

Appendix 1

The Political Party Database Round 2

Most of the data for this article come from the Political Party Database Round 2 (PPDB R2), which was released to the public in January 2022. The data and full documentation can be found at https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/Political_Party_Database/

The PPDB project is a collaborative cross-national data collection, supported by the volunteer efforts of hundreds of researchers from around the globe. Members of the PPDB team are committed to facilitating and producing cross-national comparative studies of political parties and their political roles and impacts.

The project's data collecting dimensions were established at a June 2011 meeting at the European University Institute in Florence, sponsored by the European Consortium for Political Research. Participants at this meeting included Ingrid van Biezen, Petr Kopecký, Ruud Koole, Peter Mair, Thomas Poguntke, Susan Scarrow and Paul Webb. The data collection template was finalized in a series of consultations with the Round 1 data collection team (for more on Round 1, see Poguntke, Scarrow, Webb et al 2016). The variables in the data set report on three general areas: party operational rules, party resources, and party decision-making practices. The operational variables code the “official story” version of party life, as reported in party statutes and other documents and on party websites. The decision-making variables report on the processes actually used in specific decisions, regardless of whether these followed the published rules. The 396 variables collected for Round 2 mostly replicate the Round 1 variables, thus maximizing their value for providing a picture of longitudinal change. The main exceptions to this are for the variables covering party decision-making variables, which include more forced-choice options in Round 2.

PPDB R2 covers parties in 51 countries. Whereas Round 1 focussed primarily on established parliamentary democracies, and intentionally built on the country selection in the Katz/Mair Handbook project (1992), Round 2 prioritized a much broader set of countries in terms of institutional arrangements, age of democracy, and geographic region. Most countries included in the second round fulfilled the highest standards for electoral democracies at the moment when the data were collected, but the R2 release includes several countries with regular party-based elections that do not meet these criteria (for example, Columbia, Ecuador, Malawi and Mexico).¹ Including these countries helps in testing the applicability of the variables and the feasibility of data collection in a wider range of regimes, and sheds light on politics in those specific countries. However, researchers wishing to focus solely on parties in democratic societies may wish to exclude these and other cases that do not meet their preferred criteria for full electoral democracy.

For most countries the data covers all parties represented in the lower house of the national legislature at the time when the data were collected. However, because the number of parties in each country varies widely, data collectors in each country could choose which parties to include based on their own data collection resources. For some countries the selection includes parties that did not hold legislative seats at the point when the data were collected. Round 2 data were

¹ According to Freedom House scores for 2017.

collected from 2017-2020 and cover rules and events immediately prior to the data collection (roughly 2014-2020).

Table A1 lists the team leaders for all the Round 2 data collection. The PPDB website country pages provide a full lists of team members: www.politicalpartydb.org

The coordination of this research was generously supported by grants from (DFG grant No. PO 370/11-1, ESRC grant ES/170383, NSF grant no. 1419401), and also benefitted from support from our respective universities. Many of the country teams received research support from other sources; these are listed on the PPDB web page. In addition, we wish to acknowledge the dedicated research assistants at Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf, the University of Houston, and Sussex University who helped with data management tasks: Simon Brause, Burak Giray, Samad Karimov, Sophie Karow, Pauline Marquardt, Jonathan Parker and Jamie Wright.

References:

Katz, Richard S., and Peter Mair, eds. *Party organizations: a data handbook on party organizations in western democracies, 1960-90*. SAGE Publications Limited, 1992.

Poguntke, Thomas, Susan E. Scarrow, Paul D. Webb, et al. "Party rules, party resources and the politics of parliamentary democracies: How parties organize in the 21st century." *Party politics* 22, no. 6 (2016): 661-678.

Appendix Table 1

Country & Country Team Leader(s)

Australia	Anika Gauja	Lithuania	Gintaras Sumskas
Austria	Laurenz Ennser-Jedenastik	Malawi	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Belgium	Thomas Legein, Emilie van Haute	Mexico	Fátima García Díez
Botswana	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood	Namibia	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Brazil	Fátima García Díez	Netherlands	Ruud Koole, Gerrit Voerman
Bulgaria	Ekaterina Rashkova-Gerbrands	Nigeria	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Burkina Faso	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood	Norway	Elin H. Allern
Canada	William Cross	Peru	Aldo Ponce
Chile	Fátima García Díez	Poland	Wojciech Gagattek, Anna Paczesniak
Colombia	Laura Wills-Otero	Portugal	Marina Costa-Lobo, Isabella Razuolli
Croatia	Dario Nikić Čakar, Goran Cular	Romania	Gabriela Borz
Czech Republic (Czechia)	Petr Kopecký	Serbia	Dušan Spasojević, Vuk Vukovic
Denmark	Karina Kosiara-Pedersen	Slovakia	Kevin Deegan-Krause, Marek Rybar
Ecuador	Diana Davila Gordillo, Sebastian Vallejo Vera	South Africa	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Estonia	Martin Mölder	South Korea	Yea Ji Kim
Finland	Vesa Koskimaa, Tapio Raunio	Spain	Javier Astudillo, Tania Verge Mestre
France	Elodie Fabre	Sweden	Nicholas Aylott, Niklas Bolin
Germany	Thomas Poguntke	Switzerland	Oscar Mazzoleni
Greece	Giorgos Charalambous, Costas Eleftheriou	Taiwan	Alex Tan, Ching-hsin Yu
Hungary	Zsolt Enyedi	Tanzania	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Ireland	Conor Little	Uganda	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Israel	Gideon Rahat	UK	Paul D. Webb
Italy	Enrico Calossi, Eugenio Pizzimenti	USA	Andrea Aldrich
Japan	Takayoshi Uekami	Zambia	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Kenya	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood	Zimbabwe	Matthias Krönke, Sarah Lockwood
Latvia	Janis Ikstens		

Thanks also to other team members who assisted with data collection. For a full listing, see the country pages on www.politicalpartydb.org.

Appendix 2: PPDB variables used in analysis

B22CANSELC - Candidate selection process: individual members selecting/deciding (1=yes, 0=no)

B27CANSELC - Candidate selection process: non-members can select/decide (1= yes, 0=no)

B45PRESSELC – Presidential candidate selection process: individual members can select/decide (1=yes, 0=no)

B50PRESSELC – Presidential candidate selection process: non-members can select/decide (1=yes, 0=no)

C40PLSELC – Political leader selection process: individual members can select/decide (1=yes, 0=no)

C45PLSELC – Political leader selection process: non-members can select/decide (1=yes, 0=no)

C81ELSELC – Electoral leader selection process: individual members can select/decide (1=yes, 0=no)

C86ELSELC – Electoral leader selection process: non-members can select/decide (1= yes, 0=no)

C1REF1 - Party statutes provide for the possibility of holding an intra-party ballot of members to decide a policy issue (1=yes, 0=no)

C8REF8 According to the statutes, which of the following are eligible to vote in intra-party policy ballots? (1=Members, 0=Other)

C8REF8 According to the statutes, which of the following are eligible to vote in these intra-party policy ballots? (1=Non-Members, 0=Other). NB: ‘1’ includes following categories from original coding: Members plus other registered supporters; All eligible voters; All who are interested, including some who may not be eligible to vote in national elections (e.g., young people under the voting age, or non-citizen residents).

C40PLVT1 Was there a vote (advisory or binding) at the most inclusive stage of the leadership selection process? (1=yes, 0=no)

C40PLVT2 Were party members eligible to cast a ballot as part of the leadership selection process? (1=yes, 0=no)

C41PLVT2 Were non-members eligible to cast a ballot as part of the leadership selection process? (1=yes, 0=no)

C52PLTO If there was a ballot of party members to decide political leader, turnout as a share of party members, if party provides the information this way. Participation numbers are for the most inclusive stage of voting for party leadership selection, and for the first round if there was more than one ballot. [Percentage]

C53PLCAN1 Number of political leader candidates

C54PLVOT1A Percentage of votes received by first placed candidate in political leader contest

C55PLVOT1B Percentage of votes received by second placed candidate in political leader contest

C80ELVT1 Was there a vote (advisory or binding) at the most inclusive stage of the electoral leadership selection process? (1=yes, 0=no)

C92ELTO If there was a ballot of party members to decide electoral leader, turnout as a share of party members, if party provides the information this way. Participation numbers are for the most inclusive stage of voting for party leadership selection, and for the first round if there was more than one ballot. [Percentage]

C93ELCAN1 Number of electoral leader candidates (where electoral leader is separate from political leader)

C94ELVOT1A Percentage of votes received by first-place candidate

C95ELVOT1B Percentage of votes received by second-place candidate

C104MAN5 Role of party congress delegates in formulating election manifesto.

C105MAN6 Role of party members in election manifesto (1=vote/vote & formal input, 0=neither)

C106MAN7 Role of non-member party supporters (1=vote/vote & formal input, 0=neither)