

Party-Switching Code book

<i>Presence of Switching:</i>	Distinguishes parties that witnessed no intra-session switching from those that witnessed any switching during the legislative term. 0: No switching. 1: Any switching.
<i>Pervasiveness of Switching:</i>	Measures the percentage of MPs that left the party during the legislative session.
<i>Δ Seats held by party:</i>	Measures the difference between the number of seats a party holds under the examined session, and the seats it won in the subsequent elections: $\Delta = S_t - S_{t+1}$, where S is the number of seats, and t is the examined session.
<i>Rice Scores:</i>	Defined as: $Rice_{pj} = \frac{ AYE_{pj} - NAY_{pj} }{AYE_{pj} + NAY_{pj}}$, for party p on vote j. where I average across j to get party-level Rice score index.
<i>Coalition Member:</i>	Measures whether the party was in the opposition, coded 0, or coalition, coded 1, in the period examined. In presidential system, this variable examines whether the party is the president's party or not.
<i>Ballot Type:</i>	Measures how much control voters have over the ballot on the general election day. Differentiates between fixed ballots, coded 0, where voters cannot change the ballot, weak preferential ballots, coded 1, where pre-determined list-order is important, but preferential vote may limit its effect, and strong preferential ballots, coded 2, where "preference votes are the sole basis on which individual legislators are chosen" (Karvonen, 2004, 207). SMD systems with a single candidate presented to the voters at the election stage coded as 0 since voters cannot disturb a "list" at the general election stage. On the other hand, if a SMD system presents multiple candidate from the same party to the voters, then voters can disturb the list, and their preferential vote is the only determinant of the candidate chosen; these systems are coded 2. Using the same logic we classify Mixed Member systems as 0, since the CLPR tier and the SMD tier are both coded as fixed ballots, 0.
<i>Pool:</i>	Measures whether a candidate for national office can benefit from electoral support for other candidates in his party, possibly in other districts. It measures whether and at what level the system pools votes to calculate seat allocations. Coded 0 if votes cast are pooled across the whole party to determine the allocation of seats. Coded 1 if votes are pooled at the sub-party level and coded 2 if votes cast for a candidate contribute only to that candidate's electoral success. Note that according to this definition (and as oppose to Carey and Shugart (1995)), this definition leads us to classify SMD systems as 2 on the Pool variable because votes in SMD are pooled neither to the party or the sub-party level.

<i>Vote:</i>	Measures “limitations on the number of individuals that voters can support” (Seddon et al., 2002, 12). It is coded as 0 where a voter can cast a single vote for a party, 1 where voters cast multiple votes for candidates who might not be from the same party. We coded electoral systems where voters cast a vote for a local candidate and a vote for a national candidate as 1. A code of 2 identifies systems where voters have a single vote for a single candidate. SMD electoral systems are coded as 2 as voters are given a single vote for a single candidate. This coding stands in opposition to Carey and Shugart (1995)).
<i>Selectorate:</i>	Measures who can participate in the intra-party candidate selection procedure. In operationalizing this variable we use the size criterion presented by Rahat and Hazan (2001). The variable differentiates between selection by a small group (up to 10 people) coded as 0, party delegates (like party conventions, party committees etc.), coded as 1, and selection done by primaries, coded as 2.
<i>Decentralization:</i>	A centralized selection mechanism is one where “candidates are selected exclusively by a national party selectorate with no procedure that allows for territorial and/or functional representation” (Hazan, 2002, 114). On the other hand, in a decentralized selection procedure local party organizations solely make the selection (Malcolm, 1973; Ranney, 1965). It is a threefold measure differentiating between selection processes done exclusively by the national level (0), selection procedures in which both national as well as local levels of the party participate (1), and selection processes conducted solely by local party organs (2).
<i>District Magnitude:</i>	Measures the log of the average district magnitude from the viewpoint of the individual legislator. It is operationalized similar to Seddon, Gaviria, Panizza and Stein (2002) and Johnson and Wallack (2007). Thus, it is a weighted average of the district magnitudes in a country. The weights are calculated by how many legislators run in districts of each size. Thus, in a country with 50 single member districts, and one 150 member national district District Magnitude will be equal to $(150*150+50*1)/200$ equals to 112.75. We then use the log of 112.75 as our measure of district magnitude.
<i>Effective Number of Parties:</i>	Measures the effective number of parliamentary parties as defined and operationalized by Laakso and Taagepera (1979). $N = \frac{1}{\sum p_i^2}$, where P_i is the proportion of seats held by party i .
<i>Party Size:</i>	Measures the number of seats the party held at the beginning of the period examined.
<i>Parliamentary Systems:</i>	Indicates whether the country is a presidential, coded 0, or a parliamentary system, coded 1. We followed Keefer’s 2006 Database of Political Institutions (DPI).

