

**“Introduction”  
and  
“Chapter 8: Czech Republic”**

**Sample chapters from the**

***Inventory of Political Attitude and Behaviour Surveys in East Central  
Europe and the former Soviet Union 1989-1997***  
**by Gábor Tóka**

**Edwin Ferger Verlag, 2000  
ISBN 3-931219-12-7**

## **Contents**

**Foreword by Jan W van Deth (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research)**

**Acknowledgements**

**Introduction**

**List of Data Archives**

**Study Descriptions**

1. Albania
2. Armenia
3. Azerbaijan
4. Belarus
5. Bosnia-Herzegovina
6. Bulgaria
7. Croatia
8. Czech Republic
9. Czechoslovakia
10. Estonia
11. Georgia
12. Hungary
13. Kazakhstan
14. Kyrgyzstan
15. Latvia
16. Lithuania
17. Macedonia
18. Moldova
19. Poland
20. Romania
21. Russia
22. Slovakia
23. Slovenia
24. Soviet Union
25. Tajikistan
26. Ukraine
27. Uzbekistan
28. Yugoslavia

**Bibliographical References in the Study Descriptions**

**Directory of Contact Addresses**

## **Introduction**

### **The aims of the catalogue**

Few events of human history attracted so much attention among political attitude and behaviour researchers as the transformation of East European communist systems into some sort of capitalist democracy - or something else. Within an extremely short period of time, 27 independent countries embarked upon a previously untried path of regime transformation that was bound to be exceptionally consequential.

No wonder that social scientists were fascinated not only by the complexity and interaction of the political, economic, social and cultural changes taking shape in front of their eyes, but also by the unusual opportunity to study them in cross-national comparison. Even less surprising was the enthusiasm of East European researchers for the hitherto forbidden fruit of exploring political orientations among their fellow citizens. Doing surveys in Eastern Europe in the 1990s was relatively cheap, and the returns in terms of well publicised publications potentially high.

One valuable consequence of this situation was the production of a vast number of data sets. Yet most have remained unknown for the many social scientists and graduate students who would like to utilise East European survey data in their own research, but either cannot undertake an original data collection, or would like to see what is already out there before deciding on what topics to concentrate on, what questions to replicate, and which ones to avoid in their own data collection.

This book offers an overview of accessible survey data on political attitudes and behaviour in East Central Europe and the former Soviet Union between 1990 and 1997, occasionally featuring data sets from 1988-89 and 1998 as well. This large body of - often cross-nationally comparable and/or longitudinal - data are, in principle, all available for secondary analyses, and the book explains how they can be accessed with negligible or relatively minor investment of time, money, and effort.

Some of the data sets described in this catalogue have never been deposited in a public data archive. The bulk of them are reasonably well protected in lesser known East European archives, but lack documentation in other languages than those of the interviews. A small portion of these data sets arrived - or are on their way - to highly visible Western data archives, but have escaped the attention of the scholarly community so far. In either case, following up the clues provided here will not only be an extremely cost-efficient mode of data collection, but will help preserving valuable historical documents that - inadequately protected from failures of human or organisational memory and other sources of potential damage - might otherwise perish in some *ad hoc* archives.

### **Information sources and principles of selection**

The data for this catalogue were collected at the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research in the summer of 1996 and 1997, while the author was working there as a guest researcher on the project that eventually yielded this publication. Apart from a mail survey of - and extensive correspondence with - a snowball sample of people who were believed to have done relevant research, study descriptions stored at

the Zentralarchiv and other public and private archives, plus Franklin, Scarrow and Shephard's (1993) booklet served as information sources.

Reasons of space prevent the presentation of all information obtained during the search. The studies covered are general population or elite surveys featuring at least some questions on political behaviour and attitudes that are relevant for theoretically oriented political or social research. Some studies were excluded from the catalogue because their sampling frame and methods were not identifiable, or the sampled population was not easily defined in terms relevant for social and political theory. While the threshold of relevance is always hard to draw and easy to contest, in practice all surveys were excluded that sampled just a few localities or a single occupational category - like several surveys of enterprise managers that are available from the Estonian Social Science Data Archive or the Social Monitoring Centre in Kyiv, the excellent surveys of the student population by Prof. Ivan Cifric in Zagreb, or the Tallinn-based Ethnopolity Working Group's surveys of retired Soviet military officers and EU-experts in Estonia. However, political elite surveys and political socialisation surveys of young people are still included, as are surveys of regions that can be defined in terms that have unambiguous political relevance - like the Serb Republic within Bosnia-Herzegovina - or a parallel survey of managers and employees in Poland.

While a rigorous assessment of questionnaire and research design as well as fieldwork and sampling procedures was usually not possible on the basis of the available information, everything possible was done to assure that only such data sets are described here that were collected by reliable, professional organisations. During the search for new information some priority was given to cross-national and longitudinal studies. No distinction was made, however, between surveys commissioned by domestic and foreign, private and public, or nominally academic and non-academic organisations. The catalogue does not report on those studies that are unambiguously unavailable for secondary analyses, or about which information is widely available from accessible sources mentioned later in this chapter.

During the information search carried out at the MZES, the focus fell primarily on the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia. However, because of the stunning cross-national variation in response rate to our mail questionnaire, the catalogue has a far more exhaustive coverage of the relevant studies in Belarus, the Czech Republic and Yugoslavia than in Hungary or Poland. While the shortest chapters in the catalogue usually deal with countries where relatively little seems to have been done by survey researchers (Albania, Macedonia, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and the exceptional case of Turkmenistan where we could trace no sign of survey research), our coverage seems to be the least exhaustive in the cases of Croatia and Russia.

### **The structure of the data catalogue**

The catalogue is divided into country chapters. Separate country chapters are devoted to the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia on the one hand, and their constituent parts (fission products) on the other. The chapter on Yugoslavia covers both all-Yugoslav surveys from before the break-up of the federation in 1991, and later surveys in the so called small Yugoslavia, i.e. Serbia and Montenegro.

Unlike the *Inventory of National Election Studies in Europe, 1945-1995*, this volume presents data that, for most of the time, were assembled specifically for this book. For this reason some deviations were necessary from that predecessor volume in the kind of information presented. Some new fields were added to the study descriptions (e.g. on the source of the information presented or the way the data can be accessed), while others (e.g. number of variables and cards, weighting) were eliminated for lack of data.

The original responses to the mail questionnaire sent out from the MZES were extensively edited and often rephrased so as to eliminate at least part of the confusion that might stem from the obscure or idiosyncratic terminology used by some sources. To save space, the information on multiple surveys by the same organisation was often condensed into a single catalogue entry. Some repetition does occur in the catalogue, however, because cross-national studies appear as a separate entry in the chapter on each country where they were carried out.

Most fields that are used to describe the individual studies have self-explanatory names: Title of Study, Topics, Principal Investigator, Data Collector, Dates of Data Collection, Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures, Number of Cases, Publications, Availability of Data Sets, Source of Information. Where available, the field titled "Comparability" provides further information on equivalence between the questionnaire items used in successive surveys in a longitudinal series, or with items used in other surveys. Unless otherwise noted in the field titled "Further Remarks", all surveys described were based on face-to-face interviews, and carried out by at least minimally trained part-time interviewers. The same section provides information, where available, on the procedures that were employed to control the interviewers' work, the availability of English language documentation, and the sponsors of the survey. Except when otherwise indicated by "Further Remarks", the geographic area covered by the sampling frame was the entire territory of a sovereign state.

The titles of the individual studies are reproduced here as they were given by our sources. Though some minor spelling errors were corrected and some definite articles inserted, the phrasing and grammar used in the original sources were left practically unchanged so as to avoid confusion in referencing. Note that some of the titles are not unique, and therefore an unambiguous identification of a survey requires the identification of the fieldwork dates as well. The descriptions of the topics covered by the studies also follows the language used by our sources, and - unless otherwise noted - it cannot be guaranteed that "political interest", "left-right self-placement" and so forth were measured with identical instruments in every survey which covered these topics.

For principal investigators we also provide the institutional affiliation of the researcher(s) at the time when the fieldwork was carried out. In the case of individuals with multiple affiliations, the institute or organisation reported is the one that was in some ways involved in the given study. The polling organisation is identified by the "Data Collector" field.

The "Publications" field uses the Harvard-style of referencing, and the full bibliographic information appears in the bibliography that follows the Study Descriptions section. For the same reason the addresses of the respondents to our mail

survey and other individuals and organisations appearing either in the Source of Information or the Availability of Data Sets section are presented in a separate directory at the end of the volume.

The catalogue is followed by a list of bibliographical references in the catalogue. Unless otherwise noted, the publications appeared in English. The book ends with a directory where the addresses are given for every name or organisation named as the source of information for a catalogue entry or the contact for access to the data. The addresses shown were validated in 1997.

### **A short guide to further sources**

The history and methods of East European opinion survey research in the communist era has been touched upon by many analyses and reports (cf. Connors *et al* 1977; Kadzielski and Szostniewicz 1967; Kassof 1961; Kwiatkowski 1992; Lane 1971; Mason 1985; Mickiewicz 1972; Molnár and Békés 1968; Niemann 1993; Piekalkiewicz 1972; Sicinski 1963; Slider 1985; Szekfü 1973; Welsh 1981; Wilder 1963). What needs to be stressed in the present context is how uneven the methodological development was across countries. This is important because some of the most accessible assessments of the methodology of political survey research in the former communist countries exclusively focused on the former Soviet Union in the early 1990s (Gibson 1994; Shlapentokh 1994; Swafford 1992), or stressed similarities between polling in Eastern and Western Europe (cf. Henn 1998).

In Czechoslovakia and Hungary the history of nationwide political opinion polls goes back at least to the 1945-48 period (Adamec and Viden 1947; [Hungarian Institute of Public Opinion Research] 1947a, 1947b; Schiller 1947). Some local questionnaire surveys were also done in Poland shortly after World War II, though apparently no results were published (Wilder 1963). By 1948, however, the communist takeovers brought survey research to an extinction in Czechoslovakia and Hungary too (see Henn 1998 for Adamec's - the then leading Czech pollsters' - account of the direct political reasons). For the better part of the 1950s survey research on Eastern Europe only existed in the form of interviews with emigres to the West (see e.g. Gleitman and Greenbaum 1960, 1961; Inkeles 1950; International Research Associates 1953; Kracauer and Berkman 1956) - a tradition continued by the Radio Free Europe surveys of East European travellers to the West up until the 1980s (cf. Radio Free Europe 1969, 1970, 1976, 1981a, 1981b).

Regular political polling restarted from the late 1950s, first in the form of fairly unprofessional newspaper straw polls in Poland and the Soviet Union (Kassof 1961; Wilder 1963). In the latter it remained impossible to interview nationwide probability samples of the general population until well after the beginning of the perestroika in 1985 (cf. Shlapentokh 1987). Yet, even there some steps were made towards the development of genuinely scientific survey research on value orientations, lifestyle, information flow, and opinion formation, especially in the second half of the 1960s (see for instance Grushin 1967, 1969), although massive straw polls of newspaper readers and party-sponsored single-city surveys still remained prevalent (Lane 1971; Mickiewicz 1972).

In the politically more liberal East European countries professional survey

organisations and practices started to appear from the late 1950s. As an outgrowth of the efforts to systematically analyse the correspondence from listeners, in 1958 the Polish Radio established its survey research unit called OBOP to study audience reactions. A similar institute was created in Hungary in 1963. In the same year the Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research at the Institute of Social Studies at the University of Belgrade started to carry out republic- and nationwide surveys on a variety of sociological and occasionally political topics in Yugoslavia. From the second half of the sixties new centres of public opinion research emerged in the region attached to public radio and television corporations (Bulgaria 1966; Romania 1967), or a ministry (Slovakia 1968) or within a research institute of the Academy of Science, as in Leningrad and Moscow (Szekfü 1972). The Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Centre (CJMMK) at the University of Ljubljana was founded in 1968 and have been conducting the republic-wide annual Slovene Public Opinion Survey ever since.

The methodological sophistication of some of these organisations reached respectable levels by the late 1960s (see Kadzielski and Szostniewicz 1967; Molnár and Békés 1968). Much of the best data from the several hundred surveys carried out from the 1960s till the late 1980s have survived until today in the archives of the respective institutions in Belgrade, Budapest, Ljubljana, and Warsaw.

However, the range and formulation of the questions that could be asked about political topics remained rather nebulous even in the more liberal countries of the communist bloc. Under the exceptional political circumstances of Poland in most of the 1980s, Czechoslovakia in 1968, or Hungary and the Soviet Union in the late 1980s, official restrictions became less of a problem, but political opinion surveys became - probably inevitably - crowded by idiosyncratic items focusing on the topical issues of the day (cf. Adamski 1993; Kwiatkowski 1992; Mason 1985; Piekalkiewicz 1972). On the other extreme, among the less liberalised communist countries political obstacles often seemed to prevent polling on any meaningful question. Tarifa (1996: 107, note 1) reports that in Albania all questionnaire items had to pass party review prior to the fieldwork, and any talk about the anonymity of respondents was condemned as "bourgeois mentality". According to Gozman and Etkind (1992: 22), even as late as 1983 a Leningrad sociologist was expelled from the communist party for asking a sample of workers the rather vague question "Do you expect changes?".

Overall, Polish, Yugoslav and Hungarian social scientists could the most freely engage in East-West comparative projects and publish their findings at home. In 1969, for instance, a four-volume work was published in Serbo-Croatian on the results of a survey of 517+ members of the federal level elite carried out in co-operation between the Columbia Universitys Bureau of Applied Social Research and the Institute of Social Studies in Belgrade (see Denitch 1972 and Firdus Dzinic's foreword to Barton, Denitch, and Kadushin 1973). Poland and Yugoslavia became logical choices for participation in the International Study of Values in Politics too (see Jacoby, Tenue and Watts 1968). By the 1980s Hungarian and Polish survey researchers undertook (or contributed to) some world class survey studies in fields like social stratification, value systems, and social psychology (cf. Hankiss et al. 1984, 1985; Kohn and Slomeczynki 1990; Kolosi 1983) and started to analyse political socialisation and political culture with the conceptual and methodological toolkit of Western social science (see e.g. Bruszt 1988; Szabó 1989; Ziolkowski 1988).

In terms of methodological sophistication and the reliability of fieldwork and sampling practices, a large gap appeared between these three countries and possibly Bulgaria on the one hand, and the rest of the former communist world on the other. Judging from Shlapentokh (1994), Swafford (1992) and some informal responses to our own inquiries, this gap may well have prevailed for some time in the early 1990s, with large variations across polling agencies within the same country too.

Be that as it may, pre-transition opinion surveys in Eastern Europe featured very few comparable questions on specifically political topics to those asked in Western and post-1989 East European surveys (Pavle Novosel's (1996) poorly publicised replication of Almond and Verba's "Civic Culture" survey in Croatia in 1968, and the 1982-83 replication of the World Value Study in Hungary and Moscow remained rather exceptional). Therefore, it seemed sensible to exclude them from the present catalogue.

Regarding opinion surveys carried out in the transition period, the reader is referred to the English language catalogues of the East European social science data archives listed below.

In Poland, two publicly owned public opinion research firms, CBOS and OBOP, maintain well organised private archives from which hundreds of historical (as well as contemporary) data sets can be obtained on a commercial basis. Many of these data sets have also been deposited at the Archive of Social Research at the Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences (contact person Barbara Stefanczuk), where they can be freely accessed on the spot - note that the archive is not entitled to distribute the data. Since the Archive already assembled an English language catalogue of their holdings, it was decided not to describe their data in the present catalogue.

The same decision was made for the same reason regarding the holdings of the Social Data Bank at the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Science and Eastern Europe's most gigantic public opinion research institute, VCIOM of Moscow. Both of these institutions make publicly available hundreds of surveys from the perestroika period to the present, and only the VCIOM archive operates on a fully commercial basis.

Some smaller institutional archives also store and make publicly available data sets from the transition and pre-transition period that are not (all) covered in the present catalogue. These include that of the Ethnopolity Working Group in Estonia, the Communication Theory Research Group in Hungary, the Institute of Social Studies in Poland, the Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Centre in Slovenia, and the Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research in Yugoslavia.

Among the Eastern and Central European countries, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, and Latvia have specialised social science data archives, and at least the first three have searchable English language catalogues of their holdings on the world wide web. These certainly contain information on relevant data sets that we could not obtain information about in 1997.

Several well-known data sets fail to appear in our catalogue too. Some of them were excluded because they do not seem to be publicly available. These include the New Democracies Barometer of the Vienna-based Lazarsfeld Society, and the New Russia Barometer and New Baltic Barometers of the Centre for the Study of Public Policy at the University of Strathclyde. Up-to-date information on their availability and documentation is provided by CSPP (1997-). The comparative surveys carried out by the American Jewish Committee (see Penn and Schoen Associates 1991) and by GfK Austria (see Plasser, Ulram, and Waldrauch 1997, 1998) are further examples.

Despite their low visibility, also excluded from our catalogue are most surveys carried out in Eastern Europe by the United States Information Agency (now absorbed into the State Department, which is committed to continue this research activity). The USIA-surveys featured many items on general political orientations (involvement, trust, regime support, socio-political attitudes, party preference, perception of corruption, and so forth) that can be of interest for political comparatists and survey researchers, very often in cross-nationally comparable and longitudinal form (cf. Dobson and Grant 1992; McIntosh and MacIver 1992; Office of Research 1993, 1997a, 1997b). However, at the time of writing we could not obtain systematic information about them except that they are made publicly available through the Staff of Electronic Records at the National Archives. Many other major surveys that were excluded from our survey for a similar reason are described by Hough (1994) and Fleron, Hahn, and Reisinger (1997).

Yet another class of major comparative surveys were omitted from the catalogue because they are already well-known and widely available from the Zentralarchiv or other major Western archives (including the Roper Archive). These include the annual surveys of the Central and Eastern Eurobarometer and the International Social Survey Programme (see Zentralarchiv 1997), World Values Study 2 (see Inglehart, Basanez, and Moreno 1998), the 1991 East-West comparative survey of the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press (see Duch 1995; Meisler and Toth 1991), and the New Soviet Citizen Surveys of Arthur Miller, Vicki Hesli and William Reisinger. The integrated data catalogue of CESSDA (1996-) provides ample information on these studies and where they are available from.

## References

- Adamec, Cenek, and Ivan Viden 1947. "Polls Come to Czechoslovakia." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11: 548-52.
- Adamski, Wladyslaw W ed. 1993. *Societal Conflict and Systemic Change: The Case of Poland 1980-1992*. Warsaw: IFiS Publishers.
- Barton, Allen H, Bogdan Denitch, and Charles Kadushin eds. 1973. *Opinion-Making Elites in Yugoslavia*. New York: Praeger.
- Bruszt, László 1988. "'Without Us but for Us'? Political Orientation in Hungary in the Period of Late Paternalism." *Social Research* 55: 43-76.
- CESSDA (Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives) 1996-. *Integrated Data Catalogue of the European Social Science Data Banks*. Bergen: NSD. <<http://www.nsd.uib.no/cessda/IDC/>>
- Connor, Walter D, and Zvi Y Gitelman, with Adeline Huszczo, Robert Blumstock 1977. *Public Opinion in European Socialist Systems*. New York: Praeger.

- CSPP (Centre for the Study of Public Policy) 1997-. Home Page. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, <<http://www.strath.ac.uk/Departments/CSPP/>>.
- Denitch, Bogdan 1972. "Elite Interviewing and Social Structure: An Example from Yugoslavia." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36: 143-58.
- Dobson, Richard B, and Steven A Grant 1992. "Public Opinion and the Transformation of the Soviet Union." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 4: 302-20.
- Duch, Raymond M 1995. "Economic Chaos and the Fragility of Democratic Transition in Former Communist Regimes." *The Journal of Politics* 57: 121-58.
- Franklin, Mark, Susan Scarrow, and Mark Shephard 1993. *East European Studies Directory, August 1993*. Mimeo. Houston, TX: Department of Political Science, University of Houston.
- Fleron, Frederic J, Jeffrey W Hahn, and William M Reisinger 1997. *Public Opinion Surveys and Political Culture in Post-Soviet Russia*. Occasional paper no 266. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies.
- Gibson, James L 1994. "Survey Research in the Past and Future USSR: Reflections on the Methodology of Mass Opinion Surveys." in *New Directions in Political Psychology. Research in Micropolitics* Vol. 4, ed. by Michael X Delli Carpini, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Y Shapiro. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 87-114.
- Gleitman, Henry, and Joseph J Greenbaum 1960. "Hungarian Socio-Political Attitudes and Revolutionary Action." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24: 62-76.
- Gleitman, Henry, and Joseph J Greenbaum 1961. "Attitudes and Personality Patterns of Hungarian Refugees." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25: 351-65.
- Gozman, Leonid, and Alexander Etkind 1992. *The Psychology of Post-Totalitarianism in Russia*. Translated by Roger Clarke. London: The Centre for Research into Communist Economies.
- Grushin, Boris Andreevich 1967. *Mneniia o mire i mir mnenii: problemy metodologii issledovaniia obshchestvennogo mneniia*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo polit. literatury. (In Russian.)
- Grushin, Boris Andreevich 1969. *Problems of Free Time in the USSR: A Sociological Study*. Moscow: Novosti.
- Inkeles, Alex 1950. *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hankiss, Elemér, Róbert Manchin, Árpád Szokolczai, and László Füstös 1984. "A magyar társadalom értékrendjének átalakulása 1930-1982." Working Papers Series, Centre for Value Sociology. Budapest: MTA Institute of Sociology. (In Hungarian.)
- Hankiss, Elemér, Róbert Manchin, Árpád Szokolczai, and László Füstös 1985. "Interactions between Socio-Economic Factors, Ways of Life, and Value Orientations." Working Papers Series, Centre for Value Sociology. Budapest: MTA Institute of Sociology.
- International Research Associates 1953. "Media of communication and The Free World as Seen By Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Polish Refugees: Comparative Report." New York: United States International Broadcasting Service, Voice of America.
- Henn, Matt 1998. *Opinion Polls and Volatile Electorates: Problems and Issues in Polling European Societies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hough, Jerry F 1994. "The Russian Election of 1993: Public Attitude Toward Economic Reform and Democratization." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 10: 1-37.

- [Hungarian Institute of Public Opinion Research] 1947a. "The Hungarian Institute of Public Opinion Research." *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research* 1 (2): 100.
- [Hungarian Institute of Public Opinion Research] 1947b. "World Report: Hungary." *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research* 1 (3): 144.
- Inglehart, Ronald, Miguel Basanez, and Alejandro Moreno 1998. *Human Values and Beliefs: A Cross-Cultural Sourcebook. Political, Religious, Sexual, and Economic Norms in 43 Societies: Findings from the 1990-1993 World Values Survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Jacob, Philip E, Henry Teune, and Thomas Watts 1968. Values, Leadership and Development: A Four-Nation Study." *Social Science Information* 7 (2): 49-92.
- Kadzielski, Jozef, and Stefan Szostniewicz 1967. "The Center for Public Opinion and Broadcasting Research: Organization, Methods and Prospects." *Social Science Information* 6 (1): 111-35.
- Kassof, Allen 1961. "Moscow Discovers Public Opinion Polls." *Problems of Communism* 10 (3): 52-5.
- Kohn, Melvin L, and Kazimierz M Slomczynski 1990. *Social Structure and Self-Direction: A Comparative Analysis of the United States and Poland*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Kolosi, Tamás 1983. *Státusz és réteg*. Budapest: Institute of Social Science. (In Hungarian.)
- Kracauer, Siegfried, and Paul L Berkman 1956. *Satellite Mentality: Political Attitudes and Propaganda Susceptibilities of Non-Communists in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia*. New York: Praeger.
- Kwiatkowski, Piotr 1992. "Opinion Research and the Fall of Communism: Poland 1981-1990." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 4: 358-73.
- Lane, David 1971. *The End of Inequality? Stratification under State Socialism*. Middlesex: Penguin.
- Mason, David S 1985. *Public Opinion and Political Change in Poland, 1980-1982*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McIntosh, Mary E, and Martha Abele MacIver 1992. "Coping with Freedom and Uncertainty: Public Opinion in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia 1989-1992." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 4: 375-91.
- Meisler, Stanley, and Robert C Toth 1991. "The Pulse of Europe." *Los Angeles Times* 17 September.
- Mickiewicz, Ellen 1972. "Policy Applications of Public Opinion Research in the Soviet Union." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36: 566-78.
- Molnár, Edit S, and Ferenc Békés 1968. "The Public Opinion Research Department of the Hungarian Radio and Television." *Social Science Information* 7 (5): 15-29.
- Niemann, Heinz ed. 1993. *Meinungsforschung in der DDR: Die geheimen Berichte des Instituts für Meinungsforschung an das Politbüro der SED*. Köln: Bund-Verlag.
- Novosel, Pavle 1996. "Croatian Political Culture in Times of Great Expectations." in *Political Culture in East Central Europe*, ed. by Fritz Plasser and Andreas Pribersky. Aldershot: Avebury, pp. 107-13.
- Office of Research, USIA 1993. *Democracy and Market at the Crossroads in Central and East Europe: An Assessment of Public Opinion in Romania, Bulgaria, Poland and Hungary*. Washington, DC: United States Information Agency.
- Office of Research and Media Reaction, USIA 1997a. *NATO Enlargement: Public Opinion on the Eve of the Madrid Summit*. Washington, DC: United States

- Information Agency.
- Office of Research and Media Reaction, USIA 1997b. *NATO Enlargement: The Public Opinion Dimension*. Washington, DC: United States Information Agency.
- Penn and Schoen Associates 1991. "Democracy, Economic Reform and Western Assistance in Eastern Europe: A Comparative Public Opinion Survey." Mimeo. Washington, DC: Freedom House and The American Jewish Committee.
- Piekalkiewicz, Jaroslaw A 1972. *Public Opinion Polling in Czechoslovakia, 1968-69: Results and Analysis of Surveys Conducted During the Dubcek Era*. New York: Praeger.
- Plasser, Fritz, and Peter A Ulram, and Harald Waldrauch 1997. *Politischer Kulturwandel in Ost-Mitteleuropa. Theorie und Empirie demokratischer Konsolidierung*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Plasser, Fritz, Peter A Ulram, and Harald Waldrauch 1998. *Democratic Consolidation in East-Central Europe*. London: Macmillan.
- Radio Free Europe, Audience and Public Opinion Research Dept. 1969. "Party Preferences in Hypothetical Free Elections in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia." [Research report.] Munich: Radio Free Europe.
- Radio Free Europe, Audience and Public Opinion Research Dept. 1970. "East Europeans and Hypothetical Free Elections." [Research report.] Munich: Radio Free Europe.
- Radio Free Europe, Audience and Public Opinion Research Dept. 1976. "Party Preferences in Poland, 1968-75: A Trend Study of Hypothetical Free Elections." [Research report.] Munich: Radio Free Europe.
- Radio Free Europe, Audience and Public Opinion Research Dept. 1981a. "Party Preferences in Hypothetical Free Elections in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland." [Research report.] Munich: Radio Free Europe.
- Radio Free Europe, East European Area Audience and Opinion Research 1981b. "Eastern Socialism - Western Democracy and the Functioning of the Two System." Washington, DC: East European Audience and Opinion Research, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.
- Schiller, Paul H 1947. "A Hungarian Survey on Sympathetic Attitudes." *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research* 1 (3): 85-92.
- Shlapentokh, Vladimir 1994. "The 1993 Russian Election Polls." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58: 579-602.
- Shlapentokh, Vladimir 1987. *The Politics of Sociology in the Soviet Union*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sicinski, Andrzej 1963. "Public Opinion Surveys in Poland." *International Social Science Journal* 15: 91-110.
- Slider, Darrell 1985. "Party-Sponsored Public Opinion Research in the Soviet Union." *The Journal of Politics* 47: 209-27.
- Swafford, Michael 1992. "Sociological Aspects of Survey Research in the Commonwealth of Independent States." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 4: 346-357.
- Szabó, Ildikó 1989. *Political Socialization in Hungary: The Duality of Institutional and Non-Institutional Processes*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Szekfű, András ed. 1972. *Public Opinion and Mass Communication: Working Conference, Budapest 1971*. Budapest: Mass Communication Research Center, Hungarian Radio and Television.
- Tarifa, Fatos 1996. "Neither 'Bourgeois' nor 'Communist' Science: Sociology in

- Communist and Post-Communist Albania." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 29: 103-13.
- Welsh, William A ed. 1981. *Survey Research and Public Attitudes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Wilder, Emilia 1963. "Opinion Polls." *Survey* No. 48 (July 1963): 118-29.
- Zentralarchiv 1997. *ISSP - Studies from Eastern European Countries*. URL: <http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/data/en/issp/issp-east.htm>.
- Ziolkowski, Marek 1988. "Individuals and the Social System: Values, Perceptions, and Behavioral Strategies." *Social Research* 55: 139-178.

## **Study Descriptions**

## 8. Czech Republic

**Study Number:** 1.

**Title of Study:** Economic Expectations and Attitudes (EEA)

**Topics:** This was a series of surveys of economic expectations and various financial and employment problems of private households. However, it also featured questions on voting preferences; left-right self-placement; satisfaction with the political regime; trust in institutions; attitudes towards EU- and NATO-membership, authoritarianism, ethnic minorities (i.e. Gypsies), topical issues of economic reform, poverty, social justice, the role of the state in the economy, privatisation, and immigration.

**Comparability:** The survey was repeated twice a year in 1990-92 and annually afterwards. Many items were asked in an identical way in each or most surveys in the series. For example, voting preferences and left-right self-placement (on a five point scale) were asked in every wave; confidence in public institutions in EEA III, IV, VII; attitudes towards the government of the 'strong hand' in EEA V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX; attitudes toward the prohibition of the Communist Party in EEA VII, VIII, and IX; and so on. A continuation of the series in the Czech Republic is planned.

**Principal Investigator:** The Society and Economy Team of the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, headed by Jirí Vecerník.

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** May 1990, December 1990, June 1991, December 1991, July 1992, January 1993, November 1993, November 1994, January 1996, January 1997.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Until November 1994 the surveys covered the entire territory of the (former) Czechoslovakia, and from January 1996 only the Czech Republic. The 18+ years old population living in private households was sampled. Two-step quota sampling procedure, stratified by region and size of locality in the first step, and with a quota based on gender, age and education in the second.

**Number of Cases:** 1107, 1160, 1092, 1126, 1104, 1142, 1144, 1307, 1459, 1421 respondents in the Czech Republic in the successive waves.

**Publications:** Vecerník (1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 1992d, 1993a, 1993b, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1995d, 1995e, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1996f).

**Availability of Data Sets:** All data are publicly available from the Archive of the Institute of Sociology.

**Source of Information:** Dr Jirí Vecerník.

**Further Remarks:** English translation of nearly all questionnaires is available in electronic form.

**Study Number:** 2.

**Title of Study:** Democracy and Local Governance

**Topics:** Important problems facing the locality; perceived involvement of private organisations in the provision of local government services; perceived powers/capacity of local government; preferences regarding the division of responsibilities between central, regional, and local government and NGOs; where respondent seeks political support; political attitudes; attitudes on socio-economic left-right issues; importance of local vs national goals; support for democratic values; attitudes towards political leadership styles; perception of the intensity of various cleavages in local community; which of various democratic ways can people best influence decisions; interpersonal trust; attitudes towards minority rights; tolerance; unconventional political participation; identification with various social groups; materialist-postmaterialist values; respondent's political office; whether parents ever held political office; party affiliation; length of residence in community; principal occupation of respondent and parents; left-right self-placement; ethnicity, religion, religiosity, basic demographics. The 1995 surveys also included questions on the perception of the role of parties and people's motives in joining political parties.

**Comparability:** This is a cross-national study of localities and their leaders, begun in the 1960's in 120 local communities in India, Poland, the US, and Yugoslavia. That research was extended in the late 1970's and early 80's to South Korea, Thailand, Hong Kong and Singapore, followed by the Netherlands, Sweden, the US and several times in Poland. The data collection in 1991-94 covered Austria, Belarus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Iceland, South Korea, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States and Uzbekistan. In 1995, the survey was replicated in Armenia, England, Germany, Kyrgyzstan, Spain, Belarus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, and Ukraine. The survey was carried out in the mid-1990s or is to be carried out Canada, Finland, Greece, India, Japan, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Taiwan and Venezuela. Not all items were included in all national surveys. Left-right self-placement (ten point scale), tolerance (social distance scales) and materialist-postmaterialist values (four item materialism-postmaterialism battery) were covered by standard items widely used in survey research. The 1991 and 1995 DLG-surveys used nearly identical questionnaires.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Henry Teune (Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania).

**Data Collector:** Information not available except that the fieldwork was coordinated by Dr Jan Rehak.

**Dates of Data Collection:** 1991 and 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Local leaders in medium-sized localities. The data are taken from a national sample of localities ranging in size from 25000 to 250000, nationally adjusted. About 15 political leaders--mayors, council people, and party activists--were interviewed in each selected community in both years.

**Number of Cases:** 311 respondents in 1991 and 254 in 1995.

**Publications:** Jacob, Ostrowski, and Teune (1993); note too that volume 540 of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (June 1995) is based exclusively on contributions using the DLG data.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are publicly available. English language SPSS-format data file can be downloaded from, together with the English language questionnaire, from DLG (nd).

**Source of Information:** DLG (nd).

**Further Remarks:** The East European data collections in the DLG project were funded by the US National Science Foundation, the Central European University, and the Polish Committee for Academic Research.

**Study Number:** 3.

**Title of Study:** Local Democracy and Innovation

**Topics:** The study investigated the interaction between citizens, political representatives and public administration on the municipal level from a contextual perspective. The interviews covered attitudes to local reforms, policy preferences in local service provision, management problems in local administration, local government finances, political culture.

**Comparability:** The questions on policy preferences, reform experiences, and political culture were identical in the elite and citizens surveys. The surveys were part of a comparative project on Local Democracy and Innovation, which also covered Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. Common core questionnaires supplemented with nation-specific items were administered to the respective sample in all four countries.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Harald Baldersheim and Prof. Lawrence E Rose (both at the University of Oslo).

**Data Collector:** Institute of Sociology (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** Between March 1991 and early May 1992.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Separate surveys of four different target populations were carried out: (1) adult citizen population of 2 municipalities; (2) local councilors in 135 municipalities; (3) mayors in 164 municipalities; and (4) chief administrative officials in the same 164 municipalities. All municipalities included in the citizen sample were also covered by the three elite surveys. The municipalities covered by the second (councilor) sample were also covered by the mayoral and CAO samples. For the mayoral and CAO samples, a sample of municipalities, stratified by population size, was taken, and the mayor and the CAO in each selected municipality were interviewed. For the councilor sample, all councilors were interviewed in a subsection of the same municipalities. The proportion of respondents from bigger municipalities is considerably higher in the councilor and the mayoral sample than the proportion of these municipalities among all municipalities, but smaller than their share of the total citizen population of the country (see Baldersheim *et al.* 1996: 21). For the citizen survey a standard systematic sampling procedure was followed within the selected municipalities. A roughly equal number of citizens were interviewed in each municipality.

**Number of Cases:** About 700 respondents in the citizen, 1183 respondents in the councilor, and 135 respondents each in the mayoral and CAO samples.

**Publications:** Baldersheim *et al.* (1996).

**Availability of Data Sets:** English language SPSS data-files and documentation are available from either of the principal investigators.

**Source of Information:** Prof. Harald Baldersheim.

**Further Remarks:** The project was funded by the Norwegian Foreign Ministry.

**Study Number:** 4.

**Title of Study:** Dismantling of the Social Safety Net and Its Political Consequences in East Central Europe

**Topics:** Main problem for people like respondent; evaluation of prewar, 1975, and present regime; satisfaction with life, job, political system, functioning of democracy; trust in institutions; preferences regarding the private vs public ownership of strategic sectors; left-right self-placement; attitudes towards the government's role in the economy, income inequalities; comparison of pre-1989 and present regime; probability of joining various forms of anti-government protest; political efficacy; political cynicism; perception of the what is important for getting ahead in life, how this has changed since 1989; evaluation of household finances; perceived influence of various institutions and interest groups in national politics; a long block of questions on preferences regarding public/market provision of health care, education, housing; attitudes regarding labour market regulations and the pension system; fear of unemployment and difficulties in securing education, health care and adequate housing for family; trust in politicians in general; authoritarian attitudes; political involvement (interest and discussion); support for democratic values; changes in subjective social status and employment status since regime change started; participation and vote in last election; party choice if there were an election next week.

**Comparability:** This was a cross-national study, in which identical questionnaires were simultaneously administered to Czech, Hungarian, Polish, and Slovak national samples. The questionnaire included several economic policy attitude items from the Role of Government module of the ISSP; a widely used question on left-right self-placement (on ten point scale) was also included. Several questions in this surveys were replicated in the CEU post-election surveys in 1993-96: the batteries on attitudes towards income inequalities and the comparison of pre-1989 regime and present regime in Slovakia in Winter 1994, in the Czech Republic in June 1996, in Poland in October 1993, and in Hungary in May 1994; the probability of respondent joining various forms of anti-government protest, the influence of various institutions and interest groups in national politics, subjective social status (in four dimensions) and changes in employment status since regime change in Poland in October 1993 and in Hungary in May 1994; the comparison of the regime before the war, around 1975 and at present, preferences regarding the private vs public ownership of strategic sectors in Hungary in May 1994.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Henryk Szlajfer (Institute of East-West Studies, New York), Prof. Krzysztof Jasiewicz (Institute of Political Studies, PAN, Warsaw), Dr Radoslaw Markowski (ISP PAN and Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Warsaw), Jacek Dohnalik (Pentor, Warsaw), Jan Hartl, Dr Peter Mateju, Lubos Rezler, Milan Tucek (all at the Institute of Sociology, Prague), Gábor Tóka (then at TARKI, Budapest).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** October 1991.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Clustered random sample; sampling points stratified by region and size of locality; individual respondents selected from the population register; random route.

**Number of Cases:** 1187 respondents.

**Publications:** Hartl (1994); Markowski (1993, 1994); Mateju and Tucek (1992); Tóka (1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1995a); Vecernik (1996c).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available from the Hungarian data archive TARKI (study no. C47, title in TARKI and CESSDA catalogues: TARKI - INTER).

**Source of Information:** CESSDA (1996-) and Gábor Tóka.

**Further Remarks:** The survey was funded by the Institute for East-West Studies (New York).

**Study Number:** 5.

**Title of Study:** IVVM (Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czech Central Statistical Office) omnibus

**Topics:** This is a series of omnibus surveys of public opinion on topical issues. The main thematic focus of the individual surveys (identified by their internally used IVVM serial number) is shown below.

- 93-02: Voting preference, opinion about Senate, sympathy rating of politicians, trust in state institutions, feelings about the creation of an independent Czech state, satisfaction with the development of country.
- 93-03: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, evaluation of the political system, opinions about various nations and nationalities.
- 93-04: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, opinion about Czech military participation in peace-keeping operation in the former Yugoslavia, evaluation of democracy in the Czech Republic, affection towards neighboring countries, relations with Sudeten Germans.
- 93-05: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinion about Czech membership in EU, NATO and the Czech army.
- 93-06: Voting preference, opinions about Senate, attitudes towards elections, trust in state institutions, satisfaction with development of country.
- 93-07: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, opinions about a possible compromise with the Sudeten Germans, frequency of discussion about politics.
- 93-09: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinion about influence of different political organizations and the "Prague Spring" of 1968, evaluation of local authorities.
- 93-10: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, opinion about the political crisis in Russia, evaluation of Czech-German relations and Czech foreign policy.
- 93-11: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinion about Senate and international cooperation, satisfaction with development of the country.
- 93-12: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinions about the constitutional setup of the Czech Republic, satisfaction with political situation in 1993, value orientations.
- 94-01: Voting preference and left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, evaluation of December 1993 Duma elections in Russia, opinions about the constitutional setup of the Czech Republic.
- 94-02: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, opinion about Senate, evaluation of the visit of President Clinton to Prague, perceptions of threat from foreign countries.
- 94-03: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinion about military intervention in Bosnia, attitudes towards nationalities in the Czech Republic.
- 94-04: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinion about the demonstration of trade unions and to opening of the former secret police archive.

- 94-05: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinion about cooperation of Czech army and foreign armies, evaluation of democracy, opinion about Senate and local authorities.
- 94-06: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, satisfaction with development of the country, attitudes towards army.
- 94-07: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinions about the visit of General Pinochet to Prague, the conflicts in the government coalition, the role of former president Benes, political culture in the Czech Republic, and recent political scandals.
- 94-09: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, sympathy rating of politicians, evaluation of development of the country, opinions about Czech-German relations, international standing of the Czech Republic, and local elections.
- 94-10: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, evaluation of President Havel's performance.
- 94-11a: Voting preference, elections to local authorities, satisfaction with development of the country.
- 94-11b: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, opinion on Czech membership in the EU and the NATO, satisfaction with development of the country.
- 94-12: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, evaluation of developments since November 1989 and the performance of President Havel, voting behaviour at last municipal election, value orientations.
- 94-21: Voting preference, evaluation of local authorities, evaluation of political organizations at place of residence.
- 95-01: Voting preference, opinion on various forms of protest, left-right self-placement, evaluation of democracy, evaluation of political situation, trust in state institutions.
- 95-02: Voting preference, opinion about relations with Germany and the situation in Chechnya, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, perception of military threats from abroad.
- 95-03: Voting preference, sympathy rating of politicians, opinion about Sudeten Germans, trust in state institutions, satisfaction with political situation.
- 95-04: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, evaluation of World War II, left-right self-placement, opinions about the performance of President.
- 95-23: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with political situation, evaluation of Parliament.
- 95-06: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with development of the country, sympathy rating of politicians, opinion about Czech membership in the EU and the NATO, opinion about international cooperation.
- 95-07: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, opinion about dialogue with Sudeten Germans, civic rights and liberties, civil society, and women in public life.
- 95-08: Voting preference, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, opinion about Czech-German relations.
- 95-09: Voting preference, left-right self-placement.

- 95-25: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinions on the balance of strength among the various political actors in the Czech Republic and policy debates.
- 95-10: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, opinion about role of state, interest in election programs.
- 95-26: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, opinion about role of state and various political organisations, interest in election programs, trust in state institutions, evaluation of the UN.
- 95-11: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, opinions about the role of Senate.
- 95-28: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, opinions about the role of Senate and Czech membership in NATO, trust in state institutions, evaluation of political TV programs and local authorities, satisfaction with development of the country.
- 95-12: Voting preference, interest in foreign policy.
- 95-29: Voting preference, interest in foreign policy, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, sympathy rating of politicians, value orientations.
- 95-22: Left-right self-placement, evaluation of living conditions.
- 96-01: Voting preference, opinions about cooperation with OECD.
- 96-21: Voting preference, opinions about cooperation with OECD and deployment of the Czech army in Bosnia-Herzegovina, trust in state institutions, left-right self-placement, attitudes towards various nationalities.
- 96-02: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of political parties.
- 96-22: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of political parties, trust in state institutions, opinions about Czech-German and Czech-Slovak relations, satisfaction with political situation, interest in the programs of the political parties.
- 96-03: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of democracy, evaluation of situation before 1989.
- 96-23: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of democracy, evaluation of situation before 1989, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinions about the defense forces of the Czech Republic, political culture in the Czech Republic, and the balance of strength among the various political actors in the Czech Republic.
- 96-04: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of political parties.
- 96-24: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of political parties, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, opinions about the defense forces of the Czech Republic and political culture in the Czech Republic.
- 96-05: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, electoral behaviour, trust in state institutions.
- 96-25: Voting preference, left-right self-placement, electoral behaviour, trust in state institutions, evaluation of political parties, opinion on political participation of women.
- 96-06: Electoral behaviour, evaluation of the 1996 election and election campaign.
- 96-26: Electoral behaviour, evaluation of the 1996 election and election campaign, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, left-right self-placement, evaluation of non-governmental organisations and the media.
- 96-07: Trust in state institutions, opinions about the new deputies, satisfaction with development of the country, satisfaction with the election results, evaluation of democracy, evaluation of local authorities.

- 96-08: Trust in state institutions, satisfaction with political situation, left-right self-placement, opinions about international cooperation, Czech-German relations, the elections to the Senate, and the cooperation between President, Parliament and government.
- 96-09: Voting preference, opinion on the forthcoming elections to the Senate, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, evaluation of various political organisations, left-right self-placement, opinion about the performance of President Havel.
- 96-10: Voting preference, impressions of the election campaign to the Senate, trust in state institutions, evaluation of various political organisations, left-right self-placement.
- 96-11: Voting preference, impressions of the election campaign to the Senate, trust in state institutions, opinion on Czech-German declaration and Czech membership in the NATO, evaluation of political parties and local authorities, left-right self-placement.
- 96-12: Voting preference, evaluation of Senate elections, trust in state institutions, sympathy rating of politicians, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with political situation, value orientations.

**Comparability:** The basic demographic questions show continuity, but otherwise the content of the questionnaires changed from survey to survey. Several items, however (e.g. left-right self-placement, voting preference, trust in institutions, sympathy rating of leading Czech politicians) were asked in an identical format in a large number of the surveys.

**Principal Investigator:** Varied by survey. In 1993 most of them were directed by Stanislav Hampl, from January 1994 till April 1995 by Miluse Rezková, and from May 1995 Eliska Rendlová (then all at IVVM).

**Data Collector:** IVVM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 93-02: 2-8 February 1993; 93-03: 2-8 March 1993; 93-04: 2-8 April 1993; 93-05: 2-8 May 1993; 93-06: 2-8 June 1993; 93-07: 1-12 July 1993; 93-09: 2-8 September 1993; 93-10: 6-12 October 1993; 93-11: 4 -10 November 1993; 93-12: 30 November-4 December 1993; 94-01: 7-13 January 1994; 94-02: 1-7 February 1994; 94-03: 2-7 March 1994; 94-04: 28 March - 6 April 1994; 94-05: 30 April-6 May 1994; 94-06: 28 May - 3 June 1994; 94-07: 1-13 July 1994; 94-09: 1-9 September 1994; 94-10: 30 September - 5 October 1994; 94-11a: 21-26 October 1994; 94-11b: 30 October - 4 November 1994; 94-12: 25 November - 1 December 1994; 94-21: 25-27 September 1994; 95-01: 5-10 January 1995; 95-02: 2-7 February 1995; 95-03: 3-9 March 1995; 95-04: 30 March - 4 April 1995; 95-23: 27 April - 9 May 1995; 95-06: 1-7 June 1995; 95-07: 29 June - 7 July 1995; 95-08: 1-8 August 1995; 95-09: 31 August - 6 September 1995; 95-25: 31 August - 6 September 1995; 95-10: 29 September - 4 October 1995; 95-26: 29 September - 4 October 1995; 95-11: 30 October - 6 November 1995; 95-28: 30 October - 6 November 1995; 95-12: 1-6 December 1995; 95-29: 1-6 December 1995; 95-22: 17-23 March 1995; 96-01: 2-8 January 1996; 96-21: 2-8 January 1996; 96-02: 2-7 February 1996; 96-22: 2-7 February 1996; 96-03: 1-3 March 1996; 96-23: 1-3 March 1996; 96-04: 1-9 April 1996; 96-24: 1-9 April 1996; 96-05: 30 April - 7 May 1996;

96-25: 30 April - 7 May 1996; 96-06: 3-10 June 1996; 96-26: 3-10 June 1996;  
96-07: 1-10 July 1996; 96-08: 1-7 August 1996; 96-09: 2-9 September 1996;  
96-10: 1-6 October 1996; 96-11: 1-6 November 1996; 96-12: 2-6 December  
1996.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 15+ year old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Quota by sex, age, economic activity, region, and size of locality.

**Number of Cases:** 93-02: 752; 93-03: 722; 93-04: 780; 93-05: 760; 93-06: 786; 93-07: 857; 93-09: 763; 93-10: 777; 93-11: 802; 93-12: 776; 94-01: 810 (but 1587 for the voting preference and left-right self-placement question); 94-02: 776; 94-03: 885; 94-04: 809 (1618 for voting intentions); 94-05: 846; 94-06: 1094; 94-07: 1097; 94-09: 858; 94-10: 1017; 94-11a: 1524; 94-11b: 877; 94-12: 969; 94-21: 1588; 95-01: 1030; 95-02: 1023; 95-03: 900; 95-04: 900; 95-23: 2203; 95-06: 998; 95-07: 1008; 95-08: 899; 95-09: 991; 95-25: 2018; 95-10: 978; 95-26: 1972; 95-11: 1035; 95-28: 2029; 95-12: 979; 95-29: 1970; 95-22: 1504; 96-01: 1023; 96-21: 1992; 96-02: 997; 96-22: 2009; 96-03: 1041; 96-23: 2004; 96-04: 1025; 96-24: 2040; 96-05: 1011; 96-25: 2004; 96-06: 1035; 96-26: 2038; 96-07: 983; 96-08: 1028; 96-09: 1461; 96-10: 1490; 96-11: 1001; 96-12: 993 respondents.

**Publications:** Press releases only.

**Availability of Data Sets:** All data are owned by IVVM (i.e. the Czech Central Statistical Office). The data can be accessed on the premises of the IVVM. A decision about making the data more widely available may be reached at any time.

**Source of Information:** Ján Misovic.

**Further Remarks:** The study materials were prepared in Czech only.

**Study Number:** 6.

**Title of Study:** Party Systems and Electoral Alignments in East Central Europe

**Topics:** Party images, the parties' relative issue competence; party preference; vote in last election; political attitudes and knowledge; political involvement.

**Comparability:** This survey was part of a four-country longitudinal study carried out in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The CEU "core module" was included in all surveys in the series. It covered the salience rating of various policy goals; which parties the respondent believed to be the most and the least likely to pursue that goal; political involvement (interest and discussion); political efficacy and trust; egocentric evaluation of socioeconomic conditions; participation and vote in last election; probability of participation and party choice if there were an election next weekend; respondents' overall evaluation of each main parties; knowledge of the partisan composition of the incumbent government; satisfaction with government and with the functioning of democracy; and - from August 1993 on - the Central and Eastern Eurobarometer items on the state of personal finances and of the national economy in last and next year. The CEU "long module" included all items of the "core module" plus a few agree-disagree attitude scales covering socioeconomic left vs right, religious vs secular, nationalist vs cosmopolitan issues, and left-right and liberal-conservative self-placement. The April 1994 and June-July 1995 surveys included a block on what the three most important national issues are and which party has the best policy on each. The September 1992 and the August-December 1993 surveys in the series included separate blocks on the perceived intensity of various social cleavages and the respondent's overall rating of business, farmer and environmentalist organisations, unions and churches.

**Principal Investigator:** Gábor Tóka (Central European University, Budapest, Hungary).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** September 1992, April 1993, November 1993, April 1994, November 1994, June 1995, January 1996.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18 + years old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Sampling units were stratified by region and size of localities. Individual respondents were selected randomly in 1992 from an official population register. From 1993 - due to a new information law - they were selected according to a quota by sex, age and education. The April 1993 sample combined re-interviewed respondents from the Fall 1992 sample and a quota sample.

**Number of Cases:** 815, 939, 1117, 1562, 1515, 1291, 1569, 1443, and 1595 respondents.

**Publications:** Kitschelt *et al.* (1999); Markowski (1995); Tóka (1995a, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998a, 1998b).

**Availability of Data Sets:** Most data are freely available from the principal investigator. All data will soon be publicly available from the Hungarian data archive TARKI.

**Source of Information:** Gábor Tóka.

**Further Remarks:** These surveys were funded as part of CEU Political Science Department's 1992-97 project on "Transition to What?" by the Central European University Foundation. All data files and documentation were prepared in English.

**Study Number:** 7.

**Title of Study:** Social Stratification in Eastern Europe After 1989

**Topics:** This was a conventional social stratification and social mobility survey of both the general population and former and current elite groups (1988 nomenklatura; 1993 cultural and economic elite; 1993 business elite), with very detailed questions on the job history of the respondents and the socioeconomic status of their parents (when the respondent was a child), knowledge of foreign languages and other measures of current cultural capital. It also featured very 5detailed questions about past and present party and union membership; party offices held; spouse's, father's and mother's party membership; participation and vote in last election and if there were an election next week; whether the respondents had among their friends and relatives some politicians, private businessmen, enterprise managers, media personalities, dissidents (before 1989), and whether these people helped the respondents in getting a job.

**Comparability:** The general population survey was carried out in the same year with nearly identical questionnaires in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Russia and Slovakia. Many questions were also replicated in the special elite surveys that were carried out in the framework of the same project.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Iván Szelényi and Prof. Donald J Treiman (both at the Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles).

**Data Collector:** Institute of Sociology (Prague; project directors Prof. Pavel Machonin, Dr Milan Tucek and Dr Petr Mateju) and the Universitas agency (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** March-April 1993 for the mass and January 1994 for the elite survey.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Adult population plus separate samples of the communist party nomenklatura and chief executives of the largest companies in 1988; and of the persons occupying the positions that were included in the 1988 nomenklatura list and chief executives of the largest companies (also owners in the case of private firms) in 1993. The general population survey relied on a multi-stage stratified random sample of households, with individuals randomly selected from each household using the Kish table. Response rate and sampling method of elite surveys: Information not available

**Number of Cases:** The general population sample in the Czech Republic consisted of 5621 cases, and the elite samples of 1552 cases.

**Publications:** Szelényi, Treiman and Wnuk-Lipinski (1995) and over 70 articles in scholarly journals and edited volumes. A full list is available from Donald

Treiman (University of California, Los Angeles). The October 1995 issue of *Theory and Society* was devoted entirely to this project.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are deposited in the Hungarian data archive TARKI (study no. C48, access fee as shown in CESSDA, 1996-). Access to the data is contingent on obtaining a written permission from the principal investigators. The Czech files are publicly available also from the Institute of Sociology (contact Prof. Pavel Machonin) for minor administration costs in SPSS-PC format and with Czech labels.

**Source of Information:** CESSDA (1996-), Dr Éva Fodor, Lumir Gatnar and TARKI (1996-).

**Further Remarks:** English language data file and documentation (including a codebook) are available.

**Study Number:** 8.

**Title of Study:** Factum Survey F93-06

**Topics:** Political opinions and socio-demographic characteristics of members of the Czech parliament.

**Comparability:** Information not available.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Broer Niemöller (University of Amsterdam).

**Data Collector:** Factum (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** March-May 1993.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Members of the Czech parliament.  
Exhaustive with 67.5 percent response rate.

**Number of Cases:** 135 members of the Czech lower house.

**Publications:** Information not available.

**Availability of Data Sets:** Information not available. Address queries to the principal investigator.

**Source of Information:** Stanislav Hampl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 9.

**Title of Study:** TRENDS series

**Topics:** This is a regular monthly survey of the STEM public opinion and social research institute that monitors voting preferences, the popularity of politicians, left-right self-placement (5 point scale), citizen's attitudes towards the political system, various political institutions, and topical issues.

**Comparability:** This is a series of monthly surveys started in May 1993. The items (e.g. issue questions, the list of politicians evaluated by the respondents) have been changed from time to time as required by political developments, but show considerable continuity throughout the entire series. The questions on voting preferences, trust in various political institutions, the evaluation of the regime, left-right self-placement, political participation, satisfaction with the development of democracy have been asked in an identical form ever since May 1993. Many items were also asked in an identical form in the election studies of the STEM institute (see below). A continuation of the series is planned.

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Hartl (STEM, Prague).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** These surveys have been regularly conducted in the first third of each month since May 1993.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence.

**Number of Cases:** Approximately 1500-1600 respondents every month.

**Publications:** Simoník (1996), Haberlová (1997), various press releases, radio and tv broadcasts.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM. Contact Jan Hartl.

**Source of Information:** Jan Hartl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 10.

**Title of Study:** Elections: One Year Later

**Topics:** This was a study of the attitude profile and demographic composition of the supporters of the various political parties one year after the 1992 parliamentary elections, also focusing on party-switches between the election and June 1993.

**Comparability:** Many items were asked in an identical form in the TRENDS series of the STEM institute (see above).

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Hartl (STEM, Prague).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** June 1993.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence.

**Number of Cases:** 12000 respondents.

**Publications:** Press releases.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM. Contact Jan Hartl.

**Source of Information:** Jan Hartl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 11.

**Title of Study:** The Institutionalisation of Parliamentary Democracy in Central Europe

**Topics:** Approximately 60 minute long structured interviews were conducted with parliamentary deputies about the role and organisation of the parliament in their own country. The topics included party affiliation; previous occupation and currently held jobs; opinions about the electoral system and representational roles; parliamentary work load; constituency service; preferences regarding the budget and organisation of the parliament; committee membership; influence of civil servants and interest groups on own committee's decisions; advantages and disadvantages of belonging to a parliamentary club; existence of currents in the respondent's parliamentary club; which current the respondent belongs to; distribution of power in own parliamentary club; preference for having a party line on different issues; party offices held by the respondent; relationship between parliamentary party and the national executive of the party; opinions on public funding of political parties, conflict of interest in deputies' work, defectors, desirable and real legislative-executive relations, the influence of individual legislators on government; importance of incumbency vs policy for own party; contacts with members of government; organisation of contacts between parliamentary club and ministers; evaluation of own parliamentary club's influence on ministers; opinions on single party vs coalition governments; desirable and real influence of various organisations, office holders, and institutions on parliament; preferences regarding the powers of the constitutional court, an upper house, and the president; advantages and disadvantages of having an upper house; demographic data on the respondent.

**Comparability:** The survey was part of a cross-national project. The same standardised questionnaire was used in surveys of parliamentarians in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The questionnaire adopted many questions from a previous survey of Dutch legislators.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Rudy B Andeweg and Prof. Peter Mair (both at the Department of Political Science of the University of Leiden).

**Data Collector:** FACTUM (Prague; project manager Dr Jan Herzmann).

**Dates of Data Collection:** September-December 1993.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Members of the Czech legislature (National Council). Exhaustive sample of parliamentary deputies (excluding ministers); 87 percent response rate.

**Number of Cases:** 168 respondents.

**Publications:** Kopecky (1995a); Kopecky (1995b); Kopecky (1996); Kopecky, Hubacek and Plecity (1996); Kopecky, van der Meer, and van den

Muyzenberg (1995); a detailed analysis of the Czech and Slovak data is forthcoming in the PhD dissertation of Petr Kopecky, and is to be published by Thesis Publishers (Amsterdam).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data will be made publicly available through the Steinmetz Archive (Amsterdam).

**Source of Information:** Heleen den Haan.

**Further Remarks:** The project was funded by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Department of Political Science of the University of Leiden.

**Study Number:** 12.

**Title of Study:** Opinions on Social Changes, 1993

**Topics:** Attitudes towards economic individualism and privatisation; political efficacy; trust in various institutions; respondent's present participation and position in a political party, union, local government body, civic, professional or sport association; left-right self placement (ten point scale); evaluation of various aspects of political and social changes since 1989; evaluation of post-1992 government decision on various major issues; personal satisfaction with various goods, private and social services around 1988 and at present; a long battery on attitudes towards inequalities; economic expectations and preferred strategy if losing present job; sense of anomie; leisure time activities; life goals; perception of own social and economic position in 1988 and at present; what determines and what should determine one's social standing; demographics.

**Comparability:** This survey was part of a comparative project, with an identical questionnaire administered simultaneously in Slovakia.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Pavel Machonin (Institute of Sociology, Prague).

**Data Collector:** Universitas agency (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** October 1993.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18 + year old population living in private households. Random route.

**Number of Cases:** 1902 respondents.

**Publications:** Machonin, Tucek, *et al.* (1996).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available for scientific use without any restriction, in SPSS-PC format with Czech labels from the data archive of the Institute of Sociology (contact the principal investigator or Lumir Gatnar) for minor administration costs.

**Source of Information:** Lumir Gatnar.

**Further Remarks:** An English translation of the questionnaire is available in electronic form.

**Study Number:** 13.

**Title of Study:** Values and Political Change in Post-Communist Europe

**Topics:** Political attitudes and political behaviour. Nearly all items were administered with identical phrasing to samples of citizens and MPs in several countries (see topics and countries listed below). In addition, the Russian pre- and post-election surveys featured questions on participation and vote in the April 1993 referenda; voting preference/vote in the December 1993 constitutional referendum and Duma-election); and current presidential candidate preference.

**Comparability:** The same questionnaire was simultaneously administered to nationwide samples of voters and samples of legislators in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Russia, Slovakia and the Ukraine (no legislator sample was interviewed in Slovakia). The survey was replicated in a second wave survey in Russia right after the December 1993 Duma elections. The topics covered by identically phrased items in each country included participation in parties and other voluntary associations; whether the respondent follows politics in the news; political participation (petition, contact deputy, strike, write to paper, protest); relative involvement in politics under communism and now; interpersonal trust; trust in institutions; evaluation of the development of personal finances and national economy in the last two and next two years; attitudes towards unemployment, the *nouveau* rich, private ownership of various branches of the economy, private vs public provision of welfare, market economy, ethno-national issues, secessionist movements, decentralisation; policies or personalities are important for evaluating parties; party identification; vote in last election (i.e. 1992 elections to the Czechoslovak federal legislature, the 1990 Hungarian parliamentary elections, the 1991 Russian and Ukrainian presidential elections); current party preference (if there were a parliamentary election tomorrow - this question was not asked in Russia); sympathy rating of the eight-eleven main parties; whether any of these parties should be banned; opinions on various democratic ideals (government responsiveness, direct democracy, local democracy, endurance of governments, preferred number of parties, judicial review, executive-legislative dominance); evaluations of democratic institutions; political efficacy; attitudes towards civil liberties; preference between freedom vs equality in the economic domain; support for emergency measures under various circumstances; estimated effectiveness of various forms of political participation; attitudes towards communism; former communist party membership; personal experience of oppression under communism; evaluation of communist vs present regime from various aspects; attitudes towards punishing/firing former communists; which was the best period for the country in this century; political involvement (interest and discussion); left-right identification (three-point scale); demographics.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. William L Miller, Prof. Stephen White, and Dr Paul Heywood (all three at the University of Glasgow).

**Data Collector:** Opinion Window (Prague, project director Dr Ladislav Köppl).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 23 November - 10 December 1993 for the mass, and October-November 1993 for the elite survey.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old citizen population for the general population survey; members of national parliament for the elite survey. Clustered multistage random sample of citizens; Information not available on elite sample.

**Number of Cases:** 973 citizens and altogether 504 members of the Czech, Hungarian, Ukrainian and Russian legislature.

**Publications:** Miller, White and Heywood (1997); Wyman *et al* (1995a, 1995c).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are, or soon going to be publicly available from the ESRC data archive (Colchester, UK).

**Source of Information:** Prof. Stephen White and Prof. William L. Miller.

**Further Remarks:** The survey was funded by the British Economic and Social Research Council (grant no R000233538 and R221888).

**Study Number:** 14.

**Title of Study:** Emerging Forms of Political Representation and Participation in Eastern Europe

**Topics:** The questionnaire covered with several items each of the following main themes: attitudes towards democracy and the market economy and evaluation of their actual practice in respondent's country; interpersonal trust; attitudes towards social inequalities, civil liberties, the government's role in the economy, trade unions, government regulation of the economy, environment protection, Western influence on own country, foreign ownership, and Gypsies, Jews, and ethnic minority rights in general; membership in various voluntary organisations including party; agreement with various authoritarian-nationalist statements; materialist-postmaterialist values (4 and 12 item batteries); political efficacy; attitudes towards political participation; subjective social class. There were also questions about vote in last legislative election; reason for not voting; reasons of party choice; party identification; current party preference; reasons for party preference; communist party membership under previous regime; with whom respondent discusses politics; the occupation, ethnicity, and religion of these persons; left-right self-placement (ten point scale); determinants of the chances of getting ahead in life; evaluation of the development of the national economy and household finances in the last five and the next five years; religion, religiosity, and demographic variables, with extensive questions about social class, also about spouse and parents.

**Comparability:** This survey was part of a cross-national survey. An identical questionnaire was administered to national samples in Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia and Ukraine in Summer 1993, and in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia in Spring 1994, except that the questions about presidential vote/candidate preference were only asked in Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine. The questionnaire included several items from the ISSP Role of Government module on the government's role in the economy, a battery on opportunities for getting ahead in life taken from the ISSP Inequality module, and widely used standard items on left-right self-placement, political efficacy, evaluation of the development of the national economy and household finances, postmaterialist values and party identification.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Geoffrey Evans, Dr Stephen Whitefield, Dr Anthony Heath, Dr Clive Payne (Dr Whitefield at Pembroke College, Oxford; all others at Nuffield College, Oxford).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague, project director Lubos Rezler).

**Dates of Data Collection:** Spring 1994.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old population. 182 localities (out of 13410) were selected. Then, 1681 voters were randomly

selected from the 1992 electoral lists; 423 additional addresses were selected by a random route, and 111 by a quota procedure. A 67 percent response rate was achieved.

**Number of Cases:** 1409 respondents.

**Publications:** Evans (1996a, 1996b); Evans and Whitefield (1995a, 1995c).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are going to be made available through the ESRC archive (Colchester, UK).

**Source of Information:** Study materials provided by Geoffrey Evans.

**Further Remarks:** The study was funded by the British Economic and Social Research Council (grant no. Y 309 25 3025).

**Study Number:** 15.

**Title of Study:** Elections 1994

**Topics:** This was a study of the 1994 local elections in the Czech Republic with a focus on regional differences in attitudes and opinions. It aimed at measuring the extent and intensity of support for various political parties before the 1994 local elections and exploring various aspects of local politics.

**Comparability:** Some items (including left-right self-placement) were asked in an identical form in the TRENDS series of the STEM institute (see above).

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Hartl (STEM, Prague).

**Data Collector:** STEM.

**Dates of Data Collection:** Late May - early June 1994.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence.

**Number of Cases:** 11672 respondents.

**Publications:** A series of articles titled "Profily politicikych stran" in the Czech newspaper *Telegraf*.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM. Contact Jan Hartl.

**Source of Information:** Jan Hartl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 16.

**Title of Study:** Factum Omnibus Survey

**Topics:** These were monthly omnibus polls that contained only a few political items each. The topics covered by the individual surveys were as follows:

September-October 1994: expectations regarding forthcoming local elections, party preference in local elections.

November 1994: participation and vote in local elections, evaluation of results, satisfaction with government, value orientations.

December 1994: participation and vote in local elections, evaluation of results, motives of party choice.

January 1995: party-preference.

February-April 1995, July 1995, October 1995, January 1996, July 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions.

May 1995, August 1995, November 1995, February 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions; attitudes towards parliament and government.

June 1995, September 1995, December 1995: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions, forced choice between ODS and CSSD.

March 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions, conditions of various social groups.

May 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions, motives of party preference, party images, attitudes towards democracy, liberalism, government and parliament.

June 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions, evaluation of the results of the June 1996 parliamentary elections.

August 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement.

September 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, voting intention in the forthcoming elections to the Senate, image of senators.

October 1996: party-preference, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions, trust in main parties, interest in candidates in Senate elections.

November 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of national economic conditions, voting intention in Senate elections.

December 1996: party-preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of national economic conditions, participation in November 1996 Senate elections, satisfaction with election results, attitude towards NATO and EU.

January 1997: party-preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of national economic conditions, satisfaction with the political situation and economic conditions.

January 1997: party-preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of national economic conditions, Czech-German relations.

January 1997: party-preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of national economic conditions, housing problems.

**Comparability:** Several items were replicated time and time again (see information above). The series is expected to be continued.

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Herzmann and Stanislav Hampl (Factum, Prague).

**Data Collector:** Factum (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** Once a month since September 1994.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old population who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Primary sampling units stratified by region and population size: individual respondents selected according to a quota by gender, age, and education.

**Number of Cases:** 1000 respondents every month.

**Publications:** News releases in the Czech media.

**Availability of Data Sets:** SPSS format data files are available from Factum on a commercial basis: contact Jan Herzman or Stanislav Hampl (both at Factum).

**Source of Information:** Stanislav Hampl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 17.

**Title of Study:** InterMedia Surveys in Eastern Europe

**Topics:** The main focus of these surveys was to measure the audience of foreign media broadcast (RFE/RL, VOA, BBC, DW, and so forth). However, the surveys also featured a large number of standard questions on evaluation of current and future national economy and personal economic conditions; whether the country is going in the right/wrong direction; participation in political parties, demonstrations, petitions, electoral campaigns, writing to media (in the 1995, 1996, 1997 general population surveys only); current voting intention and vote in last election; attitudes towards privatisation, income inequalities, EU, NATO, United States, liberalism vs conservatism on moral issues; the powers of various political institutions (in the 1994 and 1996 elite surveys only); the meaning of the word democracy (1996 and 1997 elite surveys only); perceived incidence of corruption (in the elite surveys only); attitudes toward civic liberties, authority, political liberalisation, foreign influence, foreign investments, and the breakup of the Soviet Union; current voting intention and left-right self-placement; attitudes toward media freedom and market vs planned economy; evaluation of national and personal economic conditions; interest in politics and frequency of political discussion; exposure to domestic media; basic demographics.

**Comparability:** The InterMedia (previously Radio Free Europe, Audience and Opinion Research) surveys have been using a nearly identical questionnaire for (bi-)annual elite and general population surveys in Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia and the Ukraine since 1994. Some of these questions were also included in InterMedia general population surveys in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, and Yugoslavia. However, some of the socio-political attitude items included in the elite surveys were not asked in the general population surveys and vice versa. Moreover, the number of such questions was somewhat reduced from 1998 on.

**Principal Investigator:** InterMedia (Washington, DC).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague) for the elite surveys, and AISA (Prague) for the general population surveys.

**Dates of Data Collection:** Elite surveys in October-November 1994; February-March 1996; April-May 1997; November 1998 - January 1999; general population surveys in March-April 1995; April 1996; May-June 1997; Spring 1998.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 15+ years old citizen population. The general population surveys used area probability sampling, with random walk and the Kish-table (or its local variant). Elites were divided into 8 groups for purpose of sampling: governmental elite (quota by office, from cabinet ministers to mayors); party politicians (members of the national executive of

all major parties and legislative factions); state economic sector (CEOs of largest companies, quota by industrial branch); private business (CEOs of largest companies); senior personnel in public service institutions (trade union leaders; head physicians in major medical facilities; heads of educational institutions, quota by level); senior military and police officers; leading media personnel; seniors of cultural, academic and religious associations and institutions. The goal was to achieve 50 interviews in each group, by interviewing the highest possible level person, one per ministry or organisation (first trying to interview the minister, then go to deputy minister; or the CEO then the director, etc).

**Number of Cases:** Approximately 400 in each elite survey; just over 1000 in each general population surveys.

**Publications:** none.

**Availability of Data Sets:** All variables except those on exposure to foreign media broadcast are available on a commercial basis. Direct all inquiries on data and sales to Mark Rhodes at InterMedia.

**Source of Information:** Mark Rhodes and study materials stored by InterMedia.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 18.

**Title of Study:** Social Costs of Transformation (SOCO)

**Topics:** This survey focused on the financial, employment and housing situation of respondent's own household. However, it also featured questions on left-right self-placement (7 point scale), attitudes to government taking responsibility in the field of social services and the economy; evaluation of the personal importance and the current state of various personal liberties and the security of the satisfaction of various needs; whether the current regime is better than the one before 1990; and what non-governmental and non-party organisations the respondents were member at the time of the survey and five years before.

**Comparability:** This was part of a fully comparative survey covering the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Zsuzsa Ferge (Institute of Sociology, Eötvös University, Budapest).

**Data Collector:** The fieldwork in the five countries was coordinated by the Szonda-Ipsos polling agency (Budapest). The fieldwork in the Czech Republic was carried out by Factum (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 13 January - 27 March 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Households in the Czech Republic. The head of household was selected by the interviewer at each systematically selected address at a sample of 417 census districts (selected randomly within 8 region with a probability proportional to population size) stratified by region. Up to three attempts were made to conduct the interview before canceling the interview.

**Number of Cases:** 1251 respondents.

**Publications:** Information not available

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are publicly available from the Hungarian data archive TARKI (catalogue no. D 17). Users are charged a small fee to partially cover costs of archival services.

**Source of Information:** Tibor Závecz (Szonda-Ipsos, Budapest).

**Further Remarks:** The project was - with the exception of the survey in Germany - funded by the Institute of Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna.

**Study Number:** 19.

**Title of Study:** IVVM (Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czech Central Statistical Office) Survey No. V:95-21

**Topics:** Opinion about political and economic development before and after 1989.

**Comparability:** This was the Czech part of a three country comparative survey. The same questionnaire was used in simultaneous surveys in the Slovak Republic and Rumania.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Zdenik Strmiska (Centre de Recherche interdisciplinaire sur les Transformations sociales, Paris).

**Data Collector:** IVVM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 23-30 January 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 15+ year old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Quota by sex, age, economic activity, region, size of locality.

**Number of Cases:** 841 respondents.

**Publications:** Information not available.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The Czech data can be accessed on the premises of the IVVM. A decision about making the data more widely available may be reached at any time. No information about the Slovak and Romanian data sets.

**Source of Information:** Ján Misovic.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 20.

**Title of Study:** Actors and Strategies of Social Transformation and Modernization

**Topics:** Preferences regarding cuts and increases in government budget in various domains; foreign policy attitudes; evaluation of democracy in respondent's country; attitudes towards various democratic principles, rights of political minorities; personal opinion and perception of the government's, the opposition's and the president's views on various economic, foreign, and social policy issues; confidence in various institutions; respondent's participation and position in a political party, union, local government body, civic, professional or sport association in 1988 and at present; voting intention and party preference in next parliamentary election; attitudes toward citizens' political participation; left-right self placement (five point scale); leisure time activities; comparison of present society and personal life situation to that before 1989 from according to various criteria; life goals of the respondent; evaluation of atmosphere at place of work from various perspectives; opinion on what kind of owner and internal changes would be best for respondent's company/organisation; attitudes towards privatisation and income inequalities; relatively detailed data on present job, income, and past unemployment of the respondent; preferred strategy if losing present job; property, savings, debts of the household.

**Comparability:** This survey was part of a comparative project, with an identical questionnaire administered simultaneously in Slovakia and a similar one in Poland.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. Pavel Machonin (Institute of Sociology, Prague).

**Data Collector:** STEM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** June 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 20-59 year old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Random route.

**Number of Cases:** 1219 respondents.

**Publications:** Machonin (1997).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available for scientific use without any restriction, in SPSS-PC format with Czech labels from the archive of the Institute of Sociology (contact the principal investigator or Lumir Gatnar) for minor administration costs.

**Source of Information:** Lumir Gatnar.

**Further Remarks:** An English translation of the questionnaire is available in electronic form.

**Study Number:** 21.

**Title of Study:** Factum Surveys F95A-31 and F96A-11

**Topics:** Opinions of citizens, local councilors and administrators and members of parliament on public policy issues, public safety, environmental issues, social welfare, housing, and health care provisions.

**Comparability:** The same questionnaire was administered simultaneously to a nationwide sample of citizens and one of local councilors and administrators. Nearly the same questionnaire was used in the survey of parliamentary deputies.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Miroslav Purkrábek (Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University) in cooperation with Prof. Maurice Simon (East Californian University, Greenville).

**Data Collector:** Factum (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** July-August 1995 for the surveys of citizens and local officials, and March-May 1996 for the survey of parliamentary deputies.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old population who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey for the mass survey, local councilors and executive administrators employed by local councils for the local representatives survey, and members of the Czech parliament for the survey of deputies. Random route sampling for the population survey, Information not available for local representatives (except that 50 percent of the final effective sample were elected representatives and 50 percent were non-elected administrative officials), and exhaustive sampling (with a 73 percent response rate) for the survey of deputies.

**Number of Cases:** 1007 respondents in the mass, 222 in the councilor/administrator survey, and 146 in the survey of parliamentary deputies.

**Publications:** Purkrábek (1996).

**Availability of Data Sets:** Individual queries must be addressed to the principal investigator.

**Source of Information:** Stanislav Hampl, Miriam Kotrusova.

**Further Remarks:** The survey was funded by the East Californian University (Greenville, NC).

**Study Number:** 22.

**Title of Study:** The International Social Justice Project

**Topics:** Attitudes towards social, economic, and political justice; political trust, efficacy, participation, post-materialism; attitudes towards socialism and capitalism; voting, party preference. In the 1996 replication new questions were added on the evaluation of the transition from communism, the new political and economic institutions, one's own position in the new structures, and the evaluation of the changes.

**Comparability:** This was a cross-national survey, carried out in 1991 in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Germany (separate samples in East and West), Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Slovenia and the United States. A replication including about 80% of questions from 1991 and some new questions was fielded in 1996 in Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary and Russia. A less complete replication of the 1991 study was done in the Czech Republic in 1995. For both waves, all questions were asked in an identical fashion in all countries, though some countries included additional country-specific questions at the end of the core questionnaire.

**Principal Investigator:** This was a collaborative project, in which teams from all countries jointly developed the questionnaire, agreed on methodological standards, and analysed the data. The overall coordinator for both waves was Prof. David S Mason (Department of Political Science, Butler University). Data merging and archiving for the first wave was coordinated by Prof. Duane Alwin (University of Michigan) by Prof. Bernd Wegener (Humboldt University, Berlin) for the second wave. The national team consisted of Dr Petr Mateju, Klara Vlachova, Blanka Rehakova, and Jindrich Krejci (all at the Institute of Sociology, Prague) in the second wave.

**Data Collector:** Institute of Sociology and STEM (Prague)

**Dates of Data Collection:** 15 September - 29 October 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ years old population who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. A two-stage stratified random sample of addresses, and within the household the person with the closest birthday was selected.

**Number of Cases:** 1246 respondents.

**Publications:** None as yet. On publications based on the data from the 1991 International Social Justice Project survey see the separate entry at Czechoslovakia.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The datasets will be deposited with data archives in the United States and Europe upon the completion of the project.

**Source of Information:** Prof. David Mason.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 23.

**Title of Study:** IVVM (Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Central Statistical Office) Survey No. V:95-27

**Topics:** Voting preference, left-right self-placement, evaluation of developments since November 1989, value orientations among the Czech youth.

**Comparability:** Information not available.

**Principal Investigator:** Information not available.

**Data Collector:** IVVM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 5-11 October 1995.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 15-34 year old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Quota by sex, age, economic activity, region, size of locality.

**Number of Cases:** 1915 respondents.

**Publications:** Press releases only.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data can be accessed on the premises of the IVVM. A decision about making the data more widely available may be reached at any time.

**Source of Information:** Ján Misovic.

**Further Remarks:** The survey was commissioned by the Czech Ministry of Education. All relevant study materials were prepared in Czech only.

**Study Number:** 24.

**Title of Study:** Elections 1996 series

**Topics:** Electoral preferences of citizens; profiles of the supporters of individual political parties immediately before and during the 1996 parliamentary elections.

**Comparability:** Many items were asked in an identical form in the TRENDS series of the STEM institute (see above).

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Hartl (STEM, Prague).

**Data Collector:** STEM and STEM/MARK (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** Two surveys were carried out in May 1996 just before the election, and an exit poll on the two days of balloting (31 May and 1 June 1996).

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** In the pre-election polls the 18+ years old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail, and the voters in the 1996 election in the exit poll. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence in the pre-election surveys, and a stratified random sample for the exit poll.

**Number of Cases:** 6205, 5455, 8846 respondents in the three waves, respectively.

**Publications:** Press releases and broadcast on TV Nova only.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM. Contact Jan Hartl.

**Source of Information:** Jan Hartl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 25.

**Title of Study:** Factum 1996 Election Surveys (Factum study numbers: 96A-05, 96A-27, 96A-28, 96A-50, 96A-75)

**Topics:** These polls investigated voting behaviour at the 31 May - 1 June 1996 lower house, and the November 1996 Senate elections. The topics covered by the individual surveys were as follows:

May 1996 pre-election poll for *MF Dnes* (96A-27): party preference, reactions to election campaign.

1996 exit poll for TV *NOVA*, lower house elections (96A-05): party choice in the election.

June 1996 post-election poll for *MF Dnes* (96A-28): participation and vote in elections, evaluation of results.

November 1996 election poll for TV *NOVA* (96A-50): participation and vote in the first round of Senate elections, evaluation of results, reactions to campaign, probability of voting in the runoff.

November 1996 pre-election polls for *MF Dnes* (96A-75): voting intention in the first and second round of Senate elections. The purpose of this poll was to predict the outcome in each single-member constituency, for both rounds.

**Comparability:** Information not available.

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Herzmann and Stanislav Hampl (Factum, Prague).

**Data Collector:** Factum (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 18-20 May 1996 for study no 96A-27; 31 May - 1 June 1996 for study no 96A-05; 4-5 June 1996 for study no 96A-28; 19-20 November 1996 for study no 96A-50; 22-24 October 1996 and 3-4 November 1996 for study no 96A-75.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Voters leaving the polling station for study no 96A-05. For all other surveys: 18+ years old citizens who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Random sampling according to the instructions given by INFAS for study no 96A-05. For all other surveys: primary sampling units stratified by region and population size: individual respondents selected according to a quota by gender, age, and education. The sample for study no 96A-75 was also stratified by constituency.

**Number of Cases:** 535 respondents in study no 96A-27; 10319 in study no 96A-05; 500 in study no 96A-28; 500 in study no 96A-50; 12961 in study no 96A-75.

**Publications:** News releases in the Czech media.

**Availability of Data Sets:** SPSS format data files are available from Factum, but the permission of the sponsors (TV *NOVA* and/or *MF Dnes*) is required for providing them: contact Jan Herzman or Stanislav Hampl (both at Factum).

**Source of Information:** Stanislav Hampl.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 26.

**Title of Study:** CONSUMER/STANDARD series

**Topics:** This is a regular module in the omnibus series of the STEM/MARK market and media research company that explores the economic and political climate in the Czech Republic. The politically relevant items focus on media consumption, attitudes towards politics and interest in politics.

**Comparability:** The unchanged module has been part of the monthly STEM/MARK omnibus surveys since August 1996 and will remain so in the foreseeable future.

**Principal Investigator:** Tomas Raiter (STEM/MARK).

**Data Collector:** STEM/MARK (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** The surveys have been regularly conducted in the first third of each month since August 1996.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ (since February 1997: 15+) year old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence.

**Number of Cases:** Approximately 1300-1500 respondents every month.

**Publications:** Press releases only.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM/MARK. Contact Tomas Raiter.

**Source of Information:** Tomas Raiter.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 27.

**Title of Study:** IVVM (Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Central Statistical Office) Survey No. V:96-28

**Topics:** Opinion about the development and prospects of the democratic system.

**Comparability:** This was the Czech part of a three country comparative survey. The same questionnaire was used in simultaneous surveys in the Slovak Republic and Romania.

**Principal Investigator:** Dr Zdenik Strmiska (Centre de Recherche interdisciplinaire sur les Transformations sociales, Paris).

**Data Collector:** IVVM (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** 2-10 December 1996.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 15+ year old population of the Czech Republic who were not hospitalised, jailed or doing military service at the time of the survey. Quota by sex, age, economic activity, region, size of locality.

**Number of Cases:** 970 respondents.

**Publications:** Information not available.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The Czech data can be accessed on the premises of the IVVM. A decision about making the data more widely available may be reached at any time. No information about the Slovak and Romanian data sets.

**Source of Information:** Ján Misovic.

**Further Remarks:**

**Study Number:** 28.

**Title of Study:** Political Party Development in the Czech Republic

**Topics:** This was a survey of Czech parliamentarians. The questionnaire focused on their involvement with their political parties, activities on its behalf, activities in parliament, contacts with other branches of government, views about party discipline and institutional change, views about influence of political and social organisations (section 1); the importance of various issues, the position of their own party and all other parties on a 10 point scale between opposite alternatives (section 2); basic but detailed demographic questions (section 3).

**Comparability:** Section 1 of the questionnaire incorporated questions from parliamentary surveys conducted under the auspices of the University of Leiden and the Centre for Electoral Studies of the University of Amsterdam in 1993-1994 as well as questions from a 1996 survey of parliamentary elites funded by the East Carolina University (see study descriptions above). Section 2 repeats questions from surveys of party elites conducted by Herbert Kitschelt and associates in 1994 (see Kitschelt *et al.* 1999).

**Principal Investigator:** Kevin Deegan Krause (then at the Department of Government, University of Notre Dame).

**Data Collector:** Social science students from the Charles University conducted the interviews under the direct supervision of the principal investigator.

**Dates of Data Collection:** 20 October - 15 November 1996.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Members of the lower house of the Czech Parliament. Quota by party affiliation.

**Number of Cases:** 75 respondents (37.5% of all deputies).

**Publications:** None.

**Availability of Data Sets:** SPSS data file with English label and questionnaire are freely available for academic purposes from the principal investigator.

**Source of Information:** Kevin Deegan Krause.

**Further Remarks:** Interviewers were told the interviewed MPs would be contacted for follow-up interviews.

**Study Number:** 29.

**Title of Study:** Echoes of the Senate elections 1996

**Topics:** Voter behaviour in the 1996 elections (lower house in May/June and two rounds of Senate elections in November 1996); the demographic and attitudinal correlates of voter support for individual candidates in the Senate elections.

**Comparability:** Many items were asked in an identical form in the TRENDS series of the STEM institute (see above).

**Principal Investigator:** Jan Hartl (STEM).

**Data Collector:** STEM, STEM/MARK (Prague).

**Dates of Data Collection:** December 1996 - January 1997.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** 18+ (since February 1997: 15+) year old citizens of the Czech Republic with the exception of those currently in jail. Quota by region, age, gender, education, and the population size of the respondent's place of residence.

**Number of Cases:** 17400 respondents.

**Publications:** none.

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data are available on a commercial basis from STEM. Contact Jan Hartl.

**Source of Information:** Jan Hartl, Tomas Reiter.

**Further Remarks:** The survey was funded (partly) by a Czech political party.

**Study Number:** 30.

**Title of Study:** Coping with Government in Post-communist Europe

**Topics:** Interactions between citizens and junior officials from state and local government who they most frequently meet; the "culture of complaining"; the role of bribes, tips, contacts, wealth, knowledge, power etc. in obtaining favours from officials, citizens' knowledge and perception of the role of these factors; whether citizens feel comfortable about this bribe culture, whether they have the wealth, power, knowledge and contacts to obtain the favours they seek; whether citizens' strategies vary by context and user; whether they developed strategies to cope with unfair treatment by officials; what networks (family, friends, ethnic, religious, political, regional, or what) of contacts citizens rely upon in seeking favourable treatment.

**Comparability:** This is a four-country survey, with identical questionnaire and interview designs followed in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Ukraine.

**Principal Investigator:** Prof. William Miller (University of Glasgow), Tatyana Koshechkina (USM Ukrainian Surveys and Market Research, Kyiv), and Ase Grodeland.

**Data Collector:** Opinion Window (Prague, project director: Ladislav Köppl).

**Dates of Data Collection:** Focus group discussions and in-depth interviews in July-September 1996; general population survey scheduled for October-December 1997; structured interviews with junior officials scheduled for early 1998.

**Universe Sampled and Sampling Procedures:** Adult citizen population and junior public officials. Survey of citizens with clustered random sample, Information not available on survey of junior officials.

**Number of Cases:** Approximately 1000-1500 respondents in the citizen survey; approximately 200 in survey of junior officials.

**Publications:** Miller, Koshechkina, and Grodeland (1997); Grodeland, Koshechkina, and Miller (1997).

**Availability of Data Sets:** The data will be made available a few years after the completion of the fieldwork, most probably via the ESRC archive (Colchester, UK).

**Source of Information:** Prof. William L Miller.

**Further Remarks:** The study was funded by the British Overseas Development Administration, under grant number R6445.