IPD-Indices – Detailed Explanation of Construction

In this document the construction of the three IPD indices presented in von dem Berge and Poguntke (2017)[1] is described and explained in detail. The three IPD indices are the "Assembly-based IPD index" (AIPD), the "Plebiscitary IPD index" (PIPD) and the "Open plebiscitary IPD index" (OIPD).

The document at hand consists of two parts and an Appendix:

(1) Part I: All items of the PPDB-Codebooks (Core Module; Modules A, B, C) which are – for theoretical reasons – relevant for IPD are listed here (including IPD-quantifications). The selection of each item is justified and its theoretical importance on IPD is explained (theoretical derivation).

(2) Part II: Explanation of the construction of the final IPD-indices with IPD-components and calculation of the final IPD-scores.

(3) Appendix: As some PPDB-items are string-variables, in these cases it is necessary to code text (instead of numerical values like in case of the other PPDB-items). In the Appendix the coding rules for these string-variables are illustrated.

Part I: Selection of PPDB-items for the IPD-Indices

The applied logic of quantification in the main AIPD index is the following: Answers to questions (PPDB-items) are attributed the values 0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75 or 1.00. The rationale behind this quantification is that all answers which – from a theoretical point of view – affect IPD unfavorably are attributed the values 0.00 or 0.25. According to the same logic all answers which affect IPD favorably are attributed the values 0.75 or 1.00. The value 0.50 is allocated to an answer when no specific effects on IPD can be identified (see example below).

Furthermore, some variables are generated on the basis of 'rankings' of individual PPDB-items. The decisions regarding the allocation of the values to the items (questions/answers) are based on theoretical considerations, which are explained in detail in Table 1 below.

Example: Ideal type-example for the logic behind the allocation of IPD-values to PPDB-items (AIPD index)

PPDB-Question: Who has a vote on adopting the final manifesto?

PPDB-answer-option	IPD-Value	Effect on IPD
Party Congress	1.00 (max IPD; most „inclusive")	Pro IPD
Party Sub-Units	0.75	Pro IPD
Party Legislators	0.50	Not explicitly pro/contra IPD
Executive Commitee	0.25	Contra IPD
Party Leader	0.00 (min IPD; least „inclusive")	Contra IPD

---

[1] Benjamin, Berge von dem, and Thomas Poguntke (2017): Varieties of Intra-Party Democracy: Conceptualization and Index Construction. In: Susan Scarrow, Thomas Poguntke, Paul Webb (eds.): Organizing Political Parties. Representation, Participation, and Power. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 136-157.

Table 1 follows the order of the PPDB-codebook (Core Module, Module A, Module B, Module C) and consists of several columns:

(1) "IPD-Component": This is mainly important for AIPD-Variables. The AIPD-Index presented in Table 2a (see Part II of this paper) consists of three different "IPD-Components" which, on their part, consist of different "IPD-Variables". The column "IPD-Component" contains for each variable the name of the "IPD-Component" to which it belongs. For the theoretical reasons for choosing these IPD-Components see von dem Berge and Poguntke (2017).

(2) "PPDB-Items(s) / IPD-Variable": This column contains the names of the IPD-Variables and also the code-numbers of the individual PPDB-items, which constitute the IPD-Variables. AIPD-Variables are illustrated in black font color, PIPD-Variables in green font color, and OPIPD-Variables in blue font color. The labels of the IPD-Variables (and the abbreviations in brackets) correspond to the variable labels in the SPSS dataset which was used to construct the indices (this SPSS dataset is available on request).

(3) "Quant." (Quantification): Here, the quantification is presented, which means the allocation of IPD-values to the individual answer-options of the individual PPDB-items.

(4) "Note Quant.": In this column the quantification is explained in more detail.

(5) "Justification": This column contains two forms of justifications: (1) theoretical justification why individual PPDB-items were included in the IPD-indices ("item-selection"); (2) theoretical justification for the quantification of individual PPDB-items ("quantification-logic").

(6) "Variable-Types": This column contains two different types of IPD-Variables: (a) "Official Story" (OS) or "Real Story" (RS). (b) "Assembly-based IPD" (AIPD), "Plebiscitary IPD" (PIPD) or "Open Plebiscitary" (OPIPD). We end up with one main IPD-Index representing AIPD; furthermore, we will have two simple indices representing PIPD and OPIPD (see tables in Part II of this document).

Table 1: Selection of PPDB-items for the IPD-Indices

IPD-Component	PPDB-Item(s) / IPD-Variable	Quant.	Note Quant.	Justification	Variable-Types
PPDB-Core Module					
Organizational Structure	**IPD-Variable: Congress_VotingRights_AIPD (cvrAIPD)**		The quantification is based on a ranking of the items (0.50 / 0.75 / 1.00). The final value of this variable equals the highest value of the individual items (Example: When in Party A "delegates sent from local parties" were eligible to vote at the congress, then the value 0.75 is allocated to Party A for the variable "cvrAIPD"). The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 1.00) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making.	_(1) Item-selection:_ As the congress is the main rule-making body within a party, it is important for IPD who can make the decisions here. _(2) Quantification-logic:_ The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 1.00) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making. The more people have a say, the more inclusive is the decision-making process:	OS + AIPD
	Opening Question: CR35CONNUM: How many national party congresses were held in the past year? ➔ 0. None / 1. One / 2. two or more	---			
	CR42CON1D: Which of the following were eligible to vote at this congress? Delegates sent from local parties ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable [there was no congress]	0.75		• "Delegates from local parties" (CR42) are more people than "delegates from regional parties" (CR43) (therefore: 0.75 to CR42 and 0.50 to CR43).	
	CR43CON1E: Which of the following were eligible to vote at this congress? Delegates sent from regional parties ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	0.50		• "Delegates from regional parties" (CR43) are the lowest number of people of all items, however their involvement in intra-party decision-making cannot be considered as exclusive/contra IPD (therefore: 0.50).	
	CR44CON1F: Which of the following were eligible to vote at this congress? All party members in attendance ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	1.00		• "All party members" (CR44, CR45) are the highest number of people and therefore the most inclusive item (therefore: 1.00).	
	CR45CON1G: Which of the following were eligible to vote at this congress? All party members, whether in attendance or not (internet voting, for instance) ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	1.00			
⇨ _The PPDB-Codebook proceeds with the same questions/items of a possible second congress in the year of data collection. In the IPD-Index only the first congress is considered._					

PPDB-Module A

Organizational structure	**IPD-Variable: Congress_Frequency_AIPD (cfAIPD)** A78CONFREQ: According to the party statutes, how frequently MUST a party congress be held? In number of years.	1 x 1 year or more = 1.00 1 x 2 years = 0.50 1 x 3 years = 0.25 1 x 4 years or less = 0.00 Not specified = 0.00	The quantification is based on a ranking of the items (from 0.00 to 1.00). The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (1.00) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making.	*(1) + (2) Item-selection and quantification-logic:* The more often a congress is held, the more the party on the ground is involved in intra-party decision-making, and the more inclusive ("democratic") is the party.	OS + AIPD
Organizational structure	**IPD-Variable: Ex-Officio-Seats_Executive_AIPD (eoseAIPD)** Which of the following sit as *ex officio* members with full voting rights on the party's highest executive body?		We generate one variable out of all these items with the arithmetic mean of the quantification of all items. This means that we sum up the values across items A85 to A89 and divide the result by the number of items (most of the time: 4; in presidential and semi-presidential systems: 5).	*(1) + (2) Item-selection and quantification-logic:* Having ex-officio members with full voting rights in the party's highest executive body of a party is exclusive (and therefore contra IPD) because to be inclusive the highest executive body has to be elected (e.g. by the congress) and only the elected members should have voting rights. However, as the items do not consider the precise number of ex-officio-seats, neither the minimum value (0.00) nor maximum (1.00) value is assigned here.	OS + AIPD
	A85EXCSTATE: Leaders of state/provincial or regional parties. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No	Yes = 0.25 No = 0.75			
	A86EXCPM: The prime minister or chancellor, when s/he is a member of this party. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No				
	A87EXCPRES: The president (in presidential or semi-presidential systems), when s/he is a member of this party. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No				
	A88EXCMIN: Government ministers, when they are members of this party. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No				
	A89EXCPPG: Leader of the party group in the lower house of the legislature. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No				

PPDB-Module B

Decision-Making: Personnel	**IPD-Variables:** **(1) Candidate_Selection_Vote_AIPD (csvAIPD)** **(2) Candidate_Selection_Vote_PIPD (csvPIPD)** Please BRIEFLY summarize the role that the candidate selection rules assign to each of the following in the candidate selection process. Roles may include advisory vote, veto, preparing approved pre-selection list, etc. ➜ **Only final (decisive) vote!**		The AIPD-Variable is based on a ranking of the items (0.25/0.50/0.75). The final value of this variable equals the highest value of the individual items. ⇨ Item B22 is not part of this ranking, because it belongs to the PIPD-Index.	*(1) Item-selection:* Candidate selection is a major factor of IPD (see especially the various publications of Hazan and Rahat). *(2) Quantification-logic (AIPD-Variable):* • The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 0.75) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making. • There is no 0.00-value because the "national organization" (B25) can also be a "delegate meeting" and is not necessarily the "national leadership" (therefore: 0.25). • In votes by "local organizations" (B23) are more people involved than in votes by "regional organizations" (B24) (therefore: 0.75 to B23 and 0.50 to B24). ⇨ For the precise coding rules of the string variables see the Appendix at the end of this document.	OS + AIPD (B22: PIPD)
	B22CANRUL2TXT: Individual Members ➜ PIPD-Variable: Candidate_Selection_Vote_PIPD (see table 2b in Part II)	Yes = 1 No = 0			
	B23CANRUL3TXT: local level organization (delegate meeting and/or local leadership)	0.75			
	B24CANRUL4TXT: regional organization (delegate meeting and/or regional leadership)	0.50			
	B25CANRUL5TXT: national organization (delegate meeting and/or national Leadership)	0.25			

PPDB-Module C					
Decision-Making: Programme (and Issues)	**IPD-Variable: Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_PIPD (bpvPIPD)** C8REF8 According to the statutes, which of the following are eligible to vote in these intra-party policy ballots? ➔ 1. Members / 2. Members plus other registered supporters / 3. All voters / 4. Procedure not specified in party statutes / -999. Not applicable ➔ PIPD-Variable: Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_PIPD (see table 2b in Part II)	Members (1) = 1 2,3,4 = 0			OS + PIPD
Decision-Making: Programme (and Issues)	**IPD-Variable: Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_OPIPD (bpvOPIPD)** C8REF8 According to the statutes, which of the following are eligible to vote in these intra-party policy ballots? ➔ 1. Members / 2. Members plus other registered supporters / 3. All voters / 4. Procedure not specified in party statutes / -999. Not applicable ➔ OPIPD-Variable: Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_OPIPD (see table 2c in Part II)	Members plus supporters (2) = 1 All voters (3) = 1 1, 4 = 0			OS + OPIPD

Organizational Structure	**IPD-Variable: PartyLeader_Prerogatives/Accountability_AIPD (ppaAIPD)** C15LDRSUM1 Party statutes give the party leader the right to summon party officials. → 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	Yes = 0.00 No = 1.00	We generate one variable out of all these items with the arithmetic mean of the quantification of all items. This means that we sum up the values across the items C15, C16, C18, C19, A90 and divide the result by the number of items (which is 5).	*(1) + (2): Item-selection and quantification-logic:* • The "prerogatives of the party leader" is an important feature of IPD. If he/she has too much power over the other party bodies, this has to be seen as exclusive, because the party leader himself/herself is the most exclusive party body (C15, C16, C19). • C18: All other bodies are more inclusive than the party leader. Therefore, the other bodies should be able to control the party leader. • A90: It is highly exclusive when the party leader (alone) is able to appoint members of the highest executive body (therefore: 0.00). It is seen positive for inclusiveness, if the party leader is not able to appoint more than one person alone (therefore: 1.00). However, it can be seen as "normal" that a party leader appoints a Secretary General who is responsible for administrative matters of the party and who usually also belongs to the party executive (therefore: 0.50).	OS + AIPD
	C16DRSUM2 Party statutes give the party leader the right to summon the party congress. → 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	Yes = 0.00 No = 1.00			
	C18LDRROLE2 Party statutes explicitly mention that the party leader is accountable to the party executive or party congress. → 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	Yes = 1.00 No = 0.00			
	C19LDRROLE3 Party statutes explicitly mention that the national party can only enter coalition agreements with the consent of the party leader. → 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	Yes = 0.00 No = 1.00			
Decision-Making: Personnel	**IPD-Variable: PartyLeader_SelectionRules_Existent_AIPD (pseAIPD)** C24PLRULE: Are there formal party rules setting out the process for selecting the holder of this position? 1. Yes, in party statutes 2. Not entirely spelled out in statutes, but rules were created for this year's process 3. There were no written rules 4. There were written rules, but they were not followed this year -999. Not applicable	Yes = 1.00 Not entirely but = 0.50 No Rules = 0.00 Rules, but not followed = 0.25 -999 = ---		*(1) Item-selection:* Party leader selection is a major factor of IPD (see especially the various publications of William Cross). *(2) Quantification-logic:* Rules are pro IPD (inclusive) because if there are no rules, everything is in the hands of the elites.	OS + AIPD

Decision-Making: Personnel	**IPD-Variables:** **(1) PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_AIPD (plsvAIPD)** **(2) PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_PIPD (plsvPIPD)** **(3) PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_OPIPD (plsvOPIPD)** Brief summary of the role of each of the following in selecting political leader. ➔ **Only final (decisive) vote!**		The AIPD-Variable is based on a ranking of the items (0.25 / 0.50/0.75). The final value of this variable equals the highest value of the individual items.	*(1) Item-selection:* Party leader selection is a major factor of IPD (see especially the various publications of William Cross). *(2) Quantification-logic (AIPD-Variable):* • The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 0.75) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making.	OS + AIPD (C25: PIPD; C29: OPIPD)
	C25PLMBRTXT: Role of Individual Members ➔ [Text] OR "No Role" OR -999. Not applicable ➔ PIPD-Variable: PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_PIPD (see table 2b in Part II)	Yes = 1 No = 0	⇨ Item C25 is not part of this ranking, because it belongs to the PIPD-Index.	• There is no 0.00-value because the "national organization" (C28) can also be a "delegate meeting" and is not necessarily the "national leadership" (therefore: 0.25).	
	C26PLLOCTXT: Role of local organization (eg. Delegate meeting and/or Local Leadership) ➔ [Text] OR "No Role" OR -999. Not applicable	0.75		• In votes by "local organizations" (C26) are more people involved than in votes by "regional organizations" (C27) (therefore: 0.75 to C26 and 0.50 to C27).	
	C27PLREGTXT: Role of regional organization (eg. Delegate meeting and/or Regional Leadership) ➔ [Text] OR "No Role" OR -999. Not applicable	0.50	⇨ Item C29 is not part of this ranking, because it belongs to the OPIPD-Index.	⇨ For the precise coding rules of the string variables see the Appendix at the end of this document.	
	C28PLNATTXT: Role of national organization (eg. Delegate meeting and/or National Leadership) ➔ [Text] OR "No Role" OR -999. Not applicable	0.25			
	C29PLSUPTXT: Role of non-member supporters ➔ Not necessarily "final" vote. "Vote" is sufficient. ➔ [Text] OR "No Role" OR -999. Not applicable ➔ OPIPD-Variable: PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_OPIPD (see table 2c in Part II)	Yes = 1 No = 0			

Decision-Making: Personnel	**IPD-Variable:** **PartyLeader_SelectionVote_Existent_AIPD (psveAIPD)** C40PLVT1: There was a vote (advisory or binding) at the most inclusive stage of the leadership selection process. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	Yes = 1.00 No = 0.00 -999 = ---		*(1) Item-selection:* Party leader selection is a major factor of IPD (see especially the various publications of William Cross). *(2) Quantification-logic:* It is inclusive if there was a vote (therefore: 1.00), and it is not inclusive if there was no vote (therefore: 0.00).	RS + AIPD
Decision-Making: Personnel	**IPD-Variables:** **(1) PartyLeader_SelectionVote_Process_AIPD (pspAIPD)** If yes [answer to question C40PLVT1], who was eligible to participate in this vote by virtue of their position (e.g., not merely because they also were party members)? If there was not a vote, answer is "not applicable".	---	The variable is based on a ranking of the items (0.25 / 0.5 / 0.75 / 1.0). The final value of this variable equals the highest value of the individual items.	*(1) Item-Selection:* Party leader selection is a major factor of IPD (see especially the various publications of William Cross). *(2) Quantification-logic:* • The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 1.00) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making. • There is no 0.00-value because it is not entirely exclusive when all members of the executive committee decide on their chairman. It would be the minimum value 0.00, if the former party leader appointed his successor alone. • "All local party leaders" (C46) are more inclusive than "all regional party leaders" (C45), because the first represent more party members (therefore: 0.75 and 0.50). There is no such unchangeable difference in numbers between "all regional leaders" (C45) and "all party legislators" (C42) (therefore: 0.5 for both). • The decision-making is most inclusive when the congress (C44) decides (therefore: 1.00).	
	C41PLVT2: All members of the party's highest-level executive committee. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	0.25			
	C42PLVT3: All party legislators. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	0.50			
	C44PLVT5: All party congress delegates. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	1.00			
	C45PLVT6: Regional party leaders. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	0.50			
	C46PLVT7: All local party leaders. ➔ 1. Yes / 2. No / -999. Not applicable	0.75			

⇨ *The PPDB-codebook proceeds with the same questions/items of a possible second election of a Party leader in the year of data collection. In the IPD-Index only the first election is considered.*

⇨ *The PPDB-codebook proceeds with the same questions/items of a possible election of an Electoral leader in the year of data collection (also in the Supplemental Questionnaire). The electoral leader is not considered in the IPD-Index, because this is often an unofficial position.*

Decision-Making: Programme	**IPD-Variables:** **(1) Manifesto_Vote_AIPD (mvAIPD)** **(2) Manifesto_Vote_PIPD (mvPIPD)** **(3) Manifesto_Vote_OPIPD (mvOPIPD)** Role played by each of the following in formulating the party's election manifesto. Formal Input means that there were organized opportunities for the groups to influence the outcome through suggestions and discussion. Vote means having a vote on adopting the final manifesto. ➔ **Only vote (answer options 2 and 3)!**		The AIPD-Variable is based on a ranking of the items (0.00/ 0.25/0.50/1.00). The final value of this variable equals the highest value of the individual items.	*(1) Item-selection:* The manifesto includes party goals which guide the actions of a party when government participation can be achieved. Therefore, it is relevant for IPD how inclusive the decision on the manifesto is. *(2) Quantification-logic (AIPD-Variable):*	RS + AIPD (C105: PIPD; C106: OPIPD)
	C101MAN2: Role of the party leader and/or a drafting committee directly appointed by him/her: ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable	0.00	⇨ Item C105 is not part of this ranking, because it belongs to the PIPD-Index.	• The items are ordered in a way that the highest value (here: 1.00) is given to the most inclusive way of decision-making. • The decision-making is most inclusive, when the congress (C104) decides (therefore: 1.00). • It is extremely exclusive, when only the party leader or a committee appointed by him (C101) is able decide on the manifesto (therefore: 0.00).	
	C102MAN3: Role of national executive committee. ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable	0.25			
	C103MAN4: Role of parliamentary party. ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable	0.50	⇨ Item C106 is not part of this ranking, because it belongs to the OPIPD-Index.		
	C104MAN5: Party congress delegates. ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable	1.00			
	C105MAN6: Party members ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable ➔ PIPD-Variable: Manifesto_Vote_PIPD (see table 2b in Part II)	Yes (answer option 2 or 3) = 1 No = 0			
	C106MAN7: Non-member party supporters ➔ 1. Formal Input / 2. Vote / 3. A and B / 4. Neither A or B / 5. Other / -999. Not applicable ➔ OPIPD-Variable: Manifesto_Vote_OPIPD (see table 2c in Part II)	Yes (answer option 2 or 3) = 1 No = 0			

Part II

Table 2a: AIPD-Index (Assembly-based Index)

IPD-Component	Decision-Making: *Programme*	Decision-Making: *Personnel*		Organizational Structure
IPD-Variables (PPDB-items)	Manifesto_Vote_AIPD *(mvAIPD)* (C101MAN2, C102MAN3, C103MAN4, C104MAN5)	PartyLeader_SelectionRules_Existent_AIPD *(pseAIPD)* (C24PLRULE)	PartyLeader_Selection_mean (mean of all "Party-Leader-Variables")	Congress_VotingRights_AIPD *(cvrAIPD)* (CR42CON1D, CR43CON1E, CR44CON1F, CR45CON1G)
		PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_AIPD *(plsvAIPD)* (C26PLLOCTXT, C27PLREGTXT, C28PLNATTXT)		Congress_Frequency_AIPD *(cfAIPD)* (A78CONFREQ)
		PartyLeader_SelectionVote_Existent_AIPD *(psveAIPD)* (C40PLVT1)		Ex-Officio-Seats_Executive_AIPD *(eoseAIPD)* (A85EXCSTATE, A86EXCPM, A87EXCPRES, A88EXCMIN, A89EXCPPG)
		PartyLeader_SelectionVote_Process_AIPD *(pspAIPD)* (C46PLVT7, C42PLVT3, C44PLVT5, C45PLVT6, C41PLVT2)		PartyLeader_Prerogatives/Accountability_AIPD *(ppaAIPD)* (C15LDRSUM1, C16DRSUM2, C18LDRROLE2, C19LDRROLE3, A90EXCLDR)
		Candidate_Selection_Vote_AIPD *(csvAIPD)* (B23CANRUL3TXT, B24CANRUL4TXT, B25CANRUL5TXT)		
IPD-score Component	$\text{comp\_programme} = \text{IPD}_{variable1}(\text{mvAIPD})$	$\text{comp}_{personnel} =$ $\dfrac{\sum \text{IPD}_{variable1}(\text{PartyLeader\_Selection\_mean}) + \text{IPD}_{variable2}(\text{CandidateSelection\_Vote})}{\text{N\_variables\_component}}$		$\text{comp}_{structure} =$ $\dfrac{\sum \text{IPD}_{variable1}(\text{cvrAIPD}) + \text{IPD}_{variable2}(\text{cfAIPD}) + \cdots}{\text{N\_variables\_component}}$
AIPD-Index score	$\text{AIPD\_Index} = \dfrac{\sum \text{comp\_programme} + \text{comp\_personnel} + \text{comp\_structure}}{\text{N\_components}}$			

Table 2b: PIPD-Index (Plebiscitary Index)

IPD-Component	IPD-Variables (PPDB-items)
Decision-Making: *Programme and issues*	Manifesto_Vote_PIPD *(mvPIPD)* (C105MAN6)
	Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_PIPD *(bpvPIPD)* (C8REF8)
Decision-Making: *Personnel*	PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_PIPD *(plsvPIPD)* (C25PLMBRTXT)
	Candidate_Selection_Vote_PIPD *(csvPIPD)* (B22CANRUL2TXT)
Organizational Structure	--- no items/variables ---
PIPD-Index Score	$$\text{PIPD\_Index} = \frac{\sum \text{IPD}_{variable1}\,(\text{mvPIPD}) \;+\; \text{IPD}_{variable2}(\text{bpvPIPD}) + \cdots}{\text{N\_variables}}$$

Table 2c: OPIPD-Index (Open Plebiscitary Index)

IPD-Component	IPD-Variables (PPDB-items)
Decision-Making: *Programme and issues*	Manifesto_Vote_OPIPD *(mvOPIPD)* (C106MAN7)
	Ballot_PolicyIssue_Vote_OPIPD *(bpvOPIPD)* (C8REF8)
Decision-Making: *Personnel*	PartyLeader_Selection_Vote_OPIPD *(plsvOPIPD)* (C29PLSUPTXT)
Organizational Structure	--- no items/variables ---
OPIPD-Index Score	$$\text{OPIPD\_Index} = \frac{\sum \text{IPD}_{variable1}\,(\text{mvOPIPD}) \;+\; \text{IPD}_{variable2}(\text{bpvOPIPD}) + \cdots}{\text{N\_variables}}$$

Appendix: Coding Rules String Variables

Variables B22 and C25 (PIPD-Index)

- As "plebiscitary IPD" is defined as occurring without any kind of organized deliberation before the vote (e.g. postal ballot), membership votes taking place within a "party body" or any kind of a "meeting" do not go into the PIPD-Index. Membership votes are only coded when no discussion is involved (e.g. postal ballots).
- This means that membership votes taking place in the scope of a party congress[2] are not included in the PIPD-Index, but in the main AIPD-Index (in the scope of the PPDB-Variable on the "congress /national organization" (B25 and C25).
- The code "1" is assigned when the possibility of a final (decisive) vote exists for individual members, even though when in the end no membership vote was held. The reason is that these variables cover the "official story" as described in the party rules.
- The code "1" is also assigned when individual members can only decide on a part of the candidates.

Variables B23, B24, B25, C27

- If a "national organization" (IPD-value: 0.25) votes on a candidate list together with the "constituency organizations" (IPD-value: 0.50) and/or "regional organizations" (IPD-value: 0.50), both are coded. The higher value goes into the index (here: 0.5).
- The "parliamentary party" in the national parliament is coded as a "national (party) organization".
- We are only interested in which party body has the "final/decisive vote". The following terms are regarded as synonyms:
  - Elect
  - Choose
  - Determine
  - Approve
  - Adopt
  - Draws up approved list of candidates
  - Final ratification
  - Ratify

---

[2] Example: "Individual members vote via congress".