demand, promoting low carbon energy supply, low-carbon buildings, carbon pricing, lower industry emissions, tackling deforestation and promoting sustainable land use, other mitigation efforts, research and development, sustainable transportation, enhancing adaptation capabilities, and natural disaster risk management. The dataset only included laws and policies that have been passed by legislative branches or published by executive branches, and that are no longer in draft form. The dataset also captures major amendments to legislation. Laws that are outdated, either because they have been repealed, replaced, or reversed, are not included. The database distinguishes between Laws or legislative acts (e.g. acts, laws, decree-laws), which were passed by a parliament or equivalent legislative authority, and Policies, or other executive provisions (e.g. presidential decrees, executive orders, regulations, government policies, strategies, or plans), which were published or decreed by the government, president, or equivalent executive authority. Link to the original source: `https://climate-laws.org/`

4.1.5.1 Climate change mitigation law or policy in place (ccl_mitlpp)

Long tag: qog_ei_ccl_mitlpp

Original tag: ccl_mitlpp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment & Sabin Center for Climate Change Law (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4044, Percent: 31.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3665, Percent: 12.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379 Percent: 9.37

Description:

Number of laws (legislative acts) or policies (executive provisions) related to climate change mitigation adopted per year.

Mitigation laws and policies refer to a legislative or executive disposition focused on curbing a country's greenhouse gases emissions in one sector or more. Measures can be directly related to emissions reductions, such as laws establishing a national carbon budget or cap and trade system, or indirectly related, such as laws or policies establishing relevant institutions or providing additional funding for research and development into low carbon technologies. Laws and policies addressing forests and land use are included as long as they explicitly support climate change mitigation through activities that reduce emissions and increase carbon removals. General forest management and conservation laws are not included, even if they may have implicit consequences for climate change mitigation.

4.1.5.2 Number of climate change mitigation laws and policies (ccl_nmitlp)

Long tag: qog_ei_ccl_nmitlp

Original tag: ccl_nmitlp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment & Sabin Center for Climate Change Law (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4044, Percent: 31.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3665, Percent: 12.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 379 Percent: 9.37

Description:

Cumulative sum of laws (legislative acts) and policies (executive provisions) related to climate change mitigation.

Mitigation laws and policies refer to a legislative or executive disposition focused on curbing a country's greenhouse gases emissions in one sector or more. Measures can be directly related to emissions reductions, such as laws establishing a national carbon budget or cap and trade system, or indirectly related, such as laws or policies establishing relevant institutions or providing additional funding for research and development into low carbon technologies. Laws and policies addressing forests and land use are included as long as they explicitly support climate change mitigation through activities that reduce emissions and increase carbon removals. General forest management and conservation laws are not included, even if they may have implicit consequences for climate change mitigation.

4.1.6 EDGAR - Fossil CO2 Emissions of All World Countries

Dataset by: European Commission The Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) provides global past and present-day anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants by country and on a spatial grid. Fossil CO2 emissions of all world countries from EDGAR provides an independent estimate of CO2 emissions for each world country, based on a robust and consistent methodology stemming from the latest IPCC guidelines and most recent activity data. Fossil CO2 emission data are available for the time period 1970-2019. Link to the original source: `https://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/report_2020`

4.1.6.1 CO2 emissions per GDP (edgar_co2gdp)

Long tag: qog_ei_edgar_co2gdp

Original tag: edgar_co2gdp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5238, Percent: 41.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4749, Percent: 15.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 489 Percent: 9.34

Description:

> The total CO2 (carbon dioxide) emissions per country, divided by each country's respective GDP (gross domestic product). Units are tonnes of CO2 per thousand US dollars of GDP.

Includes all fossil CO2 sources, such as fossil fuel combustion, non-metallic mineral processes (e.g., cement production), metal (ferrous and non-ferrous) production processes, urea production, agricultural liming, and solvents use. Large-scale biomass burning with Savannah burning, forest fires, and sources and sinks from land-use, land-use change, and forestry (LULUCF) are excluded.

4.1.7 The Environmental Democracy Index

Dataset by: The Access Initiative (TAI) and World Resources Institute (WRI) The Environmental Democracy Index measures the degree to which countries have enacted legally binding rules that provide for environmental information collection and disclosure, public participation across a range of environmental decisions, and fair, affordable, and independent avenues for seeking justice and challenging decisions that impact the environment. The index evaluates 70 countries across 75 legal indicators, based on objective and internationally recognized standards established by the United Nations Environment Programmes (UNEP) Bali Guidelines. EDI also includes a supplemental set of 24 limited practice indicators that provide insight on a country's performance in implementation. Link to the original source: `https://www.environmentaldemocracyindex.org/node/12732.html`

4.1.7.1 Alternative dispute resolution for environmental issues (Guideline 26) (edi_gadrei)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gadrei

Original tag: edi_gadrei

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states encourage the development and use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms where these are appropriate. In scoring this indicator, "alternate dispute resolution mechanisms" include mediation, conciliation, or arbitration adopted by institutions as a means of resolving environmental disputes.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (26.1) To what extent does the law provide for the possibility to use alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to address violations of the right of access to environmental information, public participation or cases of environmental harm?; (26.2) To what extent does the law provide incentives for the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms where these are appropriate?; (P26.1) In the last 5 years, has a public interest case relating to the environment or natural resources been solved by an alternate conflict resolution method (such as mediation, arbitration and conciliation)?

4.1.7.2 Due account of public comments (Guideline 11) (edi_gapc)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gapc

Original tag: edi_gapc

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that due account is taken of the comments of the public in the decision-making process and that the decisions are made public.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (11.1) To what extent do the laws concerning environmental impact assessments, pollution control standards and permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, biodiversity and terrestrial protected areas, and environmental policy-making require the State or State agencies at the national level to take due account of the public's comments in decision-making relating to the environment?; (11.2) To what extent do the laws concerning environmental impact assessments, pollution control standards and permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, biodiversity and terrestrial protected areas, and environmental policy-making require that decisions relating to the environment are made public?; (P11.1) In the three most recent large-scale extractive or development projects, did the relevant agency respond to public comments on the environmental impact assessment and make the responses available to the public?

4.1.7.3 Early public participation (Guideline 8) (edi_gepp)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gepp

Original tag: edi_gepp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states states ensure opportunities for early and effective public participation in decision-making related to the environment.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (8.1) To what extent does the law require the public concerned to have opportunities to participate in decision making related to the environment?; (8.2) To what extent does the law require public participation opportunities to be provided early in the decision-making process?; (8.3) To what extent does the law require that the public concerned be provided with information about its opportunities to participate early in the decision-making process?; (P8.1) Choose three recent controversial development projects (in terms of press coverage and potential cost and/or revenue of project) that were approved through an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process under national law. Were public notices given seeking comments on the EIA or its terms of reference?

4.1.7.4 Informed participation (Guideline 10) (edi_gip)

Long tag: qog_ei_edi_gip

Original tag: edi_gip

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 70, Percent: 0.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 69, Percent: 0.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 1.43

Description:

The indicator measures to which extent the states ensure that all information relevant for decision-making related to the environment is made available, in an objective, understandable, timely, and effective manner, to the members of the public concerned.

This indicator is an arithmetic average of expert answers to questions on a scale from 0 (worst) to 3 (best): (10.1) To what extent do the laws concerning: environmental impact assessments, pollution control permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, protected areas and terrestrial biodiversity, and environmental policy-making require all information relevant to decision-making processes relating to the environment to be made available to the public concerned, without the public having to make an official information request?; (10.2) To what extent do the laws concerning environmental impact assessments, pollution control permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, protected areas and terrestrial biodiversity, and environmental policy-making require that proactively released information relevant to decision-making be understandable to the public concerned?; (10.3) To what extent do the laws concerning environmental impact assessments, pollution control permits, forest concessions, extractive industries, biodiversity and terrestrial protected areas, and environmental policy-making require the information relevant to decision-making to be provided in a timely fashion to the public concerned?; (P10.1) Are the Environmental Impact Assessments for development projects accessible to the public online or at a national government agency?; (P10.2) Is information on wastewater discharge and air emission permit violations available to the public online or at a government agency?; (P10.3) Are extractive industry licenses/permits available to the public online or at a government agency?; (P10.4) During the past three years, in the process of granting forest use contracts, has the relevant agency made publicly available information related to such contracts?; (P10.5) Are the forest use contracts, once finalized, made available to the public online or at a government agency?

4.1.8 ENVIPOLCON

Dataset by: Holzinger, Knill, Sommerer ENVIPOLCON is the acronym of "Environmental governance in Europe: the impact of international institutions and trade on policy convergence". The project was carried out between 2003 and 2006 by the University of Konstanz, University of

Hamburg, Germany, Free University of Berlin, University of Salzburg, and Radboud University Nijmegen. The project was supported by the EU, RTD programme "Improving the human research potential and the socioeconomic knowledge base", contract no. HPSE-CT-2002-00103. This compilation only includes data on policy instrument adoption from ENVIPOLCON. Each of the instrument variables is coded with scores ranging from 1= obligatory standard to 10 = voluntary instrument. 0 = no instrument because no policy was in place yet. For the variable on the promotion of renewable energy (e.g. ener_i7) the additional instrument "legal obligation to purchase that electricity" was coded as = 11. Other variables from ENVIPOLCON are included into the extension of the dataset - ENVIPOLCONCHANGE, which is also a part of this compilation. Link to the original source: `https://www.polver.uni-konstanz.de/holzinger/research/researchprojects/enviromental-policy-convergence-in-europe-envipolcon/`

4.1.8.1 Policy instruments for quality of bathing water (epc_bath)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_bath

Original tag: epc_bath

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> Policy instruments on quality of bathing water. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.2 Policy instruments for exhaust emissions from cars (epc_car)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_car

Original tag: epc_car

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> Policy instruments on exhaust emissions from cars. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'

1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.3 Policy instruments for reduction of CO2 emissions from heavy industry (epc_co2)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_co2

Original tag: epc_co2

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on reduction of CO2 emissions from heavy industry. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.4 Policy instruments for hazardous substances in detergents (epc_dete)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_dete

Original tag: epc_dete

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on hazardous substances in detergents. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'

1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.5 Policy instruments for energy efficiency of refrigerators (epc_enef)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_enef

Original tag: epc_enef

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on energy efficiency of refrigerators. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.6 Policy instruments for electricity from renewable sources (epc_ener)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_ener

Original tag: epc_ener

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on electricity production from renewable sources. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'

2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'
11 = 'Extra instrument for energy'.

4.1.8.7 Policy instruments for forest protection policy (epc_fors)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_fors

Original tag: epc_fors

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on forest protection. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.8 Policy instruments for lead emissions from vehicles (epc_lead)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_lead

Original tag: epc_lead

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on lead emissions from vehicles. The variable measure the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'

2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.9 Policy instruments for noise emissions from lorries (epc_nois)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_nois

Original tag: epc_nois

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on noise emission from lorries. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.10 Policy instruments to promote refillable beverage containers (epc_pawa)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_pawa

Original tag: epc_pawa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments to promote refillable beverage containers. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'

3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.11 Policy instruments for contaminated sites (epc_soil)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_soil

Original tag: epc_soil

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on contaminated sites. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'
3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.8.12 Policy instruments for water protection related to industrial discharges (epc_watp)

Long tag: qog_ei_epc_watp

Original tag: epc_watp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Heichel et al. (2008)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 93, Percent: 0.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Policy instruments on industrial discharges into water bodies. The variable measures the presence of a policy instrument in 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

Variable coding:
0 = 'No policy'
1 = 'Obligatory standard, prohibition or ban'
2 = 'Technological prescription'

3 = 'Tax or levy'
4 = 'Subsidy or tax reduction'
5 = 'Liability scheme(s)'
6 = 'Planning instrument'
7 = 'Public investment'
8 = 'Data collection / monitoring programme(s)'
9 = 'Information based instrument'
10 = 'Voluntary instrument'.

4.1.9 ENVIPOLCONCHANGE

Dataset by: Holzinger, Knill, Sommerer The Dataset "ENVIPOLCONCHANGE (Environmental Policy Change). A dataset on environmental regulations in 24 OECD countries from 1970 to 2005" has been collected by the ENVIPOLCON group at the University of Konstanz (Stephan Heichel, Katharina Holzinger, Christoph Knill, Thomas Sommerer) in 2009. Data collection was funded by the German Research Foundation DFG. Link to the original source: `https://www.polver.uni-konstanz.de/holzinger/research/researchprojects/policy-wandel-in-der-umweltpolitik-der-einfluss-von-nationalen-vetospielernund-transnationalem-p` `der-datensatz-environmental-policy-chance-envipolchange/`

4.1.9.1 Change in National environmental policy/Sustainable development plan (epcc_susp_ch2)

Long tag: qog_ei_epcc_susp_ch2

Original tag: epcc_susp_ch2

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Holzinger et al. (2011)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 2.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> The variable measures whether there was a change in the policy for the national environmental policy or sustainable development plan in the recorded year. This is a binary variable, where '1' is assigned to the year when there was a change in the policy, including its first introduction, and '0' is assigned to all other years.

4.1.9.2 National environmental policy/Sustainable development plan introduction (epcc_susp_in2)

Long tag: qog_ei_epcc_susp_in2

Original tag: epcc_susp_in2

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Holzinger et al. (2011)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 2.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> The variable expresses the first introduction of the policy for the national environmental policy or sustainable development plan. This is a binary variable, where '1' is assigned to the year when the policy was first introduced and '0' is assigned to all other years.

4.1.9.3 Change in efficient use of water in industry policy (epcc_waef_ch2)

Long tag: qog_ei_epcc_waef_ch2

Original tag: epcc_waef_ch2

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Holzinger et al. (2011)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 2.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The variable measures whether there was a change in the policy for efficient use of the water industry in the recorded year. This is a binary variable, where '1' is assigned to the year when there was a change in the policy, including its first introduction, and '0' is assigned to all other years.

4.1.9.4 Efficient use of water in industry policy introduction (epcc_waef_in2)

Long tag: qog_ei_epcc_waef_in2

Original tag: epcc_waef_in2

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Holzinger et al. (2011)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 841, Percent: 2.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The variable measures the first introduction of the policy for efficient use of the water industry. This is a binary variable, where '1' is assigned to the year when the policy was first introduced and '0' is assigned to all other years.

4.1.10 Environmental Performance Index Data 2020

Dataset by: Environmental Performance Index The Environmental Performance Index provides a ranking that shines light on how each country manages environmental issues. The Environmental Performance Index (EPI) ranks how well countries perform on high-priority environmental issues in two broad policy areas: protection of human health from environmental harm and protection of ecosystems. Within these two policy objectives the EPI scores country performance in 11 issue areas comprised of 32 indicators. Indicators in the EPI measure how close countries are to meeting internationally established targets or, in the absence of agreed-upon targets, how they compare to the range of observed countries. Note: In many cases the EPI variables lack actual observations and rely on imputation. Please refer to the original documentation on more information about this. Also, some values (usually the value 0) are very unlikely, please use your judgement whether to treat these as the value 0 or as "Data missing". The values on the EPI, Policy Objectives, and Issue Categories are not comparable over time, therefore, this compilation only includes data on these variables from the latest release. The raw data on the 32 indicators, however, are comparable over time and, therefore, time-series are included. Link to the original source: `https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu/epi-downloads`

4.1.10.1 Pollution Emissions Issue Category (epi_ape)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_ape

Original tag: epi_ape

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 165, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.33

Description:

Pollution Emissions Issue Category consists of 2 indicators:

1) The SO2 growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in SO2 over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. First, the EPI team calculates Spearman's correlation coefficient between SO2 emissions and GDP over a ten-year period. Second, they regress logged SO2 emissions over ten years to find a slope. Third, they calculate an unadjusted average annual growth rate in SO2 emissions. Fourth, they adjust the negative growth rates by a factor of 1 - the correlation coefficient.

2) The NOX growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in NOX over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. First, the EPI team calculates Spearman's correlation coefficient between NOX emissions and GDP over a ten-year period. Second, they regress logged NOX emissions over ten years to find a slope. Third, they calculate an unadjusted average annual growth rate in NOX emissions. Fourth, they adjust the negative growth rates by a factor of 1 - the correlation coefficient.

Both indicators are given equal weight in the aggregation. The issue category varies from 0 to 100.

4.1.10.2 Black carbon growth rate (epi_bca)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_bca

Original tag: epi_bca

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4755, Percent: 37.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 459 Percent: 9.65

Description:

The black carbon growth rate, which makes up 5percent of the Climate Change Issue Category, is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in black carbon over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Community Emissions Data Systems.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.3 Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category (epi_bdh)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_bdh

Original tag: epi_bdh

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020), Wolf et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 165, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.33

Description:

Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category consists of 7 indicators:

1) The terrestrial biome protection (national weights) indicator. It is calculated by first taking proportions of the area of each of a country's biome types that are covered by protected areas and then constructing a weighted sum of the protection percentages for all biomes within that country. The protection percentages are weighted according to the prevalence of each biome type within that country. This indicator evaluates a country's efforts to achieve 17percent protection for all biomes within its borders, as per Aichi Target 11. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

2) The terrestrial biome protection (global weights) indicator, where protection percentages are weighted according to the global prevalence of each biome type. This indicator evaluates a country's contribution toward the global 17percent protection goal. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

3) The marine protected areas indicator, measured as a percentage of a country's total exclusive economic zone (EEZ) designated as marine protected areas (MPAs). Because each country may have multiple EEZs, the summed area of MPAs is divided by the summed EEZ. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

4) The Protected Areas Representativeness Index (PARI), which measures ecological representativeness as the proportion of biologically scaled environmental diversity included in a country's terrestrial protected areas. The measure relies on remote sensing, biodiversity informatics, and global modeling of fine-scaled variation in biodiversity composition for plant, vertebrate, and invertebrate species. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

5) Species Habitat Index (SHI) estimates potential population losses, as well as regional and global extinction risks of individual species, using habitat loss as a proxy. The SHI indicator measures the proportion of suitable habitat within a country that remains intact for each species in that country relative to a baseline set in the year 2001. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

6) Species Protection Index (SPI) evaluates the species-level ecological representativeness of each country's protected area network. The SPI metric uses remote sensing data, global biodiversity informatics, and integrative models to map suitable habitat for over 30,000 terrestrial vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species at high resolutions. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

7) The Biodiversity Habitat Index (BHI), which estimates the effects of habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation on the expected retention of terrestrial biodiversity. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

The issue category varies from 0 to 100.

4.1.10.4 Biodiversity habitat index (epi_bhv)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_bhv

Original tag: epi_bhv

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4972, Percent: 39.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4357, Percent: 14.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 615 Percent: 12.37

Description:

> Biodiversity Habitat Index (BHI) estimates the effects of habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation on the expected retention of terrestrial biodiversity.

Original source: Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.5 Climate Change Issue Category (epi_cch)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_cch

Original tag: epi_cch

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020), Wolf et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 165, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15 Percent: 8.33

Description:

Climate Change Issue Category consists of 8 indicators:

1) The CO2 growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw carbon dioxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 55percent weight in the aggregation.

2) The CH4 growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw methane emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 15percent weight in the aggregation.

3) The F-gas growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw fluorinated gas emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

4) The N2O growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw nitrous oxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

5) The black carbon growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in black carbon over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

6) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita in the year 2017. First, the EPI team calculates total greenhouse gas emissions, applying Global Warming Potentials to convert all units to Gg of CO2-equivalents. Second, they calculate GHG emissions per capita (GHP) as the GHG emissions divided by population (POP). It is log-transformed and given 2.5percent weight in the aggregation.

7) CO2 emissions from land cover change, calculated over the years 2001-2015. First, the EPI team regresses logged CO2 emissions from land cover change (LULC) over 15 years to find a slope. Then, they calculate an unadjusted average annual growth rate in these CO2 emissions. It is given 2.5percent weight in the aggregation.

8) The greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity growth rate indicator, which serves as a signal of countries' progress in decoupling emissions from economic growth. The EPI team calculates an annual average growth rate in GHG emissions per unit of GDP over the years 2008-2017. This indicator highlights the need for action on climate change mitigation in countries at all income

levels. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

The issue category varies from 0 to 100.

4.1.10.6 CO2 growth rate (epi_cda)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_cda

Original tag: epi_cda

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4833, Percent: 38.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537 Percent: 11.11

Description:

> The CO2 (carbon dioxide) growth rate, which makes up 55percent of the Climate Change Issue Category, is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw carbon dioxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.7 CH4 growth rate (epi_cha)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_cha

Original tag: epi_cha

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4833, Percent: 38.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537 Percent: 11.11

Description:

> The CH4 (methane) growth rate, which makes up 15percent of the Climate Change Issue Category, is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw methane emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.8 F-gas growth rate (epi_fga)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_fga

Original tag: epi_fga

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3072, Percent: 24.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2864, Percent: 9.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 208 Percent: 6.77

Description:

The F-gas growth rate, which makes up 10percent of the Climate Change Issue Category, is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw fluorinated gas emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.9 GHG intensity trend (epi_gib)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_gib

Original tag: epi_gib

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4842, Percent: 38.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4305, Percent: 14.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537 Percent: 11.09

Description:

The greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity growth rate indicator serves as a signal of countries' progress in decoupling emissions from economic growth. EPI calculates an annual average growth rate in GHG emissions per unit of GDP over the years 2008-2017. This indicator highlights the need for action on climate change mitigation in countries at all income levels.

Original source: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.10 Marine protected areas (epi_mpa)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_mpa

Original tag: epi_mpa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3778, Percent: 29.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3241, Percent: 10.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537 Percent: 14.21

Description:

Marine protected areas indicator is measured as the percentage of a country's total exclusive economic zone (EEZ) designated as marine protected areas (MPAs). MPAs represent a critical tool for protecting marine ecosystems from unsustainable fishing practices, pollution, and human disturbance. Because each country may have multiple EEZs, the summed area of MPAs is divided by the summed EEZ.

Original source: World Database on Protected Areas.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.11 N2O growth rate (epi_noa)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_noa

Original tag: epi_noa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4833, Percent: 38.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 537 Percent: 11.11

Description:

The N2O growth rate, which makes up 5percent of the Climate Change issue category, is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw nitrous oxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.12 NOx growth rate (epi_nxa)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_nxa

Original tag: epi_nxa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4755, Percent: 37.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 459 Percent: 9.65

Description:

The NOX growth rate is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in NOX over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Community Emissions Data Systems.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.13 Protected areas representativeness index (epi_par)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_par

Original tag: epi_par

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4972, Percent: 39.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4357, Percent: 14.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 615 Percent: 12.37

Description:

The PARI indicator measures ecological representativeness as the proportion of biologically scaled environmental diversity included in a country's terrestrial protected areas. The measure relies on remote sensing, biodiversity informatics, and global modeling of fine-scaled variation in biodiversity composition for plant, vertebrate, and invertebrate species.

Original source: Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.10.14 SO2 growth rate (epi_sda)

Long tag: qog_ei_epi_sda

Original tag: epi_sda

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4755, Percent: 37.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4296, Percent: 14.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 459 Percent: 9.65

Description:

> The SO2 growth rate is calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in SO2 over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation.

Original source: Community Emissions Data Systems.

When using this variable, please cite both EPI and the original source.

4.1.11 Green Growth

Dataset by: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development The OECD Green Growth database contains selected indicators for monitoring progress towards green growth to support policy making and inform the public at large. The database synthesises data and indicators across a wide range of domains including a range of OECD databases as well as external data sources. The database covers OECD member and accession countries, key partners (including Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa) and other selected non-OECD countries. The indicators have been selected according to well-specified criteria and embedded in a conceptual framework, which is structured around four groups to capture the main features of green growth: (1) Environmental and resource productivity: indicate whether economic growth is becoming greener with more efficient use of natural capital and to capture aspects of production which are rarely quantified in economic models and accounting frameworks; (2) The natural asset base: indicate the risks to growth from a declining natural asset base; (3) Environmental dimension of quality of life: indicate how environmental conditions affect the quality of life and wellbeing of people; (4) Economic opportunities and policy responses: indicate the effectiveness of policies in delivering green growth and describe the societal responses needed to secure business and employment opportunities. Link to the original source: `https://stats.oecd.org/`

4.1.11.1 Environmentally related government R and D budget, percent total government R and D (gg_envrd_gbaord)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_envrd_gbaord

Original tag: gg_envrd_gbaord

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 451, Percent: 3.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 451, Percent: 1.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> Environmentally related government R&D budget measures government budget appropriations or outlays for environmentally related research and development (R&D). It is expressed as a percentage of total government R&D expenditure.

4.1.11.2 Environmentally related R and D expenditure, percent GDP (gg_envrd_gdp)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_envrd_gdp

Original tag: gg_envrd_gdp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 101, Percent: 0.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 101, Percent: 0.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The environmentally related research and development (R&D) expenditure, expressed as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP).

4.1.11.3 Energy public RD and D budget, percent GDP (gg_erdgdp)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_erdgdp

Original tag: gg_erdgdp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 346, Percent: 2.72

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 346, Percent: 1.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The public budget for energy related research, development, and demonstration as a percentage of national gross domestic product (GDP).

4.1.11.4 Development of environment-related technologies, percent all technologies (gg_etp)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_etp

Original tag: gg_etp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2015, Percent: 15.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1768, Percent: 5.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 247 Percent: 12.26

Description:

The number of environment-related inventions expressed as a percentage of all domestic inventions (in all technologies).

Indicators of technology development are constructed by measuring inventive activity using patent data across a wide range of environment-related technological domains (ENV-TECH, see link below), including environmental management, water-related adaptation, and climate change mitigation technologies. The counts used here include only higher-value inventions (with patent family size = 2).

4.1.11.5 Development of environment-related technologies, percent inventions worldwide (gg_etpw)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_etpw

Original tag: gg_etpw

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2015, Percent: 15.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1768, Percent: 5.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 247 Percent: 12.26

Description:

The number of environment-related inventions expressed as a percentage of environment-related inventions worldwide.

Indicators of technology development are constructed by measuring inventive activity using patent data across a wide range of environment-related technological domains (ENV-TECH), including environmental management, water-related adaptation, and climate change mitigation technologies. The counts used here include only higher-value inventions (with patent family size = 2, meaning inventions filed in two or more jurisdictions).

4.1.11.6 Fossil fuel public RD and D budget (excluding CCS), percent total energy public RD and D (gg_ffrd)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_ffrd

Original tag: gg_ffrd

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 314, Percent: 2.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 314, Percent: 1.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The public budget directed at research, development, and demonstration (RD&D) related to fossil fuels, including oil, gas, and coal and excluding RD&D related to CO2 capture and storage (CCS), expressed as a percentage of total energy RD&D public budgets (directed at all forms of energy).

4.1.11.7 Renewable energy public RD and D budget, percent total energy public RD and D (gg_rerd_erd)

Long tag: qog_ei_gg_rerd_erd

Original tag: gg_rerd_erd

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 341, Percent: 2.68

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 341, Percent: 1.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

The percentage of all public energy related research, development, and demonstration (RD&D) that is directed towards renewable energy.

4.1.12 The International Social Survey Programme. Environment Module

Dataset by: International Social Survey Programme The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is an annual program of cross-national survey collaboration, covering a wide range of topics important for social science research. Since 1985 the ISSP provides international data sets, enabling cross-cultural and cross-temporal research. "Environment" is one of the eleven ISSP topic modules.

Central themes are attitudes towards environment-related issues, such as environmental protection, respondents' behavior, and respondents' preferences regarding governmental measures on environmental protection. This dataset includes two types of variables: 1) percentage of respondents choosing a particular response option, and 2) average response per country, unweighted, primarily because weights are unavailable for some countries. Correlation between weighted and unweighted means for countries that do provide weights is above .95 for most of the included variables and does not go below .89. Link to the original source: `https://www.gesis.org/en/issp/modules`

4.1.12.1 Environment is most or next most important issue (percent) (issp_1ap)

Long tag: qog_ei_issp_1ap

Original tag: issp_1ap

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: ISSP Research Group (2003)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 32, Percent: 0.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 31, Percent: 0.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 3.12

Description:

> Percent replying 'The environment' to 1a: 'Which of these issues is the most important for [COUNTRY] today?' plus percent replying 'The environment' to 1b: 'Which of these issues is the next most important for [COUNTRY] today?'. The issues in the list include: (1) Health care, (2) Education, (3) Crime, (4) The environment, (5) Immigration, (6) The economy, (7) Terrorism, (8) Poverty, (9) None of these, (98) Can't choose.

In Environment III (2010) - questions 1a and 1b.
In Environment II (2000) - question not part of the survey.
In Environment I (1993) - question not part of the survey.

The higher the score the higher the percentage of the population that prioritizes the environment as the most or second most important issue. The lower the score the smaller the percentage of the population that prioritizes the environment as the most or second most important issue.

4.1.13 Policy Instruments for the Environment

Dataset by: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Policy Instruments for the Environment (PINE) is originally developed by OECD in co-operation with the European Environment Agency (EEA). The database contains detailed qualitative and quantitative information on environmentally related taxes, fees and charges, tradable permits, deposit-refund systems, environmentally motivated subsidies, and voluntary approaches used for environmental policy. The dataset covers OECD member countries, accession countries and selected non-OECD countries since the year 1994, and it has been cross-validated and complemented with Revenue statistics from the OECD Tax statistics database and official national sources. Link to the original source: `http://oe.cd/pine`

4.1.13.1 Climate change related tax revenue (percent of GDP) (oecd_cctr_gdp)

Long tag: qog_ei_oecd_cctr_gdp

Original tag: oecd_cctr_gdp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*c*)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2099, Percent: 16.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2021, Percent: 6.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 3.72

Description:
No entry

4.1.13.2 Environmentally related tax revenue (percent of GDP) (oecd_etr_gdp)

Long tag: qog_ei_oecd_etr_gdp
Original tag: oecd_etr_gdp
Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)
Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*c*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2242, Percent: 17.63
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2164, Percent: 7.13
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 3.48
Description:
No entry

4.1.14 oecd_multi

Missing codebook section entry

4.1.14.1 Environmentally adjusted multifactor productivity growth (oecd_eampg)

Long tag: qog_ei_oecd_eampg
Original tag: oecd_eampg
Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)
Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*a*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1109, Percent: 8.72
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1109, Percent: 3.66
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
No entry

4.1.14.2 Pollution adjusted GDP growth (oecd_polagdpg)

Long tag: qog_ei_oecd_polagdpg
Original tag: oecd_polagdpg
Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)
Variable citation: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*a*)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1109, Percent: 8.72
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1109, Percent: 3.66
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
No entry

4.1.15 The Ocean Health Index Data

Dataset by: The Ocean Health Index The Ocean Health Index is a valuable tool for the ongoing assessment of ocean health. By providing a means to advance comprehensive ocean policy and compare future progress, the Index can inform decisions about how to use or protect marine ecosystems. The Index is a collaborative effort, made possible through contributions from more than 65 scientists/ocean experts and partnerships between organizations including the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis, Sea Around Us, Conservation International, National

Geographic, and the New England Aquarium. The Index assesses the ocean based on 10 widely-held public goals for a healthy ocean. They are: Food Provision, Artisanal Fishing Opportunities, Natural Products, Carbon Storage, Coastal Protection, Sense of Place, Coastal Livelihoods Economies, Tourism Recreation, Clean Waters, Biodiversity. Link to the original source: `http://www.oceanhealthindex.org`

4.1.15.1 Coastal human population as a proxy for trend in trash (ohi_chp)

Long tag: qog_ei_ohi_chp

Original tag: ohi_chp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ocean Health Index (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 147, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 127, Percent: 0.42

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 13.61

Description:

Coastal human population as a proxy for trend in trash. For more details on the variable construction, see the original source:

CIESIN & CIAT (Center for International Earth Science Information Network / Columbia University, & Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical) (2005). Gridded Population of the World, Version 3 (GPWv3): Population Density Grid, Future Estimates. Palisades, NY. [NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC)].

When using this variable, please cite both the OHI project and the original source.

4.1.15.2 Coastal population density as a proxy for intertidal habitat destruction (ohi_hdinter)

Long tag: qog_ei_ohi_hdinter

Original tag: ohi_hdinter

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ocean Health Index (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 148, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 128, Percent: 0.42

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 13.51

Description:

Coastal population density as a proxy for intertidal habitat destruction. For more details on the variable construction, see the original sources:

CIESIN & CIAT (Center for International Earth Science Information Network /Columbia University & Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical) (2005). Gridded Population of the World, Version 3 (GPWv3): Population Density Grid, Future Estimates. Palisades, NY.

and

NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC)

and

Halpern, B. S. et. al. (2008) A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. Science, 3199(5865): 948-952.

When using this variable, please cite both the OHI project and the original sources.

4.1.15.3 CBD Survey: Mariculture (ohi_maricul)

Long tag: qog_ei_ohi_maricul

Original tag: ohi_maricul

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ocean Health Index (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 148, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 128, Percent: 0.42

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 13.51

Description:

> CBD Survey: Mariculture. A resilience measure based on questions 158(d) and 159(a-l) from The Convention on Biological Diversity country questionnaire (Third National Report to the CBD, from 2005).

Question 158: Which of the following statements can best describe the current status of marine and coastal protected areas in your country:
d) A national system or network of marine and coastal protected areas is under development?

Question 159: Is your country applying the following techniques aimed at minimizing adverse impacts of mariculture on marine and coastal biodiversity?
a) Application of environmental impact assessments for mariculture developments;
b) Development and application of effective site selection methods in the framework of integrated marine and coastal area management;
c) development of effective methods for effluent and waste control;
d) Development of appropriate genetic resource management plans at the hatchery level;
e) Development of controlled hatchery and genetically sound reproduction methods in order to avoid seed collection from nature;
f) If seed collection from nature cannot be avoided, development of environmentally sound practices for spat collecting operations, including use of selective fishing gear to avoid by-catch;
g) Use of native species and subspecies in mariculture;
h) Implementation of effective measures to prevent the inadvertent release of mariculture species and fertile polypoids;
i) Use of proper methods of breeding and proper places of releasing in order to protect genetic diversity;
j) Minimizing the use of antibiotics through better husbandry techniques;
k) Use of selective methods in commercial fishing to avoid or minimize bycatch;
l) Considering traditional knowledge, where applicable, as a source to develop sustainable mariculture techniques.

For more details on the variable construction, see the original source:

Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD (http://www.cbd.int/reports/search/default.shtml)-

When using this variable, please cite both the OHI project and the original source.

4.1.15.4 Percent direct employment in tourism (ohi_tjpt)

Long tag: qog_ei_ohi_tjpt

Original tag: ohi_tjpt

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ocean Health Index (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 148, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 128, Percent: 0.42

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 13.51

Description:

Percent direct employment in tourism. For more details on the variable construction, see the original source:

World Travel and Tourism Council, WTTC (http://www.wttc.org/research/economic-data-search-tool/)

When using this variable, please cite both the OHI project and the original source.

4.1.15.5 CBD Survey: Tourism (ohi_tour)

Long tag: qog_ei_ohi_tour

Original tag: ohi_tour

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ocean Health Index (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 148, Percent: 1.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 128, Percent: 0.42

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 20 Percent: 13.51

Description:

CBD Survey: Tourism. A resilience measure based on questions 79, 80, and 82 from The Convention on Biological Diversity country questionnaire (Third National Report to the CBD, from 2005).

Question 79: Has your country established mechanisms to assess, monitor and measure the impact of tourism on biodiversity?
a) No;
b) No, but mechanisms are under development;
c) Yes, mechanisms are in place (please specify below);
d) Yes, existing mechanisms are under review.

Question 80: Has your country provided educational and training programmes to the tourism operators so as to increase their awareness of the impacts of tourism on biodiversity and upgrade the technical capacity at the local level to minimize the impacts?
a) No;
b) No, but programmes are under development;
c) Yes, programmes are in place (please describe below).

Question 82: Does your country provide indigenous and local communities with capacity-building and financial resources to support their participation in tourism policy-making, development planning, product development and management?
a) No;
b) No, but relevant programmes are being considered;
c) Yes, some programmes are in place;
d) Yes, comprehensive programmes are in place.

For more details on the variable construction, see the original sources:

Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD (http://www.cbd.int/reports/search/default.shtml)

When using this variable, please cite both the OHI project and the original source.

4.1.16 Oil and Gas Data, 1932-2014

Dataset by: Michael L Ross Global dataset of oil and natural gas production, prices, exports, and net exports. These data are based on the best available information about the volume and value of oil and natural gas production in all countries from 1932 to 2014. The volume figures are from the documents listed in the original source; to calculate the total value of production, the author multiplies the volume by the world price for oil or gas. Since these are world prices for a single (benchmark) type of oil/gas, they only approximate the actual price - which varies by country according to the quality, the terms of contracts, the timing of the transactions, and other factors. These figures do not tell how much revenues were collected by governments or companies - only the approximate volume and value of production. Data on oil production from 1946 to 1969, and gas production from 1955 (when it first was reported) to 1969, are from the US Geological Survey Minerals Yearbook, for various years. Link to the original source: `https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/ZTPW0Y`

4.1.16.1 Net gas exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_gas_netexp)

Long tag: qog_ei_ross_gas_netexp

Original tag: ross_gas_netexp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3871, Percent: 30.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3731, Percent: 12.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 140 Percent: 3.62

Description:

Net gas exports value, measured in constant 2000 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.1.16.2 Gas production value in 2014 dollars (ross_gas_value_2014)

Long tag: qog_ei_ross_gas_value_2014

Original tag: ross_gas_value_2014

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8352, Percent: 65.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7904, Percent: 26.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 448 Percent: 5.36

Description:

Gas production value in constant 2014 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.1.16.3 Net oil exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_oil_netexp)

Long tag: qog_ei_ross_oil_netexp

Original tag: ross_oil_netexp

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4497, Percent: 35.37

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4333, Percent: 14.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 164 Percent: 3.65

Description:
Net oil exports value measured in constant 2000 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.1.16.4 Oil production value in 2014 dollars (ross_oil_value_2014)

Long tag: qog_ei_ross_oil_value_2014

Original tag: ross_oil_value_2014

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8837, Percent: 69.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8363, Percent: 27.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 474 Percent: 5.36

Description:
Oil production value in constant 2014 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.1.17 Sustainable Governance Indicators

Dataset by: Bertelsmann Stiftung The Sustainable Governance Indicators (SGI) is a platform built on a cross-national survey of governance that identifies reform needs in 41 EU and OECD countries. SGI explores how governments target sustainable development and advocate for more sustainable governance built on three pillars: 1) Policy Performance; 2) Democracy; and 3) Governance. Link to the original source: `https://www.sgi-network.org/2020/`

4.1.17.1 Environmental policy effectiveness (sgi_epe)

Long tag: qog_ei_sgi_epe

Original tag: sgi_epe

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 246, Percent: 1.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 246, Percent: 0.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
The indicator measures how effectively a national environmental policy protects and preserves the sustainability of natural resources and the quality of the environment.

Effective environmental policies will help promote and incentivize goal-driven technological progress and environmentally friendly behavior and ensure sufficient resources are allocated for implementation. In assessing the effectiveness of environmental policies, the experts were invited to draw on the following guiding questions:

1. Are environmental policy goals ambitious (i.e., do they target more than improvements to efficiency)?

2. Are environmental policies implemented with tangible impact?

3. Are environmental concerns integrated effectively across relevant policy sectors (i.e., energy, housing, transport, manufacturing industry, research and innovation, tourism, fisheries, agriculture)?

As environmental performance may be issue-specific, the experts were invited to provide a short paragraph for each of the four key targets of protection: resource use (land, water, materials, energy), environmental pollution (water, air, soil), climate and biodiversity protection.'

The indicator is based on expert answers to these questions and varies from 0 to 10, where 0-1 is 'Environmental concerns have been largely abandoned' and 9-10 is 'Environmental policy goals are ambitious and effectively implemented as well as monitored within and across most relevant policy sectors that account for the largest share of resource use and emissions'.

4.1.17.2 Participation in global environmental regimes (sgi_ger)

Long tag: qog_ei_sgi_ger

Original tag: sgi_ger

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 246, Percent: 1.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 246, Percent: 0.81

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

> The indicator measures the extent to which governments actively contribute to the design and advancement of global environmental protection regimes.

Protecting the climate and preserving natural resources worldwide depends on effective collective action carried out on a global level. Examples of active contribution include demonstrating initiative and responsibility, acting as an agenda-setter within international frameworks, and/or achieving an alignment of purpose among conflicting interests in international negotiations.

The experts were invited to provide a paragraph addressing the following three aspects:

1. Which issues are treated as global common goods rather than domestic environmental problems (e.g., chemical pollution, biodiversity conservation, forest protection, climate protection, etc.)?

2. Which of these global issues or goals does the government address, and has it formulated and implemented action plans targeting these goals?

3. Are countries targeting the preservation of global common goods by contributing funds either through international facilities or official development assistance?'

The indicator is based on the expert answers to these questions and varies from 0 to 10, where 1-2 is 'The government does not contribute to international efforts to strengthen global environmental protection regimes,' and 9-10 is 'The government actively contributes to international efforts to design and advance global environmental protection regimes. In most cases, it demonstrates commitment to existing regimes, contributes to their being advanced and has introduced appropriate reforms'.

4.1.18 World Development Indicators

Dataset by: The World Bank Group The primary World Bank collection of development indicators, compiled from officially-recognized international sources. This is an adaptation of an original work by The World Bank. Views and opinions expressed in the adaptation are the sole responsibility of the author or authors of the adaptation and are not endorsed by The World Bank. Link to the original source: `http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-developmentindicators`

4.1.18.1 Agricultural irrigated land (percent of total agricultural land) (wdi_agrland)

Long tag: qog_ei_wdi_agrland

Original tag: wdi_agrland

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 826, Percent: 6.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 799, Percent: 2.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27 Percent: 3.27

Description:

Agricultural land refers to the share of land area that is arable, under permanent crops, and under permanent pastures. Arable land includes land defined by the FAO as land under temporary crops (double-cropped areas are counted once), temporary meadows for mowing or for pasture, land under market or kitchen gardens, and land temporarily fallow. Land abandoned as a result of shifting cultivation is excluded. Land under permanent crops is land cultivated with crops that occupy the land for long periods and need not be replanted after each harvest, such as cocoa, coffee, and rubber. This category includes land under flowering shrubs, fruit trees, nut trees, and vines, but excludes land under trees grown for wood or timber. Permanent pasture is land used for five or more years for forage, including natural and cultivated crops.

4.1.18.2 Arable land (percent of land area) (wdi_araland)

Long tag: qog_ei_wdi_araland

Original tag: wdi_araland

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8900, Percent: 70

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8050, Percent: 26.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 850 Percent: 9.55

Description:

Arable land includes land defined by the FAO as land under temporary crops (double-cropped areas are counted once), temporary meadows for mowing or for pasture, land under market or kitchen gardens, and land temporarily fallow. Land abandoned as a result of shifting cultivation is excluded.

4.1.18.3 Land area (sq. km) (wdi_area)

Long tag: qog_ei_wdi_area

Original tag: wdi_area

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9457, Percent: 74.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8419, Percent: 27.76

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1038 Percent: 10.98

Description:

Land area is a country's total area, excluding area under inland water bodies, national claims to continental shelf, and exclusive economic zones. In most cases the definition of inland water bodies includes major rivers and lakes.

4.1.18.4 Terrestrial protected areas (percent of total land area) (wdi_tpa)

Long tag: qog_ei_wdi_tpa

Original tag: wdi_tpa

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 571, Percent: 4.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 508, Percent: 1.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 63 Percent: 11.03

Description:

Terrestrial protected areas are totally or partially protected areas of at least 1,000 hectares that are designated by national authorities as scientific reserves with limited public access, national parks, natural monuments, nature reserves or wildlife sanctuaries, protected landscapes, and areas managed mainly for sustainable use. Marine areas, unclassified areas, littoral (intertidal) areas, and sites protected under local or provincial law are excluded. World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) where the compilation and management is carried out by United Nations Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in collaboration with governments, non-governmental organizations, academia, and industry. The data are available online through the Protected Planet website (https://www.protectedplanet.net/).

4.1.19 World Values Survey

Dataset by: World Values Survey The World Values Survey is a global network of social scientists studying changing values and their impact on social and political life, led by an international team of scholars, with the WVS association and secretariat headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden. The European Values Study started in 1981 when a thousand citizens in the European Member States of that time were interviewed using standardized questionnaires. Every nine years, the survey is repeated in a variable number of countries. The fourth wave in 2008 covers no less than 47 European countries/regions, from Iceland to Georgia and from Portugal to Norway. EVS is cooperating with WVS for the data collection in Europe and both datasets can be integrated. The variables are country averages calculated using the population weight provided by WVS/EVS. Link to the original source: `http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/`

4.1.19.1 Protecting environment vs economic growth (percent) (wvs_epmip)

Long tag: qog_ei_wvs_epmip

Original tag: wvs_epmip

Dataset citation: Povitkina et al. (2021)

Variable citation: EVS (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 246, Percent: 1.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 240, Percent: 0.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6 Percent: 2.44

Description:

Percent of replies mentioning 'Protecting the environment should be given priority' to the question: 'Here are two statements people sometimes make when discussing the environment and economic growth. Which of them comes closer to your own point of view?

A. Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs

B. Economic growth and creating jobs should be the top priority, even if the environment suffers to some extent'.

A higher score means that more people prioritize the environment over economic growth and jobs. A lower score means that more people prioritize economic growth and jobs over the environment.

4.2 QoG EQI Regional Level 2021 (with all NUTS2 regions)

Dataset tag: qog_eqi_agg21

Output Unit: QoG NUTS2 Region, i.e., data is collected per NUTS2 region. That means there is one row for each region in the dataset. The unit is expressed through the column region_code but can also be expressed through the column name.

Description: This index focuses on both perceptions and experiences with public sector corruption, along with the extent to which citizens believe various public sector services are impartially allocated and of good quality in the EU.

Dataset citation: Charron, Nicholas, Victor Lapuente Monika Bauhr. 2021. Sub-national Quality of Government in EU Member States: Presenting the 2021 European Quality of Government Index and its relationship with Covid-19 indicators. University of Gothenburg: The QoG Working Paper Series 2021:4.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_eqi_21.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page:
`https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/european-quality-of-government-index`

4.2.1 Identification Variables

These variables identify the observations in the dataset.

4.2.1.1 NUTS Level (nuts_level)

Long tag: qog_eqi_agg21_nuts_level

Original tag: nuts_level

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:

To what level of NUTS belong observation. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes.
(0) Country level
(1) Major socio-economic regions
(2) Basic regions for the application of regional policies

4.2.1.2 NUTS1 abbreviation code (nuts1)

Long tag: qog_eqi_agg21_nuts1

Original tag: nuts1

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Description:

Code of NUTS1 level region to which the observation belongs. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 1: major socio-economic regions.

4.3 QoG European Quality of Government Index CATI - Country Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024)

Dataset tag: qog_eqi_cati_long

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: This index focuses on both perceptions and experiences with public sector corruption, along with the extent to which citizens believe various public sector services are impartially allocated and of good quality in the EU.

Dataset citation: Nicholas Charron, Victor Lapuente and Monika Bauhr (2024). "The Geography of Quality of Government in Europe. Subnational variations in the 2024 European Quality of Government Index and Comparisons with Previous Rounds". QoG Working Paper Series 2024:2. Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg. ISSN: 1653-8919.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_eqi_24.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page:
`https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/european-quality-of-government-index`

4.3.1 Country Level Variables

EQI variables for the country level.

4.3.1.1 Corruption in my area is used to get access to special unfair priv- ileges and wealth. (greed_cor)

Long tag: qog_eqi_cati_long_greed_cor

Original tag: greed_cor

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 75, Percent: 0.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75, Percent: 0.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 means *Strongly disagree* and 10 means *Strongly agree*.

4.4 QoG European Quality of Government Index Regional Level (2010, 2013, 2017, 2021 2024)

Dataset tag: qog_eqi_long

Output Unit: QoG NUTS Region-Year, i.e., data is collected per European NUTS region and year. This means that every row in the dataset can be identified through a combination of region and year. The unit can be expressed using the columns region_code and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns nuts0, nuts1, nuts2 and year or name and year.

Description: This index focuses on both perceptions and experiences with public sector corruption, along with the extent to which citizens believe various public sector services are impartially allocated and of good quality in the EU.

Dataset citation: Nicholas Charron, Victor Lapuente and Monika Bauhr (2024). "The Geography of Quality of Government in Europe. Subnational variations in the 2024 European Quality of Government Index and Comparisons with Previous Rounds". QoG Working Paper Series 2024:2. Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg. ISSN: 1653-8919.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_eqi_24.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page:
`https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/european-quality-of-government-index`

4.4.1 Identification Variables

This section includes variables which identify observations by year, country, and region.

4.4.1.1 NUTS Level (nuts_level)

Long tag: qog_eqi_long_nuts_level

Original tag: nuts_level

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2019), Charron et al. (2014), Charron et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25, Percent: 0.08

Description:

To what level of NUTS belong observation. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical
purposes.
(0) Country level
(1) Major socio-economic regions
(2) Basic regions for the application of regional policies

4.5 QoG EU Regional Dataset Long Data

Dataset tag: qog_eureg_long

Output Unit: QoG NUTS Region-Year, i.e., data is collected per European NUTS region and year. This means that every row in the dataset can be identified through a combination of region and year. The unit can be expressed using the columns region_code and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns nuts0, nuts1 nuts2 and year.

Description: The QoG EU Regional dataset is a dataset consisting of more than 300 variables covering three levels of European regions - Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS): NUTS0 (country), NUTS1(major socio-economic regions) and NUTS2 (basic regions for the application of regional policies).

The QoG Regional Data is presented in three different forms available in separate datasets. The variable are the same across all three dataset besides a varying suffix (_nuts0, _nuts1, _nuts2) indication which NUTS level is represented.
All datasets are available in time-series format. The first one (The QoG Regional Data - Long Form) is a dataset where data is presented in the long form. The list of units of analysis contains regions of all NUTS levels.
Two other datasets are presented in the wide form for multilevel analysis. In the second dataset (The QoG Regional Data - Wide Form NUTS1) includes NUTS1 level as the unit of analysis and variables represent the values for this level and corresponding lower level – NUTS0. As an example, in this dataset the data is presented only for East Sweden(Ostra Sverige SE1), as a unit of analysis and has values for lower levels of this region - Sweden (SE).
In the third dataset (The QoG Regional Data - Wide Form NUTS2) the unit of analysis is NUTS2 level regions and variables provide values as for every unit of analysis, as well as for corresponding lower NUTS levels: NUTS1 and NUTS0. One example of unit of analysis in this dataset is Stockholm (SE11) and data for every variable will be for Stockholm, as well as for lower level regions - East Sweden (Ostra Sverige SE1) and Sweden (SE).

Dataset citation: Charron, Nicholas, Stefan Dahlberg, Aksel Sundström, Sören Holmberg, Bo Rothstein, Natalia Alvarado Pachon Cem Mert Dalli. 2020. The Quality of Government EU Regional Dataset, version Nov20. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogeuregnov20

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_eureg_nov20.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution,

commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/eu-regional-dataset`

4.5.1 Identification

Identification variables in the dataset.

4.5.1.1 The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) level (level)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_level

Original tag: level

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1693, Percent: 5.58

Description:

To what level of NUTS belong observation. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes.
(0) Country level;
(1) Major socio-economic regions;
(2) Basic regions for the application of regional policies.

4.5.1.2 Code of NUTS1 level region (nuts1)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_nuts1

Original tag: nuts1

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Code of NUTS1 level region to which the observation belongs. The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, (NUTS), is a geocode standard for referencing the administrative divisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 1: major socio-economic regions.

4.5.2 Demographics

This category includes variables describing the demographic characteristics of a population, such as its size, life-expectancy, fertility rates and death rates.

4.5.2.1 Population at 1st January, Female (eu_d2jan_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_d2jan_f

Original tag: eu_d2jan_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 987, Percent: 3.25

Description:

Female population as of 1st January of the year indicated. It is based on concept of usual resident population, i.e. the number of inhabitants of a given area on 1 January of the year in question (or, in some cases, on 31 December of the previous year). The population figures can be based on data from the most recent census adjusted by the components of population change produced since the last census, or based on population registers. Usually resident population means all persons having usual residence in a country at the reference time. Usual residence means the place where a person normally spends the daily period of rest, regardless of temporary absences for purposes of recreation, holidays, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage. The following persons alone are considered to be usual residents of the geographical area in question: a) those who have lived in their place of usual residence for a continuous period of at least 12 months before the reference time; or b) those who arrived in their place of usual residence during the 12 months before the reference time with the intention of staying there for at least one year.

4.5.2.2 Population at 1st January, Male (eu_d2jan_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_d2jan_m

Original tag: eu_d2jan_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 987, Percent: 3.25

Description:

Male population as of 1st January of the year indicated. It is based on concept of usual resident population, i.e. the number of inhabitants of a given area on 1 January of the year in question (or, in some cases, on 31 December of the previous year). The population figures can be based on data from the most recent census adjusted by the components of population change produced since the last census, or based on population registers. Usually resident population means all persons having usual residence in a country at the reference time. Usual residence means the place where a person normally spends the daily period of rest, regardless of temporary absences for purposes of recreation, holidays, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage. The following persons alone are considered to be usual residents of the geographical area in question: a) those who have lived in their place of usual residence for a continuous period of at least 12 months before the reference time; or b) those who arrived in their place of usual residence during the 12 months before the reference time with the intention of staying there for at least one year.

4.5.2.3 Population at 1st January, Total (eu_d2jan_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_d2jan_t

Original tag: eu_d2jan_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 988, Percent: 3.26

Description:

Total population as of 1st January of the year indicated. It is based on concept of usual resident population, i.e. the number of inhabitants of a given area on 1 January of the year in question (or, in some cases, on 31 December of the previous year). The population figures can be based on data from the most recent census adjusted by the components of population change produced since the last census, or based on population registers. Usually resident population means all

persons having usual residence in a country at the reference time. Usual residence means the place where a person normally spends the daily period of rest, regardless of temporary absences for purposes of recreation, holidays, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage. The following persons alone are considered to be usual residents of the geographical area in question: a) those who have lived in their place of usual residence for a continuous period of at least 12 months before the reference time; or b) those who arrived in their place of usual residence during the 12 months before the reference time with the intention of staying there for at least one year.

4.5.3 Education

This category includes a variety of indicators related to education, such as educational attainment, the students (age, gender, educational level), and educational outcomes.

4.5.3.1 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, female (eu_neet_y1524f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_neet_y1524f

Original tag: eu_neet_y1524f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 597, Percent: 1.97

Description:

15-24 year old females neither in employment nor in education as percentage. The indicator on young people neither in employment nor in education and training (NEET) provides information on young people aged 15 to 24 who meet the following two conditions: (a) they are not employed (i.e. unemployed or inactive according to the International Labour Organisation definition) and (b) they have not received any education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey. Data are expressed as a percentage of the total population in the same age group and sex, excluding the respondents who have not answered the question 'participation to education and training'. Data come from the European Union Labour Force Survey.

4.5.3.2 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, male (eu_neet_y1524m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_neet_y1524m

Original tag: eu_neet_y1524m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 598, Percent: 1.97

Description:

15-24 year old males neither in employment nor in education as percentage. The indicator on young people neither in employment nor in education and training (NEET) provides information on young people aged 15 to 24 who meet the following two conditions: (a) they are not employed (i.e. unemployed or inactive according to the International Labour Organisation definition) and (b) they have not received any education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey. Data are expressed as a percentage of the total population in the same age group and sex, excluding the respondents who have not answered the question 'participation to education and training'. Data come from the European Union Labour Force Survey.

4.5.3.3 15-24 year old neither in employment nor in education as percentage, total (eu_neet_y1524t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_neet_y1524t

Original tag: eu_neet_y1524t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 600, Percent: 1.98

Description:

15-24 year old population neither in employment nor in education as percentage. The indicator on young people neither in employment nor in education and training (NEET) provides information on young people aged 15 to 24 who meet the following two conditions: (a) they are not employed (i.e. unemployed or inactive according to the International Labour Organisation definition) and (b) they have not received any education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey. Data are expressed as a percentage of the total population in the same age group and sex, excluding the respondents who have not answered the question 'participation to education and training'. Data come from the European Union Labour Force Survey.

4.5.3.4 Employment rate for people between 15-34 years, all education levels (eu_empl_edltotal)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_empl_edltotal

Original tag: eu_empl_edltotal

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 601, Percent: 1.98

Description:

Total employment rate for people between 15 and 34 years for all education levels. The indicator is defined as the percentage of the population aged 15-34, who were employed (ILO definition), not in further education or training (i.e. neither formal nor non-formal) during the last four weeks preceding the survey.

4.5.4 Health

This category includes indicators describing the health of a population in a given country. These include reports about the prevalence of infectious diseases, and indicators such as birth rate, death rate, life expectancy. It also provides information on the capacity of the health care system, such as the number of hospital beds available.

4.5.4.1 Dentists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_dent)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_hea_dent

Original tag: eu_hea_dent

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 711, Percent: 2.34

Description:

Dentists, per hundred thousand inhabitants. Health care staff data refer to human resources

available for providing health care services in the country, irrespective of the sector of employment (i.e. whether they are independent, employed by a hospital or any other health care provider). 'Manpower' categories focus on health care professionals (physicians, dentists, nursing and caring professionals, pharmacists, physiotherapists). Three different concepts are used to present the number of health care professionals: i) 'practising', i.e. health care professionals providing services directly to patients; ii) 'professionally active', i.e. 'practising' health care professionals plus health care professionals for whom their medical education is a prerequisite for the execution of the job; iii) 'licensed to practice', i.e. health care professionals who are registered and entitled to practice as health care professionals.

4.5.4.2 Medical doctors per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_mdoc)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_hea_mdoc

Original tag: eu_hea_mdoc

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 763, Percent: 2.52

Description:

Medical doctors, per hundred thousand inhabitants. Health care staff data refer to human resources available for providing health care services in the country, irrespective of the sector of employment (i.e. whether they are independent, employed by a hospital or any other health care provider). 'Manpower' categories focus on health care professionals (physicians, dentists, nursing and caring professionals, pharmacists, physiotherapists). Three different concepts are used to present the number of health care professionals: i) 'practising', i.e. health care professionals providing services directly to patients; ii) 'professionally active', i.e. 'practising' health care professionals plus health care professionals for whom their medical education is a prerequisite for the execution of the job; iii) 'licensed to practice', i.e. health care professionals who are registered and entitled to practice as health care professionals.

4.5.4.3 Nurses and midwives per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_nurs)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_hea_nurs

Original tag: eu_hea_nurs

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 540, Percent: 1.78

Description:

Nurses and midwives, per hundred thousand inhabitants. Health care staff data refer to human resources available for providing health care services in the country, irrespective of the sector of employment (i.e. whether they are independent, employed by a hospital or any other health care provider). 'Manpower' categories focus on health care professionals (physicians, dentists, nursing and caring professionals, pharmacists, physiotherapists). Three different concepts are used to present the number of health care professionals: i) 'practising', i.e. health care professionals providing services directly to patients; ii) 'professionally active', i.e. 'practising' health care professionals plus health care professionals for whom their medical education is a prerequisite for the execution of the job; iii) 'licensed to practice', i.e. health care professionals who are registered and entitled to practice as health care professionals.

4.5.4.4 Pharmacists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_pharm)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_hea_pharm

Original tag: eu_hea_pharm

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 674, Percent: 2.22

Description:

Pharmacists per hundred thousand inhabitants. Health care staff data refer to human resources available for providing health care services in the country, irrespective of the sector of employment (i.e. whether they are independent, employed by a hospital or any other health care provider). 'Manpower' categories focus on health care professionals (physicians, dentists, nursing and caring professionals, pharmacists, physiotherapists). Three different concepts are used to present the number of health care professionals: i) 'practising', i.e. health care professionals providing services directly to patients; ii) 'professionally active', i.e. 'practising' health care professionals plus health care professionals for whom their medical education is a prerequisite for the execution of the job; iii) 'licensed to practice', i.e. health care professionals who are registered and entitled to practice as health care professionals.

4.5.4.5 Physiotherapists per hundred thousand inhabitants (eu_hea_phys)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_hea_phys

Original tag: eu_hea_phys

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 557, Percent: 1.84

Description:

Physiotherapists per hundred thousand inhabitants. Health care staff data refer to human resources available for providing health care services in the country, irrespective of the sector of employment (i.e. whether they are independent, employed by a hospital or any other health care provider). 'Manpower' categories focus on health care professionals (physicians, dentists, nursing and caring professionals, pharmacists, physiotherapists). Three different concepts are used to present the number of health care professionals: i) 'practising', i.e. health care professionals providing services directly to patients; ii) 'professionally active', i.e. 'practising' health care professionals plus health care professionals for whom their medical education is a prerequisite for the execution of the job; iii) 'licensed to practice', i.e. health care professionals who are registered and entitled to practice as health care professionals.

4.5.5 Science and Technology

This category provides information on employment rates in different sectors, for the total population as well as subgroups.

4.5.5.1 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_ab_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ab_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_ab_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 355, Percent: 1.17

Description:

Female employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing; mining and quarrying, as percentage

of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.2 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_ab_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ab_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_ab_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing; mining and quarrying, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.3 Employment in agriculture, fishing and mining, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_ab_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ab_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_ab_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing; mining and quarrying, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.4 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_c_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_c_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_c_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in manufacturing, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.5 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_c_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_c_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_c_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in manufacturing, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.6 Employment in manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_c_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_c_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_c_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in manufacturing, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.7 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_chtc_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_chtc_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_chtc_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 323, Percent: 1.06

Description:

Female employment in high-technology manufacturing, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.8 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_chtc_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_chtc_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_chtc_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 322, Percent: 1.06

Description:

Male employment in high-technology manufacturing, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.9 Employment in high-technology manufacturing, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_chtc_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_chtc_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_chtc_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 344, Percent: 1.13

Description:

Employment in high-technology manufacturing, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.10 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_df_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_df_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_df_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply; water supply and construction, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.11 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_df_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_df_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_df_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply; water supply and construction, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.12 Employment in electricity, gas and water supply, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_df_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_df_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_df_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply; water supply and construction, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey

(LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.13 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_gu_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_gu_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_gu_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in services, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.14 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_gu_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_gu_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_gu_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in services, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.15 Employment in services, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_gu_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_gu_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_gu_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in services, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.16 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_htc_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_htc_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_htc_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in high-technology sectors (high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive high-technology services), as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.17 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_htc_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_htc_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_htc_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in high-technology sectors (high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive high-technology services), as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.18 Employment in high-technology sectors, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_htc_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_htc_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_htc_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in high-technology sectors (high-technology manufacturing and knowledge-intensive high-technology services), as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.19 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_j_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_j_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_j_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in information and communication, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.20 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_j_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_j_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_j_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in information and communication, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week,

for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.21 Employment in information and communication, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_j_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_j_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_j_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in information and communication, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.22 Employment in financial and insurance activities, percent of tot. employment, Female (eu_emtk_k_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_k_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_k_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in financial and insurance activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.23 Employment in financial and insurance activities of tot. employment, Male (eu_emtk_k_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_k_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_k_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 361, Percent: 1.19

Description:

Male employment in financial and insurance activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.24 Employment in financial and insurance activities, percent of tot. employment, Total (eu_emtk_k_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_k_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_k_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in financial and insurance activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.25 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_kis_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kis_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_kis_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in total knowledge-intensive services, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.26 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_kis_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kis_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_kis_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in total knowledge-intensive services, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.27 Employment in knowledge-intensive services, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_kis_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kis_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_kis_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in total knowledge-intensive services, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.28 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_kl_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kl_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_kl_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in financial and insurance activities; real estate activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.29 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_kl_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kl_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_kl_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in financial and insurance activities; real estate activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.30 Employment in real estate activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_kl_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_kl_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_kl_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in financial and insurance activities; real estate activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.31 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_m_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_m_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_m_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or

business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.32 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_m_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_m_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_m_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.33 Employment in scientific and technical activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_m_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_m_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_m_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.34 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_n_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_n_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_n_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 364, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in administrative and support service activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.35 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_n_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_n_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_n_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in administrative and support service activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.36 Employment in admin. and support activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_n_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_n_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_n_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in administrative and support service activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.37 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_ou_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ou_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_ou_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in public administration; activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.38 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_ou_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ou_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_ou_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in public administration; activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.39 Employment in extraterritorial org. and bodies, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_ou_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_ou_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_ou_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in public administration; activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit

level.

4.5.5.40 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_p_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_p_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_p_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in education, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.41 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_p_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_p_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_p_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in education, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.42 Employment in education, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_p_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_p_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_p_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in education, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during

the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.43 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_q_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_q_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_q_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in human health and social work activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.44 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_q_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_q_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_q_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in human health and social work activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.45 Employment in health and social work activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_q_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_q_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_q_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in human health and social work activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.46 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_r_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_r_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_r_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.47 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_r_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_r_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_r_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.48 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_r_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_r_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_r_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.49 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, female (eu_emtk_s_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_s_f

Original tag: eu_emtk_s_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Female employment in other service activities, as percentage of total female employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.50 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, male (eu_emtk_s_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_s_m

Original tag: eu_emtk_s_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Male employment in other service activities, as percentage of total male employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.51 Employment in other service activities, percent of tot. employment, total (eu_emtk_s_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emtk_s_t

Original tag: eu_emtk_s_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in other service activities, as percentage of total employment. Data come from EU Labour force survey (LFS). Employed people are defined as persons aged 15 years and over who during the reference week performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training. In high-tech statistics the population excludes anyone below the age of 15 or over the age of 74. The data are aggregated based on the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community (NACE) at 2-digit level.

4.5.5.52 Total R and D employees in business enterprise sector, female, full-time equivalent (eu_prd_bes_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_prd_bes_f

Original tag: eu_prd_bes_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 447, Percent: 1.47

Description:

Female R&D employees in business enterprise sector, full-time equivalent. R&D personnel in a statistical unit include all persons engaged directly in R&D, whether employed by the statistical unit or external contributors fully integrated into the statistical unit‘s R&D activities, as well as those providing direct services for the R&D activities (such as R&D managers, administrators, technicians and clerical staff). Persons providing indirect support and ancillary services, such as canteen, maintenance, administrative and security staff, has been excluded, even though their wages and salaries are included in “other current costs” when measuring R&D expenditure. Further information on the concepts and definitions used for the production of R&D statistics can be found in Frascati Manual (OECD 2015).

4.5.5.53 Total R and D employees in business enterprise sector, total, full-time equivalent (eu_prd_bes_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_prd_bes_t

Original tag: eu_prd_bes_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 883, Percent: 2.91

Description:

Total R&D employees in business enterprise sector, full-time equivalent. R&D personnel in a statistical unit include all persons engaged directly in R&D, whether

employed by the statistical unit or external contributors fully integrated into the statistical unit‘s R&D activities, as well as those providing direct services for the R&D activities (such as R&D managers, administrators, technicians and clerical straff). Persons providing indirect support and ancillary services, such as canteen, maintenance, administrative and security staff, has been excluded, even though their wages and salaries are included in “other current costs” when measuring R&D expenditure. Further information on the concepts and definitions used for the production of R&D statistics can be found in Frascati Manual (OECD 2015).

4.5.6 Poverty and Social Exclusion

This category describes the share of the population living in or at risk of poverty.

4.5.6.1 At-risk-of-poverty rate by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_povrisk_pc)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_povrisk_pc

Original tag: eu_povrisk_pc

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 462, Percent: 1.52

Description:

Percentage of total population at-risk-of-poverty rate by NUTS 2 regions. The persons with an equivalised disposable income below the risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60 percent of the national median equivalised disposable income (after social transfers).

4.5.6.2 Severe material deprivation rate by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_matdep_pc)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_matdep_pc

Original tag: eu_matdep_pc

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 462, Percent: 1.52

Description:

Percentage of total population living in conditions of severe material deprivation by NUTS 2 regions. The collection quot;material deprivationquot; covers indicators relating to economic strain, durables, housing and environment of the dwelling. Severely materially deprived persons have living conditions severely constrained by a lack of resources, they experience at least 4 out of 9 following deprivations items: they cannot afford i) to pay rent or utility bills, ii) keep home adequately warm, iii) face unexpected expenses, iv) eat meat, fish or a protein equivalent every second day, v) a week holiday away from home, vi) a car, vii) a washing machine, viii) a colour TV, ix) a telephone.

4.5.6.3 People at risk of poverty or social exclusion by NUTS regions, percentage (eu_povr_pc)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_povr_pc

Original tag: eu_povr_pc

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 462, Percent: 1.52

Description:

People at risk of poverty or social exclusion by NUTS 2 regions, percentage of total population. Persons who are at risk of poverty or severely materially deprived or living in households with very low work intensity. Persons are only counted once even if they are present in several sub-indicators. At risk-of-poverty are persons with an equivalised disposable income below the risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60 percent of the national median equivalised disposable income (after social transfers). Material deprivation covers indicators relating to economic strain and durables. Severely materially deprived persons have living conditions severely constrained by a lack of resources, they experience at least 4 out of 9 following deprivations items: cannot afford i) to pay rent or utility bills, ii) keep home adequately warm, iii) face unexpected expenses, iv) eat meat, fish or a protein equivalent every second day, v) a week holiday away from home, vi) a car, vii) a washing machine, viii) a colour TV, or ix) a telephone. People living in households with very low work intensity are those aged 0-59 living in households where the adults (aged 18-59) work less than 20percent of their total work potential during the past year.

4.5.7 Digital Society and Economy

This category includes variables related to internet use and the use of the internet for economic purposes, such as purchases or banking.

4.5.7.1 Internet use: Internet banking (eu_iu_iubk)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_iu_iubk

Original tag: eu_iu_iubk

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 441, Percent: 1.45

Description:

Percentage of individuals using the internet banking. Data given in this domain are collected annually by the National Statistical Institutes and are based on Eurostat's annual model questionnaires on ICT (Information and Communication Technologies) usage in households and by individuals. The survey comprises questions at household level and individual level. The population of households consists of all private households having at least one member in the age group 16 to 74 years. The population of individuals consists of all individuals aged 16 to 74 (on an optional basis some countries collect separate data on other age groups, individuals aged 15 years or less, aged 75 or more). Regional breakdowns have been provided on a voluntary basis for 2006 and 2007 according to NUTS1 or NUTS2 by several countries. Starting from 2008, the collection of NUTS1 breakdowns is obligatory (regional breakdowns for all countries are available) while NUTS2 breakdowns are still optional.

4.5.8 Labour Market Statistics

This category includes variables about employment and unemployment rates, in general, as well as in subgroups of the population.

4.5.8.1 Full-time employment, female, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ft_f

Original tag: eu_emp_ft_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Full-time female employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.2 Full-time employment, male, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ft_m

Original tag: eu_emp_ft_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Full-time male employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.3 Full-time employment, total, in thousands (eu_emp_ft_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ft_t

Original tag: eu_emp_ft_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total full-time employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.4 Part-time employment, female, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_pt_f

Original tag: eu_emp_pt_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Part-time female employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.5 Part-time employment, male, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_pt_m

Original tag: eu_emp_pt_m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Part-time male employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.6 Part-time employment, total, in thousands (eu_emp_pt_t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_pt_t

Original tag: eu_emp_pt_t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 636, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total part-time employment, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.7 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, female (eu_emp_1524f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_1524f

Original tag: eu_emp_1524f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for women between 15-24 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.8 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, male (eu_emp_1524m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_1524m

Original tag: eu_emp_1524m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for men between 15-24 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.9 Employment rate for 15-24 years old, total (eu_emp_1524t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_1524t

Original tag: eu_emp_1524t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total employment rate between 15-24 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.10 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, female (eu_emp_2064f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2064f

Original tag: eu_emp_2064f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for women between 20-64 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.11 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, male (eu_emp_2064m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2064m

Original tag: eu_emp_2064m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for men between 20-64 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.12 Employment rate for 20-64 years old, total (eu_emp_2064t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2064t

Original tag: eu_emp_2064t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total employment rate between 20-64 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.13 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, female (eu_emp_2534f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2534f

Original tag: eu_emp_2534f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for women between 25-34 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.14 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, male (eu_emp_2534m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2534m

Original tag: eu_emp_2534m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for men between 25-34 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.15 Employment rate for 25-34 years old, total (eu_emp_2534t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_2534t

Original tag: eu_emp_2534t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total employment rate between 25-34 years old. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.16 Employment rate for +25 years, Female (eu_emp_ge25f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge25f

Original tag: eu_emp_ge25f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for women 25 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.17 Employment rate for +25 years, Male (eu_emp_ge25m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge25m

Original tag: eu_emp_ge25m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Employment rate for men 25 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.18 Employment rate for +25 years, Total (eu_emp_ge25t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge25t

Original tag: eu_emp_ge25t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 638, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total employment rate for 25 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.19 Employment rate for +65 years, Female (eu_emp_ge65f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge65f

Original tag: eu_emp_ge65f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 600, Percent: 1.98

Description:

Employment rate for women 65 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.20 Employment rate for +65 years, Male (eu_emp_ge65m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge65m

Original tag: eu_emp_ge65m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 625, Percent: 2.06

Description:

Employment rate for men 65 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.21 Employment rate for +65 years, Total (eu_emp_ge65t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ge65t

Original tag: eu_emp_ge65t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 628, Percent: 2.07

Description:

Total employment rate for 65 years old and above. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.22 Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing, in thousands (eu_emp_a)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_a

Original tag: eu_emp_a

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing, in thousands. The source for the regional

labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.23 Employment in industry (except construction), in thousands (eu_emp_be)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_be

Original tag: eu_emp_be

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in industry (except construction), in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.24 Employment in construction, in thousands (eu_emp_f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_f

Original tag: eu_emp_f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in construction, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.25 Employment in wholesale and retail trade, and service activities, in thousands (eu_emp_gi)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_gi

Original tag: eu_emp_gi

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in wholesale and retail trade, transport, accommodation and food service

activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.26 Employment in information and communication, in thousands (eu_emp_j)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_j

Original tag: eu_emp_j

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in information and communication, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.27 Employment in financial and insurance activities, in thousands (eu_emp_k)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_k

Original tag: eu_emp_k

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in financial and insurance activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.28 Employment in real estate activities, in thousands (eu_emp_l)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_l

Original tag: eu_emp_l

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 358, Percent: 1.18

Description:

Employment in real estate activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.29 Employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, in thousands (eu_emp_m_n)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_m_n

Original tag: eu_emp_m_n

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in professional, scientific and technical activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.30 Employment in public admin., defence, education and health, in thousands (eu_emp_oq)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_oq

Original tag: eu_emp_oq

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in public administration, defence, education, human health and social work activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.31 Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, in thousands (eu_emp_ru)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_ru

Original tag: eu_emp_ru

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 365, Percent: 1.2

Description:

Employment in arts, entertainment and recreation, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.32 Employment in all NACE activities, in thousands (eu_emp_total)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_emp_total

Original tag: eu_emp_total

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 369, Percent: 1.22

Description:

Employment in total - all NACE activities, in thousands. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The definition of unemployment is further specified in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1897/2000.

4.5.8.33 Long-term unemployment as percentage of active population (eu_ltu_pc_act)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_ltu_pc_act

Original tag: eu_ltu_pc_act

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 622, Percent: 2.05

Description:

Long-term unemployment as a percentage of active population. Long-term unemployment is defined as being unemployed for 12 months or longer. Unemployed persons comprise persons aged 15 to 74 who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.34 Long-term unemployment as percentage of unemployment (eu_ltu_pc_une)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_ltu_pc_une

Original tag: eu_ltu_pc_une

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 622, Percent: 2.05

Description:

Long-term unemployment as a percentage of unemployment. Long-term unemployment is defined as being unemployed for 12 months or longer. Unemployed persons comprise persons aged 15 to 74 who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.35 Long-term unemployment in thousands (eu_ltu_ths)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_ltu_ths

Original tag: eu_ltu_ths

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 622, Percent: 2.05

Description:

Long-term unemployment in thousands. Long-term unemployment is defined as being unemployed for 12 months or longer. Unemployed persons comprise persons aged 15 to 74 who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.36 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, female (eu_unemp_1524f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1524f

Original tag: eu_unemp_1524f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 629, Percent: 2.07

Description:

Unemployment rate for women between 15-24 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three

months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.37 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, male (eu_unemp_1524m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1524m

Original tag: eu_unemp_1524m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 633, Percent: 2.09

Description:

Unemployment rate for men between 15-24 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.38 Unemployment rate for 15-24 years old, total (eu_unemp_1524t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1524t

Original tag: eu_unemp_1524t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total unemployment rate for 15-24 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.39 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, female (eu_unemp_1574f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1574f

Original tag: eu_unemp_1574f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Unemployment rate for women between 15-74 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.40 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, male (eu_unemp_1574m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1574m

Original tag: eu_unemp_1574m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Unemployment rate for men between 15-74 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.41 Unemployment rate for 15-74 years old, total (eu_unemp_1574t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_1574t

Original tag: eu_unemp_1574t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total unemployment rate for 15-74 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.42 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, female (eu_unemp_2064f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_2064f

Original tag: eu_unemp_2064f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Unemployment rate for women between 20-64 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.43 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, male (eu_unemp_2064m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_2064m

Original tag: eu_unemp_2064m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 635, Percent: 2.09

Description:

Unemployment rate for men between 20-64 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.44 Unemployment rate for 20-64 years old, total (eu_unemp_2064t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_2064t

Original tag: eu_unemp_2064t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total unemployment rate for 20-64 years old. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly

household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.45 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, female (eu_unemp_ge15f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge15f

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge15f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Unemployment rate for women aged 15 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.46 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, male (eu_unemp_ge15m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge15m

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge15m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Unemployment rate for men aged 15 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.47 Unemployment rate for + 15 years, total (eu_unemp_ge15t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge15t

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge15t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total unemployment rate for people aged 15 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.48 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, female (eu_unemp_ge25f)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge25f

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge25f

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 634, Percent: 2.09

Description:

Unemployment rate for women aged 25 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.49 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, male (eu_unemp_ge25m)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge25m

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge25m

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 634, Percent: 2.09

Description:

Unemployment rate for men aged 25 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.8.50 Unemployment rate for + 25 years, total (eu_unemp_ge25t)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_unemp_ge25t

Original tag: eu_unemp_ge25t

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 637, Percent: 2.1

Description:

Total unemployment rate for people aged 25 years and over. Unemployed persons comprise persons who fulfil all the three following conditions: - are without work during the reference week; - are available to start work within the next two weeks; - have been actively seeking work in the past four weeks or have already found a job to start within the next three months. The source for the regional labour market information is the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS). This is a quarterly household sample survey conducted in all Member States of the EU, the United Kingdom, EFTA and Candidate Countries (Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey). The definitions of employment and unemployment, as well as other survey characteristics follow the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

4.5.9 Economy

This category provides information on household incomes and GDP.

4.5.9.1 Income of households (Balance) in euro per inhabitant (eu_b5n_eur_hab)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b5n_eur_hab

Original tag: eu_b5n_eur_hab

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 449, Percent: 1.48

Description:

Income of households (balance), Euro per inhabitant. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.2 Income of households (Balance) in million euro (eu_b5n_mio_eur)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b5n_mio_eur

Original tag: eu_b5n_mio_eur

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (balance), million Euro. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in

cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.3 Income of households (Balance) in million national currency (eu_b5n_mio_nac)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b5n_mio_nac

Original tag: eu_b5n_mio_nac

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (balance), million national currency. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.4 Income of households (Balance) in million PPS (eu_b5n_mio_pps)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b5n_mio_pps

Original tag: eu_b5n_mio_pps

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (balance), million PPS. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.5 Income of households (Disposable income) in euro per inhabitant (eu_b6n_eur_hab)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b6n_eur_hab

Original tag: eu_b6n_eur_hab

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 449, Percent: 1.48

Description:

Income of households (disposable income), Euro per inhabitant. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and

the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.6 Income of households (Disposable income) in million euro (eu_b6n_mio_eur)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b6n_mio_eur

Original tag: eu_b6n_mio_eur

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (disposable income), million Euro. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.7 Income of households (Disposable income) in million national currency (eu_b6n_mio_nac)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b6n_mio_nac

Original tag: eu_b6n_mio_nac

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (disposable income), million national currency. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.8 Income of households (Disposable income) in million PPS (eu_b6n_mio_pps)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b6n_mio_pps

Original tag: eu_b6n_mio_pps

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 491, Percent: 1.62

Description:

Income of households (disposable income), million PPS. The disposable income of private

households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.9 Income of households (Adjusted disposable income) in million euro (eu_b7n_mio_eur)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b7n_mio_eur

Original tag: eu_b7n_mio_eur

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 79, Percent: 0.26

Description:

Income of households (net adjusted disposable income), million euro. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households. Net signifies that depreciation costs have been subtracted from the income presented, and regional data are adjusted to the national values by Eurostat.

4.5.9.10 Income of households (Adjusted disposable income) in million national currency (eu_b7n_mio_nac)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_b7n_mio_nac

Original tag: eu_b7n_mio_nac

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 79, Percent: 0.26

Description:

Income of households (net adjusted disposable income), million national currency. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households. Net signifies that depreciation costs have been subtracted from the income presented, and regional data are adjusted to the national values by Eurostat.

4.5.9.11 Regional gross domestic product by NUTS 2 regions, million EUR (eu_mio_eur)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_mio_eur

Original tag: eu_mio_eur

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 376, Percent: 1.24

Description:

Regional gross domestic product (GDP) by NUTS 2 regions in Million euro. GDP is an indicator of the output of a country or a region. It reflects the total value of all goods and services produced less the value of goods and services used for intermediate consumption in their production. Expressing GDP in PPS (purchasing power standards) eliminates differences in price levels between countries. Calculations on a per inhabitant basis allow for the comparison of economies and regions significantly different in absolute size. GDP per inhabitant in PPS is the key variable for determining the eligibility of NUTS 2 regions in the framework of the European Union's structural policy.

4.5.9.12 Regional gross domestic product (million PPS) by NUTS 2 regions (eu_gdp_mio_pps)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_gdp_mio_pps

Original tag: eu_gdp_mio_pps

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Regional gross domestic product (GDP) by NUTS 2 regions in Million PPS (purchasing power standards). GDP is an indicator of the output of a country or a region. It reflects the total value of all goods and services produced less the value of goods and services used for intermediate consumption in their production. Expressing GDP in PPS eliminates differences in price levels between countries. Calculations on a per inhabitant basis allow for the comparison of economies and regions significantly different in absolute size. GDP per inhabitant in PPS is the key variable for determining the eligibility of NUTS 2 regions in the framework of the European Union's structural policy.

4.5.9.13 Regional gross domestic product (PPS per inhabitant) by NUTS 2 regions (eu_gdp_pps_hab)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_gdp_pps_hab

Original tag: eu_gdp_pps_hab

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Regional gross domestic product (GDP) by NUTS 2 regions in PPS (purchasing power standards) per inhabitant. GDP is an indicator of the output of a country or a region. It reflects the total value of all goods and services produced less the value of goods and services used for intermediate consumption in their production. Expressing GDP in PPS eliminates differences in price levels between countries. Calculations on a per inhabitant basis allow for the comparison of economies and regions significantly different in absolute size. GDP per inhabitant in PPS is the key variable for determining the eligibility of NUTS 2 regions in the framework of the European Union's structural policy.

4.5.9.14 Regional gross domestic product. PPS per inhabitant in percentage of EU27 (eu_gdp_pps_hab_eu27_2020)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_gdp_pps_hab_eu27_2020

Original tag: eu_gdp_pps_hab_eu27_2020

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Regional gross domestic product (GDP) by NUTS 2 regions in PPS (purchasing power standards) per inhabitant, as percent of EU27 (from 2020) average. GDP is an indicator of the output of a country or a region. It reflects the total value of all goods and services produced less the value of goods and services used for intermediate consumption in their production. Expressing GDP in PPS eliminates differences in price levels between countries. Calculations on a per inhabitant basis allow for the comparison of economies and regions significantly different in absolute size. GDP per inhabitant in PPS is the key variable for determining the eligibility of NUTS 2 regions in the framework of the European Union's structural policy.

4.5.9.15 Disposable income of private households by NUTS 2 regions (eu_dinc_pps_hab)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_dinc_pps_hab

Original tag: eu_dinc_pps_hab

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 283, Percent: 0.93

Description:

Disposable income of private households by NUTS 2 regions in PPS (purchasing power standards) based on final consumption per inhabitant. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households. The data for NUTS 1 and NUTS 0 regions has been calculated by computing a mean of the NUTS 2 values within each region.

4.5.9.16 Primary income of private households by NUTS 2 regions (eu_pinc_pps_hab)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_pinc_pps_hab

Original tag: eu_pinc_pps_hab

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Primary income of private households by NUTS 2 regions in PPS (purchasing power standards) based on final consumption per inhabitant. The disposable income of private households is the balance of primary income (operating surplus/mixed income plus compensation of employees plus property income received minus property income paid) and the redistribution of income in cash. These transactions comprise social contributions paid, social benefits in cash received, current taxes on income and wealth paid, as well as other current transfers. Disposable income does not include social transfers in kind coming from public administrations or non-profit institutions serving households.

4.5.9.17 Real growth rate of regional gross value added (GVA) at basic prices (eu_rgva_pch_pre)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_rgva_pch_pre

Original tag: eu_rgva_pch_pre

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent:

Description:

Real growth rate of regional gross value added (GVA) at basic prices by NUTS 2 regions, percentage change on previous year. GVA is an indicator of the economic activity of a country or a region. It reflects the total value of all goods and services produced less the value of goods and services used for intermediate consumption in their production. Several years ago Eurostat has started to collect real growth rates of regional GVA at NUTS level 2 from those Member States which calculate this already. The indicator is part of the ESA 2010 data transmission programme, but the transmission will be obligatory only as from the end of 2017.

4.5.10 Tourism

This category includes information about avaliable hotel beds as well as the number of days spent in tourist accomodation.

4.5.10.1 Number of establishments in hotels, camping places and other (eu_tour_nstour_estbl)

Long tag: qog_eureg_long_eu_tour_nstour_estbl

Original tag: eu_tour_nstour_estbl

Dataset citation: Charron et al. (2020)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 824, Percent: 2.72

Description:

Number of establishments in hotels, camping places and other. A tourist accommodation establishment is defined as any facility that regularly or occasionally provides short-term accommodation for tourists as a paid service (although the price might be partially or fully subsidised). Data is reported at the level of a local kind-of-activity unit. The local unit is an enterprise or part thereof situated in a geographically identified place. At or from this place economic activity is carried out for which - save for certain exceptions - one or more persons work (even if only part-time) for one and the same enterprise. The accommodation establishment conforms to the definition of local unit as the production unit. This is irrespective of whether the accommodation of tourists is the main or secondary activity. This means that all establishments are classified in the accommodation sector if their capacity

exceeds the national minimum even if the major part of turnover may come from restaurant or other services.

4.6 QoG Swedish Agency Database Formal Instruction Data

Dataset tag: qog_qad_inst

Output Unit: QoG Agency-Agency Instruction, i.e., data is collected per Swedish agency and agency instruction. That means there is one row for each combination of a Swedish agency and agency instruction in the dataset. This unit is identified using the agency_id column and the agency_instruction column.

We also add the agency name (agency_name column) to the unit table for a better understanding of the agency ids.

Description: This database consists of a comprehensive sample of administrative agencies in the Swedish executive bureaucracy between 1960 and 2014. The database is constituted by three distinct datasets: one that focuses on an agency's formal instruction; one that focuses on an agency's head; and one that focuses on an agency's budget. Note that each dataset has its own unit of analysis. The agency's head data can be found at SND, but is not included in DEMSCORE.

Dataset citation: Dahlström, Carl, Mikael Holmgren, Christian Björkdahl, Kersti Hazell, Anna Khomenko, Richard Svensson, and Pär Åberg. 2018. "Swedish Administrative Agencies, 1960-2014." University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_qad_18.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/qog-swedish-agency-database`

4.6.1 Aggregated Variables

This section includes variables aggregated to a country year level. Only binary variables are aggregated and the occurences of the value 1 are counted for each year.

4.6.1.1 Sum of Collaboration (agency_collab_sum)

Long tag: qog_qad_inst_agency_collab_sum

Original tag: agency_collab_sum

Dataset citation: Dahlström et al. (2018)

Description:

Count of occurences of the value 1 for the original variable agency_collab or each year.

4.7 QoG Standard Dataset Time-Series

Dataset tag: qog_std_ts

Output Unit: QoG Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means there is one row for each combination of country and year in the dataset. This unit is identified using the cname column and the year column.

Description: The QoG Standard dataset is our largest dataset. It consists of approximately 2100 variables from more than 100 data sources related to Quality of Government. In the QoG Standard TS dataset, data from 1946 to 2024 is included and the unit of analysis is country-year (e.g., Sweden-1946, Sweden-1947, etc.).

Dataset citation: Teorell, Jan, Aksel Sundström, Sören Holmberg, Bo Rothstein, Natalia Alvarado Pachon, Cem Mert Dalli, Rafael Lopez Valverde, Victor Saidi Phiri Lauren Gerber. 2025. The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan25. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government doi:10.18157/qogstdjan24`

QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/codebook_std_jan25.pdf`

License: The QoG datasets are open and available, free of charge and without a need to register your data. You can use them for your analysis, graphs, teaching, and other academic-related and non-commercial purposes. We ask our users to cite always the original source(s) of the data and our datasets.

We do not allow other uses of these data including but not limited to redistribution, commercialization and other for-profit usage. If a user is interested in such use or has doubts about the license, they will have to refer to the original source and check with them if this is allowed and what requirements they need to fulfill.

Be mindful that the original data sources are the only owners of their data and they can adjust their license without previous warning.

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/standard-dataset`

4.7.1 Judicial

This category includes judicial indicators, generally covering legal rights granted by a state to its citizens and their compliance, as well as measures of crimes and the overall state of the judicial system.

4.7.1.1 Law: companies guilty of procurement violations can't participate in future bid (aii_q27)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q27

Original tag: aii_q27

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 27. In law, companies found guilty of violations of procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids.

A 100 score is earned where the law forbids companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) from participating in future bidding in the country, whether indefinitely or for a limited period of time.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists.

4.7.1.2 Practice: companies guilty of violations cannot participate in future bids (aii_q28)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q28

Original tag: aii_q28

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 28. In practice, companies found guilty of violating procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are forbidden from participating in future bidding in the country, whether indefinitely or for a limited period of time, and

2) there is a registry of companies forbidden from bidding that citizens can access immediately or in less than two weeks upon request. A 100 is also earned if there is a registry in place that at the time of this research is empty because no company has violated the law.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are generally forbidden from participating in future bidding, but there is evidence that some exceptions exist, or

2) citizen access to the full list of companies forbidden from participating takes more than two weeks.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) companies found guilty of violating the law (procurement, tax, labor, corruption, etc.) are rarely forbidden from participating in future bidding, or

2) there is no registry of companies forbidden from participating or it exists but it's not public.

4.7.1.3 Law: senior officials of government are required to disclose records of assets (aii_q44)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q44

Original tag: aii_q44

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 44. In law, senior officials of the three branches of government (including heads of state and government, ministers, members of Parliament, judges, etc.) are required to disclose records of their assets and disclosures are public.

A 100 score is earned where in law all the following conditions are met:

1) senior officials of the three branches of government (including heads of state and government, ministers, members of Parliament, judges, etc.) must file asset disclosures,

2) disclosures must contain all assets and income belonging to them and their immediate family (including real estate, movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), and

3) disclosures must be available to the public.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) no such law exists or it exists but it doesn't apply to all senior officials of the three branches of government,

2) the law requires so little information as to render the disclosures useless (e.g. it doesn't require disclosing assets of the immediate family, or requires citing real estate but not movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), or

3) the law doesn't make the disclosures public.

4.7.1.4 Law: civil service members are required to disclose assets and these are public (aii_q46)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q46

Original tag: aii_q46

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 46. In law, members of the civil service are required to disclose records of their assets and the disclosures are public.

A 100 score is earned when in law all the following conditions are met:

1) members of the civil service must file asset disclosures,

2) disclosures must contain all assets and income belonging to them and their immediate family (including real estate, movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments, both domestic and foreign), and

3) disclosures must be available to the public.

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) no such law exists or it exists but it doesn't apply to all members of the civil service,

2) the law requires so little information as to render the disclosures useless (e.g. it doesn't require disclosing assets of the immediate family, or requires citing real estate but not movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), or

3) the law doesn't make the disclosures public.

4.7.1.5 Duty of the People is to Build Country in Constitution (ccp_buildsoc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_buildsoc

Original tag: ccp_buildsoc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution refer to a duty of the people to take part in building society or to work for the development of the country?

1. Yes

2. No

96. Other

4.7.1.6 Status of Slavery in Constitution (ccp_slave)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_slave
Original tag: ccp_slave
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59
Description:

Does the constitution prohibit slavery, servitude, or forced labor?

1. Universally prohibited

2. Prohibited except in the case of war

3. Prohibited with other exception(s)

90. Left explicitly to non-constitutional law

96. Other

98. Not specified

4.7.1.7 Associational and Organizational Rights (fh_aor)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_aor
Original tag: fh_aor
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31
Description:

Associational and Organizational Rights - The variable evaluates the freedom of assembly, demonstrations and open public discussion; the freedom for nongovernmental organizations; and the freedom for trade unions, peasant organizations and other professional and private

organizations. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

4.7.1.8 Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights (fh_pair)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fh_pair

Original tag: fh_pair

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3843, Percent: 30.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3370, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 473 Percent: 12.31

Description:

Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights - The variable evaluates the extent of state control over travel, choice of residence, employment or institutions of higher education; the right of citizens to own property and establish private businesses; the private business' freedom from unduly influence by government officials, security forces, political parties or organized crime; gender equality, freedom of choice of marriage partners and size of family; equality of opportunity and absence of economic exploitation. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

4.7.1.9 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (panel data) (fi_legprop_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_legprop_pd

Original tag: fi_legprop_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4496, Percent: 35.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4309, Percent: 14.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187 Percent: 4.16

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "no judicial independence", "no trusted legal framework exists", "no protection of intellectual property", "military interference in rule of law", and "no integrity of the legal system" and 10 corresponds to "high judicial independence", "trusted legal framework exists", "protection of intellectual property", "no military interference in rule of law", and "integrity of the legal system". The index consists of the following indicators: Judicial independence: The judiciary is independent and not subject to interference by the government or parties in dispute, Impartial courts: A trusted legal framework exists for private businesses to challenge the legality of government actions or regulations, Protection of intellectual property, Military interference in rule of law and the political process, Integrity of the legal system. Panel-data adjusted.

4.7.1.10 Judicial corruption decision (vdem_jucorrdc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_jucorrdc

Original tag: vdem_jucorrdc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10874, Percent: 85.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10514, Percent: 34.66

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 360 Percent: 3.31

Description:
Judicial corruption decision

Question: How often do individuals or businesses make undocumented extra payments or bribes in order to speed up or delay the process or to obtain a favorable judicial decision?

Responses:

0: Always.

1: Usually.

2: About half of the time.

3: Not usually.

4: Never.

4.7.1.11 Rule of Law, Estimate (wbgi_rle)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wbgi_rle
Original tag: wbgi_rle
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Kaufmann & Kraay (n.d.)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4954, Percent: 38.96
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4337, Percent: 14.3
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 617 Percent: 12.45
Description:
Rule of Law - Estimate: 'Rule of Law' includes several indicators which measure the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. These include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts. Together, these indicators measure the success of a society in developing an environment in which fair and predictable rules form the basis for economic and social interactions and the extent to which property rights are protected.

4.7.1.12 CPIA property rights and rule-based governance rating (wdi_prrbgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_prrbgr
Original tag: wdi_prrbgr
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: World Bank (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1474, Percent: 11.59
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1255, Percent: 4.14
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.86
Description:

Property rights and rule-based governance assess the extent to which private economic activity is facilitated by an effective legal system and rule-based governance structure in which property and contract rights are reliably respected and enforced (1=low to 6=high).

4.7.1.13 Civil Justice is Free of Discrimination (wjp_cj_discr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_cj_discr

Original tag: wjp_cj_discr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

Civil justice is free of discrimination measures whether the civil justice system discriminates in practice based on socio-economic status, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

4.7.1.14 Criminal System is Impartial (wjp_crsys_discr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wjp_crsys_discr

Original tag: wjp_crsys_discr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Justice Project (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1460, Percent: 11.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1382, Percent: 4.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 5.34

Description:

This variable measures whether the police and criminal judges are impartial and whether they discriminate in practice based on socio-economic status, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

4.7.2 Quality of Government

This category includes variables that are the core features of QoG (impartiality, bureaucratic quality and corruption) as well as measures that are broader (rule of law and transparency).

4.7.2.1 Practice: asset disclosure process of senior officials branches is effective (aii_q45)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q45

Original tag: aii_q45

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 45. In practice, the asset disclosure process for senior officials of the three branches of government (heads of state and government, ministers, members of Parliament, judges, etc.) is effective.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) senior officials of the three branches of government file their asset disclosures,

2) their disclosures contain detailed information about assets belonging to them and their immediate family (including real estate, movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), and

3) disclosures are available to the public online or within two weeks of request at the cost of photocopying.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) not all senior officials of the three branches of government file their asset disclosures,

2) their disclosures don't contain detailed information about them and their immediate family, or

3) disclosures are not always available to the public (they're not online, paper versions take more than two weeks to obtain, or costs are higher than photocopying).

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) senior officials of the three branches of government routinely fail to file asset disclosures,

2) asset disclosures contain so little information they are useless (e.g. they don't disclose assets of the immediate family, or cite real estate but not movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), or

3) asset disclosures are not available to the public. A 0 score is also earned where no law requires asset disclosures.

4.7.2.2 Practice: the asset disclosure process for civil service members is effective (aii_q47)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q47

Original tag: aii_q47

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 583, Percent: 4.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 561, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 47. In practice, the asset disclosure process for members of the civil service is effective.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) all members of the civil service file their asset disclosures,

2) their disclosures contain detailed information about assets belonging to them and their immediate family (including real estate, movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), and

3) disclosures are available to the public online or within two weeks of requested at the cost of photocopying.

A 50 score is earned where any of the following conditions apply:

1) most but not all members of the civil service file their asset disclosures,

2) their disclosures are not complete (e.g. they contain real estate assets but not movable property, or list the asset but don't provide its estimated value), or

3) disclosures are not always available to the public (they're not online, paper versions take more than two weeks to obtain, or costs are higher than photocopying).

A 0 score is earned where at least one of the following conditions apply:

1) members of the civil service routinely fail to file asset disclosures,

2) asset disclosures contain so little information they are useless (e.g. they don't disclose assets of the immediate family, or cite real estate but not movable property, cash, salaries, and income from investments), or

3) asset disclosures are not available to the public. A 0 score is also earned where no law requires asset disclosures.

4.7.2.3 State Fragility Index (cspf_sfi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cspf_sfi

Original tag: cspf_sfi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Marshall & Elzinga-Marshall (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3938, Percent: 30.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3825, Percent: 12.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 113 Percent: 2.87

Description:

A country's fragility is closely associated with its state capacity to manage conflict; make and implement public policy; and deliver essential services and its systemic resilience in maintaining system coherence, cohesion, and quality of life; responding effectively to challenges and crises, and sustaining progressive development. State Fragility = Effectiveness Score + Legitimacy Score (25 points possible).

4.7.2.4 E-Government Index (egov_egov)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_egov_egov

Original tag: egov_egov

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2289, Percent: 18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2016, Percent: 6.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 273 Percent: 11.93

Description:

The E-Government Development Index (EGDI) is a weighted average of normalised scores on the three most important dimensions of e-government, namely: scope and quality of online services (Online Service Index, OSI), status of the development of telecommunication infrastructure (Telecommunication Infrastructure Index, TII) and inherent human capital (Human Capital Index, HCI). Each of these sets of indices is in itself a composite measure that can be extracted and analysed independently.

4.7.2.5 ICRG Indicator of Quality of Government (icrg_qog)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_icrg_qog

Original tag: icrg_qog

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The PRS Group et al. (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5596, Percent: 44.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5342, Percent: 17.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 254 Percent: 4.54

Description:

The mean value of the ICRG variables 'Corruption', 'Law and Order' and 'Bureaucracy Quality', scaled from 0 to 1. Higher values indicate higher quality of government.

Corruption:

This is an assessment of corruption within the political system. Such corruption is a threat to foreign investment for several reasons: it distorts the economic and financial environment; it reduces the efficiency of government and business by enabling people to assume positions of power through patronage rather than ability; and, last but not least, it introduces an inherent instability into the political process. The most common form of corruption met directly by

business is financial corruption in the form of demands for special payments and bribes connected with import and export licenses, exchange controls, tax assessments, police protection, or loans. Such corruption can make it difficult to conduct business effectively, and in some cases may force the withdrawal or withholding of an investment. Although the measure takes such corruption into account, it is more concerned with actual or potential corruption in the form of excessive patronage, nepotism, job reservations, 'favor-for-favors', secret party funding, and suspiciously close ties between politics and business. According to ICRG, these insidious sorts of corruption are potentially of much greater risk to foreign business in that they can lead to popular discontent, unrealistic and inefficient controls on the state economy, and encourage the development of the black market. The greatest risk in such corruption is that at some time it will become so overweening, or some major scandal will be suddenly revealed, so as to provoke a popular backlash, resulting in a fall or overthrow of the government, a major reorganizing or restructuring of the country's political institutions, or, at worst, a breakdown in law and order, rendering the country ungovernable.

Law and order:

Law and Order are assessed separately, with each sub-component comprising zero to three points. The Law sub-component is an assessment of the strength and impartiality of the legal system, while the Order sub-component is an assessment of popular observance of the law. Thus, a country can enjoy a high rating in terms of its judicial system, but a low rating if it suffers from a very high crime rate or if the law is routinely ignored without effective sanction (for example, widespread illegal strikes).

Bureaucracy Quality:

The institutional strength and quality of the bureaucracy is another shock absorber that tends to minimize revisions of policy when governments change. Therefore, high points are given to countries where the bureaucracy has the strength and expertise to govern without drastic changes in policy or interruptions in government services. In these low-risk countries, the bureaucracy tends to be somewhat autonomous from political pressure and to have an established mechanism for recruitment and training. Countries that lack the cushioning effect of a strong bureaucracy receive low points because a change in government tends to be traumatic in terms of policy formulation and day-to-day administrative functions.

The component variables can be purchased at https://epub.prsgroup.com/products/icrg

4.7.2.6 Policy Performance (sgi_pp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_pp

Original tag: sgi_pp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

This pillar of the SGI examines each country's policy performance in terms of three dimensions of sustainable development. If the goal of politics is to promote sustainable development, and if citizens are to be empowered to live their lives in accordance with their own individual talents, then governments must be able to establish and maintain the social, economic and environmental conditions for such well-being and empowerment. The conditions for social progress must be generated by suitable outcomes in certain policy fields. Such outcomes are examined by the Policy Performance pillar, which is comprised of 16 policy fields grouped in terms of economic, social and environmental sustainability. Each policy field is addressed by a qualitative assessment and additional quantitative data. The point here is to examine domestic policymaking as well as the extent to which governments actively contribute to the provision of global public goods. The areas examined are:

1. Economic Policies: economy, labor markets, taxes, budgets, research and innovation, global financial system.

2. Social Policies: education, social inclusion, health, families, pensions, integration policy, safe living conditions, global inequalities.

3. Environmental Policies: environment policy, global environmental protection.

4.7.2.7 Legislature corrupt activities (vdem_gcrrpt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_gcrrpt

Original tag: vdem_gcrrpt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10021, Percent: 78.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9718, Percent: 32.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 303 Percent: 3.02

Description:

Legislature corrupt activities

Question: Do members of the legislature abuse their position for financial gain?

Clarification: This includes any of the following: (a) accepting bribes, (b) helping to obtain government contracts for firms that the legislator (or his/her family/friends/political supporters) own, (c) doing favors for firms in exchange for the opportunity of employment after leaving the legislature, (d) stealing money from the state or from campaign donations

for personal use.

Responses:

0: Commonly. Most legislators probably engage in these activities.

1: Often. Many legislators probably engage in these activities.

2: Sometimes. Some legislators probably engage in these activities.

3: Very occasionally. There may be a few legislators who engage in these activities but the

vast majority do not.

4: Never, or hardly ever.

4.7.2.8 Control of Corruption, Estimate (wbgi_cce)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wbgi_cce

Original tag: wbgi_cce

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Kaufmann & Kraay (n.d.)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4870, Percent: 38.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4337, Percent: 14.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 533 Percent: 10.94

Description:

Control of Corruption - Estimate: 'Control of Corruption' measures perceptions of corruption, conventionally defined as the exercise of public power for private gain. The particular aspect of corruption measured by the various sources differs somewhat, ranging from the frequency of 'additional payments to get things done', to the effects of corruption on the business environment, to measuring 'grand corruption' in the political arena or in the tendency of elite forms to engage in 'state capture'.

4.7.2.9 CPIA building human resources rating (wdi_bhr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_bhr

Original tag: wdi_bhr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1474, Percent: 11.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1255, Percent: 4.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.86

Description:

The CPIA measures the extent to which a country's policy and institutional framework

supports sustainable growth and poverty reduction and, consequently, the effective use of development assistance. More specifically, this indicator assesses the national policies and public and private sector service delivery that affect the access to and quality of health and education services, including prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria (1=low to 6=high).

4.7.2.10 CPIA gender equality rating (wdi_gendeqr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gendeqr

Original tag: wdi_gendeqr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1474, Percent: 11.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1255, Percent: 4.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.86

Description:

Gender equality assesses the extent to which the country has installed institutions and programs to enforce laws and policies that promote equal access for men and women in education, health, the economy, and protection under law (1=low to 6=high).

4.7.2.11 Economic Public Goods Sub-index (bgi_epgs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bgi_epgs

Original tag: bgi_epgs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3152, Percent: 24.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3074, Percent: 10.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 2.47

Description:

We conceptualize economic public goods provision with [six] concepts:

1) food security (measured using a food vulnerability index);

2) productive knowledge (measured via an economic complexity index);

3) vulnerable employment;

4) employment;

5) (access to) healthcare;

6) inequality reduction.

4.7.2.12 Fiscal Capacity Sub-index (bgi_fcs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bgi_fcs

Original tag: bgi_fcs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3152, Percent: 24.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3074, Percent: 10.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 2.47

Description:

Measures the state's ability to extract revenue (taxation) and manage its budget effectively. We operationalize fiscal capacity with variables relating to 4 concepts: 1) actual tax revenue (1 variable); 2) tax administration (3 variables); 3) central bank reserves (population-adjusted); and 4) the percent of government expenses required for interest payments.

4.7.2.13 Public Goods Provision Index (bgi_pgpi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bgi_pgpi

Original tag: bgi_pgpi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3152, Percent: 24.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3074, Percent: 10.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 78 Percent: 2.47

Description:

Public goods are goods and services from which citizens of a state cannot be excluded... We distinguish between three types of public goods: social public goods, economic public goods and environmental public goods.

4.7.3 Media

This category includes indicators on the freedom of the media in a given country (freedom of the press, regulation of the media) as well as the public access and confidence in the media.

4.7.3.1 Law: it's legal to report accurate news even if it damages pub. figures' reput. (aii_q54)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aii_q54

Original tag: aii_q54

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 265, Percent: 2.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 255, Percent: 0.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10 Percent: 3.77

Description:

Sub-score (0-100). Question no. 54. In law, it is legal to report accurate news even if it damages the reputation of a public figure.

A 100 score is earned where all the following conditions are met:

1) it is legal to report accurate information on public figures regardless of the damage to their reputations,

2) journalists can only be convicted if malice is proved (a story was published even though the journalist knew it was false or didn't try to verify it).

Note: Public figures include anyone in a position of responsibility in the government or civil service; political leaders; and leaders of civil society organizations, religious groups, trade unions, or large businesses.

A 0 score is earned where no such law exists, or a law exists but it doesn't include all the conditions described in 100. A 0 score is also earned where the law establishes the presumption of bad faith for all comments deemed defamatory and/or the burden of proof falls to journalists.

4.7.3.2 Freedom on the Net: Obstacles to Access (fhn_fotnota)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhn_fotnota

Original tag: fhn_fotnota

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Allie Funk and Kian Vesteinsson and Grant Baker (n.d.)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 7.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926, Percent: 3.05

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14 Percent: 1.49

Description:

Obstacles to Access: Details infrastructural and economic barriers to access, legal and ownership control over internet service providers, and independence of regulatory bodies. The score goes from 0 to 100, where 100 represents worst outcomes.

Please note that the values have changed from previous versions of QoG data given that Freedom House now provides a document with the vlaues for all years and these are different for the first years of the score.

4.7.3.3 Economic Influences over Media Content (2001-2016) (fhp_mcei5)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhp_mcei5

Original tag: fhp_mcei5

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3055, Percent: 24.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2682, Percent: 8.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 373 Percent: 12.21

Description:

Economic Influences over Media Content (2001-2016). This category includes the structure of media ownership, transparency and concentration of ownership, the costs of establishing media as well as any impediments to news production and distribution, the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors, the impact of corruption and bribery on content, and the extent to which the economic situation in a country or territory affects the development and sustainability of the media.

4.7.3.4 Economic Influences over Broadcast Media Content (1993-1995) (fhp_mceib3)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhp_mceib3

Original tag: fhp_mceib3

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 4.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 490, Percent: 1.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54 Percent: 9.93

Description:

Economic Influences over Media Content: Broadcast Media (1993-1995): The third sub-category examines the economic environment for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership, transparency and concentration of ownership, the costs of establishing media as well as any impediments to news production and distribution, the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors, the impact of corruption and bribery on content, and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development of the media. The scale of the variable is 0-20. 0 indicates more freedom.

4.7.3.5 Economic Influences over Broadcast Media Content (1996-2000) (fhp_mceib4)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhp_mceib4

Original tag: fhp_mceib4

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 915, Percent: 7.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 825, Percent: 2.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 90 Percent: 9.84

Description:

Economic Influences over Media Content: Broadcast Media (1996-2000): The third sub-category examines the economic environment for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership, transparency and concentration of ownership, the costs of establishing media as well as any impediments to news production and distribution, the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors, the impact of corruption and bribery on content, and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development of the media. The scale of the variable is 0-30. 0 indicates more freedom.

4.7.3.6 Economic Influences over Print Media Content (1993-1995) (fhp_mceip3)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhp_mceip3

Original tag: fhp_mceip3

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 544, Percent: 4.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 490, Percent: 1.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54 Percent: 9.93

Description:

Economic Influences over Media Content: Print Media (1993-1995): The third sub-category examines the economic environment for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership, transparency and concentration of ownership, the costs of establishing media as well as any impediments to news production and distribution, the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors, the impact of corruption and bribery on content, and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development of the media. The scale of the variable is 0-20. 0 indicates more freedom.

4.7.3.7 Economic Influences over Print Media Content (1996-2000) (fhp_mceip4)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fhp_mceip4

Original tag: fhp_mceip4

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Freedom House (2017)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 915, Percent: 7.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 825, Percent: 2.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 90 Percent: 9.84

Description:

Economic Influences over Media Content: Print Media (1996-2000): The third sub-category examines the economic environment for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership, transparency and concentration of ownership, the costs of establishing media as well as any impediments to news production and distribution, the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors, the impact of corruption and bribery on content, and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development of the media. The scale of the variable is 0-30. 0 indicates more freedom.

4.7.3.8 Press Freedom Index: Economic Context Component (rsf_eci)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_rsf_eci

Original tag: rsf_eci

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Reporters sans frontières (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5, Percent: 0.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Economic context component of Press Freedom Index. Questions asked for the economic context component aim to evaluate:

- economic constraints linked to governmental policies (including the difficulty of creating a news media outlet, favouritism in the allocation of state subsidies, and corruption);

- economic constraints linked to non-state actors (advertisers and commercial partners);

- economic constraints linked to media owners seeking to promote or defend their business interests.

A subsidiary score ranging from 0 to 100 is calculated for each indicator. All of the subsidiary scores contribute equally to the global score. And within each indicator, all the questions and subquestions have equal weight.

4.7.4 Conflict and Military Service

This category includes variables concerning armed conflict, including civil war and terrorism, govern- ment revenue and spending related to violent conflict (military expenditure, arms imports, military personnel).

4.7.4.1 Global Militarization Index (bicc_gmi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bicc_gmi

Original tag: bicc_gmi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bayer, Markus and Rohleder, Paul (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4999, Percent: 39.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4855, Percent: 16.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 144 Percent: 2.88

Description:

The Global Militarization Index is divided into three overarching categories: expenditure, personnel and heavy weapons. (See variables bicc_milexp, bicc_milper, and bicc_hw).

In order to increase the compatibility between different indicators and preventing extreme values from crating distortions when normalizing data, in a first step every indicator was represented in a logarithm with the factor 10. Second, all data was normalized using the formula x=(y-min)/(max-min), with min and max representing, respectively, the lowest and the highest value of the logarithm. In a third step, every indicator was weighted in accordance to a subjective factor, reflecting the relative importance attributed to it by BICC researchers. In order to calculate the final score, the weighted indicators were added together and then normalized one last time on a scale ranging from 0 to 1,000. For better comparison of individual years, all years were finally normalized.

Weighting Factors used:

Military expenditures as percentage of GDP - 5

Military expenditures in relation to health spending - 3

Military and paramilitary personnel in relation to population - 4

Military reservers in relation to population - 2

Military and paramilitary personnel in relation to physicians - 2

Heavy weapons in relation to population - 4

4.7.4.2 Military Expenditure Index (bicc_milexp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bicc_milexp

Original tag: bicc_milexp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bayer, Markus and Rohleder, Paul (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4999, Percent: 39.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4855, Percent: 16.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 144 Percent: 2.88

Description:

Military spending in relation to GDP and health spending are the most important indicators for determining the level of militarization. Financial resources which are made available via the military budget by a government are an important factor which affects capacities and size of a state's armed forces. The other indicator the GMI uses is the comparison between the total military budget and government spending on health services.

Figures for military expenditure are compiled from the data base of the Stockholm Peace Research Institute SIPRI. Even though SIPRI may currently be regarded as the most reliable source, data on military expenditure has to be treated with extreme caution. For many countries, especially in the developing world and autocratic states, the figures are but rough estimates. In cases where SIPRI does not provide any up-to-date information, we adopted the latest available figures provided they were no older than three years.

Data on gross domestic product was taken from the International Monetary Fund. Data on health expenditure used have been extracted from the data base of the World Health Organization.

4.7.4.3 Armed forces personnel (percent of total labor force) (wdi_afp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_afp

Original tag: wdi_afp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4984, Percent: 39.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4823, Percent: 15.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 161 Percent: 3.23

Description:

Armed forces personnel are active duty military personnel, including paramilitary forces if the training, organization, equipment, and control suggest they may be used to support or replace regular military forces. Labor force comprises all people who meet the International Labour Organization's definition of the economically active population.

4.7.4.4 Military expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_expmil)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expmil

Original tag: wdi_expmil

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7763, Percent: 61.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7536, Percent: 24.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 227 Percent: 2.92

Description:

Military expenditure (percent of GDP). Military expenditures data from SIPRI are derived

from the NATO definition, which includes all current and capital expenditures on the armed forces, including peacekeeping forces; defense ministries and other government agencies engaged in defense projects; paramilitary forces, if these are judged to be trained and equipped for military operations; and military space activities. Such expenditures include military and civil personnel, including retirement pensions of military personnel and social services for personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; military research and development; and military aid (in the military expenditures of the donor country). Excluded are civil defense and current expenditures for previous military activities, such as for veterans' benefits, demobilization, conversion, and destruction of weapons. This definition cannot be applied for all countries, however, since that would require much more detailed information than is available about what is included in military budgets and off-budget military expenditure items. (For example, military budgets might or might not cover civil defense, reserves and auxiliary forces, police and paramilitary forces, dual-purpose forces such as military and civilian police, military grants in kind, pensions for military personnel, and social security contributions paid by one part of government to another).

4.7.4.5 Military expenditure (percent of general government expenditure) (wdi_expmilge)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expmilge

Original tag: wdi_expmilge

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4629, Percent: 36.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4498, Percent: 14.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131 Percent: 2.83

Description:

Military expenditure (percent of central government expenditure). Military expenditures data from SIPRI are derived from the NATO definition, which includes all current and capital expenditures on the armed forces, including peacekeeping forces; defense ministries and other government agencies engaged in defense projects; paramilitary forces, if these are judged to be trained and equipped for military operations; and military space activities. Such expenditures include military and civil personnel, including retirement pensions of military personnel and social services for personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; military research and development; and military aid (in the military expenditures of the donor country). Excluded are civil defense and current expenditures for previous military activities, such as for veterans' benefits, demobilization, conversion, and destruction of weapons. This definition cannot be applied for all countries, however, since that would require much more detailed information than is available about what is included in military budgets and off-budget military expenditure items. (For example, military budgets might or might not cover civil defense, reserves and auxiliary forces, police and paramilitary forces, dual-purpose forces such as military and civilian police, military grants in kind, pensions for military personnel, and social security contributions paid by one part of government to another.)

4.7.5 Political System

This category includes variables describing the rules of the political system (presidential or parliamentary system), the chief executive (years in office), regime type, stability (age of present regime), and checks and balances as well as aspects of federalism.

4.7.5.1 Is the country in the Commonwealth (br_cw)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_br_cw

Original tag: br_cw

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bjørnskov & Rode (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 11663, Percent: 91.73

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10451, Percent: 34.46

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1212 Percent: 10.39

Description:

Is the country a member of the British Commonwealth? (0: No 1: Yes)

4.7.5.2 International Cooperation (bti_ic)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ic

Original tag: bti_ic

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1282, Percent: 10.08

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1238, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

The political leadership is willing and able to cooperate with external supporters and organizations. Including 'To what extent does the political leadership use the support of international partners to implement a long-term strategy of development?', 'To what extent does the government act as a credible and reliable partner in its relations with the international community?' and 'To what extent is the political leadership willing and able to cooperate with neighboring countries?'.

4.7.5.3 Private Property (bti_prp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_prp

Original tag: bti_prp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

There are adequate conditions to support a functional private sector. Including 'To what extent do government authorities ensure well-defined rights of private property and regulate the acquisition, benefits, use and sale of property?' and 'To what extent are private companies permitted and protected? Are privatization processes conducted in a manner consistent with market principles?'.

4.7.5.4 Component 3: Policy formulation (cbi_cpol)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbi_cpol

Original tag: cbi_cpol

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Garriga (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8200, Percent: 64.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7497, Percent: 24.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Component 3: Policy formulation. Weighted average of the following variables (weights

between parentheses): Who formulates monetary policy (0.25); Who has the final decision in monetary policy (0.50), Role of the central bank in the budget process (0.25).

4.7.5.5 Accountability Transparency (diat_ati)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_diat_ati

Original tag: diat_ati

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Williams (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4908, Percent: 38.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4608, Percent: 15.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 300 Percent: 6.11

Description:

Accountability Transparency. The author has 16 separate indicators for the Accountability Transparency Index (six for the measurement of a free media, four for fiscal transparency, and six for political constraints). 1980 is considered to be the base year. The Accountability Transparency Index has 115 countries in 1980, but rising to up to 189 countries towards the end of the period.

4.7.5.6 Information Transparency (diat_iti)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_diat_iti

Original tag: diat_iti

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Williams (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5309, Percent: 41.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4803, Percent: 15.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 506 Percent: 9.53

Description:

Information Transparency. Sub-indicators are constructed to reflect the nuances of this type of transparency. Specifically, three sub-components are constructed: (1) the existence of a free and independent media; (2) fiscal (budgetary) transparency; (3) political constraints.

The author has 13 separate indicators for the Information Transparency Index (six for the quantity of information, four for the processes that generate that information, and three for the infrastructure required to disseminate that information). 1980 is considered to be the base year. The Information Transparency Index (ITI) has scores for initially 153 countries in 1980, increasing over time to 191 by the year 2010.

4.7.5.7 Index of Globalization (dr_ig)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dr_ig

Original tag: dr_ig

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Dreher (2006)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9061, Percent: 71.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8218, Percent: 27.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 843 Percent: 9.3

Description:

The overall index of globalization (scale of 1 to 100) is the weighted average of the following

variables: economic globalization, social globalization and political globalization (dr_eg, dr_sg and dr_pg). Most weight has been given to economic followed by social globalization.

4.7.5.8 Online Service Index (egov_osi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_egov_osi

Original tag: egov_osi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2289, Percent: 18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2016, Percent: 6.65

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 273 Percent: 11.93

Description:

The Online Service Index (OSI) values were constructed by researchers, including UN experts and online United Nations Volunteers (UNVs) from over 60 countries with coverage of 66 languages assessed each country's national website in the native language, including the national portal, e-services portal and e-participation portal, as well as the websites of the related ministries of education, labour, social services, health, finance and environment as applicable. The UNVs included qualified graduate students and volunteers from universities in the field of public administration.

4.7.5.9 Independent Sub-Federal Unit (h_f)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_f

Original tag: h_f

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8903, Percent: 70.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8033, Percent: 26.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 870 Percent: 9.77

Description:

Dummy variable coded 1 if there are independent sub-federal units (states, provinces, regions etc.) that impose substantive constraints on national fiscal policy.

4.7.5.10 2nd Legislative Chamber (h_l2)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_l2

Original tag: h_l2

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9944, Percent: 78.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9018, Percent: 29.73

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 926 Percent: 9.31

Description:

Dummy variable coded 1 if there is an effective second legislative chamber, namely, where h_l1=1 and records on the composition of a second chamber exist - where that chamber is elected under a distinct electoral system and has a substantive (not merely delaying) role in the implementation of fiscal policy.

4.7.5.11 Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_polcon3

Original tag: h_polcon3

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9975, Percent: 78.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9006, Percent: 29.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 969 Percent: 9.71

Description:

This index measures the feasibility of policy change, i.e. the extent to which a change in the prefer-ences of any one political actor may lead to a change in government policy. The index is composed from the following information: the number of independent branches of government with veto power over policy change, counting the executive and the presence of an effective lower and upper house in the legislature (more branches leading to more constraint); the extent of party alignment across branches of government, measured as the extent to which the same party or coalition of parties control each branch (decreasing the level of constraint); and the extent of preference heterogeneity within each legislative branch, measured as legislative fractionalization in the relevant house (increasing constraint for aligned executives, decreasing it for opposed executives). The index scores are derived from a simple spatial model and theoretically ranges from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating more political constraint and thus less feasibility of policy change. Note that the coding reflects information as of January 1 in any given year. Henisz (2002) uses this index to demonstrate that political environments that limit the feasibility of policy change are an important determinant of investment in infrastructure.

4.7.5.12 Political Constraints Index V (h_polcon5)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_h_polcon5

Original tag: h_polcon5

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation:

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8067, Percent: 63.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7552, Percent: 24.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 515 Percent: 6.38

Description:

This index follows the same logic as Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3) but also includes two additional veto points: the judiciary and sub-federal entities. Note that the coding reflects in-formation as of January 1 in any given year. Henisz (2000) uses this index to measure the impact on cross-national growth rates of a government's ability to provide credible commitment.

4.7.5.13 HRV Index (hrv_index)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_hrv_index

Original tag: hrv_index

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hollyer et al. (2014)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3850, Percent: 30.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3726, Percent: 12.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 124 Percent: 3.22

Description:

The point estimate of the HRV index. The HRV transparency index measures the availability of credible aggregate economic data that a country discloses to the public.

4.7.5.14 Good Governance (sgi_go)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_go

Original tag: sgi_go

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

This pillar of the SGI examines the good governance capacities of a political system in terms of its executive capability and accountability. Sustainable governance is defined here as the political management of public affairs that adopts a long-term view of societal development, takes into account the interests of future generations, and facilitates capacities for social change.

The Governance index examines how effective governments are in directing and implementing policies appropriate to these three goals. As a measuring tool grounded in practical evidence, the Governance index draws on 37 qualitative indicators posed in an expert survey that measure a country's institutional arrangements against benchmarks of good practices in governance. Governance in this context implies both the capacity to act ("executive capacity") and the extent to which non-governmental actors and institutions are endowed with the participatory competence to hold the government accountable to its actions ("executive accountability"). This includes citizens, legislatures, parties, associations and the media, that is, actors that monitor the government's activities and whose effective inclusion in the political process improve the quality of governance.

The dimension of Executive Capacity draws on the categories of steering capability, policy implementation and institutional learning. Steering capability questions explore the roles of strategic planning and expert advice, the effectiveness of interministerial coordination and regulatory impact assessments, and the quality of consultation and communication policies. Questions about implementation assess the government's ability to ensure effective and efficient task delegation to ministers, agencies or subnational governments. Questions on institutional learning refer to a government's ability to reform its own institutional arrangements and improve its strategic orientation.

The dimension of Executive Accountability is comprised of three categories corresponding to actors or groups of actors considered to be important agents of oversight and accountability in theories of democracy and governance. The questions here are designed to examine the extent to which citizens are informed of government policies, whether the legislature is capable of evaluating and acting as a "check" on the executive branch, and whether intermediary organizations (i.e., media, parties, interest associations) demonstrate relevance and policy know-how in exercising oversight. This approach is based on a dynamic understanding of governance in which power and authority is dispersed throughout the

institutions, processes and structures of government. In order to account for the diversity of institutional arrangements, the index explicitly considers functional equivalencies in different countries, and pays equal attention to formal and informal as well as hierarchical and non-hierarchical institutional arrangements.

4.7.5.15 Egalitarian component index (vdem_egal)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_vdem_egal

Original tag: vdem_egal

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Pemstein et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10907, Percent: 85.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10547, Percent: 34.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 360 Percent: 3.3

Description:

Egalitarian component index

Question: To what extent is the egalitarian principle achieved?

Clarifications: The egalitarian principle of democracy holds that material and immaterial inequalities inhibit the exercise of formal rights and liberties, and diminish the ability of citizens from all social groups to participate. Egalitarian democracy is achieved when 1 rights and freedoms of individuals are protected equally across all social groups; 2 resources are distributed equally across all social groups; and 3 access to power is equally distributed by gender, socioeconomic class and social group.

Aggregation: This index is formed by averaging the following indices: equal protection index, equal access index and equal distribution of resources.

4.7.6 Public Economy

This category includes economic indicators that reflect the involvement of the government in the economy (taxes, tariff rates and government expenditures), economic key figures of a state (GDP, inflation, and economic inequality), and indicators that characterize the state of the economy (aid-flows, debt).

4.7.6.1 Monetary and fiscal stability (bti_cps)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_cps

Original tag: bti_cps

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

There are institutional or political precautions to achieve monetary and fiscal stability. Including 'To what extent does the monetary authority pursue and communicate a consistent monetary stabilization policy?' and 'To what extent do the government's budgetary policies support fiscal stability?'

4.7.6.2 Economic Output Strength (bti_eos)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_eos

Original tag: bti_eos

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

How does the economy, as measured in quantitative indicators, perform? From 1 to 10.

1. The economic performance is very poor. Strongly negative macroeconomic data may include negative GDP growth rates, very high unemployment levels, high inflation, large budget deficits, unreasonably high debt and an increasingly unsustainable current account position.

4. The economic performance is poor. Continuing negative macroeconomic data may include stagnant GDP levels, relatively high unemployment levels, low price stability, an unbalanced budget, rising debt and a volatile current account position.

7. The economic performance is good. Moderately positive macroeconomic data may include low GDP growth rates, only moderate unemployment levels, relative price stability, a slightly unbalanced budget, a tendency toward debt and a manageable current account position.

10. The economic performance is very good. Positive macroeconomic data may include relatively high GDP growth rates, relatively high employment levels, price stability, a balanced budget, a reasonable debt, and a sustainable current account position.

4.7.6.3 Economic Performance (bti_ep)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ep

Original tag: bti_ep

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Economic Performance: The economy's performance points to solid development. From 1 to 10.

4.7.6.4 Economy Status (bti_mes)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_mes

Original tag: bti_mes

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Economy Status: It groups the scores of the level of socioeconomic development, the organization of the market and competition, currency and price stability, private property, the welfare regime, economic performance, and sustainability. From 1 to 10. Higher scores reflect advanced economy status.

4.7.6.5 Organization of the Market and Competition (bti_mo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_mo

Original tag: bti_mo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Organization of the Market and Competition: There are clear rules for stable, market-based competition. From 1 to 10. State-guaranteed rules for market competition with equal opportunities for all market participants exist in countries with higher scores.

4.7.6.6 Socio-Economic Level (bti_sel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_sel

Original tag: bti_sel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Socio-Economic Level: In principle, the country's level of development permits an adequate freedom of choice for all citizens. From 1 to 10. Higher scores are present for countries with better socio-economic levels.

4.7.6.7 Component 4: Limitations on lending to the government (cbi_cll)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbi_cll

Original tag: cbi_cll

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Garriga (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8200, Percent: 64.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7497, Percent: 24.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 703 Percent: 8.57

Description:

Component 4: Limitations on lending to the government. Weighted average of the following variables (weights between parentheses): Limitations on advances (0.30) Limitations on securitized lending (0.20) Who decides the terms of lending to government (0.20) Beneficiaries of central bank lending (0.10) Type of limits when they exist (0.05) Maturity of loans (0.05) Restrictions on interest rates (0.05) Prohibition on central bank lending in primary market to Government (0.05).

4.7.6.8 Central Bank's Financial independence (cbie_finances)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbie_finances

Original tag: cbie_finances

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Romelli (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7824, Percent: 61.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7329, Percent: 24.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 495 Percent: 6.33

Description:

Financial independence.

Average of the following components: Payment of the initial capital of the central bank, Authorized capital of the central bank, Central bank financial autonomy, Arrangements for automatic recapitalization, Transfers of money from the treasury, Central bank approves its annual budget, Central bank adopt its annual balance sheet, Auditing agency, Allocation of net profits, Allocation of profits to a general reserve fund, Partial payments of dividends before the end of the fiscal year, Unrealized profits included in the calculation of distributable profits.

The index ranges from 0 to 1 where 0 corresponds to the lowest level of independence to 1, the highest level.

4.7.6.9 Central Bank Independence Extended Index (cbie_index)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbie_index

Original tag: cbie_index

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Romelli (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7824, Percent: 61.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7329, Percent: 24.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 495 Percent: 6.33

Description:

Average of the scores across these six dimensions of the index, i.e. the raw average of the four components:

(1) governor and central bank board,

(2) monetary policy and conflict resolution,

(3) objectives,

(4) limitations on lending to the government,

(5) financial independence and

(6) reporting and disclosure.

The index ranges from 0 to 1 where 0 corresponds to the lowest level of independence to 1, the highest level.

This extended index incorporates the characteristics of both the GMT and CWN indices and, includes new criteria that capture good practices in central bank financial independence and reporting and disclosure.

This index is in a scale from 0 to 1 where 1 indicates more central bank independence.

For more details about the construction of this index, please visit https://academic.oup.com/economicpolicy/article/37/112/641/6516019

4.7.6.10 Central Bank's Limitations on lending to the government (cbie_lending)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbie_lending
Original tag: cbie_lending
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Romelli (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7824, Percent: 61.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7329, Percent: 24.16
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 495 Percent: 6.33
Description:
Limitations on lending to the government.

Average of the following components: Direct credit: not automatic, Direct credit: market for lending, Who decides financing conditions to government, Beneficiaries of central bank lending, Direct credit: type of limit, Direct credit: maturity of loans, Direct credit: interest rates, Prohibition from buying government securities in primary market.

The index ranges from 0 to 1 where 0 corresponds to the lowest level of independence to 1, the highest level.

4.7.6.11 Central Bank's Monetary policy and conflicts resolution (cbie_policy)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cbie_policy

Original tag: cbie_policy

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Romelli (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7824, Percent: 61.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7329, Percent: 24.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 495 Percent: 6.33

Description:

Monetary policy and conflicts resolution. Average of the following components: Who formulates monetary policy, Central bank responsible to fix key policy rates, Banking sector supervision, Central bank role in government's budget and/or debt, Final authority in monetary policy.

The index ranges from 0 to 1 where 0 corresponds to the lowest level of independence to 1, the highest level.

4.7.6.12 Reference in Constitution to Capitalism (ccp_market)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_market

Original tag: ccp_market

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution refer to the 'free market', 'capitalism', or an analogous term?

1. Yes

2. No

96. Other

4.7.6.13 Economic Globalization (dr_eg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dr_eg

Original tag: dr_eg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Dreher (2006)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8904, Percent: 70.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8164, Percent: 26.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 740 Percent: 8.31

Description:

Economic globalisation (scale of 1 to 100) covers both trade flows as well as financial flows. De facto trade is determined with reference to the trade in goods and services. De jure trade covers customs duties, taxes and restrictions on trade.

4.7.6.14 GDP at current market prices, Euro per inhabitant (eu_eco2gdpeurhab)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_eco2gdpeurhab

Original tag: eu_eco2gdpeurhab

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 435, Percent: 3.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 424, Percent: 1.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 2.53

Description:

GDP at current market prices, Euro per inhabitant

4.7.6.15 GDP at current market prices, Million euro (eu_eco2gdpmioeur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_eco2gdpmioeur

Original tag: eu_eco2gdpmioeur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 461, Percent: 3.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 450, Percent: 1.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 11 Percent: 2.39

Description:

GDP at current market prices, Million euro

4.7.6.16 Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes and Enterprises (current) (fi_sog)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_sog

Original tag: fi_sog

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4433, Percent: 34.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4259, Percent: 14.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 174 Percent: 3.93

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "large general government consumption", "large transfer sector", "many government enterprises", and "high marginal tax rates and low income thresholds", and 10 to "small general government consumption", "small transfer sector", "few government enterprises", and "low marginal tax rates and high income thresholds". The index consists of the following indicators: General government consumption spending as a percentage of total consumption, Transfers and subsidies as a percentage of GDP, Government enterprises and investment as a percentage of total investment, Top marginal tax rate (and income threshold to which it applies).

4.7.6.17 Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes and Enterprises (panel data) (fi_sog_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_sog_pd

Original tag: fi_sog_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4432, Percent: 34.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4258, Percent: 14.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 174 Percent: 3.93

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "large general government consumption", "large transfer sector", "many government enterprises", and "high marginal tax rates and low income thresholds", and 10 to "small general government consumption", "small transfer sector", "few government enterprises", and "low marginal tax rates and high income thresholds". The index consists of the following indicators: General government consumption spending as a percentage of total consumption, Transfers and subsidies as a percentage of GDP, Government enterprises and investment as a percentage of total investment, Top marginal tax rate (and income threshold to which it applies). Panel-data adjusted.

4.7.6.18 Expenditure on economic affairs (percent of total gen. gov. exp.) (gfs_ecaf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gfs_ecaf

Original tag: gfs_ecaf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: International Monetary Fund (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1582, Percent: 12.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1550, Percent: 5.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 32 Percent: 2.02

Description:

Total expenditure on economic affairs, as the percentage of general government expenditure.

4.7.6.19 GDP per Capita (Current Prices) (gle_cgdpc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gle_cgdpc

Original tag: gle_cgdpc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gleditsch (2002)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9229, Percent: 72.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8130, Percent: 26.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1099 Percent: 11.91

Description:

GDP per capita (Current prices).

4.7.6.20 Real GDP (2005) (gle_gdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gle_gdp

Original tag: gle_gdp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gleditsch (2002)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9229, Percent: 72.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8130, Percent: 26.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1099 Percent: 11.91

Description:

Real GDP (2005). This is Gleditsch's estimate of GDP per Capita in US dollars at current year international prices.

4.7.6.21 Real GDP per Capita (2005) (gle_rgdpc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gle_rgdpc

Original tag: gle_rgdpc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gleditsch (2002)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9229, Percent: 72.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8130, Percent: 26.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1099 Percent: 11.91

Description:

This is the estimate of real GDP per Capita in constant US dollars at base year 2000, based on the imputation technique described above.

4.7.6.22 Economic Complexity Index (SITC product classification) (gpcr_eci)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gpcr_eci

Original tag: gpcr_eci

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: **?**

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4138, Percent: 32.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4063, Percent: 13.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 75 Percent: 1.81

Description:

The Economic Complexity Index (ECI) is a measure of the amount of capabilities and know-how of a given country determined by the diversity, ubiquity, and complexity of the products it exports.

A rank of countries based on how diversified and complex their export basket is. Countries that are home to a great diversity of productive know-how, particularly complex specialized know-how, are able to produce a great diversity of sophisticated products.

The complexity of a country's exports is found to highly predict current income levels, or where complexity exceed expectations for a country's income level, the country is predicted to experience more rapid growth in the future. ECI therefore provides a useful measure of economic development.

This Economic Complexity Index is computed using SITC product classification.

4.7.6.23 Forecasted annualized rate of growth for following decade (gpcr_growth)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gpcr_growth

Original tag: gpcr_growth

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: **?**

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2532, Percent: 19.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2509, Percent: 8.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 23 Percent: 0.91

Description:

A prediction of how much a country will grow based on its current level of Economic Complexity, its Complexity Outlook or connectedness to new complex products in the Product Space, as compared to its current income level in GDP per capita and expected natural resource exports.

Economic complexity alone helps explain the lion's share of variance in current income levels. But the value of economic complexity is in its predictive power on future growth, where a simple measure of current complexity and connectedness to new complex products, in relation to current income levels and expected natural resource exports, holds greater accuracy in predicting future growth than any other single economic indicator.

To calculate Economic Complexity Growth Projections, the authors consider four factors as explanatory variables: the Economic Complexity Index; the Complexity Outlook Index; the current level of income; and the expected growth in the value of natural resource exports per capita.

In effect, the growth projections show countries grow by expanding the know-how they have that allows them to produce more, and more complex products, depending on the connectedness of know-how and how many other products rely on similar capabilities, as well as the initial economic complexity the country held.

Growth projections are calculated through a process largely based on determining whether a country's economic complexity is higher or lower than expected given its level of income. The authors expect countries whose economic complexity is greater than the authors would expect for its level of income to grow faster than those that are 'too rich' for their current level of complexity.

In this data, a country's growth projection value for a given year is for the decade beginning with that year. For example, a value in a 2017 row is the projection of annualized growth for 2017–2027.

4.7.6.24 Revenue Forgone (percent of GDP) (gted_rfgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gted_rfgdp

Original tag: gted_rfgdp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Redonda et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1551, Percent: 12.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1499, Percent: 4.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 52 Percent: 3.35

Description:

Total revenue forgone by country per year as a percentage of the gross domestic product. Revenue forgone shows the amount of revenue a country forgoes or loses by granting tax deductions, exemptions, etc.

The data has been aggregated for QoG Data to the year level. The percentage of revenue forgone of GDP is the sum of all types of tax expenditures in a given year, by country. In the original dataset, the data is presented by provision ID, which means that for each type of tax expenditure there is a separate revenue forgone value.

4.7.6.25 Share Direct Taxes (gtr_centaxdir)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxdir

Original tag: gtr_centaxdir

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1886, Percent: 14.83

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1886, Percent: 6.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from direct taxes. A direct tax is imposed directly upon an individual person (legal or natural) or property, in contrast to a tax imposed upon a transaction. Direct taxes include taxes on income, property, and other direct taxes.

4.7.6.26 Share Direct Taxes in 1800 (gtr_centaxdir1800)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxdir1800

Original tag: gtr_centaxdir1800

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 58, Percent: 0.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 58, Percent: 0.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from direct taxes, in the year 1800. A direct tax is imposed directly upon an individual person (legal or natural) or property, in contrast to a tax imposed upon a transaction. Direct taxes include taxes on income, property, and other direct taxes.

4.7.6.27 Share Direct Taxes in 1850 (gtr_centaxdir1850)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxdir1850

Original tag: gtr_centaxdir1850

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 594, Percent: 4.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 594, Percent: 1.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from direct taxes, in the year 1850. A direct tax is imposed directly upon an individual person (legal or natural) or property, in contrast to a tax imposed upon a transaction. Direct taxes include taxes on income, property, and other direct taxes.

4.7.6.28 Share Direct Taxes in 1900 (gtr_centaxdir1900)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxdir1900

Original tag: gtr_centaxdir1900

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1262, Percent: 9.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1262, Percent: 4.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from direct taxes, in the year 1900. A direct tax is imposed directly upon an individual person (legal or natural) or property, in contrast to a tax imposed upon a transaction. Direct taxes include taxes on income, property, and other direct taxes.

4.7.6.29 Share Government Revenue of GDP (gtr_centaxgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxgdp

Original tag: gtr_centaxgdp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1957, Percent: 15.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1957, Percent: 6.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Total central government tax revenue as a share of GDP.

4.7.6.30 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1800 (gtr_centaxgdp1800)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxgdp1800
Original tag: gtr_centaxgdp1800
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 1.05
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 134, Percent: 0.44
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Total central government tax revenue as a share of GDP, in the year 1800.

4.7.6.31 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1850 (gtr_centaxgdp1850)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxgdp1850
Original tag: gtr_centaxgdp1850
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 862, Percent: 6.78
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 862, Percent: 2.84
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Total central government tax revenue as a share of GDP, in the year 1850.

4.7.6.32 Share Government Revenue of GDP in 1900 (gtr_centaxgdp1900)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxgdp1900
Original tag: gtr_centaxgdp1900
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1619, Percent: 12.73
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1619, Percent: 5.34
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Total central government tax revenue as a share of GDP, in the year 1900.

4.7.6.33 Share Indirect Taxes (gtr_centaxind)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxind
Original tag: gtr_centaxind
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1883, Percent: 14.81
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1883, Percent: 6.21
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from property taxes, most importantly levies on land and real estate. These include (i) recurrent taxes on immovable property, (ii) recurrent taxes on net wealth, (iii) estate, inheritance, and gift taxes, (iv) taxes in financial and capital transactions, (v) other taxes on property.

4.7.6.34 Share Indirect Taxes in 1800 (gtr_centaxind1800)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxind1800

Original tag: gtr_centaxind1800

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 0.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 67, Percent: 0.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from property taxes, most importantly levies on land and real estate, in the year 1800. These include (i) recurrent taxes on immovable property, (ii) recurrent taxes on net wealth, (iii) estate, inheritance, and gift taxes, (iv) taxes in financial and capital transactions, (v) other taxes on property.

4.7.6.35 Share Indirect Taxes in 1850 (gtr_centaxind1850)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxind1850

Original tag: gtr_centaxind1850

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 860, Percent: 6.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 860, Percent: 2.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from property taxes, most importantly levies on land and real estate , in the year 1850. These include (i) recurrent taxes on immovable property, (ii) recurrent taxes on net wealth, (iii) estate, inheritance, and gift taxes, (iv) taxes in financial and capital transactions, (v) other taxes on property.

4.7.6.36 Share Indirect Taxes in 1900 (gtr_centaxind1900)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gtr_centaxind1900

Original tag: gtr_centaxind1900

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1552, Percent: 12.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1552, Percent: 5.12

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Share of total central government tax revenue from property taxes, most importantly levies on land and real estate, in the year 1900. These include (i) recurrent taxes on immovable property, (ii) recurrent taxes on net wealth, (iii) estate, inheritance, and gift taxes, (iv) taxes in financial and capital transactions, (v) other taxes on property.

4.7.6.37 Total Resource Revenue (ictd_revres)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_revres

Original tag: ictd_revres

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1927, Percent: 15.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1781, Percent: 5.87

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 146 Percent: 7.58

Description:

Total natural resource revenues, including natural resource revenues reported as "tax revenue" or "non-tax revenue". Natural resources are here defined as natural resources that include a significant component of economic rent, primarily from oil and mining activities.

4.7.6.38 Taxes on Corporations and Other Enterprises (ictd_taxcorp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxcorp

Original tag: ictd_taxcorp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4862, Percent: 38.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4530, Percent: 14.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 332 Percent: 6.83

Description:

Total income and profit taxes on corporations, including taxes on resource firms.

4.7.6.39 Taxes on Income, Profits, and Capital Gains (ictd_taxinc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxinc

Original tag: ictd_taxinc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5882, Percent: 46.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5379, Percent: 17.73

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 503 Percent: 8.55

Description:

Total taxes on income, profits and capital gains, including taxes on natural resource firms. This figure is always exclusive of social contributions. The total value of Taxes on Income, Profits and Capital Gains may sometimes exceed the sum of Individuals and Corporations, due to revenues that are unallocated between the two.

4.7.6.40 Taxes on Individuals (ictd_taxind)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxind

Original tag: ictd_taxind

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4718, Percent: 37.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4371, Percent: 14.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 347 Percent: 7.35

Description:

Total income, capital gains and profit taxes on individuals. This figure is always exclusive of resource revenues in available sources.

4.7.6.41 Indirect Taxes (ictd_taxindirect)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxindirect

Original tag: ictd_taxindirect

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6179, Percent: 48.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5619, Percent: 18.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 560 Percent: 9.06

Description:

Total indirect taxes, including resource revenues. Includes taxes on goods and services, taxes on international trade and other taxes. Indirect may exceed the sum of Taxes on Goods and Services, Taxes on International Trade and Transactions and Other Taxes due to unallocated revenue not classified in any of these categories.

4.7.6.42 Resource Taxes (ictd_taxres)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxres

Original tag: ictd_taxres

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1091, Percent: 8.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1045, Percent: 3.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 46 Percent: 4.22

Description:

Component of reported tax revenue that is from natural resource sources, most often corporate taxation of resource firms.

4.7.6.43 Taxes on International Trade and Transactions (ictd_taxtrade)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ictd_taxtrade

Original tag: ictd_taxtrade

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5999, Percent: 47.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5472, Percent: 18.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 527 Percent: 8.78

Description:

Total taxes on international trade, including both import and export taxes. In some cases this figure may also include VAT collected at the border, where countries consistently report revenue in this way.

4.7.6.44 Absolute economic institutional quality(simple averages) (kun_ecoabs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_kun_ecoabs

Original tag: kun_ecoabs

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Kuncic (2014)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3709, Percent: 29.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3371, Percent: 11.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 338 Percent: 9.11

Description:

Absolute economic institutional quality(simple averages).

4.7.6.45 Atkinson Coefficient (epsilon=0.5) (lis_atk05)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_atk05

Original tag: lis_atk05

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Atkinson Index is a welfare-based measure of inequality, representing the percentage of total income that a given society would have to sacrifice in order to have (more) equally distributed incomes (more equal shares of income between its citizens). This measure depends on the degree of society aversion to inequality, where a higher value entails greater social utility or willingness by individuals to accept smaller incomes in exchange for a more equal distribution.

In the calculation of this variable, the aversion parameter (epsilon) is set to 0.5.

4.7.6.46 Atkinson Coefficient (epsilon=1) (lis_atk1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_atk1

Original tag: lis_atk1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Atkinson Index is a welfare-based measure of inequality, representing the percentage of total income that a given society would have to sacrifice in order to have (more) equally distributed incomes (more equal shares of income between its citizens). This measure depends on the degree of society aversion to inequality, where a higher value entails greater social utility or willingness by individuals to accept smaller incomes in exchange for a more equal distribution.

In the calculation of this variable, the aversion parameter (epsilon) is set to 1.0.

4.7.6.47 Gini Coefficient (lis_gini)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_gini

Original tag: lis_gini

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Gini Index measures the extent to which the distribution of the specified aggregate among individuals or households within an economy deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. The Gini index measures the area between the Lorenz curve and the hypothetical line of absolute equality. A Gini index of zero represents perfect equality and 1, perfect inequality.

4.7.6.48 Percentile Ratio (80/20) (lis_pr8020)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_pr8020

Original tag: lis_pr8020

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

The 80/20 Percentile Ratio represents the income of individuals at the 80th percentile compared to one of individuals at the 20th percentile, based on disposable income.

4.7.6.49 Percentile Ratio (90/10) (lis_pr9010)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_pr9010

Original tag: lis_pr9010

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

The 90/10 Percentile Ratio represents the income of individuals at the 90th percentile compared to one of individuals at the 10th percentile, based on disposable income.

4.7.6.50 Percentile Ratio (90/50) (lis_pr9050)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_pr9050

Original tag: lis_pr9050

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

The 90/50 Percentile Ratio represents the income of individuals at the 90th percentile compared to one of individuals at the 50th percentile, based on disposable income.

4.7.6.51 Real GDP per Capita (mad_gdppc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc
Original tag: mad_gdppc
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10059, Percent: 79.12
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9554, Percent: 31.5
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 505 Percent: 5.02
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.6.52 Real GDP per Capita (year 1000) (mad_gdppc1000)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1000
Original tag: mad_gdppc1000
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 450, Percent: 3.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 450, Percent: 1.48
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1000, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.6.53 Real GDP per Capita (year 1300) (mad_gdppc1300)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1300
Original tag: mad_gdppc1300
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 381, Percent: 3
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 381, Percent: 1.26
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1300, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.6.54 Real GDP per Capita (year 1400) (mad_gdppc1400)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1400
Original tag: mad_gdppc1400
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 606, Percent: 4.77
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 606, Percent: 2
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1400, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.6.55 Real GDP per Capita (year 1800) (mad_gdppc1800)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1800
Original tag: mad_gdppc1800
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1566, Percent: 12.32
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1566, Percent: 5.16
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1800, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.6.56 Capital services at constant 2017 national prices (2017=1) (pwt_cs)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_cs
Original tag: pwt_cs
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7315, Percent: 57.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7054, Percent: 23.26
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 261 Percent: 3.57
Description:
Capital services at constant 2017 national prices (2017= 1). Millions of US$.

Capital services at constant national prices,

based on investment and prices of structures and equipment.

4.7.6.57 Price level of capital formation, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plcf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_plcf
Original tag: pwt_plcf
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66
Description:
Price level of capital formation, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1.

Purchasing power parity is in units of the currency of a country per unit of the currency of the base country, it is common to divide it by the nominal exchange rate to obtain the price level.

GDPo refers to Output-side real GDP at chained PPPs, to compare relative productive capacity across countries and over time.

4.7.6.58 Price level of exports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_ple)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_ple

Original tag: pwt_ple

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66

Description:

Price level of exports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1.

Purchasing power parity is in units of the currency of a country per unit of the currency of the base country, it is common to divide it by the nominal exchange rate to obtain the price level.

GDPo refers to Output-side real GDP at chained PPPs, to compare relative productive capacity across countries and over time.

4.7.6.59 Price level of government consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plgc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_plgc

Original tag: pwt_plgc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66

Description:

Price level of government consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1.

Purchasing power parity is in units of the currency of a country per unit of the currency of the base country, it is common to divide it by the nominal exchange rate to obtain the price level.

GDPo refers to Output-side real GDP at chained PPPs, to compare relative productive capacity across countries and over time.

4.7.6.60 Price level of household consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_plhc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_plhc

Original tag: pwt_plhc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66

Description:

Price level of household consumption, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1.

Purchasing power parity is in units of the currency of a country per unit of the currency of the base country, it is common to divide it by the nominal exchange rate to obtain the price level.

GDPo refers to Output-side real GDP at chained PPPs, to compare relative productive capacity across countries and over time.

4.7.6.61 Price level of imports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1 (pwt_pli)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_pli

Original tag: pwt_pli

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66

Description:

Price level of imports, price level of USA GDPo in 2017=1.

Purchasing power parity is in units of the currency of a country per unit of the currency of the base country, it is common to divide it by the nominal exchange rate to obtain the price level.

4.7.6.62 Real GDP at constant 2017 national prices (in million US$) (pwt_rgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_rgdp
Original tag: pwt_rgdp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66
Description:
Real GDP at constant 2017 national prices (in million US Dollars), obtained from national accounts data for each country.

4.7.6.63 Share of residual trade and GDP statistical discrepancy at current PPPs (pwt_rt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_rt
Original tag: pwt_rt
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66
Description:
Share of residual trade and GDP statistical discrepancy at current PPPs.

4.7.6.64 Share of labour compensation in GDP at current national prices (pwt_slcgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_slcgdp
Original tag: pwt_slcgdp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7624, Percent: 59.97
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7351, Percent: 24.24
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 273 Percent: 3.58
Description:
Share of labour compensation in GDP at current national prices.

4.7.6.65 TFP at constant national prices (2017=1) (pwt_tfp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_tfp
Original tag: pwt_tfp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6701, Percent: 52.71
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6490, Percent: 21.4
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 211 Percent: 3.15
Description:
Total Factor Productivity (TFP) at constant national prices (2017=1).

TFP index, computed with Real GDP at constant national prices, capital services at constant national prices based on investment and prices of structures and equipment, labor input data, and the share of labour income in GDP.

This variable shows the growth of productivity over time in each country.

4.7.6.66 TFP level at current PPPs (USA=1) (pwt_tfpppp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_tfpppp

Original tag: pwt_tfpppp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6701, Percent: 52.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6490, Percent: 21.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 211 Percent: 3.15

Description:

Total Factor Productivity (TFP) level at current PPPs (USA=1).

TFP level is computed with output-side real GDP, capital services, labor input data, and the share of labour income in GDP.

This variable shows the productivity level across countries in each year.

4.7.6.67 Exchange rate, national currency/USD (market+estimated) (pwt_xr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_pwt_xr

Original tag: pwt_xr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Feenstra et al. (2015)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9949, Percent: 78.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9286, Percent: 30.62

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 663 Percent: 6.66

Description:

Exchange rate, national currency/USD (market+estimated).

4.7.6.68 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Budgets (sgi_ecbg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_ecbg

Original tag: sgi_ecbg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Budgets (Budgetary Policy, Debt to GDP, Primary Balance, Debt Interest Ratio, Budget Consolidation).

4.7.6.69 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Economy (sgi_ecec)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_ecec

Original tag: sgi_ecec

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Economy (Economic Policy, GDP per Capita, Inflation, Gross Fixed Capital Formation, Real Interest Rate, Potential Output Growth Rate).

4.7.6.70 Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Labor Markets (sgi_eclm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_eclm

Original tag: sgi_eclm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Sustainable Policies: Economic Policies - Labor Market (Labor Market Policy, Unemployment, Long-term Unemployment, Youth Unemployment, Low-skilled Unemployment, Employment, Low Pay Incidence).

4.7.6.71 Top 10percent income share (top_top10_income_share)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_top_top10_income_share

Original tag: top_top1_income_share

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Chancel et al. (2022), Alvaredo et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8490, Percent: 66.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7443, Percent: 24.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1047 Percent: 12.33

Description:

Income share of the top 10percent of the population. This refers to the share of pre-tax national income among equal-split adults for the top 10percent in each country-year.

The pre-tax national income is the sum of all pre-tax personal income flows accruing to the owners of the production factors, labor and capital, before taking into account the operation of the tax/transfer system, but after taking into account the operation of pension system.

The central difference between personal factor income and pre-tax income is the treatment of pensions, which are counted on a contribution basis by factor income and on a distribution basis by pre-tax income. The population is comprised of individuals over age 20. The base unit is the individual (rather than the household) but resources are split equally within couples.

4.7.6.72 Top 1percent income share (top_top1_income_share)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_top_top1_income_share

Original tag: top_top10_income_share

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Chancel et al. (2022), Alvaredo et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8490, Percent: 66.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7443, Percent: 24.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1047 Percent: 12.33

Description:

Income share of the top 1percent of the population. This refers to the share of pre-tax national income among equal-split adults for the top 1percent in each country-year.

The pre-tax national income is the sum of all pre-tax personal income flows accruing to the owners of the production factors, labor and capital, before taking into account the operation of the tax/transfer system, but after taking into account the operation of pension system.

The central difference between personal factor income and pre-tax income is the treatment of pensions, which are counted on a contribution basis by factor income and on a distribution basis by pre-tax income. The population is comprised of individuals over age 20. The base unit is the individual (rather than the household) but resources are split equally within couples.

4.7.6.73 Regulatory Quality, Estimate (wbgi_rqe)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wbgi_rqe

Original tag: wbgi_rqe

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Kaufmann & Kraay (n.d.)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4860, Percent: 38.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4327, Percent: 14.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 533 Percent: 10.97

Description:

Regulatory Quality - Estimate: 'Regulatory Quality' includes measures of the incidence of

market-unfriendly policies such as price controls or inadequate bank supervision, as well as perceptions of the burdens imposed by excessive regulation in areas such as foreign trade and business development.

4.7.6.74 Central government debt, total (percent of GDP) (wdi_debt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_debt

Original tag: wdi_debt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1602, Percent: 12.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1471, Percent: 4.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 131 Percent: 8.18

Description:

Debt is the entire stock of direct government fixed-term contractual obligations to others outstanding on a particular date. It includes domestic and foreign liabilities such as currency and money deposits, securities other than shares, and loans. It is the gross amount of government liabilities reduced by the amount of equity and financial derivatives held by the government. Because debt is a stock rather than a flow, it is measured as of a given date, usually the last day of the fiscal year.

4.7.6.75 Domestic general government health expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_dgovhexp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_dgovhexp

Original tag: wdi_dgovhexp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4285, Percent: 33.7

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3787, Percent: 12.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 498 Percent: 11.62

Description:

Domestic general government health expenditure (percent of GDP). Public expenditure on health from domestic sources as a share of the economy as measured by GDP.

4.7.6.76 CPIA equity of public resource use rating (1=low to 6=high) (wdi_eqpubres)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_eqpubres

Original tag: wdi_eqpubres

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1474, Percent: 11.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1255, Percent: 4.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.86

Description:

Equity of public resource use assesses the extent to which the pattern of public expenditures and revenue collection affects the poor and is consistent with national poverty reduction priorities.

4.7.6.77 Exports of goods and services (percent of GDP) (wdi_export)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_export

Original tag: wdi_export

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8086, Percent: 63.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7554, Percent: 24.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 532 Percent: 6.58

Description:

Exports of goods and services represent the value of all goods and other market services provided to the rest of the world. They include the value of merchandise, freight, insurance, transport, travel, royalties, license fees, and other services, such as communication, construction, financial, information, business, personal, and government services. They exclude compensation of employees and investment income (formerly called factor services) and transfer payments.

4.7.6.78 Foreign direct investment, net inflows (percent of GDP) (wdi_fdiin)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_fdiin

Original tag: wdi_fdiin

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8858, Percent: 69.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7979, Percent: 26.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 879 Percent: 9.92

Description:

Foreign direct investment are the net inflows of investment to acquire a lasting management interest (10 percent or more of voting stock) in an enterprise operating in an economy other than that of the investor. It is the sum of equity capital, reinvestment of earnings, other long-term capital, and short-term capital as shown in the balance of payments. This series shows net inflows (new investment inflows less disinvestment) in the reporting economy from foreign investors, and is divided by GDP.

4.7.6.79 Foreign direct investment, net outflows (percent of GDP) (wdi_fdiout)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_fdiout

Original tag: wdi_fdiout

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8296, Percent: 65.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7432, Percent: 24.5

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 864 Percent: 10.41

Description:

Foreign direct investment are the net outflows of investment to acquire a lasting management interest (10 percent or more of voting stock) in an enterprise operating in an economy other than that of the investor. It is the sum of equity capital, reinvestment of earnings, other long-term capital, and short-term capital as shown in the balance of payments. This series shows net outflows of investment from the reporting economy to the rest of the world and is divided by GDP.

4.7.6.80 Agriculture, forestry, and fishing, value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_gdpagr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpagr

Original tag: wdi_gdpagr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8231, Percent: 64.74

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7472, Percent: 24.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 759 Percent: 9.22

Description:

Agriculture corresponds to ISIC divisions 1-5 and includes forestry, hunting, and fishing, as well as cultivation of crops and livestock production. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3 or 4.

4.7.6.81 GDP per capita (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gdpcapcon2015)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpcapcon2015

Original tag: wdi_gdpcapcon2015

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10079, Percent: 79.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9020, Percent: 29.74

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1059 Percent: 10.51

Description:

GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in constant 2015 U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.82 GDP per capita (current US dollar) (wdi_gdpcapcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpcapcur

Original tag: wdi_gdpcapcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10174, Percent: 80.02

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9057, Percent: 29.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1117 Percent: 10.98

Description:

GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in current U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.83 GDP per capita growth (annual percent) (wdi_gdpcapgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpcapgr

Original tag: wdi_gdpcapgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10007, Percent: 78.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8920, Percent: 29.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1087 Percent: 10.86

Description:

Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2010 U.S. dollars. GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.

4.7.6.84 GDP per capita, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gdpcappppcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpcappppcur

Original tag: wdi_gdpcappppcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6326, Percent: 49.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5643, Percent: 18.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 683 Percent: 10.8

Description:

GDP per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). PPP GDP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in current international dollars based on the 2011 ICP round.

4.7.6.85 GDP growth (annual percent) (wdi_gdpgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpgr

Original tag: wdi_gdpgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10007, Percent: 78.71

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8920, Percent: 29.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1087 Percent: 10.86

Description:

Annual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2010 U.S. dollars. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.

4.7.6.86 Industry (including construction), value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_gdpind)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdpind

Original tag: wdi_gdpind

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8167, Percent: 64.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7397, Percent: 24.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 770 Percent: 9.43

Description:

Industry corresponds to ISIC divisions 10-45 and includes manufacturing (ISIC divisions 15-37). It comprises value added in mining, manufacturing (also reported as a separate subgroup), construction, electricity, water, and gas. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3. Note: For VAB countries, gross value added at factor cost is used as the denominator.

4.7.6.87 GDP, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gdppppcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gdppppcur

Original tag: wdi_gdppppcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6326, Percent: 49.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5643, Percent: 18.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 683 Percent: 10.8

Description:

PPP GDP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in current international dollars. For most economies PPP figures are extrapolated from the 2011 International Comparison Program (ICP) benchmark estimates or imputed using a statistical model based on the 2011 ICP. For 47 high- and upper middle-income economies conversion factors are provided by Eurostat and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

4.7.6.88 Gini index (wdi_gini)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gini

Original tag: wdi_gini

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Gini index measures the extent to which the distribution of income (or, in some cases, consumption expenditure) among individuals or households within an economy deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. A Lorenz curve plots the cumulative percentages of total income received against the cumulative number of recipients, starting with the poorest individual or household. The Gini index measures the area between the Lorenz curve and a

hypothetical line of absolute equality, expressed as a percentage of the maximum area under the line. Thus a Gini index of 0 represents perfect equality, while an index of 100 implies perfect inequality.

4.7.6.89 GNI, Atlas method (current US dollar) (wdi_gniatlcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gniatlcur

Original tag: wdi_gniatlcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9555, Percent: 75.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8606, Percent: 28.37

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 949 Percent: 9.93

Description:

GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in current U.S. dollars. GNI, calculated in national currency, is usually converted to U.S. dollars at official exchange rates for comparisons across economies, although an alternative rate is used when the official exchange rate is judged to diverge by an exceptionally large margin from the rate actually applied in international transactions. To smooth fluctuations in prices and exchange rates, a special Atlas method of conversion is used by the World Bank. This applies a conversion factor that averages the exchange rate for a given year and the two preceding years, adjusted for differences in rates of inflation between the country, and through 2000, the G-5 countries (France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States). From 2001, these countries include the Euro area, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

4.7.6.90 GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US dollar) (wdi_gnicapatlcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicapatlcur

Original tag: wdi_gnicapatlcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9555, Percent: 75.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8606, Percent: 28.37

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 949 Percent: 9.93

Description:

GNI per capita (formerly GNP per capita) is the gross national income, converted to U.S. dollars using the World Bank Atlas method, divided by the midyear population. GNI is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. GNI, calculated in national currency, is usually converted to U.S. dollars at official exchange rates for comparisons across economies, although an alternative rate is used when the official exchange rate is judged to diverge by an exceptionally large margin from the rate actually applied in international transactions. To smooth fluctuations in prices and exchange rates, a special Atlas method of conversion is used by the World Bank. This applies a conversion factor that averages the exchange rate for a given year and the two preceding years, adjusted for differences in rates of inflation between the country, and through 2000, the G-5 countries (France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States). From 2001, these countries include the Euro area, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

4.7.6.91 GNI per capita (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gnicapcon2015)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicapcon2015

Original tag: wdi_gnicapcon2015

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5490, Percent: 43.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5281, Percent: 17.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 209 Percent: 3.81

Description:

GNI per capita is gross national income divided by midyear population. GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in constant 2015 U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.92 GNI per capita growth (annual percent) (wdi_gnicapgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicapgr

Original tag: wdi_gnicapgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5524, Percent: 43.45

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5328, Percent: 17.57

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 196 Percent: 3.55

Description:

Annual percentage growth rate of GNI per capita based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2010 U.S. dollars. GNI per capita is gross national income divided by midyear population. GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad.

4.7.6.93 GNI per capita, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gnicappppcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicappppcur

Original tag: wdi_gnicappppcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6250, Percent: 49.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5616, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 634 Percent: 10.14

Description:

GNI per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). PPP GNI is gross national income (GNI) converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GNI as a U.S. dollar has in the United States. GNI is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in current international dollars based on the 2011 ICP round.

4.7.6.94 GNI (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_gnicon2015)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicon2015

Original tag: wdi_gnicon2015

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5490, Percent: 43.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5281, Percent: 17.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 209 Percent: 3.81

Description:

GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in constant 2015 prices, expressed in U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.95 GNI (current US dollar) (wdi_gnicur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnicur

Original tag: wdi_gnicur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9892, Percent: 77.8

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8911, Percent: 29.38

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 981 Percent: 9.92

Description:

GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in current U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.96 GNI growth (annual percent) (wdi_gnigr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnigr

Original tag: wdi_gnigr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5785, Percent: 45.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5594, Percent: 18.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 191 Percent: 3.3

Description:

GNI (formerly GNP) is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad.

4.7.6.97 GNI, PPP (current international dollar) (wdi_gnipppcur)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_gnipppcur

Original tag: wdi_gnipppcur

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6250, Percent: 49.16

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5616, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 634 Percent: 10.14

Description:

PPP GNI (formerly PPP GNP) is gross national income (GNI) converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GNI as a U.S. dollar has in the United States. Gross national income is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad. Data are in current international dollars. For most economies PPP figures are extrapolated from the 2011 International Comparison Program (ICP) benchmark estimates or imputed using a statistical model based on the 2011 ICP. For 47 high- and upper middle-income economies conversion factors are provided by Eurostat and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

4.7.6.98 Imports of goods and services (percent of GDP) (wdi_import)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_import

Original tag: wdi_import

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8086, Percent: 63.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7554, Percent: 24.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 532 Percent: 6.58

Description:

Imports of goods and services represent the value of all goods and other market services received from the rest of the world. They include the value of merchandise, freight, insurance, transport, travel, royalties, license fees, and other services, such as communication, construction, financial, information, business, personal, and government services. They exclude compensation of employees and investment income (formerly called factor services) and transfer payments.

4.7.6.99 Income share held by highest 10percent (wdi_incsh10h)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh10h

Original tag: wdi_incsh10h

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Income share held by highest 10percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles.

4.7.6.100 Income share held by lowest 10percent (wdi_incsh10l)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh10l

Original tag: wdi_incsh10l

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:
Income share held by lowest 10percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles.

4.7.6.101 Income share held by second 20percent (wdi_incsh202)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh202

Original tag: wdi_incsh202

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:
Income share held by second 20percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

4.7.6.102 Income share held by third 20percent (wdi_incsh203)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh203

Original tag: wdi_incsh203

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:
Income share held by third 20percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

4.7.6.103 Income share held by fourth 20percent (wdi_incsh204)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh204

Original tag: wdi_incsh204

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:
Income share held by fourth 20percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

4.7.6.104 Income share held by highest 20percent (wdi_incsh20h)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh20h

Original tag: wdi_incsh20h

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Income share held by highest 20percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

4.7.6.105 Income share held by lowest 20percent (wdi_incsh20l)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_incsh20l

Original tag: wdi_incsh20l

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Income share held by lowest 20percent. Percentage share of income or consumption is the share that accrues to subgroups of population indicated by deciles or quintiles. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

4.7.6.106 Real interest rate (percent) (wdi_intrate)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_intrate

Original tag: wdi_intrate

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4535, Percent: 35.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4098, Percent: 13.51

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 437 Percent: 9.64

Description:

Real interest rate is the lending interest rate adjusted for inflation as measured by the GDP deflator. The terms and conditions attached to lending rates differ by country, however, limiting their comparability.

4.7.6.107 Oil rents (percent of GDP) (wdi_oilrent)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_oilrent

Original tag: wdi_oilrent

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7802, Percent: 61.37

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7158, Percent: 23.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 644 Percent: 8.25

Description:

Oil rents are the difference between the value of crude oil production at world prices and total costs of production.

4.7.6.108 Services, value added (constant 2015 US dollar) (wdi_sva2015)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_sva2015

Original tag: wdi_sva2015

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7271, Percent: 57.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6628, Percent: 21.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 643 Percent: 8.84

Description:

Services correspond to ISIC divisions 45-99. They include value added in wholesale and retail trade (including hotels and restaurants), transport, and government, financial, professional, and personal services such as education, health care, and real estate services. Also included are imputed bank service charges, import duties, and any statistical discrepancies noted by national compilers as well as discrepancies arising from rescaling. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The industrial origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 4. Data are in constant 2015 prices, expressed in U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.109 Services, value added (annual percent growth) (wdi_svapg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_svapg

Original tag: wdi_svapg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7181, Percent: 56.48

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6547, Percent: 21.59

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 634 Percent: 8.83

Description:

Services, value added (annual percent growth). Annual growth rate for value added in services based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2010 U.S. dollars. Services correspond to ISIC divisions 50-99. They include value added in wholesale and retail trade (including hotels and restaurants), transport, and government, financial, professional, and personal services such as education, health care, and real estate services. Also included are imputed bank service charges, import duties, and any statistical discrepancies noted by national compilers as well as discrepancies arising from rescaling. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The industrial origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3 or 4.

4.7.6.110 Services, value added (percent of GDP) (wdi_svapgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_svapgdp

Original tag: wdi_svapgdp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7787, Percent: 61.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7085, Percent: 23.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 702 Percent: 9.02

Description:

Services, value added (percent of GDP). Services correspond to ISIC divisions 50-99 and they include value added in wholesale and retail trade (including hotels and restaurants), transport, and government, financial, professional, and personal services such as education, health care, and real estate services. Also included are imputed bank service charges, import duties, and any statistical discrepancies noted by national compilers as well as discrepancies arising from rescaling. Value added is the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The industrial origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3 or 4.

4.7.6.111 Tax revenue (percent of GDP) (wdi_taxrev)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_taxrev

Original tag: wdi_taxrev

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4548, Percent: 35.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4303, Percent: 14.19

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 245 Percent: 5.39

Description:

Tax revenue refers to compulsory transfers to the central government for public purposes. Certain compulsory transfers such as fines, penalties, and most social security contributions are excluded. Refunds and corrections of erroneously collected tax revenue are treated as negative revenue.

Note: The value for San Marino for 1995 was extremely high (44326) and has been recoded to missing.

4.7.6.112 Trade (percent of GDP) (wdi_trade)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_trade

Original tag: wdi_trade

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8086, Percent: 63.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7554, Percent: 24.91

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 532 Percent: 6.58

Description:

Trade is the sum of exports and imports of goods and services measured as a share of gross domestic product.

4.7.6.113 Trade in services (percent of GDP) (wdi_tradeserv)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_tradeserv

Original tag: wdi_tradeserv

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 7278, Percent: 57.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6629, Percent: 21.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 649 Percent: 8.92

Description:

Trade in services is the sum of service exports and imports divided by the value of GDP, all in current U.S. dollars.

4.7.6.114 World Trade Uncertainty Index (wui_wtui)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wui_wtui

Original tag: wui_wtui

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Ahir et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4260, Percent: 33.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4154, Percent: 13.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 106 Percent: 2.49

Description:

World Trade Uncertainty Index (WTUI) is constructed by counting the number of times uncertainty (and its variants) is mentioned, in proximity to a word related to trade, in the EIU country report. Specifically, the authors looked at the following words: protectionism, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), tariff, trade, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and World Trade Organization (WTO).

Examples of texts referring to trade uncertainty include: "uncertainty over the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement", and "market uncertainty over future trade policy will weigh on investor sentiment". As for the main index, they scale the index per thousand of words.

4.7.6.115 Completed loans, vague official finance, adjusted (USD 2021) (gcdf_lnvof)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gcdf_lnvof

Original tag: gcdf_lnvof

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2358, Percent: 18.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2132, Percent: 7.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 226 Percent: 9.58

Description:

Total adjusted commitment amount in constant 2021 USD for completed project or activity records that are Recommended For Aggregates, where the simplified flow type is Loan and the flow class is Vague (Official Finance). This category includes loans backed by official commitments that cannot be reliably classified as ODA-like or OOF-like due to insufficient information. Values are summed by recipient country and commitment year using AidData's Adjusted Amount (Constant USD 2021).

4.7.6.116 Completed vague flows, vague official finance, adjusted (USD 2021) (gcdf_vgvof)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gcdf_vgvof

Original tag: gcdf_vgvof

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2358, Percent: 18.55

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2132, Percent: 7.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 226 Percent: 9.58

Description:

Total adjusted commitment amount in constant 2021 USD for completed project or activity records that are Recommended For Aggregates, where the simplified flow type is Vague and the flow class is Vague (Official Finance). This category captures official commitments that cannot be reliably classified as ODA-like or OOF-like due to insufficient information. Values are summed by recipient country and commitment year using AidData's Adjusted Amount (Constant USD 2021).

4.7.7 Gender Equality

This category includes variables related to the differences of access and opportunities between women and men by country, such as access to education, overall employment and employment by specific sectors, and indexes that shine a light on the general differences in treatment between men and women.

4.7.7.1 Equal Opportunity (bti_eo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_eo

Original tag: bti_eo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent does equality of opportunity exist? From 1 to 10.

1. Equality of opportunity is not achieved. Women and/or members of ethnic or religious groups have only very limited access to education, public office, and employment. There are no legal provisions against discrimination.

4. Equality of opportunity is only partially achieved. Women and/or members of ethnic, religious, and other groups have limited access to education, public office, and employment. There are some legal provisions against discrimination, but their implementation is highly deficient.

7. Equality of opportunity is largely achieved. Women and members of ethnic or religious groups have near-equal access to education, public office, and employment. There are a number of legal provisions against discrimination, but their implementation is at times insufficient.

10. Equality of opportunity is achieved. Women and members of ethnic or religious groups have equal access to education, public office, and employment. There is a comprehensive and effective legal and institutional framework for the protection against discrimination.

4.7.7.2 Comparative Abortion Index 1 (0 to 7) (cai_cai1)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_cai1

Original tag: cai_cai1

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

The scale quantifies grounds on which a country might grant legal access to abortion: saving a woman's life, preserving a woman's physical health, preserving a woman's mental health, in case of rape or incest, in case of fetal impairment, for social or economic reasons, and on request. 0 represents a country with a complete ban on abortions. 7 represents a country that allows abortions on request.

4.7.7.3 Social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for legal abortion (cai_social)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_cai_social

Original tag: cai_social

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Forman-Rabinovici & Sommer (2018)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4121, Percent: 32.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3628, Percent: 11.96

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 493 Percent: 11.96

Description:

Binary variable that codes whether or not social or economic reasons are accepted as grounds for a legal abortion. 1 means that they are accepted as grounds for abortion. 0 means that it is illegal, and they are not accepted as grounds for legal abortion.

4.7.7.4 Women's Economic Rights (ciri_wecon)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_wecon

Original tag: ciri_wecon

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6905, Percent: 54.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6248, Percent: 20.6

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 657 Percent: 9.51

Description:

Women's economic rights include a number of internationally recognized rights. These rights

include:

- Equal pay for equal work

- The right to free choice of gainful employment or profession without the need to obtain a

husband or male relative's consent

- Equality in hiring and promotion practices

- Job security (maternity leave, unemployment benefits, no arbitrary firing or layoffs, etc.)

- Non-discrimination by employers

- The right to be free from sexual harassment in the workplace

- The right to work at night

- The right to work in occupations classified as dangerous, including the military and police

force.

In measuring women's economic rights the authors are primarily interested in two things: 1) the extensiveness of laws pertaining to women's economic rights; 2) government practices towards

women or how effectively the government enforces the laws.

Scoring Scheme:

Regarding the economic equality of women:

(0) There are no economic rights for women under law and systematic discrimination based on sex

may be built into the law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.

(1) There are some economic rights for women under law; however, in practice, the government

does not enforce the laws effectively or enforcement of laws is weak. The government tolerates a

moderate level of discrimination against women.

(2) There are some economic rights for women under law. In practice, the government does enforce

these laws effectively. However, the government still tolerates a low level of discrimination against

women.

(3) All or nearly all of women's economic rights are guaranteed by law. In practice, the government

fully and vigorously enforces these laws. The government tolerates no or almost no discrimination

against women.

4.7.7.5 Global Gender Gap Economic Participation and Opportunity Subindex (gggi_pos)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gggi_pos

Original tag: gggi_pos

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Economic Forum (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2515, Percent: 19.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2458, Percent: 8.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 57 Percent: 2.27

Description:

Economic Participation and Opportunity (0 to 1, where 1 indicates no gap). This subindex contains three concepts: the participation gap, the remuneration gap and the advancement gap. The participation gap is captured using the difference between women and men in labour force participation rates. The remuneration gap is captured through a hard data indicator (ratio of estimated female-to-male earned income) and a qualitative indicator gathered through the World Economic Forum's annual Executive Opinion Survey (wage equality for similar work). Finally, the gap between the advancement of women and men is captured through two hard data statistics (the ratio of women to men among legislators, senior officials and managers, and the ratio of women to men among technical and professional workers).

4.7.7.6 Employers, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empf

Original tag: wdi_empf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Employers refers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs' i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced, and, in this capacity, have engaged, on a continuous basis, one or more persons to work for them as employee(s). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.7.7 Women Business and the Law Index Score (scale 1-100) (wdi_wombuslawi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_wombuslawi

Original tag: wdi_wombuslawi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9000, Percent: 70.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8164, Percent: 26.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 836 Percent: 9.29

Description:

Women Business and the Law Index Score (1-100) measures how laws and regulations affect women's economic opportunity. Overall scores are calculated by taking the average score of each of the eight areas (Going Places, Starting a Job, Getting Paid, Getting Married, Having Children, Running a Business, Managing Assets and Getting a Pension), with 100 representing the highest possible score.

4.7.8 Private Economy

This category includes variables characterizing the private sector in a country, inter alia: regulation of the private sector, indicators concerning economic characteristics of groups in the society, such as poverty and household consumption, as well as tax rates.

4.7.8.1 Socio-Economic Barriers (bti_seb)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_seb

Original tag: bti_seb

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent are significant parts of the population fundamentally excluded from society due to poverty and inequality? From 1 to 10.

1. Poverty and inequality are extensive and structurally ingrained.

4. Poverty and inequality are pronounced and partly structurally ingrained.

7. Poverty and inequality are limited and barely structurally ingrained.

10. Poverty and inequality are minor and not structurally ingrained.

4.7.8.2 Freedom to Trade Internationally (current) (fi_ftradeint)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_ftradeint

Original tag: fi_ftradeint

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3983, Percent: 31.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3830, Percent: 12.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 153 Percent: 3.84

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "increasing tax rate on international trade", "slow import or export process", "small trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size", "exchange rate controls are present and a black-market exists", and "restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners" and 10 corresponds to "no specific taxes on international trade", "swift import or export process", "large trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size", "no black-market exchange rate", and "no restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners". The index consists of the following indicators: Taxes on international trade, Regulatory trade barriers, Actual size of trade sector compared to expected size, Difference between official exchange rate and black market rate, and International capital market controls.

4.7.8.3 Freedom to Trade Internationally (panel data) (fi_ftradeint_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_ftradeint_pd

Original tag: fi_ftradeint_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3925, Percent: 30.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3779, Percent: 12.46

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 146 Percent: 3.72

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "increasing tax rate on international trade", "slow import or export process", "small trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size", "exchange rate controls are present and a black-market exists", and "restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners" and 10 corresponds to "no specific taxes on international trade", "swift import or export process", "large trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size", "no black-market exchange rate", and "no restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners". The index consists of the following indicators: Taxes on international trade, Regulatory trade barriers, Actual size of trade sector compared to expected size, Difference between official exchange rate and black market rate, and International capital market controls. Panel-data adjusted.

4.7.8.4 Economic Freedom of the World Index (current) (fi_index)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_index

Original tag: fi_index

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4319, Percent: 33.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4152, Percent: 13.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 167 Percent: 3.87

Description:

The index is founded upon objective components that reflect the presence (or absence) of economic freedom. The index comprises 21 components designed to identify the consistency of institutional arrangements and policies with economic freedom in five major areas: size of government (fi_sog), legal structure and security of property rights (fi_legprop), access to sound money (fi_sm), freedom to trade internationally (fi_ftradeint), regulation of credit, labor and business (fi_reg). The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "less economic freedom" and 10 to "more economic freedom". This is the version of the index published at the current year of measurement, without taking methodological changes over time into account.

4.7.8.5 Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights (current) (fi_legprop)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_legprop

Original tag: fi_legprop

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4496, Percent: 35.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4309, Percent: 14.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 187 Percent: 4.16

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "no judicial independence", "no trusted legal framework exists", "no protection of intellectual property", "military interference in rule of law", and "no integrity of the legal system" and 10 corresponds to "high judicial independence", "trusted legal framework exists", "protection of intellectual property", "no military interference in rule of law", and "integrity of the legal system". The index consists of the following indicators: Judicial independence: The judiciary is independent and not subject to interference by the government or parties in dispute, Impartial courts: A trusted legal framework exists for private businesses to challenge the legality of government actions or regulations, Protection of intellectual property, Military interference in rule of law and the political process, Integrity of the legal system.

4.7.8.6 Regulation of Credit, Labor and Business (current) (fi_reg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_reg

Original tag: fi_reg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4426, Percent: 34.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4251, Percent: 14.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 175 Percent: 3.95

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "low percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks", "high foreign bank license denial rate", "private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-minimum", "deposit and lending rates is fixed by the government and real rates is persistently negative", "high impact of minimum wage", "widespread use of price controls throughout various sectors of the economy", and "starting a

new business is generally complicated" and 10 corresponds to "high percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks", "low foreign bank license denial rate", "private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-maximum", "interest rates is determined primarily by market forces and the real rates is positive", "low impact of minimum wage", "no price controls or marketing boards", and "starting a new business is generally easy". The index consists of the following indicators: Credit Market Regulations, Labor Market Regulations, Business Regulations.

4.7.8.7 Regulation of Credit, Labor and Business (panel data) (fi_reg_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_reg_pd

Original tag: fi_reg_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4423, Percent: 34.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4248, Percent: 14.01

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 175 Percent: 3.96

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "low percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks", "high foreign bank license denial rate", "private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-minimum", "deposit and lending rates is fixed by the government and real rates is persistently negative", "high impact of minimum wage", "widespread use of price controls throughout various sectors of the economy", and "starting a new business is generally complicated" and 10 corresponds to "high percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks", "low foreign bank license denial rate", "private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-maximum", "interest rates is determined primarily by market forces and the real rates is positive", "low impact of minimum wage", "no price controls or marketing boards", and "starting a new business is generally easy". The index consists of the following indicators: Credit Market Regulations, Labor Market Regulations, Business Regulations. Panel-data adjusted.

4.7.8.8 Access to Sound Money (current) (fi_sm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_sm

Original tag: fi_sm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4406, Percent: 34.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4227, Percent: 13.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 179 Percent: 4.06

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "high annual money growth", "high variation in the annual rate of inflation", "high inflation rate", and "restricted foreign currency bank accounts" and 10 corresponds to "low annual money growth", "low or no variation in the annual rate of inflation", "low inflation rate", and "foreign currency bank accounts are permissible without restrictions". The index consists of the following indicators: Average annual growth of the money supply in the last five years minus average annual growth of real GDP in the last ten years, Standard inflation variability in the last five years, Recent inflation rate, Freedom to own foreign currency bank accounts domestically and abroad.

4.7.8.9 Access to Sound Money (chain_linked) (fi_sm_pd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_fi_sm_pd

Original tag: fi_sm_pd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Gwartney et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4405, Percent: 34.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4226, Percent: 13.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 179 Percent: 4.06

Description:

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to "high annual money growth", "high variation in the annual rate of inflation", "high inflation rate", and "restricted foreign currency bank accounts" and 10 corresponds to "low annual money growth", "low or no variation in the annual rate of inflation", "low inflation rate", and "foreign currency bank accounts are permissible without restrictions". The index consists of the following indicators: Average annual growth of the money supply in the last five years minus average annual growth of real GDP in the last ten years, Standard inflation variability in the last five years, Recent inflation rate, Freedom to own foreign currency bank accounts domestically and abroad. Panel-data adjusted.

4.7.8.10 Children Poverty Rates among Single-Mother (50percent) (lis_cprsmf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_cprsmf

Original tag: lis_cprsmf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

This variable reports the percentage of single-mother families whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as half of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.11 Children Poverty Rates among Two-Parent Families (50percent) (lis_cprtpf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_cprtpf

Original tag: lis_cprtpf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

This variable reports the percentage of two-parent families whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as half of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.12 Distribution of Children by Income Group (above 150percent) (lis_dc150)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_dc150

Original tag: lis_dc150

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

This variable reflects the percentage of children whose household income is more than 150percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income.

Disposable Household Income refers to cash and non-cash income from labour, income from capital, income from pensions (including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. Disposable Household Income is equivalised at individual level as the total amount divided by the square root of household members. Before equivalisation, top and bottom coding has been applied by setting boundaries for extreme values of log transformed Disposable Household Income: at the top Q3 plus 3 times the interquartile range (Q3-Q1), and at the bottom Q1 minus 3 times the interquartile range.

4.7.8.13 Distribution of Children by Income Group (50-75percent) (lis_dc5075)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_dc5075

Original tag: lis_dc5075

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

This variable reflects the percentage of children whose household income falls between 50percent and 75percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income.

Disposable Household Income refers to cash and non-cash income from labour, income from capital, income from pensions (including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. Disposable Household Income is equivalised at individual level as the total amount divided by the square root of household members. Before equivalisation, top and bottom coding has been applied by setting boundaries for extreme values of log transformed Disposable Household Income: at the top Q3 plus 3 times the interquartile range (Q3-Q1), and at the bottom Q1 minus 3 times the interquartile range.

4.7.8.14 Distribution of Children by Income Group (75-150percent) (lis_dc75150)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_dc75150

Original tag: lis_dc75150

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

This variable reflects the percentage of children whose household income falls between 75percent and 150percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income.

Disposable Household Income refers to cash and non-cash income from labour, income from capital, income from pensions (including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. Disposable Household Income is equivalised at individual level as the total amount divided by the square root of household members. Before equivalisation, top and bottom coding has been applied by setting boundaries for extreme values of log transformed Disposable Household Income: at the top Q3 plus 3 times the interquartile range (Q3-Q1), and at the bottom Q1 minus 3 times the interquartile range.

4.7.8.15 Mean Equivalized Income (lis_meaneqi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_meaneqi

Original tag: lis_meaneqi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

The mean value of the Equivalized Income. Equivalised Disposable Household Income refers to cash and non-cash income from labour, income from capital, income from pensions (including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. Disposable Household Income is equivalised at individual level as the total amount divided by the square root of household members. Before equivalisation, top and bottom coding has been applied by setting boundaries for extreme values of log transformed Disposable Household Income: at the top Q3 plus 3 times the interquartile range (Q3-Q1), and at the bottom Q1 minus 3 times the interquartile range.

4.7.8.16 Median Equivalized Income (lis_medeqi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_medeqi

Original tag: lis_medeqi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

The median value of the Equivalized Income. Equivalised Disposable Household Income refers to cash and non-cash income from labour, income from capital, income from pensions (including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid. Disposable Household Income is equivalised at individual level as the total amount divided by the square root of household members. Before equivalisation, top and bottom coding has been applied by setting boundaries for extreme values of log transformed Disposable Household Income: at the top Q3 plus 3 times the interquartile range (Q3-Q1), and at the bottom Q1 minus 3 times the interquartile range.

4.7.8.17 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (40percent) (lis_rprc40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprc40

Original tag: lis_rprc40

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Children at 40percent of the Median is the percentage of the children population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 40 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.18 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (50percent) (lis_rprc50)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprc50

Original tag: lis_rprc50

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Children at 50percent of the Median is the percentage of the children population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as half of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.19 Relative Poverty Rates among Children (60percent) (lis_rprc60)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprc60

Original tag: lis_rprc60

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 932, Percent: 7.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 916, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.72

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Children at 60percent of the Median is the percentage of the children population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 60 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.20 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (50percent) (lis_rpre50)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rpre50

Original tag: lis_rpre50

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 952, Percent: 7.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 936, Percent: 3.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.68

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Elderly at 50percent of the Median is the percentage of the elderly population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as half of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.21 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (60percent) (lis_rpre60)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rpre60

Original tag: lis_rpre60

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 952, Percent: 7.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 936, Percent: 3.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.68

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Elderly at 60percent of the Median is the percentage of the elderly population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 60 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.22 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (40percent) (lis_rprt40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprt40

Original tag: lis_rprt40

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate at 40percent of the Median is the percentage of the total population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 40 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.23 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (50percent) (lis_rprt50)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprt50

Original tag: lis_rprt50

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate at 50percent of the Median is the percentage of the total population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as half of the median of equivalised disposable or gross household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.24 Relative Poverty Rates - Total Population (60percent) (lis_rprt60)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rprt60

Original tag: lis_rprt60

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 959, Percent: 7.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 940, Percent: 3.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19 Percent: 1.98

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate at 60percent of the Median is the percentage of the total population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 60 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.25 Proportion of people living below 50 percent of median income (percent) (wdi_belmedinc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_belmedinc

Original tag: wdi_belmedinc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2340, Percent: 18.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2303, Percent: 7.59

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.58

Description:

The percentage of people in the population who live in households whose per capita income or consumption is below half of the median income or consumption per capita. The median is measured at 2011 Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) using PovcalNet (http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet). For some countries, medians are not reported due to grouped and/or confidential data. The reference year is the year in which the

underlying household survey data was collected. In cases for which the data collection period bridged two calendar years, the first year in which data were collected is reported.

4.7.8.26 New business density (new registrations per 1,000 people ages 15-64) (wdi_busden)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_busden

Original tag: wdi_busden

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2292, Percent: 18.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2086, Percent: 6.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 206 Percent: 8.99

Description:

New businesses registered are the number of new limited liability corporations registered in the calendar year.

4.7.8.27 Relative Poverty Rates among Elderly (40percent) (lis_rpre40)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_lis_rpre40

Original tag: lis_rpre40

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 952, Percent: 7.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 936, Percent: 3.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 1.68

Description:

Relative Poverty Rate among Elderly at 40percent of the Median is the percentage of the elderly population whose income falls below the poverty line as defined as 40 percent of the median of equivalised disposable household income. In combination with decompositions, the ratio refers to the percentage of each group, whose income falls below the above defined poverty line.

4.7.8.28 Poverty gap at USD 3.00 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap300)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_povgap300

Original tag: wdi_povgap300

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Poverty gap at $3.00 a day (2021 PPP) is the mean shortfall in income or consumption from the poverty line $3.00 a day (counting the nonpoor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. This measure reflects the depth of poverty as well as its incidence.

4.7.8.29 Poverty gap at USD 4.20 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap420)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_povgap420

Original tag: wdi_povgap420

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Poverty gap at $4.20 a day (2021 PPP) is the mean shortfall in income or consumption from the poverty line $4.20 a day (counting the nonpoor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. This measure reflects the depth of poverty as well as its incidence.

4.7.8.30 Poverty gap at USD 8.30 a day (2021 PPP) (percent) (wdi_povgap830)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_povgap830

Original tag: wdi_povgap830

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2363, Percent: 18.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 7.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 37 Percent: 1.57

Description:

Poverty gap at $8.30 a day (2021 PPP) is the mean shortfall in income or consumption from the poverty line $8.30 a day (counting the nonpoor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. This measure reflects the depth of poverty as well as its incidence.

4.7.9 Welfare

This category includes indicators on government expenditure related to social welfare (pension, sick- ness coverage and accidents coverage).

4.7.9.1 Social Safety Nets (bti_ssn)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_ssn

Original tag: bti_ssn

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

To what extent do social safety nets provide compensation for social risks? From 1 to 10.

1. Social safety nets do not exist. Poverty is combated hardly at all, or only ad hoc.

4. Social safety nets are rudimentary and cover only few risks for a limited number of beneficiaries. The majority of the population is at risk of poverty.

7. Social safety nets are well developed, but do not cover all risks for all strata of the

population. A significant part of the population is still at risk of poverty.

10. Social safety nets are comprehensive and compensate for social risks, especially nationwide health care and a well-focused prevention of poverty.

4.7.9.2 Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Education (sgi_soed)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_soed

Original tag: sgi_soed

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Education (Education Policy, Upper Secondary Attainment, Tertiary Attainment, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) Results, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) Socioeconomic Background, Pre-primary Expenditure).

4.7.9.3 Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Integration Policy (sgi_soin)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_sgi_soin

Original tag: sgi_soin

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Schiller & Hellmann (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 2.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 328, Percent: 1.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Sustainable Policies: Social Policies - Integration (Integration Policy, Foreign-born to Native Upper Secondary Attainment, Foreign-born to Native Tertiary Attainment, Foreign-born to Native Unemployment, Foreign-born to Native Employment).

4.7.9.4 CPIA social protection rating (wdi_spr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_spr

Original tag: wdi_spr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1466, Percent: 11.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1247, Percent: 4.11

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 219 Percent: 14.94

Description:

Social protection and labor assess government policies in social protection and labor market regulations that reduce the risk of becoming poor, assist those who are poor to better manage further risks, and ensure a minimal level of welfare to all people (1=low to 6=high).

4.7.10 Education

This category includes a variety of indicators related to education, such as key characteristics of the educational system (public expenditure, gross enrollment, number of teachers), the students (age, gender, educational level), and educational outcomes (mean scores, literacy rates, numbers of researchers and scientists).

4.7.10.1 Sustainability (bti_su)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_bti_su

Original tag: bti_su

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Donner et al. (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1283, Percent: 10.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1239, Percent: 4.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 44 Percent: 3.43

Description:

Economic growth is balanced, environmentally sustainable and future-oriented. Including 'To what extent are environmental concerns effectively taken into account?' and 'To what extent are there solid institutions for basic, secondary and tertiary education, as well as for research and development?'.

4.7.10.2 Human Development Index (undp_hdi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_undp_hdi

Original tag: undp_hdi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: United Nations Development Program (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5820, Percent: 45.78

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5249, Percent: 17.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 571 Percent: 9.81

Description:

The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone. The HDI can also be used to question national policy choices, asking how two countries with the same level of GNI per capita can end up with different human development outcomes. These contrasts can stimulate debate about government policy priorities.

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and having a decent standard of living. The HDI is the geometric mean of normalized indices for each of the three dimensions. The closer the score is to 1, the better the country is doing.

The health dimension is assessed by life expectancy at birth, the education dimension is measured by mean of years of schooling for adults aged 25 years and more and expected years of schooling for children of school entering age. The standard of living dimension is measured

by gross national income per capita. The HDI uses the logarithm of income, to reflect the diminishing importance of income with increasing GNI. The scores for the three HDI dimension indices are then aggregated into a composite index using geometric mean. Refer to Technical notes for more details.

The HDI simplifies and captures only part of what human development entails. It does not reflect on inequalities, poverty, human security, empowerment, etc. The HDRO offers the other composite indices as broader proxy on some of the key issues of human development, inequality, gender disparity and human poverty.

4.7.10.3 Government expenditure on education, total (percent of GDP) (wdi_expedu)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expedu

Original tag: wdi_expedu

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4871, Percent: 38.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4471, Percent: 14.74

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 400 Percent: 8.21

Description:

General government expenditure on education (current, capital, and transfers) is expressed as a percentage of GDP. It includes expenditure funded by transfers from international sources to government. General government usually refers to local, regional and central governments.

Note: The value for Tuvalu in 1997 has been recoded to missing due to an extreme and very unlikely value.

4.7.10.4 Government expenditure per student, primary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstup)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expstup

Original tag: wdi_expstup

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1545, Percent: 12.15

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1428, Percent: 4.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 117 Percent: 7.57

Description:

Government expenditure per student is the average general government expenditure (current, capital, and transfers) per student in the primary level of education, expressed as a percentage of GDP per capita.

4.7.10.5 Government expenditure per student, secondary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstus)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expstus

Original tag: wdi_expstus

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1392, Percent: 10.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1298, Percent: 4.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 94 Percent: 6.75

Description:

Government expenditure per student is the average general government expenditure (current, capital, and transfers) per student in the secondary level of education, expressed as a percentage of GDP per capita.

4.7.10.6 Government expenditure per student, tertiary (percent of GDP per capita) (wdi_expstut)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_expstut

Original tag: wdi_expstut

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1402, Percent: 11.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1346, Percent: 4.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 56 Percent: 3.99

Description:

Government expenditure per student is the average general government expenditure (current, capital, and transfers) per student in the given tertiary of education, expressed as a percentage of GDP per capita.

4.7.10.7 School enrollment, secondary (percent net) (wdi_ners)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_ners

Original tag: wdi_ners

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2652, Percent: 20.86

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2440, Percent: 8.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 212 Percent: 7.99

Description:

Net enrollment rate is the ratio of children of official school age who are enrolled in school to the population of the corresponding official school age. Secondary education completes the provision of basic education that began at the primary level, and aims at laying the foundations for lifelong learning and human development, by offering more subject- or skill-oriented instruction using more specialized teachers.

4.7.10.8 School enrollment, secondary, female (percent net) (wdi_nersf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_nersf

Original tag: wdi_nersf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2513, Percent: 19.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2307, Percent: 7.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 206 Percent: 8.2

Description:

Net enrollment rate is the ratio of girls of official school age who are enrolled in school to the population of the corresponding official school age. Secondary education completes the provision of basic education that began at the primary level, and aims at laying the foundations for lifelong learning and human development, by offering more subject- or skill-oriented instruction using more specialized teachers. Female.

4.7.10.9 School enrollment, secondary, male (percent net) (wdi_nersm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_nersm

Original tag: wdi_nersm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2513, Percent: 19.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2307, Percent: 7.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 206 Percent: 8.2

Description:

Net enrollment rate is the ratio of boys of official school age who are enrolled in school to the population of the corresponding official school age. Secondary education completes the provision of basic education that began at the primary level, and aims at laying the foundations for lifelong learning and human development, by offering more subject- or skill-oriented instruction using more specialized teachers. Male.

4.7.11 Labour Market

This category includes variables about employment, unemployment and union density rate, in general, as well as in subgroups of the population.

4.7.11.1 Limits on Child Work in Constitution (ccp_childwrk)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ccp_childwrk

Original tag: ccp_childwrk

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Elkins & Ginsburg (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10533, Percent: 82.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9312, Percent: 30.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1221 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Does the constitution place limits on child employment?

1. Yes

2. No

90. Left explicitly to non-constitutional law

96. Other

4.7.11.2 Employed ICT specialists (percent of total employment) (eu_empict)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_empict

Original tag: eu_empict

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 667, Percent: 5.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 667, Percent: 2.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employed ICT specialists (percent of total employment)

4.7.11.3 Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resallf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resallf

Original tag: eu_resallf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 553, Percent: 4.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 553, Percent: 1.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (female)

4.7.11.4 Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resallt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resallt

Original tag: eu_resallt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 891, Percent: 7.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 891, Percent: 2.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in all sectors as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (total)

4.7.11.5 Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resbusf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resbusf

Original tag: eu_resbusf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (female)

4.7.11.6 Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resbust)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resbust

Original tag: eu_resbust

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 6.98

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 887, Percent: 2.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in Business Sector as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (total)

4.7.11.7 Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_reseduf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_reseduf

Original tag: eu_reseduf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 615, Percent: 4.84

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 615, Percent: 2.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (female)

4.7.11.8 Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resedut)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resedut

Original tag: eu_resedut

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 895, Percent: 7.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 895, Percent: 2.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Researchers in Higher Education as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (total)

4.7.11.9 Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resgovf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resgovf

Original tag: eu_resgovf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 624, Percent: 4.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 624, Percent: 2.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (female)

4.7.11.10 Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resgovt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resgovt

Original tag: eu_resgovt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 901, Percent: 7.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 901, Percent: 2.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Researchers in Government as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (total)

4.7.11.11 Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time (Female) (eu_resnonpf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resnonpf

Original tag: eu_resnonpf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 3.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 408, Percent: 1.35

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (female)

4.7.11.12 Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time (Total) (eu_resnonpt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_resnonpt

Original tag: eu_resnonpt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 635, Percent: 4.99

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 635, Percent: 2.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Researchers in Non-profits as percentage of total employment - full-time equivalent (total)

4.7.11.13 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctabf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctabf

Original tag: eu_sctabf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 560, Percent: 4.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 560, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarrying (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.14 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctabm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctabm

Original tag: eu_sctabm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarrying (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.15 Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarry (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctabt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctabt

Original tag: eu_sctabt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Quarrying (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.16 Employment in Manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcff)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcff

Original tag: eu_sctcff

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 4.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.17 Employment in Manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcfm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcfm

Original tag: eu_sctcfm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.18 Employment in Manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcft)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcft

Original tag: eu_sctcft

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.19 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcf

Original tag: eu_sctchtcf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 516, Percent: 4.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 516, Percent: 1.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.20 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcm

Original tag: eu_sctchtcm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 522, Percent: 4.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 522, Percent: 1.72

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.21 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmf

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 520, Percent: 4.09

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 520, Percent: 1.71

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.22 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmhf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmhf

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmhf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 560, Percent: 4.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 560, Percent: 1.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.23 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmhm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmhm

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmhm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.24 Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmht)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmht

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmht

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in High and medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.25 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmm

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.26 Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtcmt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtcmt

Original tag: eu_sctchtcmt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 565, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Medium high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.27 Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctchtct)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctchtct

Original tag: eu_sctchtct

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 551, Percent: 4.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 551, Percent: 1.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in high-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.28 Employment in Low-technology manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltcf

Original tag: eu_sctcltcf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low-technology manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.29 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltclmf

Original tag: eu_sctcltclmf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.30 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltclmm

Original tag: eu_sctcltclmm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low and medium low-technology manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.31 Employment in Low and medium low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltclmt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltclmt

Original tag: eu_sctcltclmt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low and medium low-technology manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.32 Employment in Low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltcm

Original tag: eu_sctcltcm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 4.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low-technology manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.33 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltcmf

Original tag: eu_sctcltcmf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 4.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 564, Percent: 1.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Medium low-technology manufacturing (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.34 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltcmm

Original tag: eu_sctcltcmm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Medium low-technology manufacturing (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.35 Employment in Medium low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltcmt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltcmt

Original tag: eu_sctcltcmt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Medium low-technology manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.36 Employment in Low-tech manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctcltct)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctcltct

Original tag: eu_sctcltct

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Low-technology manufacturing (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.37 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctgitf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctgitf

Original tag: eu_sctgitf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.38 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctgitm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctgitm

Original tag: eu_sctgitm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.39 Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activ. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctgitt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctgitt

Original tag: eu_sctgitt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Wholesale, Retail trade, Food service activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.40 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79f)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scth52n79f

Original tag: eu_scth52n79f

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.41 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Male) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79m)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scth52n79m

Original tag: eu_scth52n79m

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.42 Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_scth52n79t)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scth52n79t

Original tag: eu_scth52n79t

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Land, Water, Air transport, Warehouse (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.43 Employment in high-tech sectors (Female) percent total employment (eu_scthtcf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scthtcf

Original tag: eu_scthtcf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in high-tech sectors (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.44 Employment in high-tech sectors (Male) percent total employment (eu_scthtcm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scthtcm

Original tag: eu_scthtcm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in high-tech sectors (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.45 Employment in high-tech sectors (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_scthtct)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_scthtct

Original tag: eu_scthtct

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in high-tech sectors (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.46 Employment in Information and communication (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctjf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctjf

Original tag: eu_sctjf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Information and communication (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.47 Employment in Information and communication (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctjm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctjm

Original tag: eu_sctjm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Information and communication (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.48 Employment in Information and communication (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctjt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctjt

Original tag: eu_sctjt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Information and communication (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.49 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkf

Original tag: eu_sctkf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.50 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkisf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkisf

Original tag: eu_sctkisf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.51 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtcf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkishtcf

Original tag: eu_sctkishtcf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.52 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtcm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkishtcm

Original tag: eu_sctkishtcm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.53 Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkishtct)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkishtct

Original tag: eu_sctkishtct

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Knowledge-intensive high-tech services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.54 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkism)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkism

Original tag: eu_sctkism

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.55 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktothf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkismktothf

Original tag: eu_sctkismktothf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Knowledge-intensive market services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.56 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktothm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkismktothm

Original tag: eu_sctkismktothm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Knowledge-intensive market services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.57 Employment in Knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkismktotht)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkismktotht

Original tag: eu_sctkismktotht

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Knowledge-intensive market services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.58 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctkisothf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkisothf

Original tag: eu_sctkisothf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.59 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkisothm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkisothm

Original tag: eu_sctkisothm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.60 Employment in Other knowledge-intensive serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkisotht)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkisotht

Original tag: eu_sctkisotht

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other knowledge-intensive services (Total) percent total employment

4.7.11.61 Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkist)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkist

Original tag: eu_sctkist

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.62 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctkm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkm

Original tag: eu_sctkm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 4.51

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 573, Percent: 1.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.63 Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctkt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctkt

Original tag: eu_sctkt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Financial and insurance activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.64 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkisf

Original tag: eu_sctlkisf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.65 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkism)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkism

Original tag: eu_sctlkism

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.66 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkismktf

Original tag: eu_sctlkismktf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.67 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkismktm

Original tag: eu_sctlkismktm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.68 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkismktt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkismktt

Original tag: eu_sctlkismktt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive market services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.69 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisothf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkisothf

Original tag: eu_sctlkisothf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive services (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.70 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisothm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkisothm

Original tag: eu_sctlkisothm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive services (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.71 Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive serv. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkisotht)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkisotht

Original tag: eu_sctlkisotht

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other less knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.72 Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctlkist)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctlkist

Original tag: eu_sctlkist

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Less knowledge-intensive services (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.73 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctmf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctmf

Original tag: eu_sctmf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.74 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctmm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctmm

Original tag: eu_sctmm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.75 Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctmt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctmt

Original tag: eu_sctmt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Professional, scientific and tech activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.76 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctnf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctnf

Original tag: eu_sctnf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 4.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 576, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Administrative and support service activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.77 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctnm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctnm

Original tag: eu_sctnm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Administrative and support service activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.78 Employment in Administrative and support service activ. (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctnt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctnt

Original tag: eu_sctnt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Administrative and support service activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.79 Employment in Education (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctpaf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpaf

Original tag: eu_sctpaf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Public administration activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.80 Employment in Education (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctpam)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpam

Original tag: eu_sctpam

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Public administration activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies (Male) percent total employment activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.81 Employment in Education (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctpat)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpat
Original tag: eu_sctpat
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: European Commission (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Employment in Public administration

4.7.11.82 Employment in Education (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctpf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpf
Original tag: eu_sctpf
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: European Commission (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Employment in Education (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.83 Employment in Education (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctpm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpm
Original tag: eu_sctpm
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: European Commission (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Employment in Education (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.84 Employment in Education (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctpt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctpt
Original tag: eu_sctpt
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: European Commission (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Employment in Education (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.85 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctqf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctqf

Original tag: eu_sctqf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.86 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctqm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctqm

Original tag: eu_sctqm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Human health and social work activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.87 Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctqt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctqt

Original tag: eu_sctqt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Human health and social work activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.88 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctrf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctrf

Original tag: eu_sctrf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.89 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctrm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctrm

Original tag: eu_sctrm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.90 Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctrt)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctrt

Original tag: eu_sctrt

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Arts, entertainment and recreation (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.91 Employment in Other service activities (Female) percent total employment (eu_sctsf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctsf

Original tag: eu_sctsf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Employment in Other service activities (Female) percent total employment

4.7.11.92 Employment in Other service activities (Male) percent total employment (eu_sctsm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctsm

Original tag: eu_sctsm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 4.52

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 575, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Other service activities (Male) percent total employment

4.7.11.93 Employment in Other service activities (Female and male) percent total employment (eu_sctst)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_sctst

Original tag: eu_sctst

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 4.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 577, Percent: 1.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Employment in Other service activities (Female and male) percent total employment

4.7.11.94 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Female (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunef)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unemppcunef

Original tag: eu_unemppcunef

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 7.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 911, Percent: 3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Long-term unemployment 25+ years, female (percent of unemployment)

4.7.11.95 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Male (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunem)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unemppcunem

Original tag: eu_unemppcunem

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 7.21

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 917, Percent: 3.02

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
Long-term unemployment 25+ years, male (percent of unemployment)

4.7.11.96 Long-term unemployment 25+ years, Total (percent of unemployment) (eu_unemppcunet)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unemppcunet

Original tag: eu_unemppcunet

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 927, Percent: 7.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 927, Percent: 3.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Long-term unemployment 25+ years, total (percent of unemployment)

4.7.11.97 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524f)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy1524f

Original tag: eu_unempy1524f

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 545, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 545, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 24 Years, Female (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.98 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524m)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy1524m

Original tag: eu_unempy1524m

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 24 Years, Male (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.99 Unemployment rates: 15-24 Years, Total (percent of active population) (eu_unempy1524t)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy1524t

Original tag: eu_unempy1524t

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 24 Years, Total (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.100 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574f)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy2574f

Original tag: eu_unempy2574f

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Female (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.101 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574m)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy2574m

Original tag: eu_unempy2574m

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Male (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.102 Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Total (percent of active population) (eu_unempy2574t)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempy2574t

Original tag: eu_unempy2574t

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 25-74 Years, Total (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.103 Unemployment rates: Total, Female (percent of active population) (eu_unempytotf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempytotf

Original tag: eu_unempytotf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 74 Years, Female (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.104 Unemployment rates: Total, Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempytotm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempytotm

Original tag: eu_unempytotm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 74 Years, Male (percentage of active population)

4.7.11.105 Unemployment rates: Total, Female and Male (percent of active population) (eu_unempytott)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_unempytott

Original tag: eu_unempytott

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 4.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 546, Percent: 1.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Unemployment rates: 15 to 74 Years, Total (percentage of active population) for Female and Male population

4.7.11.106 Employers, total (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_emp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_emp

Original tag: wdi_emp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Employers refers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs' i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced, and, in this capacity, have engaged, on a continuous basis, one or more persons to work for them as employee(s). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.107 Employment in agriculture (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empagr

Original tag: wdi_empagr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Employment in agriculture as a percentage of all employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The agriculture sector consists of activities in agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing, in accordance with division 1 (ISIC 2) or categories A-B (ISIC 3) or category A (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.108 Employment in agriculture, female (percent female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagrf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empagrf

Original tag: wdi_empagrf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Female employment in agriculture as a percentage of all female employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The agriculture sector consists of activities in agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing, in accordance with division 1 (ISIC 2) or categories A-B (ISIC 3) or category A (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.109 Employment in agriculture, male (percent male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empagrm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empagrm

Original tag: wdi_empagrm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Male employment in agriculture as a percentage of all male employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The agriculture sector consists of activities in agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing, in accordance with division 1 (ISIC 2) or categories A-B (ISIC 3) or category A (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.110 Children in employment, total (percent of children ages 7-14) (wdi_empch)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empch

Original tag: wdi_empch

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 277, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 0.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8 Percent: 2.89

Description:

Children in employment refer to children involved in economic activity for at least one hour in the reference week of the survey.

4.7.11.111 Children in employment, female (percent of female children ages 7-14) (wdi_empchf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empchf

Original tag: wdi_empchf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 277, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 0.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8 Percent: 2.89

Description:

Children in employment refer to children involved in economic activity for at least one hour in the reference week of the survey. Female.

4.7.11.112 Children in employment, male (percent of male children ages 7-14) (wdi_empchm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empchm

Original tag: wdi_empchm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 277, Percent: 2.18

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 269, Percent: 0.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8 Percent: 2.89

Description:

Children in employment refer to children involved in economic activity for at least one hour in the reference week of the survey. Male.

4.7.11.113 Employment in industry (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empind)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empind

Original tag: wdi_empind

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Employment in industry as a percentage of all employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The industry sector consists of mining and quarrying, manufacturing, construction, and public utilities (electricity, gas, and water), in accordance with divisions 2-5 (ISIC 2) or categories C-F (ISIC 3) or categories B-F (ISIC

4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.114 Employment in industry, female (percent female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empindf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empindf

Original tag: wdi_empindf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Female employment in industry as a percentage of all female employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The industry sector consists of mining and quarrying, manufacturing, construction, and public utilities (electricity, gas, and water), in accordance with divisions 2-5 (ISIC 2) or categories C-F (ISIC 3) or categories B-F (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.115 Employment in industry, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empindm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empindm

Original tag: wdi_empindm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Male employment in industry as a percentage of all male employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The industry sector consists of mining and quarrying, manufacturing, construction, and public utilities (electricity, gas, and water), in accordance with divisions 2-5 (ISIC 2) or categories C-F (ISIC 3) or categories B-F (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.116 Employers, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empm

Original tag: wdi_empm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Employers refers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few

partners, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs' i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced, and, in this capacity, have engaged, on a continuous basis, one or more persons to work for them as employee(s). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.117 Employment in services (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empser)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empser

Original tag: wdi_empser

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Total employment in services as percentage of total employment. Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The services sector consists of wholesale and retail trade and restaurants and hotels; transport, storage, and communications; financing, insurance, real estate, and business services; and community, social, and personal services, in accordance with divisions 6-9 (ISIC 2) or categories G-Q (ISIC 3) or categories G-U (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.118 Employment in services, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empserf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empserf

Original tag: wdi_empserf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Female employment in services (percent of female employment). Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The services sector consists of wholesale and retail trade and restaurants and hotels; transport, storage, and communications; financing, insurance, real estate, and business services; and community, social, and personal services, in accordance with divisions 6-9 (ISIC 2) or categories G-Q (ISIC 3) or categories G-U (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.119 Employment in services, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_empserm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_empserm

Original tag: wdi_empserm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Male employment in services (percent of male employment). Employment is defined as persons of working age who were engaged in any activity to produce goods or provide services for pay or profit, whether at work during the reference period or not at work due to temporary absence from a job, or to working-time arrangement. The services sector consists of wholesale and retail trade and restaurants and hotels; transport, storage, and communications; financing, insurance, real estate, and business services; and community, social, and personal services, in accordance with divisions 6-9 (ISIC 2) or categories G-Q (ISIC 3) or categories G-U (ISIC 4). Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.120 Labor force with advanced education percent of total working-age pop. (wdi_lfpedua)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpedua

Original tag: wdi_lfpedua

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2321, Percent: 18.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2261, Percent: 7.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 60 Percent: 2.59

Description:

The percentage of the working age population with an advanced level of education who are in the labor force. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.121 Labor force with advanced education percent of female working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduaf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpeduaf

Original tag: wdi_lfpeduaf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2317, Percent: 18.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2258, Percent: 7.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.55

Description:

The percentage of the working age female population with an advanced level of education who are in the labor force. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.122 Labor force with advanced education percent of male working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduam)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpeduam

Original tag: wdi_lfpeduam

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2320, Percent: 18.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2261, Percent: 7.45

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.54

Description:

The percentage of the working age male population with an advanced level of education who are in the labor force. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.123 Labor force with basic education percent of total working-age pop. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedub)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpedub

Original tag: wdi_lfpedub

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2330, Percent: 18.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2270, Percent: 7.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 60 Percent: 2.58

Description:

The percentage of the working age population with a basic level of education who are in the labor force. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.124 Labor force with basic education percent of female working-age pop. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedubf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpedubf

Original tag: wdi_lfpedubf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2332, Percent: 18.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2272, Percent: 7.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 60 Percent: 2.57

Description:

The percentage of the working age female population with a basic level of education who are in the labor force. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.125 Labor force with basic education percent of male working-age pop. w. basic edu. (wdi_lfpedubm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpedubm

Original tag: wdi_lfpedubm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2327, Percent: 18.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2268, Percent: 7.48

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.54

Description:

The percentage of the working age male population with a basic level of education who are in the labor force. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.126 Labor force with intermediate education percent of total working-age pop. (wdi_lfpedui)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpedui

Original tag: wdi_lfpedui

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 18.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2267, Percent: 7.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.54

Description:

The percentage of the working age population with an intermediate level of education who are in the labor force. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.127 Labor force with intermediate education percent of female working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduif)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpeduif

Original tag: wdi_lfpeduif

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2326, Percent: 18.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2267, Percent: 7.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.54

Description:

The percentage of the working age female population with an intermediate level of education who are in the labor force. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.128 Labor force with intermediate education percent of male working-age pop. (wdi_lfpeduim)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpeduim

Original tag: wdi_lfpeduim

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2325, Percent: 18.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2266, Percent: 7.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.54

Description:

The percentage of the working age male population with an intermediate level of education who are in the labor force. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary

non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.129 Labor force, female (percent of total labor force) (wdi_lfpf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpf

Original tag: wdi_lfpf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Female labor force as a percentage of the total show the extent to which women are active in the labor force. Labor force comprises people ages 15 and older who meet the International Labour Organization's definition of the economically active population.

4.7.11.130 Labor force participation rate (percent female ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpfilo15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpfilo15

Original tag: wdi_lfpfilo15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of female ages 15+) (modeled ILO est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.131 Labor force participation rate (percent of female ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpfne15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpfne15

Original tag: wdi_lfpfne15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4328, Percent: 34.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4105, Percent: 13.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 223 Percent: 5.15

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of female ages 15+) (national est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.132 Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpilo15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpilo15

Original tag: wdi_lfpilo15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (modeled ILO est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.133 Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpmilo15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpmilo15

Original tag: wdi_lfpmilo15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (modeled ILO est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.134 Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpmne15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpmne15

Original tag: wdi_lfpmne15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4328, Percent: 34.04

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4105, Percent: 13.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 223 Percent: 5.15

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of male ages 15+) (national est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.135 Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (national est.) (wdi_lfpne15)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpne15

Original tag: wdi_lfpne15

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4443, Percent: 34.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4212, Percent: 13.89

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 231 Percent: 5.2

Description:

Labor force participation rate (percent of total ages 15+) (national est.). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15 and older that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.136 Labor force participation rate, total (percent of total pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfpr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpr

Original tag: wdi_lfpr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate, total (percent of total population ages 15-64) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15-64 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.137 Labor force participation rate, female (percent of female pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfprf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfprf

Original tag: wdi_lfprf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate, female (percent of female population ages 15-64) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15-64 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.138 Labor force participation rate, male (percent of male pop. ages 15-64) (ILO) (wdi_lfprm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfprm

Original tag: wdi_lfprm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate, male (percent of male population ages 15-64) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate is the proportion of the population ages 15-64 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.139 Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpyfilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpyfilo

Original tag: wdi_lfpyfilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.140 Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpyfne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpyfne

Original tag: wdi_lfpyfne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3855, Percent: 30.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3700, Percent: 12.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 155 Percent: 4.02

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, female (percent) (national estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.141 Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpyilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpyilo

Original tag: wdi_lfpyilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.142 Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (modeled ILO) (wdi_lfpymilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpymilo

Original tag: wdi_lfpymilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6096, Percent: 47.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5757, Percent: 18.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 339 Percent: 5.56

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (modeled ILO estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.143 Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpymne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpymne

Original tag: wdi_lfpymne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3855, Percent: 30.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3700, Percent: 12.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 155 Percent: 4.02

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, male (percent) (national estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.144 Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (national est.) (wdi_lfpyne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_lfpyne

Original tag: wdi_lfpyne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3873, Percent: 30.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3714, Percent: 12.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 159 Percent: 4.11

Description:

Labor force participation rate 15-24, total (percent) (national estimate). Labor force participation rate for ages 15-24 is the proportion of the population ages 15-24 that is economically active: all people who supply labor for the production of goods and services during a specified period.

4.7.11.145 Part time employment, total (percent of total employment) (wdi_pte)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_pte

Original tag: wdi_pte

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2249, Percent: 17.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2204, Percent: 7.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45 Percent: 2

Description:

Part time employment, total (percent of total employment). Part time employment refers to regular employment in which working time is substantially less than normal. Definitions of part time employment differ by country.

4.7.11.146 Part time employment, female (percent of total female employment) (wdi_ptef)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_ptef

Original tag: wdi_ptef

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2249, Percent: 17.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2204, Percent: 7.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45 Percent: 2

Description:

Part time employment, female (percent of total female employment). Part time employment refers to regular employment in which working time is substantially less than normal. Definitions of part time employment differ by country.

4.7.11.147 Part time employment, male (percent of total male employment) (wdi_ptem)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_ptem

Original tag: wdi_ptem

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2249, Percent: 17.69

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2204, Percent: 7.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45 Percent: 2

Description:

Part time employment, male (percent of total male employment). Part time employment refers to regular employment in which working time is substantially less than normal. Definitions of part time employment differ by country.

4.7.11.148 Self-employed, total (percent of total employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_semp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_semp

Original tag: wdi_semp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Self-employed workers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners or in cooperative, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs'. i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced. Self-employed workers include four sub-categories of employers, own-account workers, members of producers' cooperatives, and contributing family workers. Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.149 Self-employed, female (percent of female employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_sempf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_sempf

Original tag: wdi_sempf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Self-employed female workers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners or in cooperative, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs'. i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced. Self-employed workers include four sub-categories of employers, own-account workers, members of producers' cooperatives, and contributing family workers. Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.150 Self-employed, male (percent of male employment) (modeled ILO) (wdi_sempm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_sempm

Original tag: wdi_sempm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5772, Percent: 45.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5453, Percent: 17.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 319 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Self-employed male workers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners or in cooperative, hold the type of jobs defined as a 'self-employment jobs'. i.e. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced. Self-employed workers include four sub-categories of employers, own-account workers, members of producers' cooperatives, and contributing family workers. Modeled ILO estimate.

4.7.11.151 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedua)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempedua

Original tag: wdi_unempedua

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2443, Percent: 19.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2389, Percent: 7.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 54 Percent: 2.21

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an advanced level of education who are unemployed. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.152 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempeduaf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempeduaf

Original tag: wdi_unempeduaf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2402, Percent: 18.89

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2349, Percent: 7.74

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 53 Percent: 2.21

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an advanced level of education who are unemployed. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Female.

4.7.11.153 Unemployment with advanced education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempeduam)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempeduam

Original tag: wdi_unempeduam

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2407, Percent: 18.93

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2362, Percent: 7.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 45 Percent: 1.87

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an advanced level of education who are unemployed. Advanced education comprises short-cycle tertiary education, a bachelor's degree or equivalent education level, a master's degree or equivalent education level, or doctoral degree or equivalent education level according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Male.

4.7.11.154 Unemployment with basic education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedub)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempedub

Original tag: wdi_unempedub

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2472, Percent: 19.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2411, Percent: 7.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 61 Percent: 2.47

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with a basic level of education who are unemployed. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.155 Unemployment with basic education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempedubf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempedubf

Original tag: wdi_unempedubf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2460, Percent: 19.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2401, Percent: 7.92

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 59 Percent: 2.4

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with a basic level of education who are unemployed. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Female.

4.7.11.156 Unemployment with basic education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempedubm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempedubm

Original tag: wdi_unempedubm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2464, Percent: 19.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2404, Percent: 7.93

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 60 Percent: 2.44

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with a basic level of education who are unemployed. Basic education comprises primary education or lower secondary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Male.

4.7.11.157 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of total labor force) (wdi_unempedui)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempedui

Original tag: wdi_unempedui

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2448, Percent: 19.25

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2390, Percent: 7.88

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 58 Percent: 2.37

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an intermediate level of education who are unemployed. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011).

4.7.11.158 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of female labor force) (wdi_unempeduif)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempeduif

Original tag: wdi_unempeduif

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2419, Percent: 19.03

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2366, Percent: 7.8

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 53 Percent: 2.19

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an intermediate level of education who are unemployed. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Female.

4.7.11.159 Unemployment with intermediate education (percent of male labor force) (wdi_unempeduim)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempeduim

Original tag: wdi_unempeduim

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2428, Percent: 19.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2373, Percent: 7.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 55 Percent: 2.27

Description:

The percentage of the labor force with an intermediate level of education who are unemployed. Intermediate education comprises upper secondary or post-secondary non tertiary education according to the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED 2011). Male.

4.7.11.160 Unemployment, female (percent of female labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempfilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempfilo

Original tag: wdi_unempfilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Female.

4.7.11.161 Unemployment, female (percent of female labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempfne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempfne

Original tag: wdi_unempfne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4211, Percent: 33.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4010, Percent: 13.22

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 201 Percent: 4.77

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country. Female.

4.7.11.162 Unemployment, total (percent of total labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempilo

Original tag: wdi_unempilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Total.

4.7.11.163 Unemployment, male (percent of male labor force) (modeled ILO) (wdi_unempmilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempmilo

Original tag: wdi_unempmilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Male.

4.7.11.164 Unemployment, male (percent of male labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempmne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempmne

Original tag: wdi_unempmne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4213, Percent: 33.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4012, Percent: 13.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 201 Percent: 4.77

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country. Male.

4.7.11.165 Unemployment, total (percent of total labor force) (national est.) (wdi_unempne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempne

Original tag: wdi_unempne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4566, Percent: 35.91

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4331, Percent: 14.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 235 Percent: 5.15

Description:

Unemployment refers to the share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country. Total.

4.7.11.166 Unemployment, youth female (percent of female labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempyfilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempyfilo

Original tag: wdi_unempyfilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment.

4.7.11.167 Unemployment, youth female (percent of female labor force 15-24)(nation est.) (wdi_unempyfne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempyfne

Original tag: wdi_unempyfne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3132, Percent: 24.63

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3024, Percent: 9.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 108 Percent: 3.45

Description:

Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country.

4.7.11.168 Unemployment, youth total (percent of total labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempyilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempyilo

Original tag: wdi_unempyilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment.

4.7.11.169 Unemployment, youth male (percent of male labor force 15-24)(modeled ILO) (wdi_unempymilo)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempymilo

Original tag: wdi_unempymilo

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5946, Percent: 46.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 5617, Percent: 18.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 329 Percent: 5.53

Description:

Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment.

4.7.11.170 Unemployment, youth male (percent of male labor force 15-24)(national est.) (wdi_unempymne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempymne

Original tag: wdi_unempymne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3134, Percent: 24.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3026, Percent: 9.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 108 Percent: 3.45

Description:

Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country.

4.7.11.171 Unemployment, youth total (percent of total labor force 15-24)(national est.) (wdi_unempyne)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_unempyne

Original tag: wdi_unempyne

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3166, Percent: 24.9

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3056, Percent: 10.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 110 Percent: 3.47

Description:
Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labor force ages 15-24 without work but available for and seeking employment. Definitions of labor force and unemployment differ by country.

4.7.11.172 Public sector employment as a share of formal employment (wwbi_psefemp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psefemp
Original tag: wwbi_psefemp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 876, Percent: 6.89
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 876, Percent: 2.89
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Public sector employment as a share of formal employment

4.7.11.173 Public sector employment as a share of total employment (wwbi_psemptot)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psemptot
Original tag: wwbi_psemptot
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1135, Percent: 8.93
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1133, Percent: 3.74
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.18
Description:
Public sector employment as a share of total employment

4.7.11.174 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Female) (wwbi_psemptotf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psemptotf
Original tag: wwbi_psemptotf
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1010, Percent: 7.94
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1008, Percent: 3.32
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.2
Description:
Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Female)

4.7.11.175 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Male) (wwbi_psemptotm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psemptotm
Original tag: wwbi_psemptotm
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)
Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1007, Percent: 7.92

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1006, Percent: 3.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.1

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of total employment by gender (Male)

4.7.11.176 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Rural) (wwbi_psemptotr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psemptotr

Original tag: wwbi_psemptotr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 949, Percent: 7.46

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 948, Percent: 3.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.11

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Rural)

4.7.11.177 Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Urban) (wwbi_psemptotu)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psemptotu

Original tag: wwbi_psemptotu

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 994, Percent: 7.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 992, Percent: 3.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.2

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of total employment by location (Urban)

4.7.11.178 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment (wwbi_psepemp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psepemp

Original tag: wwbi_psepemp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1121, Percent: 8.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1118, Percent: 3.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3 Percent: 0.27

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of paid employment

4.7.11.179 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Female) (wwbi_psepempf)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psepempf

Original tag: wwbi_psepempf

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 993, Percent: 7.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 991, Percent: 3.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.2

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Female)

4.7.11.180 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Male) (wwbi_psepempm)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psepempm

Original tag: wwbi_psepempm

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 994, Percent: 7.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 992, Percent: 3.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.2

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by gender (Male)

4.7.11.181 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Rural) (wwbi_psepempr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psepempr

Original tag: wwbi_psepempr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 934, Percent: 7.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 933, Percent: 3.08

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1 Percent: 0.11

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Rural)

4.7.11.182 Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Urban) (wwbi_psepempu)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wwbi_psepempu

Original tag: wwbi_psepempu

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: The World Bank (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 991, Percent: 7.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 989, Percent: 3.26

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 0.2

Description:

Public sector employment as a share of paid employment by location (Urban)

4.7.11.183 Worker Rights Laws (ciri_work_l_s)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_work_l_s

Original tag: ciri_work_l_s

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5489, Percent: 43.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4805, Percent: 15.84

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 684 Percent: 12.46

Description:

Worker Rights Laws is an additive index of the following variables: (1) rights to form worker union, (2) right to bargain collectively,

(3) reasonable limitations on working hours, (4) right to be free from forced or compulsory labor,

(5) children's rights (6) right to a minimum wage, and (7) right to occupational safety and health

The index ranges from 0 to 14. Higher values indicate greater levels of human rights respect.

4.7.11.184 Worker Rights Practices (ciri_work_p_s)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_work_p_s

Original tag: ciri_work_p_s

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5491, Percent: 43.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4806, Percent: 15.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 685 Percent: 12.47

Description:

Worker Rights Practices is an additive index of the following variables: (1) practice of rights to form worker union, (2) practice of right to bargain collectively,

(3) practice of reasonable limitations on working hours, (4) practice of right to be free from forced or compulsory labor,

(5) practice of children's rights (6) practice of right to a minimum wage, and (7) practice of right to occupational safety and health.

The index ranges from 0 to 14. Higher values indicate greater levels of human rights respect

4.7.12 Civil Society, Population and Culture

This category includes variables that relate to social capital, personal beliefs, size and distribution of the population as well as ethnic and linguistic fractionalization.

4.7.12.1 Freedom of Assembly and Association (ciri_assn)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ciri_assn

Original tag: ciri_assn

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Mark et al. (2023)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 6963, Percent: 54.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 6306, Percent: 20.79

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 657 Percent: 9.44

Description:

It is an internationally recognized right of citizens to assemble freely and to associate with other persons in political parties, trade unions, cultural organizations, or other groups. This variable evaluates the extent to which the freedoms of assembly and association are subject to actual governmental limitations or restrictions (as opposed to strictly legal protections).

Scoring Scheme:

Citizens' rights to freedom of assembly and association are:

(0) Severely restricted or denied completely to all citizens.

(1) Limited for all citizens or severely restricted or denied for select groups.

(2) Virtually unrestricted and freely enjoyed by practically all citizens.

4.7.12.2 Social Globalization (dr_sg)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_dr_sg

Original tag: dr_sg

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Dreher (2006)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9194, Percent: 72.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8250, Percent: 27.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 944 Percent: 10.27

Description:

Social globalization (scale of 1 to 100) is comprised of three segments, each with its own de facto and de jure segment. Interpersonal contact is measured within the de facto segment with reference to international telephone connections, tourist numbers and migration. Within the de jure segment, it is measured with reference to telephone subscriptions, international airports and visa restrictions. Flows of information are determined within the de facto segment with reference to international patent applications, international students and trade in high technology goods. The de jure segment measures access to TV and the internet, freedom of the press and international internet connections. Cultural proximity is measured in the de facto segment from trade in cultural goods, international trademark registrations and the number of McDonald's restaurants and IKEA stores. The de jure area focuses on civil rights (freedom of citizens), gender equality and public spending on school education.

4.7.12.3 Internet use: internet banking (eu_isiubk)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_eu_isiubk

Original tag: eu_isiubk

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: European Commission (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 696, Percent: 5.47

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 696, Percent: 2.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Internet use: internet banking as percentage of all individuals

4.7.12.4 Global Peace Index (gpi_gpi)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_gpi_gpi

Original tag: gpi_gpi

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Institute for Economics and Peace (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2880, Percent: 22.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2804, Percent: 9.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 76 Percent: 2.64

Description:

The GPI (scaled from 1 to 5, 5 being least peaceful) measures a country's level of Negative Peace using three domains of peacefulness. The first domain, Ongoing Domestic and International Conflict, investigates the extent to which countries are involved in internal and external conflicts, as well as their role and duration of involvement in conflicts.

The second domain evaluates the level of harmony or discord within a nation; ten indicators broadly assess what might be described as Societal Safety and Security. The assertion is that low crime rates, minimal terrorist activity and violent demonstrations, harmonious relations with neighbouring countries, a stable political scene and a small proportion of the population being internally displaced or made refugees can be equated with peacefulness.

Seven further indicators are related to a country's Militarisation-reflecting the link between a country's level of military build-up and access to weapons and its level of peacefulness, both domestically and internationally. Comparable data on military expenditure as a percentage of GDP and the number of armed service officers per head are gauged, as are financial contributions to UN peacekeeping missions.

4.7.12.5 Births attended by skilled health staff (percent of total) (wdi_birthskill)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_birthskill

Original tag: wdi_birthskill

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2873, Percent: 22.6

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2610, Percent: 8.61

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 263 Percent: 9.15

Description:

Births attended by skilled health staff are the percentage of deliveries attended by personnel trained to give the necessary supervision, care, and advice to women during pregnancy, labor, and the postpartum period; to conduct deliveries on their own; and to care for newborns.

4.7.12.6 Population density (people per sq. km of land area) (wdi_popden)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_popden

Original tag: wdi_popden

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10331, Percent: 81.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9207, Percent: 30.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1124 Percent: 10.88

Description:

Population density is midyear population divided by land area in square kilometers. Population is based on the de facto definition of population, which counts all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship--except for refugees not permanently settled in the country of asylum, who are generally considered part of the population of their country of origin. Land area is a country's total area, excluding area under inland water bodies, national claims to continental shelf, and exclusive economic zones. In most cases the definition of inland water bodies includes major rivers and lakes.

4.7.12.7 Population growth (annual percent) (wdi_popgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_popgr

Original tag: wdi_popgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10656, Percent: 83.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9453, Percent: 31.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1203 Percent: 11.29

Description:

Annual population growth rate for year t is the exponential rate of growth of midyear population from year t-1 to t, expressed as a percentage. Population is based on the de facto definition of population, which counts all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship.

4.7.12.8 Rural population growth (annual percent) (wdi_poprulgr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_poprulgr

Original tag: wdi_poprulgr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10442, Percent: 82.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9360, Percent: 30.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1082 Percent: 10.36

Description:

Rural population growth. Rural population refers to people living in rural areas as defined

by national statistical offices. It is calculated as the difference between total population and urban population.

4.7.12.9 Urban population growth (annual percent) (wdi_popurbagr)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_popurbagr

Original tag: wdi_popurbagr

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10657, Percent: 83.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9454, Percent: 31.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1203 Percent: 11.29

Description:

Urban population growth. Urban population refers to people living in urban areas as defined by national statistical offices. It is calculated using World Bank population estimates and urban ratios from the United Nations World Urbanization Prospects.

4.7.13 Environment

This category includes geographical characteristics such as the geographical region, land area etc. as well as indicators describing the state of the environment, ecosystems and materials, the impact of human beings on the environment, and environmental protection.

4.7.13.1 Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category (epi_bdh)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_epi_bdh

Original tag: epi_bdh

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020), Wolf et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 179, Percent: 1.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 8.94

Description:

Biodiversity and Habitat Issue Category consists of 7 indicators:

1) The terrestrial biome protection (national weights) indicator. It is calculated by first taking proportions of the area of each of a country's biome types that are covered by protected areas and then constructing a weighted sum of the protection percentages for all biomes within that country. The protection percentages are weighted according to the prevalence of each biome type within that country. This indicator evaluates a country's efforts to achieve 17percent protection for all biomes within its borders, as per Aichi Target 11. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

2) The terrestrial biome protection (global weights) indicator, where protection percentages are weighted according to the global prevalence of each biome type. This indicator evaluates a country's contribution toward the global 17percent protection goal. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

3) The marine protected areas indicator, measured as a percentage of a country's total exclusive economic zone (EEZ) designated as marine protected areas (MPAs). Because each country may have multiple EEZs, the summed area of MPAs is divided by the summed EEZ. It is given 20percent weight in the aggregation.

4) The Protected Areas Representativeness Index (PARI), which measures ecological representativeness as the proportion of biologically scaled environmental diversity included in a country's terrestrial protected areas. The measure relies on remote sensing, biodiversity informatics, and global modeling of fine-scaled variation in biodiversity composition for plant, vertebrate, and invertebrate species. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

5) Species Habitat Index (SHI) estimates potential population losses, as well as regional and global extinction risks of individual species, using habitat loss as a proxy. The SHI indicator measures the proportion of suitable habitat within a country that remains intact for each species in that country relative to a baseline set in the year 2001. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

6) Species Protection Index (SPI) evaluates the species-level ecological representativeness of each country's protected area network. The SPI metric uses remote sensing data, global biodiversity informatics, and integrative models to map suitable habitat for over 30,000 terrestrial vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species at high resolutions. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

7) The Biodiversity Habitat Index (BHI), which estimates the effects of habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation on the expected retention of terrestrial biodiversity. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

The issue category varies from 0 to 100.

4.7.13.2 Climate Change Issue Category (epi_cch)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_epi_cch

Original tag: epi_cch

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Wendling et al. (2020), Wolf et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 179, Percent: 1.41

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 163, Percent: 0.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 16 Percent: 8.94

Description:

Climate Change Issue Category consists of 8 indicators:

1) The CO2 growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw carbon dioxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 55percent weight in the aggregation.

2) The CH4 growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw methane emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 15percent weight in the aggregation.

3) The F-gas growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw fluorinated gas emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 10percent weight in the aggregation.

4) The N2O growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in raw nitrous oxide emissions over the years 2008-2017. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

5) The black carbon growth rate, calculated as the average annual rate of increase or decrease in black carbon over the years 2005-2014. It is then adjusted for economic trends to isolate change due to policy rather than economic fluctuation. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

6) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita in the year 2017. First, the EPI team calculates total greenhouse gas emissions, applying Global Warming Potentials to convert all units to Gg of CO2-equivalents. Second, they calculate GHG emissions per capita (GHP) as the GHG emissions divided by population (POP). It is log-transformed and given 2.5percent weight in the aggregation.

7) CO2 emissions from land cover change, calculated over the years 2001-2015. First, the EPI team regresses logged CO2 emissions from land cover change (LULC) over 15 years to find a slope. Then, they calculate an unadjusted average annual growth rate in these CO2

emissions. It is given 2.5percent weight in the aggregation.

8) The greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity growth rate indicator, which serves as a signal of countries' progress in decoupling emissions from economic growth. The EPI team calculates an annual average growth rate in GHG emissions per unit of GDP over the years 2008-2017. This indicator highlights the need for action on climate change mitigation in countries at all income levels. It is given 5percent weight in the aggregation.

The issue category varies from 0 to 100.

4.7.13.3 Agricultural irrigated land (percent of total agricultural land) (wdi_agrland)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_agrland

Original tag: wdi_agrland

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1193, Percent: 9.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1163, Percent: 3.83

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 30 Percent: 2.51

Description:

Agricultural land refers to the share of land area that is arable, under permanent crops, and under permanent pastures. Arable land includes land defined by the FAO as land under temporary crops (double-cropped areas are counted once), temporary meadows for mowing or for pasture, land under market or kitchen gardens, and land temporarily fallow. Land abandoned as a result of shifting cultivation is excluded. Land under permanent crops is land cultivated with crops that occupy the land for long periods and need not be replanted after each harvest, such as cocoa, coffee, and rubber. This category includes land under flowering shrubs, fruit trees, nut trees, and vines, but excludes land under trees grown for wood or timber. Permanent pasture is land used for five or more years for forage, including natural and cultivated crops.

4.7.13.4 Arable land (percent of land area) (wdi_araland)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_araland

Original tag: wdi_araland

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10167, Percent: 79.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9207, Percent: 30.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 960 Percent: 9.44

Description:

Arable land includes land defined by the FAO as land under temporary crops (double-cropped areas are counted once), temporary meadows for mowing or for pasture, land under market or kitchen gardens, and land temporarily fallow. Land abandoned as a result of shifting cultivation is excluded.

4.7.13.5 Land area (sq. km) (wdi_area)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_area

Original tag: wdi_area

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10331, Percent: 81.26

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9207, Percent: 30.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1124 Percent: 10.88

Description:

Land area is a country's total area, excluding area under inland water bodies, national claims to continental shelf, and exclusive economic zones. In most cases the definition of inland water bodies includes major rivers and lakes.

4.7.13.6 Would give part of my income for the environment (wvs_envinc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wvs_envinc

Original tag: wvs_envinc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: EVS (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 180, Percent: 1.42

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 178, Percent: 0.59

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2 Percent: 1.11

Description:

Would give part of my income for the environment

4.7.13.7 Count of environmental and legislative research and development policies (aepd_rd)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_aepd_rd

Original tag: aepd_rd

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2169, Percent: 17.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2057, Percent: 6.78

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 112 Percent: 5.16

Description:

Number of R
amp;D policies recorded for this country and year. This is a country-year aggregate restricted to national-scale policies and excluding policies labeled as repealed. For EU member states, EU-level R
amp;D policies for the same year are added to each EU member state.

4.7.14 Political Parties and Elections

This category includes variables describing various aspects of the legislature and political parties in the legislature (number of seats) as well as variables related to the election for the executive and variables on the outcomes of elections.

4.7.14.1 Net change in the agg. vote share for all parties in Demarcation Bloc (EP) (evep_dembloc)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_evep_dembloc

Original tag: evep_dembloc

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Emanuele et al. (2020)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 0.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 100, Percent: 0.33

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

Net change in the aggregate vote share for all parties included in the Demarcation Bloc. Those political parties that defend anti-EU, anti-immigration and economically protectionist policies are included in the demarcation bloc. Full list of parties in the demarcation bloc can be found in the original codebook.

4.7.14.2 Was More Than One Party Legal (nelda_mtop)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_nelda_mtop

Original tag: nelda_mtop

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Hyde & Marinov (2021)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 2969, Percent: 23.35

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 2638, Percent: 8.7

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 331 Percent: 11.15

Description:

This variable indicates whether multiple political parties were technically legal. The legalization of multiple parties need not necessarily mean the existence of a functioning opposition party, as there may be other non-legal barriers to the development of an opposition party. Similarly, a well organized opposition party may exist but may not be legal.

Values:

0. No

1. Yes

3. Unclear

4.7.15 History

This category includes variables related to historical phenomena or situations, for example colonial origin, legal origin and GDP per capita in the year 1500.

4.7.15.1 Real GDP per Capita (year 1500) (mad_gdppc1500)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1500

Original tag: mad_gdppc1500

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 792, Percent: 6.23
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 792, Percent: 2.61
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1500, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.15.2 Real GDP per Capita (year 1600) (mad_gdppc1600)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1600
Original tag: mad_gdppc1600
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1102, Percent: 8.67
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1102, Percent: 3.63
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1600, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.15.3 Real GDP per Capita (year 1700) (mad_gdppc1700)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1700
Original tag: mad_gdppc1700
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1256, Percent: 9.88
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1256, Percent: 4.14
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1700, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.15.4 Real GDP per Capita (year 1900) (mad_gdppc1900)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_mad_gdppc1900
Original tag: mad_gdppc1900
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Bolt & van Zanden (2020), Bolt & van Zanden (2024)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3555, Percent: 27.96
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3465, Percent: 11.42
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 90 Percent: 2.53
Description:
Real GDP per capita in 2011 US dollars for year 1900, multiple benchmarks.

4.7.16 Energy and Infrastructure

This category includes indicators that cover descriptions of different energy sources (production, con- sumption and trade) and variables related to quality and quantity of different sectors of infrastructure (transportation and communication).

4.7.16.1 Net gas exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_gas_netexp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ross_gas_netexp

Original tag: ross_gas_netexp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 3869, Percent: 30.43
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3729, Percent: 12.29
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 140 Percent: 3.62
Description:
Net gas exports value, measured in constant 2000 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.7.16.2 Gas production value in 2014 dollars (ross_gas_value_2014)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ross_gas_value_2014
Original tag: ross_gas_value_2014
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8243, Percent: 64.83
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 7829, Percent: 25.81
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 414 Percent: 5.02
Description:
Gas production value in constant 2014 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.7.16.3 Net oil exports value, constant 2000 dollars (ross_oil_netexp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ross_oil_netexp
Original tag: ross_oil_netexp
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4491, Percent: 35.32
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4327, Percent: 14.27
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 164 Percent: 3.65
Description:
Net oil exports value measured in constant 2000 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.7.16.4 Oil production value in 2014 dollars (ross_oil_value_2014)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_ross_oil_value_2014
Original tag: ross_oil_value_2014
Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)
Variable citation: Ross & Mahdavi (2015)
Merge scores:
Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 8669, Percent: 68.18
Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 8240, Percent: 27.17
Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 429 Percent: 4.95
Description:
Oil production value in constant 2014 US dollars to adjust for inflation.

4.7.16.5 Access to electricity (percent of population) (wdi_acel)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_acel
Original tag: wdi_acel

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 5675, Percent: 44.64

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4987, Percent: 16.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 688 Percent: 12.12

Description:

Access to electricity is the percentage of population with access to electricity. Electrification data are collected from industry, national surveys and international sources.

4.7.17 Health

This category includes indicators describing the health of a population in a given country. These include reports about self-perceived health (state of health), policies and provided infrastructure concerning health (expenditure, number of hospitals), the prevalence of diseases (HIV, tuberculosis), and indicators such as birth rate, death rate and life expectancy.

4.7.17.1 Current health expenditure (percent of GDP) (wdi_chexppgdp)

Long tag: qog_std_ts_wdi_chexppgdp

Original tag: wdi_chexppgdp

Dataset citation: Teorell et al. (2026)

Variable citation: World Bank (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4298, Percent: 33.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 3800, Percent: 12.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 498 Percent: 11.59

Description:

Current health expenditure (percent of GDP). Level of current health expenditure expressed as a percentage of GDP. Estimates of current health expenditures include healthcare goods and services consumed during each year. This indicator does not include capital health expenditures such as buildings, machinery, IT and stocks of vaccines for emergency or outbreaks.

5 REPDEM

The **Representative Democracy Data Archive (REPDEM)** presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe. As a world-leading database for research on the competition for government in Europe, the archive contains unique data on governments, parliaments, political parties, length of government formation periods, bargain rounds, as well as procedures and mechanism for intra-coalition governance, etc. The latest updates were made in the research infrastructure project Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED). PAGED builds on REPDEM's previous international and comparative projects on European parliamentary democracy. More information is available on the project's website: `http://repdem.org`

5.1 REPDEM Basic

Dataset tag: repdem_basic

Output Unit: REPDEM Cabinet-Date, i.e., data is collected per cabinet and date. The unit for this dataset is a cabinet and the day a cabinet started. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a cabinet in combination with a date, using the columns cab_name and date_in. The unit can also be expressed using the columns cab_id and date_in.

Description: Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED) – Basic dataset, is a research infrastructure project that aims to build a state-of-the-art database for comparative coalition research on political institutions, political parties, parliaments and governments.

This comparative dataset builds on several previous datasets (Andersson et al. 2020, Bergman et al. 2019, Bergman et al. 2021, Bergman et al. 2024, Hellström et al. 2021, Strøm et al. 2008) and has been updated in-house to cover additional years, countries, and variables. The dataset provides detailed information on key aspects of government formation and termination across 33 parliamentary democracies. It covers governments formed from 1945 (or their democratic transitions) up to September 30, 2026.

Dataset citation:
Hellström, Johan, Jonas Lindahl, and Elsa Karlsson Gustafsson (2026). The Representative Democracy Data Archive (REPDEM) - Basic dataset, Version 2026.10. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, a national research infrastructure (grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council). Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Comments:
For party abbreviations see party codebook: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5185/party-codebook-repdem-3.pdf`
Notes on coding principles: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5187/notes-on-coding-principles.pdf`

Link to original codebook
`https://repdem.org/index.php/download/113/governments-dataset-basic/5184/repdem-basic-data-set-codebook.pdf`

License: REPDEM presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe.
REPDEM offers a range of datasets available for free (without even a demand for registration).

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://repdem.org/index.php/current-dataset/`

5.1.1 Cabinet Information

These variables provide information on the Cabinet composition.

5.1.1.1 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected)

Long tag: repdem_basic_cab_connected

Original tag: cab_connected

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 991, Percent: 82.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1790, Percent: 5.9

Description:

Ideologically "connected cabinet" (i.e., the parties are next to one another) on economic left-right placement of political parties.
0: no
1: yes

5.1.1.2 Party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_1st)

Long tag: repdem_basic_median_party_economic_1st

Original tag: median_party_economic_1st

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 795, Percent: 65.87

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1410, Percent: 4.65

Description:

The median legislator party on the economic left-right policy dimension

5.1.1.3 Second party of the median legislator on the economic left-right policy dimension (median_party_economic_2nd)

Long tag: repdem_basic_median_party_economic_2nd

Original tag: median_party_economic_2nd

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 12, Percent: 0.99

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 22, Percent: 0.07

Description:

The second median legislator party on the economic left-right policy dimension, if there is a tie between two parties (i.e., when there are two median legislators).

5.2 REPDEM PAGED Western, Central and Eastern Europe

Dataset tag: repdem_wecee

Output Unit: REPDEM Cabinet-Date, i.e., data is collected per cabinet and date. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a cabinet in combination with a date, using the columns cab_name and date_in. The unit can also be expressed using the columns cab_id and date_in.

Description: This dataset contains data on governments, parliaments, political parties, and political institutions for Western Europe until 2019 and data for Central and Eastern Europe until 2021.

It includes data collected by experts on coalition politics in their respective countries using standardised coding instructions and interview guidelines. Specifically, the data were gathered from official documents (government, administration, and parliament) and party documents (election manifestos, coalition agreements), by conducting semi-structured interviews with (former) staff and cabinet members as well as a systemic analysis of media reports.

Dataset citation:
Hellström, Johan, Torbjörn Bergman, Jonas Lindahl, Hanna Bäck, Gabriella Ilonszki, Wolfgang C. Müller, and Kaare Strøm (2025) Party Government in Europe Database (PAGED) – Coalition Governance in Central Eastern and Western Europe Dataset, Version 2024.12. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

And

Bergman, Torbjörn, Hanna Bäck, and Johan Hellström (eds.). (2021). Coalition Governance in Western Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

And

Bergman, Torbjörn, Gabriella Ilonszki, and Johan Hellström (eds.) (2024). Coalition Politics in Central Eastern Europe: Governing in Times of Crisis. London: Routledge.

Comments:
For party abbreviations see party codebook: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4266/party-codebook-wecee-4.pdf`
Notes on coding principles: `https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4291/paged-notes-on-coding-principles-2.pdf`

Link to original codebook
`https://repdem.org/index.php/download/98/central-eastern-europe-and-western-europe-dataset/4606/data-set-codebook-wecee-2.pdf`

License: REPDEM presents the comparative data collection efforts undertaken by various research and data infrastructure projects on political institutions, political parties, cabinets and governments in Europe.
REPDEM offers a range of datasets available for free (without even a demand for registration).

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://repdem.org/index.php/current-dataset/`

5.2.1 Information on the Cabinets

These variables provide general information on each cabinet such as duration, cabinet composition and majoritiy relations.

5.2.1.1 Ideologically connected cabinet (cab_connected)

Long tag: repdem_wecee_cab_connected

Original tag: cab_connected

Dataset citation: Hellström et al. (2025), Bergman & Hellström (2021), Bergman & Hellström (2024)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 706, Percent: 58.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1272, Percent: 4.19

Description:

Ideologically "connected cabinet" (i.e., the parties are next to one another) on economic left-right placement of political parties.

0: no

1: yes

6 V-DEM

Based at the University of Gothenburg, the **Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)** Research Project takes a comprehensive approach to understanding democratization. This approach encompasses multiple core principles: electoral, liberal, majoritarian, consensual, participatory, deliberative, and egalitarian. Each Principle is represented by a separate index, and each is regarded as a separate outcome in the proposed study. In this manner V-Dem reconceptualizes democracy from a single outcome to a set of outcomes. In addition, V-Dem breaks down each core principle into its constituent components, each to be measured separately. Components include features such as free and fair elections, civil liberties, judicial independence, executive constraints, gender equality, media freedom, and civil society. Finally, each component is disaggregated into specific indicators. This fundamentally different approach to democratization is made possible by the V-Dem Database, which measures 450+ indicators annually from 1789 to the present for all countries of the world. The V-Dem approach stands out, first, as a large global collaboration among scholars with diverse areas of expertise; second, as the first project attempting to explain different varieties of democracy; and third, thanks to the highly disaggregated V-Dem data, the first project to explore causal mechanisms linking different aspects of democracy together. With five Principal Investigators, 19 Project Managers with special responsibility for issue areas covered in the V-Dem dataset, around 23 Regional Managers, 134 Country Coordinators and more than 4000 Country Experts, the V-Dem project is one of the world's largest social science data collection projects on democracy. More information is available on the project's website: `https://www.v-dem.net/`

6.1 V-Dem Country-Year: V-Dem Full+Others v16

Dataset tag: vdem_cy

Output Unit: V-Dem Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by one country in combination with a year, using the columns country_name and year. The unit can also be expressed through a combination of the columns county_id or country_text_id and year.

Description: All 531 V-Dem indicators and 245 indices + 60 other indicators from other data sources. For R users, we recommend to install our vdemdata R package which includes the most recent V-Dem dataset and some useful functions to explore the data.

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Michael, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, David Altman, Fabio Angiolillo, Michael Bernhard, Agnes Cornell, M. Steven Fish, Linnea Fox, Lisa Gastaldi, Haakon Gjerløw, Adam Glynn, Ana Good God, Sandra Grahn, Allen Hicken, Katrin Kinzelbach, Kyle L. Marquardt, Kelly McMann, Valeriya Mechkova, Anja Neundorf, Pamela Paxton, Daniel Pemstein, Johannes von Römer, Brigitte Seim, Rachel Sigman, Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jeffrey Staton, Aksel Sundström, Marcus Tannenberg, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Felix Wiebrecht, Tore Wig, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2026. "V-Dem Codebook v16" Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.
and:
Pemstein, Daniel, Kyle L. Marquardt, Eitan Tzelgov, Yi-ting Wang, Juraj Medzihorsky, Joshua Krusell, Farhad Miri, and Johannes von Römer. 2025. "The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data". V-Dem Working Paper No. 21. 10th edition. University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute.

V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Link to original codebook
`https://v-dem.net/documents/55/codebook.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://v-dem.net/data/reference-documents/`

6.1.1 V-Dem Democracy Indices - V-Dem Mid-Level Indices: Components of the Democracy Indices

This section includes the V-Dem mid-level indices, subcomponents of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V-Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.1.1 Share of population with suffrage (v2x_suffr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_suffr

Original tag: v2x_suffr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27923, Percent: 99.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27923, Percent: 92.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: What share of adult citizens as defined by statute has the legal right to vote in national elections?
CLARIFICATION: This question does not take into consideration restrictions based on age, residence, having been convicted for crime, or being legally incompetent. It covers legal *de jure* restrictions, not restrictions that may be operative in practice *de facto*. The adult population as defined by statute is defined by citizens in the case of independent countries or the people living in the territorial entity in the case of colonies. Universal suffrage is coded as 100percent. Universal male suffrage only is coded as 50percent. Years before electoral provisions are introduced are scored 0percent. The scores do not reflect whether an electoral regime was interrupted or not. Only if new constitutions, electoral laws, or the like explicitly introduce new regulations of suffrage, the scores were adjusted accordingly if the changes suggested doing so. If qualifying criteria other than gender apply such as property, tax payments, income, literacy, region, race, ethnicity, religion, and/or 'economic independence', estimates have been calculated by combining information on the restrictions with different kinds of statistical information on population size, age distribution, wealth distribution, literacy rates, size of ethnic groups, etc., secondary country-specific sources, and — in the case of very poor information — the conditions in similar countries or colonies. The scores reflect *de jure* provisions of suffrage extension in percentage of the adult population. If the suffrage law is revised in a way that affects the extension, the scores reflect this change as of the calendar year the law was enacted.
RESPONSES:
Percent.

SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2elsuffrage
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: v2elsuffrage/100
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.1.2 Equality before the law and individual liberty index (v2xcl_rol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_rol

Original tag: v2xcl_rol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are laws transparent and rigorously enforced and public administration impartial, and to what extent do citizens enjoy access to justice, secure property rights, freedom from forced labor, freedom of movement, physical integrity rights, and freedom of religion?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2clrspct v2cltrnslw v2xcl_acjst v2xcl_prpty v2cltort v2clkill v2xcl_slave v2clrelig v2clfmove v2xcl_dmove
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for rigorous and impartial public administration (v2clrspct), transparent laws with predictable enforcement (v2cltrnslw), access to justice for men/women (v2clacjstm, v2clacjstw), property rights for men/women (v2clprptym, v2clprptyw), freedom from torture (v2cltort), freedom from political killings (v2clkill), from forced labor for men/women (v2clslavem v2clslavef), freedom of religion (v2clrelig), freedom of foreign movement (v2clfmove), and freedom of domestic movement for men/women (v2cldmovem, v2cldmovew).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman,

Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.1.3 Civil society participation index (v2x_cspart)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_cspart

Original tag: v2x_cspart

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 97.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27465, Percent: 90.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Are major CSOs routinely consulted by policymakers; how large is the involvement of people in CSOs; are women prevented from participating; and is legislative candidate nomination within party organization highly decentralized or made through party primaries?
CLARIFICATION: The sphere of civil society lies in the public space between the private sphere and the state. Here, citizens organize in groups to pursue their collective interests and ideals. We call these groups civil society organizations CSOs. CSOs include, but are by no means limited to, interest groups, labor unions, spiritual organizations if they are engaged in civic or political activities, social movements, professional associations, charities, and other non-governmental organizations.
The core civil society index CCSI is designed to provide a measure of a robust civil society, understood as one that enjoys autonomy from the state and in which citizens freely and actively pursue their political and civic goals, however conceived.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pscnslnl v2cscnsult v2csprtcpt v2csgender
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for candidate selection — national/local (v2pscnslnl), CSO consultation (v2cscnsult), CSO participatory environment (v2csprtcpt), and CSO women participation (v2csgender).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von

Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: intercept.

6.1.1.4 Direct Popular Vote Index (v2xdd_dd)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_dd

Original tag: v2xdd_dd

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the direct popular vote utilized?
CLARIFICATION: Direct popular voting refers here to an institutionalized process by which citizens of a region or country register their choice or opinion on specific issues through a ballot. It is intended to embrace initiatives, referendums, and plebiscites, as those terms are usually understood. It captures some aspects of the more general concept of direct democracy at the national level. The term does not encompass recall elections, deliberative assemblies, or settings in which the vote is not secret or the purview is restricted. Likewise, it does not apply to elections for representatives.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2ddlexci v2ddsigpci v2ddsiglci v2ddsigdci v2ddpartci v2ddapprci v2ddspmci v2ddadmci v2ddyrci v2ddlexrf v2ddsigprf v2ddsigdrf v2ddpartrf v2ddapprrf v2ddspmrf v2ddadmrf v2ddyrrf v2ddpartpl v2ddapprpl v2ddspmpl v2ddadmpl v2ddlexpl v2ddyrpl v2ddlexor v2ddpartor v2ddappor v2ddspmor v2ddadmor v2ddyror v2ddthreor v2ddthrerf v2ddthrepl v2ddthreci
DATA RELEASE: 1-16. New aggregation formula in version 7.
AGGREGATION: This index results from the addition of the weighted scores of each type of popular votes studied (popular initiatives $\times 1.5$, referendums $\times 1.5$, plebiscites, and obligatory referendums). Each type of popular vote receives a maximum score of two resulting from the addition of two terms (easiness of initiation and easiness of approval), where each term obtains a maximum value of one. As we are studying four types of popular votes, the minimum value is 0, and the maximum is 8. In the v2xdd_dd all scores are normalized to range between 0 and 1. For an elaboration of the weighting factor of each component, see: Altman, David. 2017.
The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_dd = \&(v2xdd_i_ci) \times 1.5 + (v2xdd_i_rf) \times 1.5$$

$$\&+(v2xdd_i_pl) + (v2xdd_i_or)$$

Regarding each type of citizen initiated popular vote (i.e., popular initiative), the ease of initiation is measured by (a) the existence of a direct democracy process (v2ddlexci), (b) the number of signatures needed (v2ddsigpci), and (c) time-limits to circulate the signatures (v2ddsigdci). Easiness of approval is measured by the surface of the polygon determined by (a) participation quorum (v2ddsigdci), (b) approval quorum (v2ddpartci), and (c) supermajority (v2ddspmci). The resulting score is then multiplied with (d) district majority (v2ddadmci). Consequences are measured by (a) the legal status of the decision made by citizens (binding or merely consultative) (v2ddlexci), and (b) the frequency and degree of success with which direct popular votes have been held in the past (v2ddthreci). The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_dd = \&[(IF\ v2ddlexcigt; 0, 1, 0) \times (1 - (v2ddsigpci)) \times (IF\ v2dds$$

$$\&= 0, 1, .5 + (2 \times v2ddsigdci/365))+$$

$$\&(v2ddsigdci) \cap (v2ddpartci) \cap (v2ddspmci)]$$

$$\&\times(0.5 + ((100 - v2ddadmci)/100))/2]$$

$$\&\times(IF\ v2ddlexci = 2, 1, IF\ v2ddlexci = 1, 0.75, v2ddlexci = 0, 0)$$

$$\&\times(IF\ years\ since\ last\ successful\ eventlt; 6,$$

$$\& v2ddthreci = 1, afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.06\ units\ per\ year$$

$$\& until\ 0.1;\ if\ the\ event\ was\ not\ successful$$

$$\& during\ the\ first\ years\ v2ddapprci$$

$$\&= 0.9, afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.1\ units\ per\ year\ until\ 0.1)$$

In case the vote originates from above (i.e., authorities), there is no need to account for v2ddsigpci and v2ddsigdci. For an elaboration of the interaction among quorums, $(v2ddsigdci) \cap (v2ddpartci) \cap (v2ddspmci)$, see Altman, David. 2017.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.1.5 Egalitarian Component Index (v2x_egal)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_egal

Original tag: v2x_egal

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge et al. (2015), Sigman & Lindberg (2015), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent is the egalitarian principle achieved?
CLARIFICATION: The egalitarian principle of democracy holds that material and immaterial inequalities inhibit the exercise of formal rights and liberties, and diminish the ability of citizens from all social groups to participate. Egalitarian democracy is achieved when (1) rights and freedoms of individuals are protected equally across all social groups; (2) resources are distributed equally across all social groups; and (3) access to power is equally distributed by gender, socioeconomic class and social group.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xeg_eqprotec v2xeg_eqaccess v2xeg_eqdr
DATA RELEASE: 1-16. Release 1-4 used a different, preliminary aggregation formula, 5-8 modified aggregation formula including v2xeg_eqaccess.
AGGREGATION: This index is formed by averaging the following indices: equal protection index (v2xeg_eqprotec), equal access index (v2xeg_eqaccess) and equal distribution of resources (v2xeg_eqdr).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Coppedge et al. (2015); Sigman & Lindberg (2015); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.1.6 Equal access index (v2xeg_eqaccess)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xeg_eqaccess

Original tag: v2xeg_eqaccess

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Sigman & Lindberg (2017), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 91.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: How equal is access to power?
CLARIFICATION: The Equal Access subcomponent is based on the idea that neither the protections of rights and freedoms nor the equal distribution of resources is sufficient to ensure adequate representation. Ideally, all groups should enjoy equal *de facto* capabilities to participate, to serve in positions of political power, to put issues on the agenda, and to influence policymaking.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pepwrgen v2pepwrsoc v2pepwrses
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators power distributed by socioeconomic position (v2pepwrses), power distributed by social group (v2pepwrsoc), and power distributed by gender (v2pepwrgen).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Sigman & Lindberg (2017); Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: intercept.

6.1.1.7 Equal distribution of resources index (v2xeg_eqdr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xeg_eqdr

Original tag: v2xeg_eqdr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Sigman & Lindberg (2015), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken,

Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: How equal is the distribution of resources?
CLARIFICATION: This component measures the extent to which resources — both tangible and intangible — are distributed in society. An equal distribution of resources supports egalitarian democracy in two ways. First, lower poverty rates and the distribution of goods and services such as food, water, housing, education and healthcare ensure that all individuals are capable of participating in politics and government. In short, basic needs must be met in order for individuals to effectively exercise their rights and freedoms see, for example, Sen 1999, Maslow 1943. Second, high levels of resource inequality undermine the ability of poorer populations to participate meaningfully Aristotle, Dahl 2006. Thus, it is necessary to include not only measures of poverty and the distribution of goods and services, but also the levels of inequality in these distributions, and the proportion of the population who are not eligible for social services *i.e.* means-tests, particularistic distribution, etc.. This principle also implies that social or economic inequalities can translate into political inequalities, an issue addressed most notably by Walzer 1983, who argues that overlapping quot;spheresquot; of inequality are particularly harmful to society. To address these overlapping quot;spheresquot;, this component also includes measures of the distribution of power in society amongst different socio-economic groups, genders, etc.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2dlencmps v2dlunivl v2peedueq v2pehealth
DATA RELEASE: 5, 7-16. Release 7 modified: v2pepwrses, v2pepwrsoc and v2pepwrgen now form a separate subcomponent index.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for particularistic or public goods v2dlencmps, means tested vs. universalistic welfare policies v2dlunivl, educational equality v2peedueq and health equality v2pehealth.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Sigman & Lindberg (2015); Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: intercept.

6.1.2 V-Dem Indicators - Elections

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys) **Elections:** Among national elections we distinguish elections to: (i) the lower or unicameral chamber of the legislature (including constituent or constitutional assemblies), (ii) the upper chamber of the legislature, and (iii) the presidency. For present purposes an executive who is elected by a legislature is considered a *prime minister*, not a president. In order to be considered a *president*, an executive must, under ordinary circumstances, be chosen directly by the electorate (perhaps mediated by an electoral college).

Non-election specific coding: The following questions are not election-specific and should be coded for every year from 1900 (or when applicable) to the present.

Election specific questions: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date. If you have coded for V-Dem in the past, your previous scores will be displayed in the survey. You are welcome to revise previously submitted scores in all surveys. For this section, we kindly ask you make sure that you have coded all election years.

Election specific questions – Historical clarification: The following questions pertain to specific national elections. National elections include elections to the presidency (if applicable) and legislature (lower and upper house, whatever applies), whether direct or indirect, as well as constituent assembly elections. It does not include other elections, *e.g.*, subnational elections, plebiscites, initiatives, referendums, or by-elections. The date of each election is pre-coded. In cases where more than one election is held on the same day(s), the questions in this section are for all elections taking place on that date."

Subnational elections and offices: This section of the survey asks a small number of questions about *subnational* elections and offices. You will be instructed to identify two subnational levels, referred to as "regional government" and "local government". Questions in this section should be answered for every year, rather than for specific elections.

Lower chamber election: The following questions pertain to specific lower chamber or unicameral legislative elections. The dates of these elections have been pre-coded.

Executive and legislative versions of Election specific variables

- In order to subset election specific variables for executive elections only (previously *_ex) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecpres is 1.
- In order to subset election specific variables for legislative elections only (previously *_leg) – keep only those observations where v2xel_elecparl is 1.

6.1.2.1 Percent of population with suffrage (v2elsuffrage)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elsuffrage

Original tag: v2elsuffrage

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Elkins & Ginsburg (2025)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27923, Percent: 99.4

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27923, Percent: 92.06

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: A
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
QUESTION: What percentage (percent) of adult citizens (as defined by statute) has the legal right to vote in national elections?
CLARIFICATION: This question does not take into consideration restrictions based on age, residence, having been convicted for crime, being in the military service or being legally incompetent. It covers legal (*de jure*) restrictions, not restrictions that may be operative in

practice (*de facto*). The adult population (as defined by statute) is defined by citizens in the case of independent countries or the people living in the territorial entity in the case of colonies.
Universal suffrage is coded as 100percent. Universal male suffrage is only coded as 50percent. Years before electoral provisions are introduced are scored 0percent. The scores do not reflect whether an electoral regime was interrupted or not. Only if new constitutions, electoral laws, or the like explicitly introduce new regulations of suffrage, the scores were adjusted accordingly if the changes suggested doing so. If qualifying criteria other than gender apply (such as property, tax payments, income, literacy, region, race, ethnicity, religion, and/or 'economic independence'), estimates have been calculated by combining information on the restrictions with different kinds of statistical information (on population size, age distribution, wealth distribution, literacy rates, size of ethnic groups, etc.), secondary country-specific sources, and — in the case of very poor information — the conditions in similar countries or colonies.
The scores reflect *de jure* provisions of suffrage extension in percentage of the adult population. If the suffrage law is revised in a way that affects the extension, the scores reflect this change as of the calendar year the law was enacted.
RESPONSES:
Percent.
SCALE: Interval.
SOURCE(S): **?**; **?**; Elkins & Ginsburg (2025); **?**; **?**; **?**, country-specific sources.
NOTES: In Version 3 of the dataset this variable was re-coded from scratch based on the modified criteria reflected in the clarification section (above).
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.2.2 Public campaign finance (v2elpubfin)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elpubfin

Original tag: v2elpubfin

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27091, Percent: 96.44

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27091, Percent: 89.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is significant public financing available for parties' and/or candidates' campaigns for national office?
RESPONSES:
0: No. Public financing is not available.
1: Little. There is public financing but it is so small or so restricted that it plays a minor role in most parties' campaigns.
2: Ambiguous. There is some public financing available but it is unclear whether it plays a significant role for parties.
3: Partly. Public financing plays a significant role in the campaigns of many parties.
4: Yes. Public financing funds a significant share of expenditures by all, or nearly all parties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

6.1.2.3 Election free campaign media (v2elfrcamp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elfrcamp

Original tag: v2elfrcamp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 13071, Percent: 46.53

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 13071, Percent: 43.09

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In this national election, did parties or candidates receive either free or publicly financed access to national broadcast media?
RESPONSES:
0: Either no parties or only the governing party receives free access.
1: Some parties in addition to the governing party receive free access.

2: All parties receive free access.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (v2eltype).
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.2.4 Subnational election area less free and fair characteristics (v2elsnlfc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elsnlfc

Original tag: v2elsnlfc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15357, Percent: 54.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15357, Percent: 50.63

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country in which elections are significantly *less* free and fair?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_11]
12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_14]

15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnlfc_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.2.5 Subnational election area more free and fair characteristics (v2elsnmrfc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2elsnmrfc

Original tag: v2elsnmrfc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15334, Percent: 54.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15334, Percent: 50.56

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country in which elections are significantly *more* free and fair?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_11]

12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_14]
15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2elsnmrfc_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.3 V-Dem Indicators - Political Parties

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Political parties:

A "political party" refers to an organization that nominates candidates for public office. A party may refer to a longstanding coalition such as the CDU/CSU in Germany if that coalition functions in most respects like a single party. Sometimes, the identity of a party is obscured by name changes. However, if the party/coalition changes names but retains key personnel and is still run by and for the same constituency then it should be considered the same organization. Our notion of a party includes loose factional groupings such as the Tories and Whigs in the 19th-century Britain or the Caps and Hats in 18th-century Sweden. Unless stated otherwise the following questions pertain to parties that compete for seats in the national legislature or for the presidency.

Most of the questions in the following section ask you to generalize across parties in a particular country (and at a particular point in time). We realize that practices vary from party to party; these are, after all, highly diverse organizations. However, for our purposes it is important to consider what the most common practices are.

In answering these questions it is sometimes important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens on the ground). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues wherever you see them. And if there is no clarification of the issue, assume that the question is referring to practices rather than formal rules.

6.1.3.1 Party linkages (v2psprlnks)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2psprlnks

Original tag: v2psprlnks

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 25752, Percent: 91.67

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 25752, Percent: 84.9

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Allen Hicken
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Among the major parties, what is the main or most common form of linkage to their constituents?
CLARIFICATION: A party-constituent linkage refers to the sort of quot;goodquot; that the party offers in exchange for political support and participation in party activities.
RESPONSES:
0: Clientelistic. Constituents are rewarded with goods, cash, and/or jobs.
1: Mixed clientelistic and local collective.
2: Local collective. Constituents are rewarded with local collective goods, *e.g.*, wells, toilets, markets, roads, bridges, and local development.
3: Mixed local collective and policy/programmatic.
4: Policy/programmatic. Constituents respond to a party's positions on national policies, general party programs, and visions for society.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

6.1.4 V-Dem Indicators - The Executive

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Executive:

In this section, we distinguish between the head of state (HOS) and the head of government (HOG). The *head of state* is an individual or collective body that serves as the chief public representative of the country. Sometimes this is a largely ceremonial role, *e.g.* a monarch who reigns but does not rule, or a president whose powers are strictly circumscribed. The *head of government* is the chief officer(s) of the executive branch of government, typically presiding over a cabinet. In a parliamentary system, this is usually the prime minister. In a presidential system, this is usually the president, who then serves as both, head of state and head of government. In a typical semi-presidential system, the president serves as head of state and the prime minister serves as head of government.

These definitions are grounded in the *functions* that each office performs, as described above. Titles

can be confusing. Do not assume, for example, that simply because an individual holds the title of "president" s/he is serving as the chief public representative of the country. Likewise, it may be that the *effective* head of state/head of government is someone other than the *official* head of state/head of government. In this instance, the following questions apply to the person who effectively wields this power. In some socialist systems, for example, the official head of state was a person within the state bureaucracy, but in practice the chief public representative of the country was the chairman of the communist party. It is the latter who is the "effective" head of state, and hence should be the focus of your answers. The same applies if the head of state/head of government is so old, sick or perhaps mentally disabled that s/he cannot perform his/her functions, which are instead performed by someone else. It is the latter person who is the effective head of state/head of government.

If you are considering a semi sovereign territory, such as a colony, an annexed territory or a member of the British Commonwealth, please answer the following questions with respect to the head of state and (if separate) the head of government who is located in the territory in question. Thus, in a typical British colony the governor-general—not the King/Queen of England—would be understood as the head of state. Likewise, in a British colony the local prime minister in the colony—not the prime minister in London—would be understood as the head of government.

In order to mitigate potential misunderstandings, the identities of the head of state and head of government for each country have been pre-coded for as many years as possible. Thus, when conducting your coding make sure to pay close attention to the names of these individuals, which you can see by clicking on the year grid for a particular year in the first question of this section, "HOS name." This is your key to what we mean by "head of state" or "head of government."

Note also that when the two functions are fused in the same office, we ask you to code only the head of state section of the survey. Any precoded years contain an orange triangle. This means that either the score or text and/or specific date have already been entered, so we are asking you only to add your confidence in the precoded rating; we do not want you to change the rating, as we need all the Country Experts to answer the subsequent questions for the same executives. If you feel strongly that the precoded information is wrong, please rate your confidence in the preloaded information and then consult your V-Dem contact. You will have to rate confidence in all the available years in order to proceed to the next question.

In order to avoid spending time on short-lived executives, we have included only executives who held office for at least 100 days.

6.1.4.1 Regime most important support group (v2regimpgroup)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regimpgroup

Original tag: v2regimpgroup

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27008, Percent: 96.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27008, Percent: 89.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which (one) group does the current political regime rely on most strongly in order to maintain power?
CLARIFICATION: Choose the group that, if it were to retract its support to the regime, would most endanger the regime (most strongly increase the chance that it loses power).
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes.
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders.
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive).
3: Business elites.
4: Civil servants.
5: The military.
6: An ethnic or racial group(s).
7: A religious group(s).
8: Local elites, including chiefs.
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions.
10: Urban middle classes
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants).
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers).
13: A foreign government or colonial power.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
quot;Tiesquot; between categories are resolved so that the corresponding category in v2regsupgroups with the highest mean for the same country-date is chosen.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.2 Regime support groups size (v2regsupgroupssize)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regsupgroupssize

Original tag: v2regsupgroupssize

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26984, Percent: 96.06

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26984, Percent: 88.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In total, how large is the percentage share of the domestic adult (18+) population that belongs to the political regime's supporting groups?
CLARIFICATION: You should consider the sum of all the groups (excepting foreign governments and colonial powers) entered in v2regsupgroups. Hence, your answer should take into account the total size of the/those groups that are supportive of the regime, and, if it/they were to retract support would substantially increase the chance that the regime would lose power. Regarding the issue of overlapping identities, and one individual potentially belonging to more than one groups: Individuals should only be quot;countedquot; once; thus if the two relevant supporting groups are (4) civil servants, which total about 5percent, and all of them belong to a particular ethnic group (6) also coded as a relevant, the overall total size of the supporting groups is still 5percent (presuming that no other members of that ethnic group are essential for the regime staying in power).
RESPONSES:
0: Extremely small (About 1 percent of the population or less; examples of this could include regimes supported by — and needing the support from — a handful of higher-rank military officers, or by only a royal council and a few hundred landowners)
1: Very small (Between 1 percent and 5 percent of the population; examples of this could include regimes supported by — and needing the support from — higher ranking civil servants and the military, or by moderately sized business and agrarian elites)
2: Small (Between 5 percent and 15 percent; examples of this could include regimes supported by — and needing the support from — relatively small ethnic groups, or by urban elites and the urban middle classes in predominantly rural societies)
3: Moderate (Between 15 percent and 30 percent; examples of this could include regimes supported by — and needing the support from — moderately sized ethnic groups, by rural middle classes in rural societies, or by urban middle classes in urban societies)
4: Large (More than 30 percent; examples of this could include regimes supported by — and needing the support from — large ethnic groups (and then not only the elites/leaders of such groups), or by rural working classes in rural societies.)
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.3 Regime most important opposition group (v2regimpoppgroup)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regimpoppgroup

Original tag: v2regimpoppgroup

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19368, Percent: 68.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19368, Percent: 63.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which (one) group constitutes the greatest threat to the current regime?
CLARIFICATION: Choose the one group (among those you registered as opposition groups under the v2regoppgroups question) that is the most dangerous threat to the regime in a given year. That is, the group that could most strongly increase the chance that the regime loses power. The importance/danger associated with an opposition group will be affected both by its level of hostility towards the regime and its power resources/how capable it is of removing the regime should it try to do so. We remind you that groups need not be actively mobilized or explicitly engaged in high-level opposition activities to be counted; key opposition groups may include actors who oppose the regime and constitute a dormant threat to the regime, even though they do not take particular actions in a given year.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes.
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders.
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive).
3: Business elites.
4: Civil servants.
5: The military.
6: An ethnic or racial group(s).
7: A religious group(s).
8: Local elites, including chiefs.
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions.
10: Urban middle classes
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants).
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers)
13: A foreign government or colonial power.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
quot;Tiesquot; between categories are resolved so that the corresponding category in v2regoppgroups with the highest mean for the same country-date is chosen.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.4 Strongest pro-regime preferences (v2regproreg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regproreg

Original tag: v2regproreg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19367, Percent: 68.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19367, Percent: 63.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which (one) group has the strongest pro-regime preferences, irrespective of the group's resources and capabilities for affecting the regime's hold on power?
CLARIFICATION: Consider only the pro-regime preferences of individuals in this group, and do not take into consideration the abilities of this group to actually affect regime survival. Hence, the group with the strongest pro-regime preferences need not be the most important support group.
One way to think about what pro-/anti-regime preferences means is: what would individuals hypothetically (honestly) answer if asked in a survey: "On a scale from 0-10, how pleased are you with the current political regime, with 10 indicating the strongest support." Select the group with the highest average score in this hypothetical survey.
We remind you of the definition of a regime as the set of formal and/or informal rules that are essential for choosing political leaders and/or maintaining political leaders in power. Hence, we are not asking about which groups oppose the current government in a democracy (and who would vote for another party), but still accept the democratic rules as legitimate. We are, instead, asking about groups that want to see the wider political regime removed and replaced.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes.
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders.
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive).
3: Business elites.
4: Civil servants.
5: The military.
6: An ethnic or racial group(s).
7: A religious group(s).
8: Local elites, including chiefs.
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions.
10: Urban middle classes
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants).
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers)
13: A foreign government or colonial power.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
quot;Tiesquot; between categories are resolved so that the corresponding category in

v2regsupgroups with the highest mean for the same country-date is chosen.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.5 Strongest anti-regime preferences (v2regantireg)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regantireg

Original tag: v2regantireg

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19319, Percent: 68.77

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19319, Percent: 63.69

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which (one) group has the strongest anti-regime preferences/antipathy against the current regime, irrespective of the group's resources and capabilities for affecting the regime's hold on power?
CLARIFICATION: Consider only the anti-regime preferences of the actors in this group, and do not take into consideration the abilities of this group to actually affect regime survival and change. Hence, the group with the strongest anti-regime preferences need not be the most important opposition group. Both capable and incapable political actors may have strong anti-regime preferences and want to see the regime removed from power. We also remind that the group needs not be currently mobilized or explicitly engaged in high-level opposition activities to be counted; individuals may strongly resent a regime, without taking particular actions, in a given year.
One way to think about what pro-/anti-regime preferences mean, independently of ability to affect regime survival is: what would individuals hypothetically (honestly) answer if asked in a survey: "On a scale from 0-10, how pleased are you with the current political regime".
We remind you of the definition of a regime as the set of formal and/or informal rules that are essential for choosing political leaders and/or maintaining political leaders in power. Hence, we are not asking about which groups oppose the current government in a democracy (and who would vote for another party), but still accept the democratic rules as legitimate. We are, instead, asking about groups that want to see the wider political regime removed and replaced.

RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes.
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders.
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive).
3: Business elites.
4: Civil servants.
5: The military.
6: An ethnic or racial group(s).
7: A religious group(s).
8: Local elites, including chiefs.
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions.
10: Urban middle classes
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants).
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers)
13: A foreign government or colonial power.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
quot;Tiesquot; between categories are resolved so that the corresponding category in v2regoppgroups with the highest mean for the same country-date is chosen.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.6 Most powerful group in affecting regime duration and change (v2regpower)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regpower

Original tag: v2regpower

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19366, Percent: 68.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19366, Percent: 63.85

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Irrespective of its stance toward the regime (pro-, anti-, or neutral), which one group is the most important for affecting the current regime's chances of staying in power?

CLARIFICATION: Here we ask you to disregard group preferences, and only consider a group's resources and capabilities vis-a-vis affecting regime survival. In other words, do not consider whether this group is pro-regime, anti-regime, or neutral to the regime. Take only into consideration the capabilities of this group to affect regime survival, if key members of the group were to hypothetically mobilize the group in an effort to remove the regime. Politically neutral, as well as pro- and anti-regime groups, may have ample resources and be capable of organizing coordinated action. As a result, all three types of groups may have great influence over regime survival and change.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes.
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders.
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive).
3: Business elites.
4: Civil servants.
5: The military.
6: An ethnic or racial group(s).
7: A religious group(s).
8: Local elites, including chiefs.
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions.
10: Urban middle classes
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants).
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers)
13: A foreign government or colonial power.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
quot;Tiesquot; between categories are resolved so that the corresponding category in v2regsupgroups
with the highest mean for the same country-date is chosen.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.7 Regime opposition groups (v2regoppgroups)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regoppgroups

Original tag: v2regoppgroups

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19369, Percent: 68.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19369, Percent: 63.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C

PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which groups include noteworthy opposition actors – that is, individuals (mobilized or not) who both want to and who could, under favorable circumstances, be able to remove the existing political regime? (Check all that apply.)
CLARIFICATION: Consider which group(s) include a significant share of individuals who both oppose the regime and pose a non-negligible threat to the regime (either mobilized or dormant). In other words, these individuals must both want to see the regime removed and, at least under hypothetical "favorable conditions", be capable of removing the regime. Groups need not be actively mobilized or explicitly engaged in high-level opposition activities to be counted; opposition groups also include individuals who oppose the regime without taking particular actions, at the moment. We remind you of the definition of a regime as the set of formal and/or informal rules that are essential for choosing political leaders and/or maintaining political leaders in power. Hence, we are not asking about which groups oppose the current government in a democracy (and who would vote for another party), but still accept the democratic rules as legitimate. We are, instead, asking about groups that want to see the wider political regime removed and replaced.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. [v2regoppgroups_0]
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. [v2regoppgroups_1]
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive). [v2regoppgroups_2]
3: Business elites. [v2regoppgroups_3]
4: The state bureaucracy. [v2regoppgroups_4]
5: The military. [v2regoppgroups_5]
6: An ethnic or racial group(s). [v2regoppgroups_6]
7: A religious group(s). [v2regoppgroups_7]
8: Local elites, including customary chiefs. [v2regoppgroups_8]
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions. [v2regoppgroups_9]
10: Urban middle classes. [v2regoppgroups_10]
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). [v2regoppgroups_11]
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). [v2regoppgroups_12]
13: A foreign government or colonial power. [v2regoppgroups_13]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.8 Explicit and active regime opposition groups (v2regoppgroupsact)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regoppgroupsact

Original tag: v2regoppgroupsact

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19369, Percent: 68.95

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19369, Percent: 63.86

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sirianne Dahlum, Tore Wig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which (if any) groups include a significant share of individuals who explicitly and actively mobilize against the regime in a particular year? (Check all that apply.)
CLARIFICATION: Consider which group(s) include a significant share of individuals who engage in active and explicit opposition to the regime to promote its removal. These actors make explicit statements of dissent from the regime, publicly voice their preference for regime change, and may possibly engage in other actions intended to further the removal of the regime such as anti-regime demonstrations, sit-ins, boycotts, strikes, the formation of anti-system parties, acts of sabotage, or armed rebellion.
Please note that only years when anti-regime speech or activity occurs should be coded. In years when groups probably oppose the regime, but are not engaged in any explicit acts of opposition, the group should not be selected. We remind you of the definition of a regime as the set of formal and/or informal rules that are essential for choosing political leaders and/or maintaining political leaders in power. Hence, we are not asking about which groups oppose the current government in a democracy (and who would vote for another party), but still accept the democratic rules as legitimate. We are, instead, asking about groups that want to see the wider political regime removed and replaced.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. [v2regoppgroupsact_0]
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. [v2regoppgroupsact_1]
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive). [v2regoppgroupsact_2]
3: Business elites. [v2regoppgroupsact_3]
4: The state bureaucracy. [v2regoppgroupsact_4]
5: The military. [v2regoppgroupsact_5]
6: An ethnic or racial group(s). [v2regoppgroupsact_6]
7: A religious group(s). [v2regoppgroupsact_7]
8: Local elites, including customary chiefs. [v2regoppgroupsact_8]
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions. [v2regoppgroupsact_9]
10: Urban middle classes. [v2regoppgroupsact_10]
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). [v2regoppgroupsact_11]
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). [v2regoppgroupsact_12]
13: A foreign government or colonial power. [v2regoppgroupsact_13]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 11-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.4.9 Regime support groups (v2regsupgroups)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2regsupgroups

Original tag: v2regsupgroups

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26925, Percent: 95.85

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26925, Percent: 88.77

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Carl Henrik Knutsen
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: Which groups does the current political regime rely on in order to maintain power? (Check all that apply.)
CLARIFICATION: Consider which group(s) is supportive of the regime, and, if it/they were to retract support would substantially increase the chance that the regime would lose power.
RESPONSES:
0: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. [v2regsupgroups_0]
1: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. [v2regsupgroups_1]
2: Party elites (of the party or parties that control the executive). [v2regsupgroups_2]
3: Business elites. [v2regsupgroups_3]
4: The state bureaucracy. [v2regsupgroups_4]
5: The military. [v2regsupgroups_5]
6: An ethnic or racial group(s). [v2regsupgroups_6]
7: A religious group(s). [v2regsupgroups_7]
8: Local elites, including customary chiefs. [v2regsupgroups_8]
9: Urban working classes, including labor unions. [v2regsupgroups_9]
10: Urban middle classes. [v2regsupgroups_10]
11: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). [v2regsupgroups_11
12: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). [v2regsupgroups_12]
13: A foreign government or colonial power. [v2regsupgroups_13]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CLEANING: Set to missing where v2regint is 0.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
DEFAULT DATE: Default date for this variable is January 1.

6.1.5 V-Dem Indicators - The Legislature

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

The Legislature:

The following questions pertain to the legislature, an assembly of deputies or representatives with powers to consider, pass, amend, or repeal laws. If there is no legislature in the country you are coding for some period of years, do not code any questions for those year. If you are considering a semi-sovereign territory such as a colony please answer this question with respect to the legislature that is seated within the territory in question (such as the local legislative assembly in a British colony, not the Parliament in London). A popular election need not involve universal suffrage; indeed, suffrage may be highly restricted. A "direct election" can include seats reserved for special groups (*e.g.*, ethnic groups or women) so long as these members are chosen by popular election.

Frequently, it is important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens on the ground). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues. Note that sometimes we ask different coders to code different aspects of a question. So, you might get a question about the *de facto* state of affairs, but another source might provide the answer to the *de jure* state of affairs.

6.1.5.1 Legislature corrupt activities (v2lgcrrpt)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgcrrpt

Original tag: v2lgcrrpt

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18650, Percent: 66.39

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18650, Percent: 61.49

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Steven Fish, Matthew Kroenig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do members of the legislature abuse their position for financial gain?
CLARIFICATION: This includes any of the following: (a) accepting bribes, (b) helping to obtain government contracts for firms that the legislator (or his/her family/friends/political supporters) own, (c) doing favors for firms in exchange for the opportunity of employment after leaving the legislature, (d) stealing money from the state or from campaign donations for personal use.
Please make your best estimate, based upon what is known or suspected to be true.
RESPONSES:
0: Commonly. Most legislators probably engage in these activities.
1: Often. Many legislators probably engage in these activities.
2: Sometimes. Some legislators probably engage in these activities.
3: Very occasionally. There may be a few legislators who engage in these activities but the vast majority do not.
4: Never, or hardly ever.

SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: For reasons of consistency, as of December, 2014, responses to this question are reversed so that the least democratic response is "0" and the most democratic is "4".
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2lgbicam is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.5.2 Legislature controls resources (v2lgfunds)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgfunds

Original tag: v2lgfunds

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18605, Percent: 66.23

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18605, Percent: 61.34

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Steven Fish, Matthew Kroenig
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: In practice, does the legislature control the resources that finance its own internal operations and the perquisites of its members?
RESPONSES:
0: No. The benefits legislators receive or the finances needed for the legislature's operation depend on remaining in good standing with an outside authority, such as the executive.
1: Yes.
SCALE: Dichotomous, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 3-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2lgbicam is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von

Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.5.3 Representation of disadvantaged social groups (v2lgdsadlo)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgdsadlo

Original tag: v2lgdsadlo

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14937, Percent: 53.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14937, Percent: 49.25

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Considering all disadvantaged social groups in the country, how well represented are these groups, as a whole, in the national legislature?
CLARIFICATION: Disadvantage refers to socioeconomic disadvantage. Specifically, in order to be considered disadvantaged members of a social group must have an average income that is significantly below the median national income.
RESPONSES:
0: They have no representation at all.
1: They are highly under-represented relative to their proportion of the general population.
2: They are slightly under-represented relative to their proportion of the general population.
3: They are represented roughly equal relative to their proportion of the general population.
4: They are over-represented relative to their proportion of the general population.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: As of December 2014, the former category 0: There are no disadvantaged groups in the society, is coded as a separate variable (v2lgdsadlobin). The variable is then rebased to zero.
DATA RELEASE: 3-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2lgbicam is 0
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.5.4 Representation of disadvantaged groups binary (v2lgdsadlobin)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2lgdsadlobin

Original tag: v2lgdsadlobin

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 14943, Percent: 53.19

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 14943, Percent: 49.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are there disadvantaged groups in the society?
CLARIFICATION: Disadvantage refers to socioeconomic disadvantage. Specifically, in order to be considered a disadvantaged member of a social group, one must have an average income that is significantly below the median national income.
RESPONSES:
0: No.
1: Yes.
SCALE: Dichotomous, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 3-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.6 V-Dem Indicators - Deliberation

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Deliberation:

The following questions address the deliberative or non-deliberative nature of a country's politics, with particular focus on elite levels. Some of these questions focus on the quality of discourse and others focus on public policies.

6.1.6.1 Reasoned justification (v2dlreason)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2dlreason

Original tag: v2dlreason

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge, John Gerring, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: When important policy changes are being considered, *i.e.* before a decision has been made, to what extent do political elites give public and reasoned justifications for their positions?
CLARIFICATION: Because discourse varies greatly from person to person, base your answer on the style that is most typical of prominent national political leaders.
RESPONSES:
0: No justification. Elites almost always only dictate that something should or should not be done, but no reasoning about justification is given. For example, quot;We must cut spending.quot;
1: Inferior justification. Elites tend to give reasons why someone should or should not be for doing or not doing something, but the reasons tend to be illogical or false, although they may appeal to many voters. For example, quot;We must cut spending. The state is inefficient.quot; [The inference is incomplete because addressing inefficiencies would not necessarily reduce spending and it might undermine essential services.]
2: Qualified justification. Elites tend to offer a single simple reason justifying why the proposed policies contribute to or detract from an outcome. For example, quot;We must cut spending because taxpayers cannot afford to pay for current programs.quot;
3: Sophisticated justification. Elites tend to offer more than one or more complex, nuanced and complete justification. For example, quot;We must cut spending because taxpayers cannot afford to pay for current government programs. Raising taxes would hurt economic growth, and deficit spending would lead to inflation.quot;
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.6.2 Common good (v2dlcommon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2dlcommon

Original tag: v2dlcommon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge, John Gerring, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: When important policy changes are being considered, to what extent do political elites justify their positions in terms of the common good?
CLARIFICATION: Because discourse varies greatly from person to person, base your answer on the style that is most typical of prominent national political leaders.
RESPONSES:
0: Little or no justification in terms of the common good is usually offered.
1: Specific business, geographic, group, party, or constituency interests are for the most part offered as justifications.
2: Justifications are for the most part a mix of specific interests and the common good and it is impossible to say which justification is more common than the other.
3: Justifications are based on a mixture of references to constituency/party/group interests and on appeals to the common good.
4: Justifications are for the most part almost always based on explicit statements of the common good for society, understood either as the greatest good for the greatest number or as helping the least advantaged in a society.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.6.3 Range of consultation (v2dlconslt)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2dlconslt

Original tag: v2dlconslt

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27803, Percent: 98.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27803, Percent: 91.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge, John Gerring, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: When important policy changes are being considered, how wide is the range of consultation at *elite levels*?
CLARIFICATION: Because practices vary greatly from policy to policy, base your answer on the style that is most typical of policymaking.
RESPONSES:
0: No consultation. The leader or a very small group (*e.g.* military council) makes authoritative decisions on their own.
1: Very little and narrow. Consultation with only a narrow circle of loyal party/ruling elites.
2: Consultation includes the former plus a larger group that is loyal to the government, such as the ruling party's or parties' local executives and/or women, youth and other branches.
3: Consultation includes the former plus leaders of other parties.
4: Consultation includes the former plus a select range of society/labor/business representatives.
5: Consultation engages elites from essentially all parts of the political spectrum and all politically relevant sectors of society and business.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.6.4 Means-tested vs. universalistic (v2dlunivl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2dlunivl

Original tag: v2dlunivl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Coppedge, John Gerring, Staffan Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How many welfare programs are means-tested and how many benefit all (or virtually all) members of the polity?
CLARIFICATION: A means-tested program targets poor, needy, or otherwise underprivileged constituents. Cash-transfer programs are normally means-tested.
A universal (non-means tested) program potentially benefits everyone. This includes free education, national health care schemes, and retirement programs. Granted, some may benefit more than others from these programs (*e.g.*, when people with higher salaries get higher unemployment benefits). The key point is that practically everyone is a beneficiary, or potential beneficiary.
The purpose of this question is not to gauge the size of the welfare state but rather its quality. So, your answer should be based on whatever programs exist.
RESPONSES:
0: There are no, or extremely limited, welfare state policies (education, health, retirement, unemployment, poverty programs).
1: Almost all of the welfare state policies are means-tested.
2: Most welfare state policies means-tested, but a significant portion (*e.g.* 1/4 or 1/3) is universalistic and potentially benefits everyone in the population.
3: The welfare state policies are roughly evenly divided between means-tested and universalistic.
4: Most welfare state policies are universalistic, but a significant portion (*e.g.*, 1/4 or 1/3) are means-tested.
5: Almost all welfare state policies are universal in character. Only a small portion is means-tested.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.7 V-Dem Indicators - The Judiciary

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Judiciary: This set of questions pertains to the judiciary. Before you proceed, we would like to clarify several general points. First, some questions below refer to the judiciary in general, whereas others ask for specific evaluations of particular courts or types of courts. Unless otherwise prompted, please consider the judiciary as a whole. This includes all courts in the judicial system at every level, both general jurisdiction courts and more specialized courts. However, with potentially one exception, it excludes specialized courts that are located outside the judiciary, *e.g.* an immigration court that lies inside the executive branch. The one potential exception is the peak constitutional court of the country. Please include this court in your considerations, even though it will be located outside of the judiciary in some countries. If the country you are coding is a federal state, please focus only on the federal judiciary and the federal government.

Seven of the questions about the judiciary concern high courts. By "high court" we are asking you to consider the country's constitutional court, if one exists. If there is no constitutional court, please consider the court of last resort for constitutional matters. If there is no court in your country with constitutional jurisdiction, please consider the highest ordinary court of the state.

For example, in Mexico in 2004, you would consider the Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation and not the Electoral Tribunal for the Federal Judiciary. In Russia in the same year, you would consider the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation and not the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. In Sweden, you would ignore the Supreme Administrative Court and instead focus on the Supreme Court. Germany has both a constitutional court, the Federal Constitutional Court, and a court of last resort for ordinary matters, the Federal Court of Justice. The Federal Constitutional Court is the high court for our purposes. In the United States, there is no separate constitutional court or review body. The Supreme Court is both the highest ordinary court and the highest court in the state with constitutional jurisdiction. Therefore, we consider it to be the high court of the United States. smallskip If your country's highest judicial body has separate divisions, only one of which is dedicated to final constitutional review, please consider that division to be the high court if its judges are permanently assigned to that division only. For example, the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica has four chambers. The Fourth Chamber reviews constitutional matters, its judges are appointed to it specifically and the other judges of the Supreme Court do not rotate onto the Fourth Chamber. Therefore, the high court for Costa Rica is the constitutional chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice.

If a new high court was established in a given year, please consider that court as the high court for the purposes of these questions only if the court was functioning for the majority of the calendar year. If a new high court was established in a given year, but did not start functioning until a subsequent year, please do not consider the new court as the high court until it was functioning for the majority of the given calendar year. If you are considering a semi sovereign territory, such as a colony, please answer this question with respect to the government or judicial bodies seated within the territory in question (*e.g.*, the governor-general and his local administration in a British colony or a Commonwealth country), not abroad (*e.g.*, the King/Queen or government of England).

In coding the following questions it is sometimes important to distinguish between formal rules (as stipulated by statute, legislative rules, the constitution, or common law precedent) and actual practice (what happens "on the ground"). In order to clarify the *de jure*/*de facto* distinction, we employ the terms "by law..." and "in practice..." Please pay close attention to these cues wherever you see them.

6.1.7.1 Judicial corruption decision (v2jucorrdc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2jucorrdc

Original tag: v2jucorrdc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge,

Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27716, Percent: 98.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27716, Percent: 91.38

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jeffrey Staton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do individuals or businesses make undocumented extra payments or bribes in order to speed up or delay the process or to obtain a favorable judicial decision?
RESPONSES:
0: Always.
1: Usually.
2: About half of the time.
3: Not usually.
4: Never.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: For reasons of consistency, as of December, 2014, responses to this question are reversed so that the least democratic response is ”0” and the most democratic is ”4”.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.8 V-Dem Indicators - Civil Liberty

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civil Liberty: The following questions are focused on actual practices (*de facto*) rather than formal legal or constitutional rights (*de jure*). Note that if there is significant variation in the respect for a particular civil liberty across the territory, the score should reflect the "average situation" across the territorial scope of the country unit (for each period) as defined in the coder instructions.

6.1.8.1 Freedom from forced labor for men (v2clslavem)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clslavem

Original tag: v2clslavem

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge,

Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27894, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are adult men free from servitude and other kinds of forced labor?
CLARIFICATION: Involuntary servitude occurs when an adult is unable to quit a job s/he desires to leave — not by reason of economic necessity but rather by reason of employer's coercion. This includes labor camps but not work or service which forms part of normal civic obligations such as conscription or employment in command economies.
RESPONSES:
0: Male servitude or other kinds of forced labor is widespread and accepted (perhaps even organized) by the state.
1: Male servitude or other kinds of forced labor is substantial. Although officially opposed by the public authorities, the state is unwilling or unable to effectively contain the practice.
2: Male servitude or other kinds of forced labor exists but is not widespread and usually actively opposed by public authorities, or only tolerated in some particular areas or among particular social groups.
3: Male servitude or other kinds of forced labor is infrequent and only found in the criminal underground. It is actively and sincerely opposed by the public authorities.
4: Male servitude or other kinds of forced labor is virtually non-existent.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.8.2 Freedom from forced labor for women (v2clslavef)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clslavef

Original tag: v2clslavef

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27890, Percent: 99.28

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27890, Percent: 91.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are adult women free from servitude and other kinds of forced labor?
CLARIFICATION: Involuntary servitude occurs when an adult is unable to quit a job s/he desires to leave — not by reason of economic necessity but rather by reason of employer's coercion. This includes labor camps but not work or service which forms part of normal civic obligations such as conscription or employment in command economies.
This question does not ask you to assess the *relative* freedom of men and women from forced labor. Thus, a country in which both men and women suffer the same conditions of servitude might be coded a (0) for women, even though there is equality across the sexes.
RESPONSES:
0: Female servitude or other kinds of forced labor is widespread and accepted (perhaps even organized) by the state.
1: Female servitude or other kinds of forced labor is substantial. Although officially opposed by the public authorities, the state is unwilling or unable to effectively contain the practice.
2: Female servitude or other kinds of forced labor exists but is not widespread and usually actively opposed by public authorities, or only tolerated in some particular areas or among particular social groups.
3: Female servitude or other kinds of forced labor is infrequent and only found in the criminal underground. It is actively and sincerely opposed by the public authorities.
4: Female servitude or other kinds of forced labor is virtually non-existent.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.8.3 Social class equality in respect for civil liberty (v2clacjust)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clacjust

Original tag: v2clacjust

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27902, Percent: 99.32

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27902, Percent: 91.99

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do poor people enjoy the same level of civil liberties as rich people do?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which the level of civil liberties is generally the same across socioeconomic groups so that people with a low social status are not treated worse than people with high social status. Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Poor people enjoy much fewer civil liberties than rich people.
1: Poor people enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than rich people.
2: Poor people enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than rich people.
3: Poor people enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than rich people.
4: Poor people enjoy the same level of civil liberties as rich people.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.8.4 Social group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clsocgrp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clsocgrp

Original tag: v2clsocgrp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27898, Percent: 99.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27898, Percent: 91.98

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do all social groups, as distinguished by language, ethnicity, religion, race, region, or caste, enjoy the same level of civil liberties, or are some groups generally in a more favorable position?
CLARIFICATION: Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Members of some social groups enjoy much fewer civil liberties than the general population.
1: Members of some social groups enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than the general population.
2: Members of some social groups enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than the general population.
3: Members of some social groups enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than the general population.
4: Members of all salient social groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.8.5 Stronger civil liberties characteristics (v2clrgstch)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clrgstch

Original tag: v2clrgstch

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18143, Percent: 64.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18143, Percent: 59.82

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country where government officials' respect for civil liberties is significantly *stronger*?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_11]
12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_14]
15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgstch_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.8.6 Weaker civil liberties characteristics (v2clrgwkch)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clrgwkch

Original tag: v2clrgwkch

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18242, Percent: 64.94

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18242, Percent: 60.14

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Kelly McMann
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: How would you describe the areas of the country where government officials' respect for civil liberties is significantly *weaker*?
CLARIFICATION: Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Rural. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_0]
1: Urban. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_1]
2: Areas that are less economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_2]
3: Areas that are more economically developed. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_3]
4: Inside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_4]
5: Outside the capital city. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_5]
6: North. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_6]
7: South. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_7]
8: West. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_8]
9: East. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_9]
10: Areas of civil unrest (including areas where insurgent groups are active). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_10]
11: Areas where illicit activity is widespread. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_11]
12: Areas that are very sparsely populated. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_12]
13: Areas that are remote (difficult to reach by available transportation, for example). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_13]
14: Areas where there are indigenous populations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_14]
15: Areas where the national ruling party or group is strong. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_15]
16: Areas where the national ruling party or group is weak. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_16]
17: Areas that were subject to a longer period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_17]
18: Areas that were subject to a shorter period of foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_18]
19: Areas that were recently subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_19]
20: Areas that have not recently been subject to foreign rule. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_20]
21: None of the above. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2clrgwkch_21]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
ANSWER-TYPE: Multiple-selection.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.8.7 State ownership of economy (v2clstown)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clstown

Original tag: v2clstown

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27887, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27887, Percent: 91.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Does the state own or directly control important sectors of the economy?
CLARIFICATION: This question gauges the degree to which the state owns and controls capital (including land) in the industrial, agricultural, and service sectors.
It does *not* measure the extent of government revenue and expenditure as a share of total output; indeed, it is quite common for states with expansive fiscal policies to exercise little direct control (and virtually no ownership) over the economy.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually all valuable capital belongs to the state or is directly controlled by the state. Private property may be officially prohibited.
1: Most valuable capital either belongs to the state or is directly controlled by the state.
2: Many sectors of the economy either belong to the state or are directly controlled by the state, but others remain relatively free of direct state control.
3: Some valuable capital either belongs to the state or is directly controlled by the state, but most remains free of direct state control.
4: Very little valuable capital belongs to the state or is directly controlled by the state.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.9 V-Dem Indicators - Sovereignty and State

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Sovereignty: This section addresses a number of issues concerning the sovereignty of the state. A state is political organization that organizes compulsory domination over a fixed territory on a continual basis. With respect to state sovereignty, we are interested in measuring two distinct areas of sovereignty. The first is an attribute of states within the context of the international system. Here, we are interested in the state's autonomy from other actors in the system. The second component of sovereignty concerns the relationship of the state to the population and territory over which it claims

to rule. Here, we want to gauge the extent of recognition of the preeminent authority of the state over its claimed territory and population.

Sovereignty – Historical clarification: This section addresses a number of issues concerning the state. A state is a political organization that organizes compulsory domination over a fixed territory on a continual basis. The questions concern two general themes: state sovereignty and state administration.

With respect to state sovereignty, we are interested in measuring two distinct areas of sovereignty. The first is an attribute of states within the context of the international system. Here, we are interested in the state's autonomy from and recognition by other actors in the system. The second component of sovereignty concerns the relationship of the state to the population and territory over which it claims to rule. Here, we want to gauge the extent of recognition of the preeminent authority of the state over its claimed territory and population.

A second attribute of states is the state administration: the set of institutions that administer and implement governmental decisions. Here we are mainly interested in the professionalization, or lack thereof, of the state administrative staff – in this context termed the state administrators.

The State: "This section addresses a number of issues concerning the state. A state is a political organization that organizes compulsory domination over a fixed territory on a continual basis. The questions concern two general themes: state sovereignty and state administration.

With respect to state sovereignty, we are interested in measuring two distinct areas of sovereignty. The first is an attribute of states within the context of the international system. Here, we are interested in the state's autonomy from and recognition by other actors in the system. The second component of sovereignty concerns the relationship of the state to the population and territory over which it claims to rule. Here, we want to gauge the extent of recognition of the preeminent authority of the state over its claimed territory and population.

A second attribute of states is the state administration: the set of institutions that administer and implement governmental decisions. Here we are mainly interested in the professionalization, or lack thereof, of the state administrative staff–in this context termed the state administrators."

6.1.9.1 Domestic Autonomy (v2svdomaut)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2svdomaut

Original tag: v2svdomaut

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 91.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is the state autonomous from the control of other states with respect to the

conduct of domestic policy?
CLARIFICATION: The question of domestic autonomy does not include restrictions emanating from treaties (*e.g.*, NATO), international organizations (*e.g.*, the WTO), or confederations (*e.g.*, the European Union) if these agreements are freely negotiated by the state and if the state is free to exit from that treaty, organization, or confederation. Nor does it include restrictions on policymaking emanating from international market forces and trans-national corporations.
RESPONSES:
0: Non-autonomous. National level authority is exercised by an external power, either by law or in practice. The most common examples of this are direct colonial rule and military occupation (*e.g.* quadripartite occupation of Germany in 1945). It also includes situations in which domestic actors provide *de jure* cover for *de facto* control by a foreign power (*e.g.* Vichy France). However, control of some part of the territory of a state by an enemy during war is not considered control by external actors if the sovereign government remains on scene and continues to wage conventional war (*e.g.*, the USSR during WW II).
1: Semi-autonomous. An external political actor directly constrains the ability of domestic actors to rule, decides who can or cannot rule through formal rules or informal understandings, or precludes certain policies through explicit treaty provisions or well-understood rules of the game from which the subject state cannot withdraw. Examples include Soviet quot;satellitequot; states in Eastern Europe, and situations where colonial powers grant limited powers of national self-government to their possessions (*e.g.*, protectorates and limited home government).
2: Autonomous. Domestic political actors exercise political authority free of the direct control of external political actors.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.9.2 State fiscal source of revenue (v2stfisccap)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2stfisccap

Original tag: v2stfisccap

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26591, Percent: 94.66

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26591, Percent: 87.67

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: On which of the following sources of revenue does the central government primarily rely to finance its activities?
RESPONSES:
0: The state is not capable of raising revenue to finance itself.
1: The state primarily relies on external sources of funding (loans and foreign aid) to finance its activities.
2: The state primarily relies on directly controlling economic assets (natural resource rents, public monopolies, and the expropriation of assets within and outside the country) to finance its activities.
3: The state primarily relies on taxes on property (land taxes) and trade (customs duties).
4: The state primarily relies on taxes on economic transactions (such as sales taxes) and/or taxes on income, corporate profits and capital.
SCALE: Ordinal.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.9.3 Bureaucratic remuneration (v2strenadm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2strenadm

Original tag: v2strenadm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26442, Percent: 94.13

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26442, Percent: 87.18

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell

ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent are state administrators salaried employees?
CLARIFICATION: A state administrator is anyone who works for the state administration. By quot;salaried employeequot;, we mean someone who is employed on a contract and paid a regular allowance directly out of the state coffers. It does not include unpaid work; work paid for through a private collection of fees, material perquisites or bribes; private employment by a higher-ranking quot;patronquot; within the administration; contractors being paid on an irregular basis; or quot;parastatalsquot; (those working for state-owned companies), since the latter are not paid directly out of the state coffers. Note that the question refers to the practices obtaining in the state administration, excluding the armed forces.
RESPONSES:
0: None or almost none are salaried state employees.
1: A small share is salaried state employees.
2: About half are salaried state employees.
3: A substantial number are salaried state employees.
4: All or almost all are salaried state employees.
SCALE: Ordinal.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.9.4 Remuneration in the Armed Forces (v2strenarm)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2strenarm

Original tag: v2strenarm

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 26436, Percent: 94.11

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 26436, Percent: 87.16

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Jan Teorell, Agnes Cornell
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent are members of the armed forces salaried employees?
CLARIFICATION: By members of the armed forces, we mean members of all ranks,

excluding conscripts. By quot;salaried employeequot;, we mean someone who is employed on a contract and paid a regular allowance directly out of the state coffers. It does not include unpaid work, work paid for through a private collection of fees, material perquisites or bribes, or private employment by a higher-ranking quot;patronquot; within the armed forces.
RESPONSES:
0: None or almost none are salaried employees
1: A small share is salaried employees
2: About half are salaried employees
3: A substantial number are salaried employees
4: All or almost all are salaried employees
ORDERING: Ordinal.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.10 V-Dem Indicators - Political Equality

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Political Equality: This section pertains to political equality, that is, the extent to which members of a polity possess equal political power. It does not refer to the inevitable differentiation in power that occurs in all large societies between those who hold positions of power within the state (political elites) and lay citizens. It is, rather, about the distribution of political power among identifiable groups within the population.

What does it mean for a group of individuals to wield real political power? Although political power cannot be directly observed, one can infer that groups possess power to the extent that they: (a) actively participate in politics (by voting, etc.), (b) are involved in civil society organizations, (c) secure representation in government, (d) are able to set the political agenda, (e) influence political decisions, and (f) influence the implementation of those decisions. Please consider all these factors when answering the following questions. (Of course, the picture across these different dimensions may be mixed; your response should indicate the overall picture, taking all aspects of political power into account.)

6.1.10.1 Power distributed by socioeconomic position (v2pepwrses)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pepwrses

Original tag: v2pepwrses

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein

et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27887, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27887, Percent: 91.94

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is political power distributed according to socioeconomic position?
CLARIFICATION: All societies are characterized by some degree of economic (wealth and income) inequality. In some societies, income and wealth are distributed in a grossly unequal fashion. In others, the difference between rich and poor is not so great. Here, we are concerned not with the degree of social inequality but rather with the political effects of this inequality. Specifically, we are concerned with the extent to which wealth and income translates into political power.
RESPONSES:
0: Wealthy people enjoy a virtual monopoly on political power. Average and poorer people have almost no influence.
1: Wealthy people enjoy a dominant hold on political power. People of average income have little say. Poorer people have essentially no influence.
2: Wealthy people have a very strong hold on political power. People of average or poorer income have some degree of influence but only on issues that matter less for wealthy people.
3: Wealthy people have more political power than others. But people of average income have almost as much influence and poor people also have a significant degree of political power.
4: Wealthy people have no more political power than those whose economic status is average or poor. Political power is more or less equally distributed across economic groups.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025
CONVERGENCE: Model parameters with convergence issues: universal thresholds.

6.1.10.2 Power distributed by social group (v2pepwrsoc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pepwrsoc

Original tag: v2pepwrsoc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning,

Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 91.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is political power distributed according to social groups?
CLARIFICATION: A social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, or some combination thereof. (It does *not* include identities grounded in sexual orientation or socioeconomic status.) Social group identity is contextually defined and is likely to vary across countries and through time. Social group identities are also likely to cross-cut, so that a given person could be defined in multiple ways, *i.e.*, as part of multiple groups. Nonetheless, at any given point in time there are social groups within a society that are understood — by those residing within that society — to be different, in ways that may be politically relevant.
RESPONSES:
0: Political power is monopolized by one social group comprising a minority of the population. This monopoly is institutionalized, *i.e.*, not subject to frequent change.
1: Political power is monopolized by several social groups comprising a minority of the population. This monopoly is institutionalized, *i.e.*, not subject to frequent change.
2: Political power is monopolized by several social groups comprising a majority of the population. This monopoly is institutionalized, *i.e.*, not subject to frequent change.
3: Either all social groups possess some political power, with some groups having more power than others; or different social groups alternate in power, with one group controlling much of the political power for a period of time, followed by another — but all significant groups have a turn at the seat of power.
4: All social groups have roughly equal political power *or* there are no strong ethnic, caste, linguistic, racial, religious, or regional differences to speak of. Social group characteristics are not relevant to politics.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.10.3 Power distributed by sexual orientation (v2pepwrort)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2pepwrort

Original tag: v2pepwrort

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim,

Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19726, Percent: 65.04

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): John Gerring
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent is political power distributed according to sexual orientation?
CLARIFICATION: This question contrasts (A) the political power of heterosexuals and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) members of the polity who are not open about their sexuality with (B) the political power of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) members of the polity who are open about their sexuality. (A) will be referred to as quot;heterosexualquot; and (B) as quot;LGBT.quot;
Note that in comparing the political power of these two groups we are comparing their power per person. So, when we say that LGBT have less, equal, or more power than heterosexuals we mean relative to their share of the population (as near as this can be estimated).
RESPONSES:
0: LGBTs are entirely excluded from the public sphere and thus deprived of any real political power (even though they may possess formal powers such as the ballot).
1: LGBTs have much less political power than heterosexuals. LGBTs enjoy formal rights to participate in politics but are subject to informal norms that often serve to exclude them from the halls of power.
2: LGBTs have somewhat less political power than heterosexual citizens.
3: LGBTs have about the same political power as heterosexuals. Each group enjoys a degree of political power that is roughly proportional to their population.
4: LGBTs enjoy somewhat more political power than heterosexuals by virtue of greater wealth, education, and high level of organization and mobilization.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.11 V-Dem Indicators - Exclusion

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Exclusion:

The following survey contains questions pertaining to exclusion. Political, economic and social well-being may depend on whether groups or individuals are excluded from positions of power, the state's protection of rights and freedoms, access to public goods and services, and opportunities to work or do business with the state.

Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. It is not necessary for all members of a group to be excluded in order for group-based exclusion to occur. Exclusion occurs even when only a single individual is excluded based on her or his identity or membership (perceived or actual) in a particular group.

Political groups are defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates. A common form of partisan exclusion is when state services or regulations are implemented in a way that seeks to reward the incumbent's political supporters and punish non-supporters.

Socio-Economic position defines groups based on attributes of wealth, occupation, or other economic circumstances such as owning property. Exclusion of economic groups occurs when, for example, those who are not property owners are restricted from voting, or when fees associated with justice, health or education are set at a rate that is unaffordable for poorer individuals.

Social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, migration status, or some combination thereof. (It does not include identities grounded in sexual orientation, gender, or socioeconomic status.) Social group identity is contextually defined and is likely to vary across countries and through time. Social group identities are also likely to cross-cut, so that a given person could be defined in multiple ways, i.e., as part of multiple groups. Nonetheless, at any given point in time there are social groups within a society that are understood - by those residing within that society - to be different, in ways that may be politically relevant. Contrast Identity group.

Geographic group refers to those living in rural or urban areas. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer and there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road. (World Development Report, 2009: 54).

6.1.11.1 Access to public services distributed by socio-economic position (v2peapsecon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peapsecon

Original tag: v2peapsecon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18918, Percent: 67.34

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18918, Percent: 62.37

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Is access to basic public services, such as order and security, primary education, clean water, and healthcare, distributed equally according to socioeconomic position?
CLARIFICATION: This question asks if socio-economic position is an important cleavage in

society for the distribution of public services. Thus, if there are inequalities in access to public services, but these are not mainly due to differentiation between particular socio-economic position, the code should be "4" (equal). The situation could of course vary by type of public service, such that a socio-economic group is denied access to some basic public services but not others. Please base your response on whether access to most of the aforementioned services are distributed equally or unequally.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of poverty or low income, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
1: Unequal. Because of poverty or low income, 25 percent (percent) or more of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of poverty or low income, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of poverty or low income, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
4: Equal. Because of poverty or low income, less than 5 percent (percent) of the population lack access to basic public services of good quality.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.2 Access to state jobs by socio-economic position (v2peasjsoecon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasjsoecon

Original tag: v2peasjsoecon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18903, Percent: 67.29

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18903, Percent: 62.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state jobs equally open to qualified individuals regardless of socio-economic

position?
CLARIFICATION: Socio-economic position defines groups based on attributes of wealth, occupation, or other economic circumstances such as owning property.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of poverty or low income, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
1: Unequal. Because of poverty or low income, makes 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of poverty or low income, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of poverty or low income, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
4: Equal. Because of poverty or low income, less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.3 Access to state business opportunities by socio-economic position (v2peasbecon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbecon

Original tag: v2peasbecon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 67.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 62.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals regardless of socio-economic position?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive

a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc. Socio-economic position defines groups based on attributes of wealth, occupation, or other economic circumstances such as owning property.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of poverty or low income makes 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because of poverty or low income makes 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of poverty or low income makes 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of poverty or low income makes 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because of poverty or low income makes less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.4 Gender equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgencl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clgencl

Original tag: v2clgencl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 67.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 62.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do women enjoy the same level of civil liberties as men?
CLARIFICATION: Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:

0: Women enjoy much fewer civil liberties than men.
1: Women enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than men.
2: Women enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than men.
3: Women enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than men.
4: Women enjoy the same level of civil liberties as men.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.5 Access to state business opportunities by gender (v2peasbgen)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbgen

Original tag: v2peasbgen

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18868, Percent: 67.17

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18868, Percent: 62.21

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals or firms regardless of gender?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their gender, 75 percent (percent) or more of women, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because of their gender, 25 percent (percent) or more of women, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their gender, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of women, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their gender, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of women, even if

qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because of their gender, 5 percent (percent) of women, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.6 Urban-rural location equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgeocl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clgeocl

Original tag: v2clgeocl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 67.54

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18973, Percent: 62.55

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do those who reside in rural areas enjoy same level of civil liberties as those residing in urban areas?
CLARIFICATION: This question specifies the extent to which the level of civil liberties is generally the same across geographic areas. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer, there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road (World Development Report, 2009: 54). Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Those who live in rural areas enjoy much fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
1: Those who live in rural areas enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
2: Those who live in rural areas enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.

3: Those who live in rural areas enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than residents of urban areas.
4: Residents of rural areas enjoy the same level of civil liberties as those in urban areas.
5: Residents of rural areas enjoy more civil liberties than those in urban areas.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.7 Access to state business opportunities by urban-rural location (v2peasbegeo)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbegeo

Original tag: v2peasbegeo

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals or firms regardless of their rural or urban locations?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc. Urban areas are defined as an area that meets the following conditions: population density exceeds a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer, there is access to a sizeable settlement of 50,000 people or more within some reasonable travel time, for example 60 minutes by road. (World Development Report, 2009: 54)
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because they live in rural areas, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because they live in rural areas, 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.

2: Somewhat Equal. Because they live in rural areas, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
3: Relatively Equal. Because they live in rural areas, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because they live in rural areas, less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
5: Rural-Bias. Because they live in urban areas, 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.8 Political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2clpolcl

Original tag: v2clpolcl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 67.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18928, Percent: 62.4

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do members of all political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties, or are some groups generally in a more favorable position?
CLARIFICATION: A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates that can be distinguished from others in terms of enjoyment of civil liberties. Responses should not reflect which party controls the legislature and executive. Here, civil liberties are understood to include access to justice, private property rights, freedom of movement, and freedom from forced labor.
RESPONSES:
0: Some political groups enjoy much fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
1: Some political groups enjoy substantially fewer civil liberties than other political groups.

2: Some political groups enjoy moderately fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
3: Some political groups enjoy slightly fewer civil liberties than other political groups.
4: All political groups enjoy the same level of civil liberties.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.9 Access to state business opportunities by political group (v2peasbepol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbepol

Original tag: v2peasbepol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 67.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 62.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals or firms regardless of an individual's association with a political group?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc. A political group is defined as those who are affiliated with a particular political party or candidate, or a group of parties/candidates that can be distinguished from others in terms of access to power. Responses should not reflect which party controls the legislature and executive.
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their political group affiliation 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because of their political group affiliation 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their political group affiliation 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.

3: Relatively Equal. Because of their political group affiliation 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because of their political group affiliation less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack equal access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.10 Access to state jobs by social group (v2peasjsoc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasjsoc

Original tag: v2peasjsoc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18888, Percent: 67.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18888, Percent: 62.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state jobs equally open to qualified individuals regardless of social group?
CLARIFICATION: Social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, migration status, or some combination thereof. (It does not include identities grounded in sexual orientation, gender, or socioeconomic status.)
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their social group, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
1: Unequal. Because of their social group identity, 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their social group identity, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their social group identity, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
4: Equal. Because of their social group identity, less than 5 percent (percent) of the

population, even if qualified, lack access to state jobs.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.11.11 Access to state business opportunities by social group (v2peasbsoc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2peasbsoc

Original tag: v2peasbsoc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18888, Percent: 67.24

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18888, Percent: 62.27

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Rachel Sigman
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are state business opportunities equally available to qualified individuals or firms regardless of social group?
CLARIFICATION: State business opportunities refer to the ability to compete for or receive a public procurement contract, to partner with the government in public-private partnerships, etc. Social group is differentiated within a country by caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, migration status, or some combination thereof. (It does not include identities grounded in sexual orientation, gender, or socioeconomic status.)
RESPONSES:
0: Extreme. Because of their social group, 75 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
1: Unequal. Because of their social group, 25 percent (percent) or more of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
2: Somewhat Equal. Because of their social group, 10 to 25 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
3: Relatively Equal. Because of their social group, 5 to 10 percent (percent) of the population, even if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
4: Equal. Because of their social group, less than 5 percent (percent) of the population, even

if qualified, lack access to state business opportunities.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.12 V-Dem Indicators - Legitimation

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Legitimation strategies:

Governments make legitimacy claims–provide justifications for the form of rule under which they govern. In the following section we are interested in the nature of the legitimacy claims made by the sitting government. Please note that the government's claims to legitimacy - their legitimation strategies - are the object of inquiry here. We are not asking you to assess how ordinary people judge the legitimacy of their rulers. Do not assume that governments make legitimacy claims on only one basis. We are interested in multi-track and hybrid legitimation strategies. The regime is understood as a set of formal and/or informal rules that govern the choice of political leaders and their exercise of power. The government is understood as the chief executive along with the cabinet, ministries, and top civil servants.

6.1.12.1 Ideology (v2exl_legitideol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exl_legitideol

Original tag: v2exl_legitideol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18913, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18913, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Marcus Tannenberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the current government promote a specific ideology or societal model (an officially codified set of beliefs used to justify a particular set of social,

political, and economic relations; for example, socialism, nationalism, religious traditionalism, etc.) in order to justify the regime in place?
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all.
1: To a small extent.
2: To some extent but it is not the most important component.
3: To a large extent but not exclusively.
4: Almost exclusively.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.12.2 Performance legitimation (v2exl_legitperf)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2exl_legitperf

Original tag: v2exl_legitperf

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Marcus Tannenberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the government refer to performance (such as providing economic growth, poverty reduction, effective and non-corrupt governance, and/or providing security) in order to justify the regime in place?
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all.
1: To a small extent.
2: To some extent but it is not the most important component.
3: To a large extent but not exclusively.
4: Almost exclusively.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.13 V-Dem Indicators - Civic and Academic Space

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Civic and Academic Space:

In this survey, we ask you to assess several issues concerning the space for and state of civil society and academia. First, we ask about some general issues such as polarization and peaceful assembly. Then, we probe into mobilization for mass events and associations. Finally, we ask you to consider questions related to academia.

6.1.13.1 Engagement in state-administered mass organizations (v2castate)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2castate

Original tag: v2castate

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19331, Percent: 68.81

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19331, Percent: 63.73

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sebastian Hellmeier
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What share of the population is regularly active in state-administered mass associations, such as women, worker or youth leagues?
CLARIFICATION: State-administered mass associations are civilian organizations created and led by the government or the ruling party. Large shares of specific societal groups are voluntary or compulsory members of these associations. Examples include youth leagues such as the Hitlerjugend in Nazi Germany and the pioneers in the Soviet Union, women leagues such as the Women's Federation in China or the Federacion de Mujeres Cubanas and official trade unions in the Soviet Union. Such organizations are formally or informally affiliated with the state and/or with the ruling party. We consider an individual as active if they

attend a meeting, activity or event at least twice a year.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no one.
1: A small share of the population (less than 5percent).
2: A moderate share of the population (about 5 to 15 percent).
3: A large share of the population (about 16 percent to 25percent).
4: A very large share of the population (about 26percent or more).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.13.2 Engagement in independent trade unions (v2catrauni)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2catrauni

Original tag: v2catrauni

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19266, Percent: 68.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19266, Percent: 63.52

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sebastian Hellmeier
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What share of the population is regularly active in independent trade unions?
CLARIFICATION: An organization is independent if it is not controlled by the state or the ruling party and membership is voluntary. We consider an individual as active if they attend a meeting, activity or event at least twice a year.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no one.
1: A small share of the population (less than 5percent).
2: A moderate share of the population (about 5 to 15 percent).
3: A large share of the population (about 16 percent to 25percent).
4: A very large share of the population (about 26percent or more).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.

DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.13.3 Engagement in independent political associations (v2capolit)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2capolit

Original tag: v2capolit

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19241, Percent: 68.49

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19241, Percent: 63.44

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sebastian Hellmeier
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What share of the population is regularly active in independent political interest associations, such as environmental associations, animal rights groups, or LGBT rights groups?
CLARIFICATION: Political associations include all associations whose main purpose is the change of policy or practice at the state or societal level. It does NOT include political parties or trade unions. An organization is independent if it is not controlled by the state or the ruling party and membership is voluntary. We consider an individual as active if they attend a meeting, activity or event at least twice a year.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no one.
1: A small share of the population (less than 5percent).
2: A moderate share of the population (about 5 to 15 percent).
3: A large share of the population (about 16 percent to 25percent).
4: A very large share of the population (about 26percent or more).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean

CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.13.4 Engagement in independent non-political associations (v2canonpol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2canonpol

Original tag: v2canonpol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19316, Percent: 68.76

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19316, Percent: 63.68

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Sebastian Hellmeier
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What share of the population is regularly active in independent non-political associations, such as sports clubs, literary societies, charities, fraternal groups, or support groups?
CLARIFICATION: Non-political associations include all associations whose main purpose is not the change of policy or practice at the state or societal level. It does NOT include political parties, or trade unions. An organization is independent if it is not controlled by the state or the ruling party and membership is voluntary. We consider an individual as active if they attend a meeting activity or event at least twice a year.
RESPONSES:
0: Virtually no one.
1: A small share of the population (less than 5percent).
2: A moderate share of the population (about 5 to 15 percent).
3: A large share of the population (about 16 percent to 25percent).
4: A very large share of the population (about 26percent or more).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson &

Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.13.5 Freedom to research and teach (v2cafres)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cafres

Original tag: v2cafres

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15276, Percent: 54.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15276, Percent: 50.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Katrin Kinzelbach, Ilyas Saliba, Janika Spannagel
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent are scholars free to develop and pursue their own research and teaching agendas without interference?
CLARIFICATION: Examples of interference include research agendas or teaching curricula being drafted, restricted, or fully censored by a non-academic actor; scholars being externally induced, through possible reprisals, to self-censor; or the university administration abusing its position of power to impose research or teaching agendas on individual academics. It also includes public pressure on academics - offline and online. We do not consider as interference restrictions that are due to research priorities, as well as ethical and quality standards, freely defined by the scholarly community as well as the development of standardized curricula by academics that aim to structure and enhance teaching.
RESPONSES:
0: Completely restricted. When determining their research agenda or teaching curricula, scholars are, across all disciplines, consistently subject to interference or incentivized to self-censor.
1: Severely restricted. When determining their research agenda or teaching curricula, scholars are, in some disciplines, consistently subject to interference or incentivized to self-censor.
2: Moderately restricted. When determining their research agenda or teaching curricula, scholars are occasionally subject to interference or incentivized to self-censor.
3: Mostly free. When determining their research agenda or teaching curricula, scholars are rarely subject to interference or incentivized to self-censor.
4: Fully free. When determining their research agenda or teaching curricula, scholars are not subject to interference or incentivized to self-censor.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean

CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.13.6 Institutional autonomy (v2cainsaut)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2cainsaut

Original tag: v2cainsaut

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 15257, Percent: 54.31

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 15257, Percent: 50.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Katrin Kinzelbach, Ilyas Saliba, Janika Spannagel
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent do universities exercise institutional autonomy in practice?
CLARIFICATION: Institutional autonomy "means the independence of institutions of higher education from the State and all other forces of society, to make decisions regarding its internal government, finance, administration, and to establish its policies of education, research, extension work and other related activities" (Lima Declaration). Note that institutional autonomy does not preclude universities from accepting state or third party funding, but does require that they remain in charge of all types of decisions listed above. Institutional autonomy does also not preclude a public oversight role by the state over universities' spending of public funds.
RESPONSES:
0: No autonomy at all. Universities do not exercise any degree of institutional autonomy; non-academic actors control decision-making.
1: Minimal autonomy. Universities exercise only very limited institutional autonomy; non-academic actors interfere extensively with decision-making.
2: Moderate autonomy. Universities exercise some institutional autonomy; non-academic actors interfere moderately with decision-making.
3: Substantial autonomy. Universities exercise institutional autonomy to a large extent; non-academic actors have only rare and minimal influence on decision-making.
4: Complete autonomy. Universities exercise complete institutional autonomy from non-academic actors.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 10-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see

V-Dem Methodology).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.14 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Liberties

The *Civil Liberties Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.14.1 Private liberties index (v2x_clpriv)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_clpriv

Original tag: v2x_clpriv

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 99.58

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27974, Percent: 92.23

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: To what extent are private liberties respected?
CLARIFICATION: Private liberties are understood as freedom of movement, freedom of religion, freedom from forced labor, and property rights. The index is based on indicators that reflect government repression and that are not directly referring to elections.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xcl_slave v2xcl_prpty v2clfmove v2xcl_dmove v2clrelig v2csrlgrep
DATA RELEASE: 6-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by point estimates drawn from a Bayesian factor analysis model including the following indicators: property rights for men/women (v2clprptym, v2clprptyw), from forced labor for men/women (v2clslavem v2clslavef), freedom of religion (v2clrelig), religious organization repression (v2csrlgrep), freedom of foreign movement (v2clfmove), and freedom of domestic movement for men/women (v2cldmovem, v2cldmovew).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman,

Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.15 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Exclusion

The *Exclusion Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.15.1 Exclusion by Socio-Economic Group (v2xpe_exlecon)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpe_exlecon

Original tag: v2xpe_exlecon

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18913, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18913, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Index of (political) exclusion by socio-economic group
CLARIFICATION: Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces (spaces that are part of the public space and the government should regulate, while excluding private spaces and organizations except when exclusion in those private spheres is linked to exclusion in the public sphere) based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. The point estimates for this index have been reversed such that the directionality is opposite to the input variables. That is, lower scores indicate a normatively better situation (e.g. more democratic) and higher scores a normatively worse situation (e.g. less democratic). Note that this directionality is opposite of that of other V-Dem indices, which generally run from normatively worse to better.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2pepwrses v2clacjust v2peapsecon v2peasjsoecon v2peasbecon
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators power distributed by socio-economic group (v2pepwrses), soci-economic position equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clacjust), access to public services by socio-economic group (v2peapsecon), access to state jobs by socio-economic group (v2peasjsoecon), and access to state business opportunities by socio-economic group

(v2peasbecon).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.15.2 Exclusion by Gender (v2xpe_exlgender)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpe_exlgender

Original tag: v2xpe_exlgender

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18929, Percent: 67.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18929, Percent: 62.41

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Index of (political) exclusion by gender
CLARIFICATION: Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces (spaces that are part of the public space and the government should regulate, while excluding private spaces and organizations except when exclusion in those private spheres is linked to exclusion in the public sphere) based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. The point estimates for this index have been reversed such that the directionality is opposite to the input variables. That is, lower scores indicate a normatively better situation (e.g. more democratic) and higher scores a normatively worse situation (e.g. less democratic). Note that this directionality is opposite of that of other V-Dem indices, which generally run from normatively worse to better.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2pepwrgen v2clgencl v2peapsgen v2peasjgen v2peasbgen
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators power distributed bygender (v2pepwgen), equality in respect for civil liberties by gender (v2clgencl), access to public services by gender (v2peapsgen), access to state jobs by gender (v2peasjgen), and access to state business opportunities by gender (v2peasbgen).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken,

Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.15.3 Exclusion by Urban-Rural Location (v2xpe_exlgeo)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpe_exlgeo

Original tag: v2xpe_exlgeo

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Index of (political) exclusion by urban-rural location
CLARIFICATION: Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces (spaces that are part of the public space and the government should regulate, while excluding private spaces and organizations except when exclusion in those private spheres is linked to exclusion in the public sphere) based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. The point estimates for this index have been reversed such that the directionality is opposite to the input variables. That is, lower scores indicate a normatively better situation (e.g. more democratic) and higher scores a normatively worse situation (e.g. less democratic). Note that this directionality is opposite of that of other V-Dem indices, which generally run from normatively worse to better.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2pepwrgeo v2clgeocl v2peapsgeo v2peasjgeo v2peasbegeo
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators power distributed by urban-rural location (v2pepwrgeo), urban-rural equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clgeocl), access to public services by urban-rural location (v2peapsgeo), access to state jobs byurban-rural location (v2peasjgeo), and access to state business opportunities by urban-rural location (v2peasbgeo).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.15.4 Exclusion by Political Group (v2xpe_exlpol)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpe_exlpol

Original tag: v2xpe_exlpol

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 67.2

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18878, Percent: 62.24

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Index of (political) exclusion by political group
CLARIFICATION: Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces (spaces that are part of the public space and the government should regulate, while excluding private spaces and organizations except when exclusion in those private spheres is linked to exclusion in the public sphere) based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. The point estimates for this index have been reversed such that the directionality is opposite to the input variables. That is, lower scores indicate a normatively better situation (e.g. more democratic) and higher scores a normatively worse situation (e.g. less democratic). Note that this directionality is opposite of that of other V-Dem indices, which generally run from normatively worse to better.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2clpolcl v2peapspol v2peasjpol v2peasbepol
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators political group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clpolcl), access to public services by political group (v2peapspol), access to state jobs by political group (v2peasjpol), and access to state business opportunities by political group (v2peasbpol).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.15.5 Exclusion by Social Group (v2xpe_exlsocgr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpe_exlsocgr

Original tag: v2xpe_exlsocgr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 67.33

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 18914, Percent: 62.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Staffan I. Lindberg
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Index of (political) exclusion by social group
CLARIFICATION: Exclusion is when individuals are denied access to services or participation in governed spaces (spaces that are part of the public space and the government should regulate, while excluding private spaces and organizations except when exclusion in those private spheres is linked to exclusion in the public sphere) based on their identity or belonging to a particular group. The point estimates for this index have been reversed such that the directionality is opposite to the input variables. That is, lower scores indicate a normatively better situation (e.g. more democratic) and higher scores a normatively worse situation (e.g. less democratic). Note that this directionality is opposite of that of other V-Dem indices, which generally run from normatively worse to better.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1)
SOURCE(S): v2pepwrsoc v2clsocgrp v2peapssoc v2peasjsoc v2peasbsoc
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators power distributed by social group (v2pepwrsoc), social group equality in respect for civil liberties (v2clsocgrp), access to public services by social group (v2peapssoc), access to state jobs by social group (v2peasjsoc), and access to state business opportunities by social group (v2peasbsoc).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2023

6.1.16 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Women's Empowerment

The *Women's Empowerment Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level

indices.

6.1.16.1 Women civil liberties index (v2x_gencl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2x_gencl

Original tag: v2x_gencl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Sundström et al. (2017), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 99.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27896, Percent: 91.97

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Do women have the ability to make meaningful decisions in key areas of their lives?
CLARIFICATION: Women's civil liberties are understood to include freedom of domestic movement, the right to private property, freedom from forced labor, and access to justice.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2cldmovew v2clslavef v2clprptyw v2clacjstw
DATA RELEASE: 5-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for freedom of domestic movement for women (v2cldmovew), freedom from forced labor for women (v2clslavef), property rights for women (v2clprptyw), and access to justice for women (v2clacjstw).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Pemstein et al. (2026); Sundström et al. (2017); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.17 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Direct Democracy

The *Direct Democracy Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.17.1 Popular initiative index (v2xdd_i_ci)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_i_ci

Original tag: v2xdd_i_ci

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the *popular initiative utilized*?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2ddlexci v2ddsigpci v2ddsiglci v2ddsigdci v2ddpartci v2ddapprci v2ddspmci v2ddadmci v2ddyrci v2ddthreci
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index receives a maximum score of two resulting from the addition of the two terms easiness of initiation and easiness of approval of popular initiatives, where each term obtains a maximum value of one. The ease of initiation is measured by:

- The existence of a direct democracy process v2ddlexci,
- The number of signatures needed v2ddsigpci, and
- Time-limits to circulate the signatures v2ddsigdci.

Easiness of approval is measured by the surface of the polygon determined by:

- Participation quorum v2ddpartci,
- Approval quorum v2ddapprci, and
- Supermajority v2ddspmci.

For an elaboration of the interaction among quorums, see David Altman (2017). The resulting score is then multiplied with (d) district majority v2ddadmci. Consequences are measured by:

- The legal status of the decision made by citizens binding or merely consultative v2ddlexci, and
- The frequency and degree of success with which direct popular votes have been held in the past v2ddthreci. The baseline for those countries that have the legal apparatus to hold a particular MDD but have never experienced one is 0.1.

The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_i_ci = \&[(IF\ v2ddlexci\ gt; 0, 1, 0) \times (1 - v2ddsigpci))$$

$$\&\times(IF\ v2ddsigdci\ = 0, 1, 0.5 + v2ddsigdci/365/2)$$

$$\&+(v2ddsigdci) \cap (v2ddpartci) \cap (v2ddspmci)]$$

$$\&\times(0.5 + 1 - v2ddadmci/2)]$$

$$\&\times(IF\ v2ddlexci = 1, 0.75, 1 \times IF\ years\ since\ last\ successful$$

$$\& eventlt; 6, then\ v2ddthreci = 1, afterwards\ decr$$

$$\& then\ v2ddthreci = 1, afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.06\ units\ per\ year$$

$$\& until\ 0.1;\ if\ the\ event\ was\ not\ successful\ during\ the\ first\ years$$

$$\& v2ddthrerci{=}0.9,\ afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.1$$

$$\& units\ per\ year\ until\ 0.1)$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.17.2 Popular referendum index (v2xdd_i_rf)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_i_rf

Original tag: v2xdd_i_rf

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the *referendum* utilized?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-2).
SOURCE(S): v2ddlexrf v2ddsigprf v2ddsigdrf v2ddpartrf v2ddapprrf v2ddspmrf v2ddadmrf v2ddyrrf v2ddthrerf
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index receives a maximum score of two resulting from the addition of the two terms easiness of initiation and easiness of approval of referendums, where each term obtains a maximum value of one. The ease of initiation is measured by:

- The existence of a direct democracy process v2ddlexrf,
- The number of signatures needed v2ddsigprf,
- Time-limits to circulate the signatures v2ddsigdrf.

Easiness of approval is measured by the surface of the polygon determined by:

- Participation quorum v2ddpartrf,
- Approval quorum v2ddapprrf, and
- Supermajority v2ddspmrf. For an elaboration of the interaction among quorums, see David Altman 2016.

The resulting score is then multiplied with d district majority v2ddadmrf. Consequences are measured by:

- The legal status of the decision made by citizens binding or merely consultative v2ddlexrf, and
- The frequency and degree of success with which direct popular votes have been held in the past v2ddthrerf. The baseline for those countries that have the legal apparatus to hold a particular MDD but have never experienced one is 0.1.

The index is aggregated using this *formula*:

$$v2xdd_i_rf = \&[(IF\ v2ddlexrfgt; 0, 1, 0) \times (1 - v2ddsigprf)$$

$$\&\times(IF\ v2ddsigdrf = 0, 1, .5 + (v2ddsigdrf \times 2)/365)$$

$$\&+(v2ddpartrf \cap v2ddapprrf \cap v2ddspmrf)] \times (0.5 + (1 - v2ddadmrf)/2)$$

$$\&\times(IF\ v2ddlexrf = 1, .75, 1) \times (IF\ years\ since\ last\ successful\ event\ lt; 6,$$

$$\& then\ v2ddthrerf = 1, afterwards\ decreases\ by\ .06 units\ per\ year\ until\ .1,$$

$$\& if\ the\ event\ was\ not\ successful\ during\ the\ first\ years\ v2ddthrerf = .9,$$

$$\& afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.1 units\ per\ year\ until\ .1)$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.17.3 Obligatory referendum index (v2xdd_i_or)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_i_or

Original tag: v2xdd_i_or

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the *obligatory referendum* utilized?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-2).
SOURCE(S): v2ddlexor v2ddpartor v2ddappor v2ddspmor v2ddadmor v2ddthreor
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index receives a maximum score of two resulting from the addition of the two terms easiness of initiation and easiness of approval of obligatory referendums, where each term obtains a maximum value of one.

The ease of initiation is measured by:

- The existence of a direct democracy process v2ddlexor.

Easiness of approval is measured by the surface of the polygon determined by:

- Participation quorum v2ddpartor
- Approval quorum v2ddappor, and
- Supermajority V2ddspmor. For an elaboration of the interaction among quorums, see David Altman 2017.

The resulting score is then multiplied with (d) district majority v2ddadmor.
Consequences are measured by:

- The legal status of the decision made by citizens binding or merely consultative v2ddlexor, and
- The frequency and degree of success with which direct popular votes have been held in the past v2ddthreor.

The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_i_or = \&(IF\ v2ddlexorgt; 0, 1, 0) + (v2ddpartor) \cap v2ddapp$$

$$\&\times((.5 + (1 - v2ddadmor)/2) \times (IF\ v2ddlexor = 1, .75, 1)$$

$$\&\times(IF\ years\ since\ last\ successful\ eventlt; 6, then\ v2ddthreor = 1,$$

$$\& afterwards\ decreases\ by\ .06\ units\ per\ year\ until\ .1,$$

$$\& if\ the\ event\ was\ not\ successful\ during\ the\ first\ years\ v2ddthreor = .9,$$

$$\& afterwards\ decreases\ by\ .1\ units\ per\ year\ until\ .1)$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.17.4 Plebiscite index (v2xdd_i_pl)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_i_pl

Original tag: v2xdd_i_pl

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the *plebiscite* utilized?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-2).
SOURCE(S): v2ddlexpl v2ddpartpl v2ddapprpl v2ddspmpl v2ddadmpl v2ddyrpl v2ddthrepl
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index receives a maximum score of two resulting from the addition of the two terms easiness of initiation and easiness of approval of plebiscites, where each term obtains a maximum value of one. The ease of initiation is measured by:

- The existence of a direct democracy process v2ddlexpl.

Easiness of approval is measured by the surface of the polygon determined by:

- Participation quorum v2ddpartpl,
- Approval quorum v2ddapprpl, and
- Supermajority v2ddspmpl. For an elaboration of the interaction among quorums, see David Altman 2017.

The resulting score is then multiplied with (d) district majority v2ddadmpl.
Consequences are measured by:

- The legal status of the decision made by citizens (binding or merely consultative) (v2ddlexpl), and
- The frequency and degree of success with which direct popular votes have been held in the past (v2ddthrepl). The baseline for those countries that have the legal apparatus to hold a particular MDD but have never experienced one is 0.1.

The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_i_pl = \&(IF\ v2ddlexplgt; 0, 1, 0) + (v2ddpartpl \cap v2ddapp$$

$$\&\times((0.5 + (1 - v2ddadmpl)/2)) \times (IF\ v2ddlexpl = 1, 0.75, 1)$$

$$\&\times(IF\ years\ since\ last\ successful\ event\ lt; 6, then\ v2ddthrepl = 1,$$

$$\& afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.06\ units\ per\ year\ until\ 0.1,$$

$$\& if\ the\ event\ was\ not\ successful\ during\ the\ first\ years\ v2ddthrepl = 0.9,$$

$$\& afterwards\ decreases\ by\ 0.1\ units\ per\ year\ until\ 0.1)$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.17.5 Citizen-initiated component of direct popular vote index (v2xdd_cic)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_cic

Original tag: v2xdd_cic

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the Citizen Initiated Component utilized?
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xdd_i_ci v2xdd_i_rf
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index is the normalized average of the scores of both indices of citizen-initiated mechanism of direct democracy popular initiatives and referendums. For an elaboration of the weighting factor of each component, see David Altman 2017. The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_cic = [v2xdd_i_ci + v2xdd_i_rf]/4$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.17.6 Top-Down component of direct popular vote index (v2xdd_toc)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xdd_toc

Original tag: v2xdd_toc

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 70.22

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 19725, Percent: 65.03

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): David Altman
QUESTION: To what extent is the Top-Down Component utilized?

SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2xdd_i_pl v2xdd_i_or
DATA RELEASE: 7-16.
AGGREGATION: This index is the normalized average of the scores of both indices of mechanism of direct democracy which are not citizen-initiated obligatory referendums and plebiscites. For an elaboration of the weighting factor of each component, see David Altman 2016. The index is aggregated using this formula:

$$v2xdd_toc = [v2xdd_i_pl + v2xdd_i_or]/4$$

COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Last
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1900-2025

6.1.18 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Civil Society

The *Civil Society Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.18.1 Core Civil Society Index (v2xcs_ccsi)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcs_ccsi

Original tag: v2xcs_ccsi

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Bernhard et al. (2017), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27695, Percent: 98.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27695, Percent: 91.31

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Michael Bernhard
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: How robust is civil society?
CLARIFICATION: The sphere of civil society lies in the public space between the private sphere and the state. Here, citizens organize in groups to pursue their collective interests and ideals. We call these groups civil society organizations CSOs. CSOs include, but are by no means limited to, interest groups, labor unions, spiritual organizations if they are engaged in

civic or political activities, social movements, professional associations, charities, and other non-governmental organizations.
The core civil society index CCSI is designed to provide a measure of a robust civil society, understood as one that enjoys autonomy from the state and in which citizens freely and actively pursue their political and civic goals, however conceived.
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2cseeorgs v2csreprss v2csprtcpt
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: The index is formed by taking the point estimates from a Bayesian factor analysis model of the indicators for CSO entry and exit (v2cseeorgs), CSO repression (v2csreprss) and CSO participatory environment (v2csprtcpt).
COUNTRY-YEAR AGGREGATION: Day-weighted mean
CITATION: Bernhard et al. (2017); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.19 Other Indices Created Using V-Dem Data - Elections

The *Elections Index* uses V-Dem data but is not a subcomponent of the V-Dem Democracy Indices. Please see Appendix A of the V -Dem codebook (`https://www.v-dem.net/documents/70/codebook_v16.pdf`) for an overview of all indices, component-indices, and lower-level indices.

6.1.19.1 Freedom from forced labor (v2xcl_slave)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xcl_slave

Original tag: v2xcl_slave

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 99.27

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 27888, Percent: 91.95

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Pamela Paxton, Svend-Erik Skaaning
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd
QUESTION: Are adult citizens free from servitude and other kinds of forced labor?
CLARIFICATION: Involuntary servitude occurs when an adult is unable to quit a job s/he desires to leave — not by reason of economic necessity but rather by reason of employer's coercion. This includes labor camps but not work or service which forms part of normal civic obligations such as conscription or employment in command economies.

SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2clslavem v2clslavef
DATA RELEASE: 1-16.
AGGREGATION: We estimate the index by averaging two indicators: freedom from forced labor for men (v2clslavem) and women (v2clslavef).
CITATION: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1789-2025

6.1.20 Digital Society Survey - Social Cleavages

The Digital Society Survey, designed by the Digital Society Project, contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the internet and social media. The data collected through expert-coded surveys provides information on topics related to coordinated information operations, digital media freedom, online media polarization, social cleavages as well as state internet regulation capacity and approach.

Principal investigators for the Digital Society Project are Valeriya Mechkova, Daniel Pemstein, Brigitte Seim, Steven Wilson.

For more information, please visit `www.digitalsocietyproject.org`.

Instructions to the coders (as shown in the surveys)

Digital society: The following survey contains questions pertaining to the political environment of the Internet and social media. Please bear in mind the following definitions as you respond to questions on this survey:

The government and its agents include official government organs, such as bureaucracies, courts, intelligence services, and the military, but also unofficial agents, such as officially unaffiliated cyber-warfare operatives who perform services, even "off-book" work, on behalf of the government.

Major political parties include the group of political parties that hold a significant number of seats in national legislative body(-ies), or earn a significant number of votes in elections for the executive. When we ask you to consider "major political parties," you do not need to consider parties that run in elections but receive only a small minority of seats or votes, or those that receive no seats at all.

We define the Internet as all information that people access over public and private digital networks, worldwide. The Internet includes both publicly accessible digital spaces and private or gated information transmission platforms. The Internet does not include traditional media transmission mechanisms such as paper, television, traditional voice telephone, and radio.

Social media are a subset of Internet platforms that enable normal individuals to create and share content with networks of other people. Social media platforms are available to the public, although content on such networks may be shared privately within subgroups of users. Social media includes both publicly visible, or semi-public platforms, like Facebook, Flickr, Friendster, Google+, Instagram, Myspace, LinkedIn, Twitter, VKontakte, and Weibo and private social networking and messaging platforms like Signal, Slack, Snapchat, or WhatsApp.

Domestic online media is any media source originating in the country in question. For example, the New York Times' website is domestic online media in the United States, but not in India, even though it operates bureaus in India. Media includes any source reporting on current events or political issues, ranging from well-established brands to newsletters and websites run by an individual.

Cyber security threats include penetration of private digital networks, using means ranging from exploiting software vulnerabilities, password cracking, or social engineering (e.g., tricking individuals into revealing passwords or other information necessary to break into a digital system) to obtain information or disrupt an organization or individual's use of digital networks and tools. They also include unauthorized alterations of an individual or organization's digital presence, such as defacing websites and commandeering social media accounts. These threats range from unsophisticated (e.g., exploitation of failure to password protect private networks or use of common

passwords by authorized users, and spear phishing) to moderate (e.g., embedding malicious code in emails or exploiting well-known software flaws that organizations have failed to patch), to sophisticated (e.g., exploiting unknown exploits in commonly used software or even embedding exploits into commercial systems unbeknownst to their creators).

Clarification: When we discuss shutting down online content, please consider instances where a website (or websites) have been taken entirely offline as well as instances where a website (or websites) have been slowed down or had access similarly intentionally inhibited, such that use of this website is challenging. In other words, both outright shutting down and more subtle measures that inhibit access should be considered when answering these questions.

Clarification: When we discuss "censorship" or "censoring" content online, we are not concerned with censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, or defamatory speech, unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions.

6.1.20.1 Types of organization through social media (v2smorgtypes)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2smorgtypes

Original tag: v2smorgtypes

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 16.5

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 4636, Percent: 15.28

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: What types of offline political action are most commonly mobilized on social media?
CLARIFICATION: Multiple selection. Choose all that apply.
RESPONSES:
0: Petition signing [v2smorgtypes_0]
1: Voter turnout [v2smorgtypes_1]
2: Street protests [v2smorgtypes_2]
3: Strikes/labor actions [v2smorgtypes_3]
4: Riots [v2smorgtypes_4]
5: Organized rebellion [v2smorgtypes_5]
6: Vigilante Justice (e.g., mob lynching, stalking harassment) [v2smorgtypes_6]
7: Terrorism [v2smorgtypes_7]
8: Ethnic cleansing/genocide [v2smorgtypes_8]
9: Other (specify in the next question) [v2smorgtypes_9]
SCALE: Mean-aggregated scores of dichotomized variable.
DATA RELEASE: 9-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean.
CITATION: **?**; Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 2000-2025

6.1.21 Varieties of Indoctrination

The Varieties of Indoctrination (V-Indoc) dataset is constructed based on an expert survey fielded in collaboration with V-Dem and led by the ERC-funded project "Democracy under Threat: How Education can Save it" (DEMED). The dataset contains indices and indicators that measure indoctrination efforts in education and the media across 160 countries from 1945 to 2021. The indices capture broad dimensions of indoctrination such as indoctrination potential and indoctrination content, while the indicators cover topics related to the curriculum, teachers, schools, and the media. The principal investigators are Anja Neundorf, Eugenia Nazrullaeva, Ksenia Northmore-Ball, Katerina Tertytchnaya, and Wooseok Kim. For more information, please visit `https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/az/democracyresearch/`.

6.1.21.1 Political education, primary school (v2edpoledprim)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edpoledprim

Original tag: v2edpoledprim

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10781, Percent: 38.38

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10781, Percent: 35.54

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are primary school students required to study at least one subject that predominately focuses on teaching political values?
CLARIFICATION: Examples of subjects that focus on teaching political values include specific subjects in political education, as well subjects where political values are integrated in the curriculum: for example, moral, religious, and civic education; ethics and civics; 'knowledge about society' with elements of sociology, politics, legal studies, or economics. This does not include history as a subject. We are not interested in *de jure* subject labels but in *de facto* subject content: a course does not need to be entitled "political values" to be considered here.
Political values refer to goals that are the desirable purposes for socio-political organizations such as the political community, the nation-state, and regime. Political values guide an individual's or group's general behavior/attitudes toward political 'objects' (e.g. leaders, events, ideologies).
RESPONSES:
0: No. There is no general requirement for the majority of primary school students to study at least one subject predominately focused on political values.
1: Yes. The majority of primary school students are required to study at least one subject

that is predominately focused on political values.
SCALE: Binary, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.2 Political education, secondary school (v2edpoledsec)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edpoledsec

Original tag: v2edpoledsec

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10758, Percent: 38.3

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10758, Percent: 35.47

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are secondary school students required to study at least one subject that predominately focuses on teaching political values?
CLARIFICATION: Examples of subjects that focus on teaching political values include specific subjects in political education, as well subjects where political values are integrated in the curriculum: for example, moral, religious, and civic education; ethics and civics; 'knowledge about society' with elements of sociology, politics, legal studies, or economics. This does not include history as a subject. We are not interested in *de jure* subject labels but in *de facto* subject content: a course does not need to be entitled "political values" to be considered here.
In cases, where upper secondary education is specialized, please only consider lower secondary education.
Political values refer to goals that are the desirable purposes for socio-political organizations such as the political community, the nation-state, and regime. Political values guide an individual's or group's general behavior/attitudes toward political 'objects' (e.g. leaders, events, ideologies).
RESPONSES:
0: No. There is no general requirement for the majority of secondary school students to study at least one subject predominately focused on political values.

1: Yes. The majority of secondary school students are required to study at least one subject that is predominately focused on political values.
SCALE: Binary, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.3 Political rights and duties in the curriculum (v2edpoledrights)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edpoledrights

Original tag: v2edpoledrights

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10713, Percent: 38.14

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10713, Percent: 35.32

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the curriculum of subjects that include the teaching of political values cover topics related to individuals' political rights and duties?
CLARIFICATION: In this question we are asking about the subjects you considered in the previous two questions, on average across primary and secondary education. Again, these subjects may be specifically focused on political education or may be subjects into which the teaching of political values is only integrated.
Political rights and duties include: guarantees of equal political opportunities and equal protection under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, or other personal attributes; the right or duty to vote; the right to organize and protest; or the right to join labor unions.
RESPONSES:
0: These subjects do not cover these topics.
1: These subjects rarely cover these topics.
2: These subjects cover these topics, but not at depth.
3: These subjects cover these topics in some depth.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see

V-Dem Methodology).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.4 Patriotic education in the curriculum (v2edpatriot)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edpatriot

Original tag: v2edpatriot

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10777, Percent: 38.36

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10777, Percent: 35.53

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often does the language curriculum promote patriotism?
CLARIFICATION: We are interested in the curriculum for core subjects in language studies, common to a majority of students, for example, teaching the official language(s) of the country. We are not interested in foreign languages.
By promoting patriotism, we mean encouraging feelings of love, pride, loyalty and commitment to one's country. For example, promoting patriotism can take the form of teaching narratives that celebrate the country's military past, national origin stories, the majority ethnic or religious group, or accomplishments in economic or technological sectors. Patriotic education could be part of the texts used to teach basic literacy skills (e.g. handwriting exercises), language textbooks, assigned readings in the literature curriculum, as well as in accompanying teaching manuals.
Please consider a typical situation for students in primary and secondary schools. If the situation varies across educational levels, please provide the response that is most accurate for the majority of students.
RESPONSES:
0: Rarely or never.
1: Sometimes.
2: Often.
3: Extensively.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see

V-Dem Methodology).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.5 Patriotism in the media (v2medpatriot)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2medpatriot

Original tag: v2medpatriot

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10703, Percent: 38.1

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10703, Percent: 35.29

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:
VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How often do media outlets promote patriotism?
CLARIFICATION: Promotion of patriotism can be associated with promotion of patriotic consciousness, the love of the country, national pride, loyalty and commitment. For example, specific narratives can celebrate the country's military past, national origin stories, or accomplishments in economic or technological sectors. Patriotism can be promoted in news, movies, TV shows, radio shows, music, or magazines.
For this question, please consider <u>all</u> (state-owned as well as not state-owned) broadcast and print media outlets.
RESPONSES:
0: Rarely or never.
1: Sometimes.
2: Often.
3: Extensively.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).

YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.6 Extracurricular activities (v2edscextracurr)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edscextracurr

Original tag: v2edscextracurr

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10708, Percent: 38.12

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10708, Percent: 35.3

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Do schools promote involvement in extracurricular civic and/or political activities?
CLARIFICATION: Extracurricular civic activities can include (but are not limited to): joining a political organization, a specific political party, the army, a civil society organization, a labor union, a grassroots activist organization, volunteering in the local community, leadership activities, school-community partnerships.
Schools can promote these activities by providing such opportunities (e.g. by having a school council), or encouraging pupils to get involved in these outside of school (e.g. by emphasizing the importance of volunteering).
RESPONSES:
0: Schools do not promote extracurricular civic and/or political activities.
1: Schools promote extracurricular civic and/or political activities to some extent, but these activities are not considered an integral part of education.
2: Schools promote extracurricular civic and/or political activities as an integral part of education.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.7 Education requirements for primary school teachers (v2edtequal)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edtequal

Original tag: v2edtequal

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10667, Percent: 37.97

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10667, Percent: 35.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: What are the *de facto* education requirements to become a primary school teacher?
CLARIFICATION: If there is substantive variation at the sub-national or local levels, please consider the education requirements for the majority of primary school teachers in the country. Some countries may require a degree/diploma in education and others may accept a degree in any subject – indicate the completed education level required regardless of specialization. Please consider initial requirements to be a teacher not those for further professional development.
RESPONSES:
0: There are no educational requirements for aspiring teachers beyond proof of basic literacy and/or numeracy skills (ISCED Level 2 or lower).
1: Aspiring teachers must have completed a secondary school level education (ISCED Level 3).
2: Aspiring teachers must have achieved an education at the post-secondary, non-university level (for example, technical or vocational institutions) (ISCED Level 4).
3: Aspiring teachers must have completed at least one degree program taught at the university level (ISCED Level 5 and above).
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: In defining different education levels, we use the ISCED classification adopted by UNESCO, the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.8 Presence of teacher unions (v2edteunion)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edteunion

Original tag: v2edteunion

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10678, Percent: 38.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10678, Percent: 35.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_mode, *_nr
QUESTION: Do officially recognized teacher unions exist in this country?
CLARIFICATION: Please answer this question without taking into account the nature of the union. That is, for the purposes of this question it is irrelevant if the teacher union is distinct or part of a larger union (e.g. a trade union federation). This question does not concern why a teacher's union does or does not exist. It is irrelevant if a union does not exist because (teacher) unionization is formally prohibited, teacher unionization can be allowed *de jure* but prohibited *de facto* due to government pressure, or there can be a lack of organization capacity among teachers.
RESPONSES:
0: No officially recognized teacher unions exist.
1: Officially recognized teacher unions exist.
ORDERING: If answer is 0 in a given year, please skip v2edteunionindp for this year.
SCALE: Binary, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: This is a filtering question for v2edteunionindp. For the mode version of this variable, we assign an observation a value of 0.5 if the mode is not unique, i.e., a value of 0.5 represents a multimodal response distribution.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.9 Presence of teacher unions (v2edteunion_mode)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edteunion_mode

Original tag: v2edteunion_mode

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 10678, Percent: 38.01

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 10678, Percent: 35.2

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
QUESTION: Do officially recognized teacher unions exist in this country?
CLARIFICATION: Please answer this question without taking into account the nature of the union. That is, for the purposes of this question it is irrelevant if the teacher union is distinct or part of a larger union (e.g. a trade union federation). This question does not concern why a teacher's union does or does not exist. It is irrelevant if a union does not exist because (teacher) unionization is formally prohibited, teacher unionization can be allowed *de jure* but prohibited *de facto* due to government pressure, or there can be a lack of organization capacity among teachers.
RESPONSES:
0: No officially recognized teacher unions exist.
0.5: Multimodal.
1: Officially recognized teacher unions exist.
SCALE: Binary unless it is multimodal, aggregated by expert mode.
NOTES: This version builds on v2edteunion but is aggregated across coders using the mode. If the mode is not unique we assign that observation a value of 0.5. Hence, a value of 0.5 represents a multimodal response distribution.
DATA RELEASE: 12_ed.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mode.
CITATION: **?**; **?**.
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.21.10 Independent teacher unions (v2edteunionindp)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2edteunionindp

Original tag: v2edteunionindp

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Pemstein et al. (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 9453, Percent: 33.65

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 9453, Percent: 31.17

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Anja Neundorf
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Are officially recognized teacher unions independent from political authorities?
CLARIFICATION: Please answer this question regardless of the nature of teacher unions, that is, it is irrelevant if teacher unions are distinct or part of a comprehensive union (e.g. trade union federations). In cases where there is substantive sub-national variation, please consider teacher unions in the most populous sub-national units.
Political authorities can be national / sub-national / local public authorities and include ruling political parties and office holders such as presidents, prime minister or ministers.
This question does not distinguish between different mechanisms that can lead to teacher unions being dependent on the state. It is irrelevant if the relationship with the state was due to coercion, co-optation, or voluntary strategic alliances.
RESPONSES:
0: Teacher unions are fully independent.
1: Teacher unions are mostly independent.
2: Teacher unions are somewhat independent.
3: Teacher unions are not independent.
SCALE: Ordinal, converted to interval by the measurement model.
NOTES: Please answer this question only when option 1 was selected for v2edteunion.
DATA RELEASE: 13-16.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V-Dem Methodology*).
CLEANING: Set to missing when v2edteunion is 0.
CITATION: **?**; **?**; Pemstein et al. (2026); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1945-2021

6.1.22 Party Systems

The following indices refer to a variety of latent positions that party systems have on several policy orientations and governance. The Party Systems indices are designed by aggregating individual parties' policy orientations in a given country-election-year using data from the Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V-Party, v2) during the period between 1970-2019 for 178 countries. To find out more about this data and/or the component variables that underly these indicies, please visit `https://www.v-dem.net/data/v-party-dataset/`. The indices in this section have been developed by Fabio Angiolillo and Felix Wiebrecht. The following applies to all indices in this section:

- These indices are only computed for election-years, as identified by V-Party. They are not calculated for non-election years as the aggregation equation relies on political parties' institutional positions which can change across the legislature.
- The codehigh and codelow versions of the indices are derived by simply using the corresponding versions from each component. This propagates the uncertainty measurement from the component variables to the indices.
- All country-election-year components used for the party systems indices are weighted by the seat shares for each political party within a given party system (v2passeatshare). In the equations for each index, the weights are denoted by ws and are indexed by gp for government parties, op for opposition parties, and t for election-year. These components are weighted in order to adjust for the size of each party in influencing the party system.

6.1.22.1 Government Coalition Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion_government

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do parties in the governing coalition reject cultural superiority and support immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Exclusion Index (GCEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with government coalitions' more inclusive stances and higher values with government coalitions' more exclusive stances. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The GCEXI is a restricted version of the PSEXI index. It captures only the aggregated positions on exclusion for parties in the government. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The GCEXI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCEXI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.1.22.2 Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard,

Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.61

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1858, Percent: 6.13

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent do opposition parties reject cultural superiority and support immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Exclusion Index (OPEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more inclusive opposition parties and higher values with opposition parties advocating for more exclusion. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The OPEXI is a restricted version of the PSEXI index. It only captures the aggregated exclusion positions for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (t).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The OPREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPREI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.1.22.3 Party-System Exclusion Index (v2xpas_exclusion)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_exclusion

Original tag: v2xpas_exclusion

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt,

McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.82

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1634, Percent: 5.39

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: To what extent does the party system reject cultural superiority and support immigration policies and the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Exclusion Index (PSEXI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more inclusive party systems and higher values with more exclusive party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2paculsup v2paimmig v2pawomlab v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The PSEXI is calculated by using three V-Party variables: v2paculsup, v2paimmig, and v2pawomlab. Using these variables a measure of political parties' exclusion preferences is calculated. Then, seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare) is used to weigh the index and parties are divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0,1, or 2) or those in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The PSEXI is a derivative of the measure party_exclusion_index_PS, which is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{PS}} = 2(\text{v2paculsup}) + 0.5(\text{v2paimmig} + \text{v2pawomlab})$$

The PSEXI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSEXI}_{\text{PS}} = 1 - \left[\left(\& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}}) \right) + \& \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{party_exclusion_index}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}}) \right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.1.22.4 Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_opposition)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic_opposition

Original tag: v2xpas_economic_opposition

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1850, Percent: 6.59

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1850, Percent: 6.1

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are opposition parties located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Opposition Parties' Left-Right Index (OPLRI) ranges from approximately -4 to 4, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning opposition parties and higher values with more right-leaning opposition parties. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The OPLRI is a restricted version of the PSLRI index. It only captures the aggregated economic position levels for parties in the opposition. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The OPREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{OPREI}_{\text{PS}} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.1.22.5 Government Coalition Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic_government)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic_government

Original tag: v2xpas_economic_government

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox,

Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are parties in the governing coalition located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Government Coalition Left-Right Index (GCLRI) ranges from approximately -4 to 4, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning government coalitions and higher values with more right-leaning government coalitions. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The GCLRI is a restricted version of the PSLRI index. It only captures the aggregated economic position levels for parties in the government. The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The GCLRI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{GCLRI}_{\text{PS}} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} (\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.1.22.6 Party-System Left-Right Index (v2xpas_economic)

Long tag: vdem_cy_v2xpas_economic

Original tag: v2xpas_economic

Dataset citation: Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Grahn, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Krusell, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Medzihorsky, Natsika, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, von Römer, Seim, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wiebrecht, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Variable citation: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023), Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.79

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1626, Percent: 5.36

Lost observations in chosen unit: Sum: 0 Percent: 0

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: D
PROJECT MANAGER(S): Fabio Angiolillo
QUESTION: Where are parties in the party system located on their overall ideological stance on economic issues?
CLARIFICATION: The Party-System Left-Right Index (PSLRI) ranges from 0 to 1, where lower values are associated with more left-leaning party systems and higher values with more right-leaning party systems. As this index is calculated for country-election-year, we advise caution using it for years where a country does not have a general election (lower house).
SCALE: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
SOURCE(S): v2pariglef v2paseatshare v2pagovsup
NOTES: The PSLRI is calculated by using two V-Party indicators: (1) the economic left-right scale indicator for each political party in the party system (v2pariglef) and (2) the seat shares for each political party within that party system (v2paseatshare). Parties are further divided into those in the government (v2pagovsup = 0,1, or 2) or those in the opposition (v2pagovsup = 3). The symbol *ws* denotes the weight for the seatshare of the government coalition (*gp*) or opposition (*op*) for a given election-year (*t*).
DATA RELEASE: 14-16.
AGGREGATION: The PSREI is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{PSREI}_{\text{PS}} = \left[\left(\&\sum_{p=1}^{N}(\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{gpt}} \cdot ws_{\text{gpt}})\right) + \&\sum_{p=1}^{N}(\text{v2pariglef}_{\text{opt}} \cdot ws_{\text{opt}})\right]$$

DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates (V-Party v2 election dates).
CITATION: Angiolillo & Wiebrecht (2023); Coppedge, Gerring, Knutsen, Lindberg, Teorell, Altman, Angiolillo, Bernhard, Cornell, Fish, Fox, Gastaldi, Gjerløw, Glynn, Good God, Hicken, Kinzelbach, Marquardt, McMann, Mechkova, Neundorf, Paxton, Pemstein, Pernes, von Römer, Sigman, Skaaning, Staton, Sundström, Tannenberg, Tzelgov, Wang, Wig, Wilson & Ziblatt (2026) (see suggested citation at the top of this document).
YEARS: 1970-2019

6.2 V-Dem V-Party v2

Dataset tag: vdem_vparty

Output Unit: V-Dem Party-Country-Year, i.e., data is collected per party, country and year. That means each row in the dataset can be identified by a party and a country in combination with a date, using the columns v2paid and historical_date. To make the party Ids more comprehensive, we also include the party name (v2paenname) in the Output Unit.

Description: The V-Party dataset includes global data on Political Parties.

Dataset citation: Staffan I. Lindberg, Nils Düpont, Masaaki Higashijima, Yaman Berker Kavasoglu, Kyle L. Marquardt, Michael Bernhard, Holger Döring, Allen Hicken, Melis Laebens, Juraj

Medzihorsky, Anja Neundorf, Ora John Reuter, Saskia Ruth–Lovell, Keith R. Weghorst, Nina Wiese- homeier, Joseph Wright, Nazifa Alizada, Paul Bederke, Lisa Gastaldi, Sandra Grahn, Garry Hindle, Nina Ilchenko, Johannes von Römer, Steven Wilson, Daniel Pemstein, and Brigitte Seim. 2022. "Codebook Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V–Party) V2". Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project. https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2

and:

Lindberg, Staffan I., Nils Düpont, Masaaki Higashijima, Yaman Berker Kavasoglu, Kyle L. Marquardt, Michael Bernhard, Holger Döring, Allen Hicken, Melis Laebens, Juraj Medzihorsky, Anja Neundorf, Ora John Reuter, Saskia Ruth–Lovell, Keith R. Weghorst, Nina Wiesehomeier, Joseph Wright, Nazifa Alizada, Paul Bederke, Lisa Gastaldi, Sandra Grahn, Garry Hindle, Nina Ilchenko, Johannes von Römer, Steven Wilson, Daniel Pemstein, and Brigitte Seim. "Varieties of Party Identity and Organization (V–Party) Dataset V2." Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project, 2022. https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2.

and:

Pemstein, Daniel, Kyle. L. Marquardt, Eitan Tselgov, Yi–ting Wang, Juraj Medzihorsky, Joshua Krusell, Farhad Miri, and Johannes von Römer. 2020. "The V–Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross–National and Cross–Temporal Expert–Coded Data". V–Dem Working Paper No. 21. 5th edition. University of Gothenburg: Varieties of Democracy Institute

Link to original codebook
`https://v-dem.net/documents/6/vparty_codebook_v2.pdf`

License: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International
`https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode`

More detailed information on the dataset can be found at the following web page: `https://www.v-dem.net/vpartyds.html`

6.2.1 Party Identity

This section lists variables related to party identity and ideology.

6.2.1.1 Anti-elitism (v2paanteli)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paanteli

Original tag: v2paanteli

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1406, Percent: 4.64

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: How important is anti-elite rhetoric for this party?
CLARIFICATION: Elites are relatively small groups that have a greater say in society than others, for instance due to their political power, wealth or societal standing. The specific groups considered to be the elite may vary by country and even from party to party within the same country as do the terms used to describe them. In some cases, "elites" can also refer to an international elite.
RESPONSES:
0: Not at all important. The leadership of this party never makes statements against the elite.
1: Not important. The leadership of this party rarely makes statements against the elite.

2: Somewhat important. The leadership of this party sometimes makes statements against the elite.
3: Important. The leadership of this party often makes statements against the elite.
4: Very important. The leadership of this party makes statements against the elite whenever possible.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.1.2 Cultural Superiority (v2paculsup)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2paculsup

Original tag: v2paculsup

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1406, Percent: 4.64

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does the party leadership promote the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole?
CLARIFICATION: This question refers to key non-economic cleavages in society, which could, for example, be based on caste, ethnicity, language, race, region, religion, or some combination thereof. This question further refers to cultural issues related to the national history and identity of a country. This question does not pertain to social groups based on gender or sexual orientation.
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly promotes. The party strongly promotes the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
1: Promotes. The party promotes the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
2: Ambiguous. The party does not take a specific position on the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
3: Opposes. The party opposes the promotion of the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
4: Strongly opposes. The party strongly opposes the promotion of the cultural superiority of a specific social group or the nation as a whole.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.1.3 Working Women (v2pawomlab)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pawomlab

Original tag: v2pawomlab

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1406, Percent: 4.64

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr

QUESTION: To what extent does this party support the equal participation of women in the labor market?
CLARIFICATION: Measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market include - but are not limited to - legal provisions on equal treatment and pay, parental leave and financial support for child care.
RESPONSES:
0: Strongly opposes. This party strongly opposes all or almost all types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
1: Opposes. This party opposes most types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
2: Ambiguous/No position. This party has no clear policy with regard to measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
3: Supports. This party supports most types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
4: Strongly supports. This party strongly supports all or almost all types of measures that support the equal participation of women in the labor market.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.1.4 Economic Left-Right Scale (v2pariglef)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pariglef

Original tag: v2pariglef

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1406, Percent: 4.64

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: Please locate the party in terms of its overall ideological stance on economic issues.
CLARIFICATION: Parties on the economic left want government to play an active role in the economy. This includes higher taxes, more regulation and government spending and a more generous welfare state. 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.
RESPONSES:
0: Far-left.
1: Left.
2: Center-left.
3: Center.
4: Center-right.
5: Right.
6: Far-right.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.2 Party Organisation

This section lists variables related to how parties operate and are organised internally.

6.2.2.1 Affiliate Organizations (v2pasoctie)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pasoctie

Original tag: v2pasoctie

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1402, Percent: 4.62

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_osp, *_ord, *_codelow, *_codehigh, *_sd, *_mean, *_nr
QUESTION: To what extent does this party maintain ties to prominent social organizations?
CLARIFICATION: When evaluating the strength of ties between the party and social organizations please consider the degree to which social organizations contribute to party operations by providing material and personnel resources, propagating the party's message to its members and beyond, as well as by directly participating in the party's electoral campaign and/or mobilization efforts. Social organizations include: Religious organizations (e.g. churches, sects, charities), trade unions/syndical organizations or cooperatives, cultural and social associations (e.g. sports clubs, neighborhood associations), political associations (e.g. environmental protection) and professional and business associations. Social organizations do not include paramilitary units or militias.
RESPONSES:
0: The party does not maintain ties to any prominent social organization.
1: The party maintains weak ties to prominent social organizations.
2: The party maintains moderate ties to prominent social organizations.
3: The party maintains strong ties to prominent social organizations.
4: The party controls prominent social organizations.
DATA RELEASE: 10-12.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Bayesian item response theory measurement model (see *V–Dem Methodology*).
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.2.2 Party Resources (v2pafunds_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pafunds_nr

Original tag: v2pafunds_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1403, Percent: 4.63

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: What were the major sources of party funds for this election campaign?
CLARIFICATION: Choose up to three most important ones. If a main source of funding for this campaign
comes from the party's assets such as properties and stocks, please code where these assets originally came from.
RESPONSES:
0: Formal state subsidies for political parties. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_0]
1: Large-scale donations from individuals. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_1]
2: Large-scale donations from companies. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_2]
3: Large-scale donations from civil society organizations (including trade unions). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_3]
4: Membership fees and small-scale supporters' donations. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_4] 5: Informal use of state resources as incumbent party. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_5]

6: Funds of the party leader. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_6]
7: Funds of candidates. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pafunds_7]
SOURCE(S): Quality of Government Standard Dataset (2019).
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

6.2.2.3 Party Support Group (v2pagroup_nr)

Long tag: vdem_vparty_v2pagroup_nr

Original tag: v2pagroup_nr

Dataset citation: Lindberg et al. (2022)

Merge scores:

Non-missing observations in original unit: Sum: 0, Percent: 0

Non-missing observations in chosen unit: Sum: 1403, Percent: 4.63

Description:

VARIABLE TYPE: C
ADDITIONAL VERSIONS: *_nr
QUESTION: To which particular group in society does the core membership and supporters of this party belong?
CLARIFICATION: Choose only the key groups. Though you may choose up to three groups, if only one
group is most relevant, please only choose that group.
RESPONSES: 0: No specific, clearly identifiable group. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_0]
1: The aristocracy, including high status hereditary social groups and castes. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_1]
2: Agrarian elites, including rich peasants and large landholders. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_- 2]
3: Business elites. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_3]
4: The military. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_4]
5: An ethnic or racial group(s). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_5]
6: A religious group(s). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_6]
7: Local elites, including customary chiefs. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_7]
8: Urban working classes, including labor unions. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_8]
9: Urban middle classes. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_9]
10: Rural working classes (e.g., peasants). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_10]
11: Rural middle classes (e.g., family farmers). (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_11]
12: Regional groups or separatists. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_12]
13: Women. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_13]
14: Other specific groups. (0=No, 1=Yes) [v2pagroup_14]
DATA RELEASE: 1-2.
CROSS-CODER AGGREGATION: Mean
DATE SPECIFIC: Election-specific dates.

7 Bibliography

Ahir, H., Bloom, N. & Furceri, D. (2022), 'The world uncertainty index'. NBER Working Papers 29763.
URL: *https://worlduncertaintyindex.com/*

Allie Funk and Kian Vesteinsson and Grant Baker (n.d.), 'Freedom on the net 2024: The repressive power of artificial intelligence'.
URL: *http://freedomonthenet.org*

Alvaredo, F., Atkinson, A. B., Piketty, T. & Saez, E. (2024), 'World inequality database'.
URL: *http://wid.world/data*

Andersson, Per F. and Brambor, Thomas (2019), 'Financing the state: Government tax revenue from 1800 to 2012. version 2.0'.
URL: *https://www.perfandersson.com/data*

Angiolillo, F. & Wiebrecht, F. (2023), 'From Individual Parties to Party Systems: A New Approach to Calculate Systems' Variabels', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* (146).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp146.pdf*

Bayer, Markus and Rohleder, Paul (2022), *Global Militarization Index 2022*, Bonn International Center for Conversion BICC.
URL: *https://gmi.bicc.de/*

Bergman, Torbjörn, G. I. & Hellström, J. (2024), 'Coalition politics in central eastern europe: Governing in times of crisis', *London: Routledge.* . REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.
URL: *https://repdem.org*

Bergman, Torbjörn, H. B. & Hellström, J. (2021), 'Coalition governance in western europe.', *Oxford: Oxford University Press.* . REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.
URL: *https://repdem.org*

Bernhard, M., Jung, D.-J., Tzelgov, E., Coppedge, M. & Lindberg, S. I. (2017), 'Making Embedded Knowledge Transparent: How the V-Dem Dataset Opens New Vistas in Civil Society Research', *Perspectives on Politics* **15**(2), 342–360.
URL: *https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/making-embedded-knowledge-transparent-how-the-vdem-dataset-opens-new-vistas-in-civil-society-research/D5888FCFA89BE17A508194E4EF6C77AE*

Bjørnskov, C. & Rode, M. (2020), 'Regime types and regime change: A new dataset on democracy, coups, and political institutions', *Review of International Organizations* **15**, 531–551.

Bolt, J. & van Zanden, J. L. (2020), 'Maddison project database, version 2020'. Maddison style estimates of the evolution of the world economy: A new 2020 update.
URL: *https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/historicaldevelopment/maddison/research*

Bolt, J. & van Zanden, J. L. (2024), 'Maddison style estimates of the evolution of the world economy: A new 2023 update', *Journal of Economic Surveys* pp. 1–41. MPD version 2023.
URL: *https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/joes.12618*

Boräng, F., Felgendreher, S., Harring, N. & Löfgren, (2019), 'Committing to the climate: a global study of accountable climate targets', *Sustainability* **11**(7), 1861.

Bäck, H., Teorell, J., Von Hagen-Jamar, A. & Quiroz Flores, A. (2021), 'War, performance, and the survival of foreign ministers', *Foreign Policy Analysis* **17**(2).

Bättig, M. B., Brander, S. & Imboden, D. M. (2008), 'Measuring countries' cooperation within the international climate change regime', *Environmental Science & Policy* **11**(6), 478–489.

Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E. & Zucman, G. (2022), 'World inequality report 2022'.
URL: *http://wid.world/*

Charron, N., Dahlberg, S., Sundström, A., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Alvarado Pachon, N. & Dalli, C. M. (2020), 'The quality of government: Eu regional dataset, version nov20', *University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www. gu. se/en/quality-government* .

Charron, N., Dijkstra, L. & Lapuente, V. (2014), 'Regional governance matters: Quality of government within european union member states', *Regional Studies* **48**(1), 68–90.

Charron, N., Lapuente, V. & Annoni, P. (2019), 'Measuring quality of government in eu regions across space and time', *Papers in Regional Science* **98**(5), 1925–1953.

Charron, N., Lapuente, V. & Bauhr, M. (2021), 'Sub-national quality of government in eu member states: Presenting the 2021 european quality of government index and its relationship with covid-19 indicators', *The QoG Working Paper Series* (2021:4).

Charron, N., Lapuente, V. & Bauhr, M. (2024), 'The geography of quality of government in europe. subnational variations in the 2024 european quality of government index and comparisons with previous rounds', *QoG Working Paper Series. ISSN 1653-8919* (2).

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Grahn, S., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Krusell, J., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Medzihorsky, J., Natsika, N., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., von Römer, J., Seim, B., Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wiebrecht, F., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-dem country-year dataset v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Angiolillo, F., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Fox, L., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., Neundorf, A., Paxton, P., Pemstein, D., Pernes, J., von Römer, Johannes Seim, B., Sigman, R., Skaaning, S.-E., Staton, J., Sundström, A., Tannenberg, M., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Wig, T., Wilson, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2026), 'V-Dem Codebook v16'. V-Dem is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.

Coppedge, M., Lindberg, S., Skaaning, S.-E. & Teorell, J. (2015), 'Measuring High Level Democratic Principles using the V-Dem Data', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2015**(6).
URL: *https://www.v-dem.net/media/publications/v-dem_working_paper_2015_6.pdf*

Dahlström, C., Holmgren, M., Björkdahl, C., Hazell, K., Khomenko, A., Svensson, R. & Åberg, P. (2018), 'Swedish administrative agencies, 1960-2014'.

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022), 'United nations e-government survey'.
URL: *https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Reports/UN-E-Government-Survey-2022*

Donner, S., Hartmann, H., Härterich, C. & Steinkamp, S. (2020), *Transformation Index of the Bertelsmann Stiftung 2020*, Bertelsmann Stiftung.
URL: *http://www.bti-project.org*

Donner, S., Hartmann, H. & Steinkamp, S. (2024), *Transformation Index BTI 2024: Governance in International Comparison*, Bertelsmann Stiftung.
URL: *http://www.bti-project.org*

Dreher, A. (2006), 'Does globalization affect growth? evidence from a new index of globalization', *Applied Economics* **38**(10), 1091–1110.

Duit, A., Sommerer, T. & Lim, S. (2023), 'The grace v.2.0 data set', *Department of Political Science, Stockholm University* . Funding for GRACE data was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (Dnr 2012-05514, 2021-00162_VR) and the Marcus and Marianne Wallenberg Foundation (Dnr 2017-0087).

Elkins, Z. & Ginsburg, T. (2021), 'Characteristics of national constitutions, version 3.0'. Last modified: May 20, 2021. Available at comparativeconstitutionsproject.org.
URL: *http://www.comparativeconstitutionsproject.org*

Elkins, Z. & Ginsburg, T. (2025), 'Characteristics of National Constitutions, Version 5.0'.
URL: *https://comparativeconstitutionsproject.org/download-data/*

Emanuele, V., Angelucci, D., Marino, B., Puleo, L. & Vegetti, F. (2020), 'The congealing of a new cleavage? the evolution of the demarcation bloc in europe (1979–2019)', *Italian Political Science Review* pp. 1–20.

European Commission (2024), 'Eurostat'.
URL: *http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database*

EVS (2020), 'European Values Study 2017: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2017)'.
URL: *https://doi.org/10.4232/1.13560*

Feenstra, R. C., Inklaar, R. & Timmer, M. P. (2015), 'The next generation of the penn world table', *The American Economic Review* **105**(10), 3150–3182.
URL: *www.ggdc.net/pwt*

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2021), 'Aquastat database'. Date accessed: 10 June 2021.
URL: *http://www.fao.org/aquastat/statistics/query/index.html*

Forman-Rabinovici, A. & Sommer, U. (2018), 'Reproductive health policymakers: Comparing the influences of international and domestic institutions on abortion policy', *Public Administration* **96**(1), 185–199.

Freedom House (2017), 'Freedom of the press 2017'.
URL: *https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/freedom-press-2017*

Freedom House (2024), 'Freedom in the world 2024'.
URL: *https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world*

Garriga, A. C. (2025), 'Revisiting central bank independence in the world: An extended dataset', *International Studies Quarterly* .
URL: *http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4816563*

Gerring, J., Nong, X., Chatterton, B., Cojocaru, L., Dalli, C. M., Knutsen, C. H., Kokkonen, A., Smith, D. S., Teorell, J., Selsky, S., Ward, D. & Jeon, J. Y. (2024), Leader tenure through the ages: The growth of constraints. Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin.

Gleditsch, K. S. (2002), 'Expanded trade and GDP data (version 6.0)', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* **46**(5), 712–724.

Global Integrity and African Institute for Development Policy (2024), 'Africa integrity indicators 2014-2024'.
URL: *https://www.africaintegrityindicators.org/*

Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment & Sabin Center for Climate Change Law (2021), 'Climate change laws of the world database'. Date accessed: 7 June 2021.
URL: *climate-laws.org*

Gwartney, J., Lawson, R., Hall, J. & Murphy, R. (2024), 'Economic Freedom Dataset, published in Economic Freedom of the World: 2024 Annual Report', *Fraser Institute* .
URL: *https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/dataset*

Heichel, S., Holzinger, K., Sommerer, T., Liefferink, D., Pape, J. & Veenman, S. (2008), Research design, variables and data, *in* K. Holzinger, C. Knill & H. Jörgens, eds, 'Environmental Policy Convergence in Europe: The Impact of International Institutions and Trade', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 64–97. Date accessed: 24 March 2020.
URL: *https://www.polver.uni-konstanz.de/en/holzinger/research/research-projects/enviromental-policy-convergence-in-europe-envipolcon/project-deliverables/*

Helbling, M., Abou-Chadi, T., Berger, V., Bjerre, L., Breyer, M., Römer, F. & Zobel, M. (2024), 'IMPIC Database v2', *Immigration Policies in Comparison Project.* . Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Hellström, J., Bergman, T., Lindahl, J., Bäck, H., Ilonszki, G., Müller, W. C. & Strøm, K. (2025), 'Party government in europe database (paged) – coalition governance in central eastern and western europe dataset, version 2024.12'. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Hellström, J., Bergman, T., Lindahl, J. & Gustafsson, E. K. (2026), 'The representative democracy data archive (repdem) – basic dataset, version 2026.02'. REPDEM is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council. Available on `https://repdem.org`.

Henisz, W. J. (2017), 'The Political Constraint Index (POLCON) Dataset 2017 release'.
URL: *https://mgmt.wharton.upenn.edu/profile/1327*

Hollyer, J. R., Rosendorff, B. P. & Vreeland, J. R. (2014), 'Measuring transparency', *Political Analysis* **22**(4), 413–434.

Holzinger, K., Knill, C. & Sommerer, T. (2011), 'Is there convergence of national environmental policies? an analysis of policy outputs in 24 oecd countries', *Environmental politics* **20**(1), 20–41. Date accessed: 23 July 2020.
URL: *https://www.polver.uni-konstanz.de/holzinger/research/research-projects/policy-wandel-in-der-umweltpolitik-der-einfluss-von-nationalen-vetospielern-und-transnationalem-policy-learning/der-datensatz-environmental-policy-chance-envipolchange/*

Hyde, S. D. & Marinov, N. (2021), 'Codebook for national elections across democracy and autocracy dataset, 5.0'.
URL: *https://nelda.co/*

ICTD/UNU-WIDER (2022), 'Government revenue dataset'. Version 2022.
URL: *https://www.wider.unu.edu/project/government-revenue-dataset*

Institute for Economics and Peace (2022), 'Global peace index 2022: Measuring peace in a complex world'. Accessed 01-09-2022.
URL: *http://visionofhumanity.org/resources*

International Monetary Fund (2024), 'Government finance statistics - expenditure by function of government (cofog)'.
URL: *https://data.imf.org/?sk=a0867067-d23c-4ebc-ad23-d3b015045405*

ISSP Research Group (2003), 'International social survey programme: Environment ii - issp 2000', GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA3440 Data file Version 1.0.0, https://doi.org/10.4232/1.3440. Date accessed: 17 February 2016.

Kaufmann, D. & Kraay, A. (n.d.), 'Worldwide governance indicators, 2024 update'. Accessed on 2024-11-19.
URL: *www.govindicators.org*

Kuncic, A. (2014), 'Institutional quality dataset', *Journal of Institutional Economics* **10**(01), 135–161.

Lindberg, S. I., Düpont, N., Higashijima, M., Kavasoglu, Y. B., Marquardt, K. L., Bernhard, M., Döring, H., Hicken, A., Laebens, M., Medzihorsky, J., Neundorf, A., Reuter, O. J., Ruth–Lovell, S., Weghorst, K. R., Wiesehomeier, N., Wright, J., Alizada, N., Bederke, P., Gastaldi, L., Grahn, S., Hindle, G., Ilchenko, N., von Römer, J., Wilson, S., Pemstein, D. & Seim, B. (2022), 'Varieties of party identity and organization (v–party) dataset v2', *Varieties of Democracy (V–Dem) Project* .
URL: *https://doi.org/10.23696/vpartydsv2*

LIS Cross-National Data Center in Luxembourg (2024), 'Lis inequality and poverty key figures'. Accessed on 2024-11-14.
URL: *https://www.lisdatacenter.org/download-key-figures/*

Mark, S., Cingranelli, D., Filippov, M. & Richards, D. L. (2023), 'The cirights data project scoring manual v2.11.06.23 (november 6, 2023)'. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4625036 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4625036.

Marshall, M. G. & Elzinga-Marshall, G. (2017), 'Global report 2017: Conflict, governance, and state fragility'.

Nelson, K., Fredriksson, D., Korpi, T., Korpi, W., Palme, J. & Sjöberg, O. (2020), 'The social policy indicators (spin) database', *International Journal of Social Welfare* **29**(3), 285–289. Funding for the SPIN database was provided by grants from Riksbankens jubileumsfond (In10-0846:1, IN18-0897:1) and the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162).

Ocean Health Index (2024), 'ohi-global version: Global scenarios data for ocean health index'. ohi-global version 2024. Date accessed: 9 January 2025.
URL: *https://github.com/OHI-Science/ohi-global/releases*

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*a*), 'Environmentally adjusted multifactor productivity'. Date accessed: 13 May 2020.
URL: *oe.cd/eamfp*

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*b*), 'Green growth indicators database'. Date accessed: 23 August 2020.
URL: *https://stats.oecd.org/*

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2020*c*), 'Policy instruments for the environment (pine)'. Date accessed: 13 May 2020.
URL: *oe.cd/pine*

Pedroza, L., Palop-García, P. & Chang, S. Y. (2022), 'IMISEM Codebook (version 3.0)', German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA). Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Pemstein, D., Marquardt, K. L., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y., Medzihorsky, J., Krusell, J., Miri, F. & von Römer, J. (2026), 'The V-Dem Measurement Model: Latent Variable Analysis for Cross-National and Cross-Temporal Expert-Coded Data', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2026**(21, 11th edition).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/wp21_2026.pdf*

Pemstein, D., Marquardt, K. L., Tzelgov, E., Wang, Y.-t., Medzihorsky, J., Krusell, J., Miri, F. & von Römer, J. (2023), 'The v-dem measurement model: Latent variable analysis for cross-national and cross-temporal expert-coded data', `https://v-dem.net/wp.html`,.

PETERS, M., Borang, F., Kalm, S., Lindvall, J. & Shin, A. (2024), 'Historical Immigration Policy dataset (HIP)'. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).
URL: *https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/F7V8YL*

Povitkina, M., Alvarado Pachon, N. & Dalli, C. M. (2021), 'The quality of government environmental indicators dataset, version sep21', *University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government* .

Redonda, A., von Haldenwang, C. & Aliu, F. (2024), 'Global tax expenditures database (gted), version 1.3.0'.
URL: *https://gted.taxexpenditures.org/*

Reporters sans frontières (2024), 'World press freedom index'.
URL: *https://rsf.org/en/index*

Romelli, D. (2024), 'Trends in central bank independence: a de-jure perspective', *BAFFI CAREFIN Centre Research Paper* (217).

Ross, M. & Mahdavi, P. (2015), 'Oil and gas data, 1932-2014'.
URL: *http://dx.doi.org/10.7910/DVN/ZTPW0Y*

Römer, F., Harris, E., Henninger, J. & Missler, F. (2021), 'The immigrant social rights data set (immigsr)'. Version 2023. SFB 1342. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).
URL: *https://www.socialpolicydynamics.de/projekte/projektbereich-b-transregionale-entwicklungsdynamiken/teilprojekt-b04-2022-25-/immigsr/download-immigsr-data*

Schiller, C. & Hellmann, T. (2024), 'Sustainable governance indicators 2024', *Bertelsmann Stiftung* . Date accessed: 18 January 2025.
URL: *https://www.sgi-network.org*

Sigman, R. & Lindberg, S. I. (2015), 'The Index of Egalitarian Democracy and its Components: V-Dem's Conceptualization and Measurement', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2015**(22).
URL: *http://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2727612*

Sigman, R. & Lindberg, S. I. (2017), 'Neopatrimonialism and Democracy: An Empirical Investigation of Africa's Political Regimes', *V-Dem Working Paper Series* **2017**(56).
URL: *https://v-dem.net/media/publications/v-dem_working_paper_2017_56.pdf*

Solano, G. & Huddelston, T. (2020), 'Migrant Integration Policy Index', Migration Policy Group & CIDOB. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Sundström, A., Paxton, P., Wang, Y.-T. & Lindberg, S. I. (2017), 'Women's Political Empowerment: A New Global Index, 1900–2012', *World Development* **94**, 321–335.
URL: *https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X17300323*

Teorell, J., Sundström, A., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Alvarado Pachon, N., Phiri, V. S., Chen, C. & Liu, Z. (2026), *The Quality of Government Standard Dataset, version Jan26.* QoG Data is part of and funded by DEMSCORE, national research infrastructure grant 2021-00162 from the Swedish Research Council.
URL: *https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government*

The Growth Lab at Harvard University (2019), 'Growth projections and complexity rankings'.

The PRS Group et al. (2025), 'International country risk guide'.

The World Bank (2021), 'Worldwide bureacracy indicators version 2.0'.
URL: *https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/migrationremittancesdiasporaissues/brief/migration-remittances-data*

United Nations Development Program (2024), 'Human development report 2023/2024'.
URL: *https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2023-24*

Vink, M., van der Baaren, L., Bauböck, R., Džankić, J., Honohan, I. & Manby, B. (2023), 'GLOBALCIT Citizenship Law Dataset, v2.0', Global Citizenship Observatory. Funding for MIGPOL was provided by grants from the Swedish Research Council (2021-00162_VR).

Wendling, Z. A., Emerson, J. W., de Sherbinin, A., Esty, D. C., Hoving, K., Ospina, C., Murray, J., Gunn, L., Ferrato, M., Schreck, M. et al. (2020), 'Environmental performance index', *New Haven, CT: Yale Center for Environmental Law And Policy* .

Williams, A. (2015), 'A global index of information transparency and accountability', *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**(3), 804–824.

Wolf, M., Emerson, J. W., Esty, D. C., de Sherbinin, A. & Wendling, Z. A., e. a. (2022), '2022 environmental performance index', *New Haven, CT: Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy* . Date accessed: 17 October 2022.
URL: *epi.yale.edu*

World Bank (2024), 'World development indicators'.
URL: *https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators*

World Economic Forum (2024), 'The global gender gap report 2024'. All Rights Reserved.
URL: *https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-gender-gap-report-2024/*

World Justice Project (2023), 'WJP Rule of Law Index 2022'.
URL: *https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/*

World Resource Institute & the Access Initiative (2015), 'Environmental democracy index'. Date accessed: 8 February 2021.
URL: *https://environmentaldemocracyindex.org/*