

Information on the Data File

**24 hours before elections
(Senate election)**

Two surveys conducted on the panel of respondents, before the first and the second round of elections to the Senate of the Czech Parliament in 1996

Prepared by Jindrich Krejci
(e-mail: krejci@soc.cas.cz)
Sociological Data Archive, Social Trends project
Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences

A. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Country: Czech Republic.

Fieldwork Date:

Survey 1 - from November 15 to November 16, 1996

Survey 2 - from November 22 to November 23, 1996

Investigator:

SC&C (Prague) for Czech Television.

Context of the Survey:

Merged data file results from two surveys conducted on the panel of respondents. First survey was fielded during the period of 48 hours before the first round of election for the Senate of the Parliament of the Czech Republic in 1996, second survey was conducted during the period of 24 hours before the second round. The results were aired on Czech television as a part of electoral news.

Both surveys were organized by SC&C. The fieldwork was carried out by Aktuel (Prague) under supervision of SC&C.

After the election the research continued in third survey of the same panel of respondents. Its data are not included in the file.

General Population: Adult population (over 18) in the Czech Republic.

Sampling Procedure:

- 1) Probability stratified sample on the base of regional and political segmentation prepared by SC&C.
- 2) Cluster sampling of localities.
- 3) Selection of individuals - random walk with quote ending (sex, age, education).
- 4) Selected sample was used in both surveys.

N = 1174

Response rate information is not provided because of the sampling method used.

Fieldwork Method:

Standardized interview.

Weighting:

The data should be weighted. Weighting variable **VAHA1** was constructed on the bases of the official results and participation in elections.

Elections to the Parliament of the Czech Republic in 1996:

The elections in 1996 were the first regular parliamentary elections in the newly established Czech Republic. After the split of the Czechoslovak Federation into the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic in 1993 the Czech National Council became the Lower House of the Parliament of the Czech Republic - the Chamber of Deputies.

There were two elections in the Czech Republic in 1996. The new electoral system to the Parliament of the Czech Republic was adopted in 1995. On the base of its amendments was held elections to the Chamber of Deputies (the lower house of the Parliament) as well as new elections to the Senate (the upper house).

The elections for the Chamber of Deputies were held from Friday, 31 May to Saturday, 1 June. The electoral system is based on the principle of proportional representation. The chamber has 200 Deputies who shall be elected for a term of four years.

The Senate shall have 81 members, which are elected by direct franchise according to the principles of the majority system. There were established 81 single-mandate election districts for the election of senators so, that each of them includes the territory having approximately the same amount of population. There is one senator being elected for the period of 6 years in each of these districts.

Pursuant to the Constitution of the Czech Republic in this first election to the Senate there are senators elected in all 81 election districts, with the exception of one third of them being elected only for two years, one third of them for four years and the last third of them for six years. From this scheme arises, that within the next years the election to the Senate shall be held every two years always in 27 election districts, while the term of post of so elected senators shall be always six years.

The first elections to the Senate (two rounds) were held in November 1996.

First round: from November 15 to November 16, 1996.

Second round: from November 22 to November 23, 1996.

Results: Number of senators by the political parties

PARTY ID	Number of Senators
KDU-CSL	11
CSSD	23
ODA	3
KSCM	2
ODS	32
No party	10

B. INFORMATION ON VARIABLES

ATTENTION: 24 hours before Senate election data file has been merged from data of two surveys of the same panel of respondents. Therefore first there are variables, which correspond to the questionnaire of the first survey, than variables of the second survey were attached.

DOTAZNIK questionnaire no.
TAZATEL inquirer
LOKALITA locality code
DATUM date
HODINA hour
DELKA length in min.

A1 Most appealing party
A2 Least appealing party
A3 Party voted for Chamber of Deputies

From the following list, please choose the parties which are, in your opinion, the most appealing, the least appealing, and for which you voted.

- 1) In your opinion, which party is the most appealing? Please choose only one party.
- 2) In your opinion, which party is the least appealing? Please choose only one party.
- 3) And which of the parties did you vote for the Chamber of Deputies in May, this year?

q. 1 - no. of the most appealing party	
q. 2 - no. of the least appealing party	
q. 3 - no. of the party from 1996	

A4 Why this party?

4) If you took part in Parliamentary election please state why you voted for this party. Please choose only the most important reason.

- 1) it is a strong party
- 2) it bothers me the least
- 3) there are strong people in it
- 4) it has a good election program
- 5) I trust it
- 6) it offers a good outlook for the future
- 7) it is led by appealing people
- 8) other reason

A5 Party voted in 1992-Czech Nat.Council

5) Please try to remember which party you voted for the Czech National Council in the 1992.

2	CSSD	Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party
3	ODS-KDS	Civic Democratic Party
8	ODA	Civic Democratic Alliance
10	KDU-CSL	Christian Democratic Union - Czech People's Party
15	LB	Left block – coalition of The Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia and The Party of the Democratic Left
17	SPR-RSC	The Union for Republic - Czechoslovak Party of Republicans
95	OTHERS	other political party
96		didn't vote
98		can't remember
99		don't want to answer

A6 Will resp. vote for Senate?

6) What is your present intention? Will you vote in the Senate election?

- 1 definitely not
- 2 rather not
- 3 rather yes
- 4 definitely yes

A6A Reason why will not vote

6a) Can you state the reason of your decision

- 1) I never take part in any elections
- 2) I do not agree with the existence of the Senate
- 3) there is no party running in my election district that would be acceptable for me
- 4) there is not an acceptable candidate running in my election district
- 5) I know nothing about the Senate so I have no reason to take part in this election
- 6) as a whole, the electoral system for the Senate does not seem fair to me
- 7) most of my friends (relatives etc.) will not vote, so I will not take part as well
- 8) other reasons

A6B When decided

6b) Can you state when did you decide?

- 1) Before September
- 2) In September
- 3) In October
- 4) In the first week of November
- 5) In the week of the 1st. round

- A7.1 1-st:Senator-first name**
- A7.1P 1-st:Senator-Surname**
- A7.2 1-st:Party**
- A7.3J 2-nd:Senator-first name**
- A7.3P 2-nd:Senator-Surname**
- A7.4 2-nd:Party**

7) What senator will you vote for? Mention his (her) name.

- 7.1) name.....
- 7.2) What party do you identify him with? party number (card):
- 7.3) What other candidate do you like?
name:
- 7.4) What party do you identify him with? party number (card):

A8 Reason for decision

8) What is going to be deciding for your vote?

- 1) party, that is represented by a candidate
- 2) personality, without regards to the party
- 3) combination of both: personality in a party that I support

A9A Party-Personality 1

9a) Which one of the statements describes your decision the best?

- 1) I want to support a party, even though the candidate does not satisfy me
- 2) I do not know the candidate well, but I trust the party that appointed him
- 3) it is a strong personality that persuaded me
- 4) it is well known personality that most of the people trust

A9B Party-Personality 2

9b) And what reason would you put in the second position? no. from 9a)

- A10.1 Expectation-local politics**
- A10.2 Expectation-better lows**
- A10.3 Expectation-interests of people**
- A10.4 Expectation-nothing special**

10) What do you expect from a future senator?

	yes	no
1) support of the local requests in our town / district	1	0
2) creation of new and better lows	1	0
3) ability to enforce interests of people same as I am	1	0
4) I do not expect anything special from him	1	0

- A11.1 R.knows candidate -personally**
- A11.2 R.knows candidate -visits r.at home**
- A11.3 R.knows candidate -meeting**
- A11.4 R.knows candidate-well known in district**
- A11.5 R.knows candidate-well known in Czech R.**
- A11.6 R.knows candidate -political activity**
- A11.7 R.knows candidate -TV**
- A11.8 R.knows candidate -radio**
- A11.9 R.knows candidate -leaflet**
- A11.10 R.knows candidate -advertisement**
- A11.11 R.knows candidate -friends**

11) Can you state how did you get to know the candidate that you want to vote for?

	yes	no
11.1) personally	1	0
11.2) he was in our house and introduced himself	1	0
11.3) from a meeting	1	0
11.4) it is a well known person within our district	1	0
11.5) it is well known person throughout the Republic	1	0
11.6) from his political activity	1	0
11.7) from television	1	0
11.8) from radio	1	0
11.9) from a leaflet	1	0
11.10) from an advertisement	1	0
11.11) from people I know	1	0

A12 Family vote

12) How is your family going to vote like?

- 1) the same as I will; we have the same opinions
- 2) everyone of us differently
- 3) I do not know

A13A 2-nd round: vote for the same candidate

13a) Will you vote in the second round if your candidate will get to the second round?

- 1) yes, and I will vote for him again
- 0) no, I will not vote a second time

- A13B** **2-nd round: vote for other candidate**
- A13BJMEN** **2-nd round: other name**
- A13BSTR** **2-nd round: other party**

13b) Will you vote in the second round if your candidate will not get to the second round?

- 1) yes I will vote again, iffrom the party..... stays
(name of a different candidate)
- 0) no, I will not vote for the second time

- A14.1** **Characteristic: independent-party interest**
- A14.2** **Characteristic: politician-expert**
- A14.3** **Characteristic: flexible-scrupulous**
- A14.4** **Characteristic: locality-society**
- A14.5** **Characteristic: equality-indiv.freedom**

14) What characteristic should a senator have according to you?

Mark what you prefer.

1 = characteristic on the left side; 5 = characteristic on the right side

1) behaves independently	1	2	3	4	5	he incites interest in his party
2) experienced politician	1	2	3	4	5	excellent expert
3) flexible	1	2	3	4	5	scrupulous
4) places emphasis on local problems	1	2	3	4	5	places emphasis on societal problems
5) demands human equality	1	2	3	4	5	demands freedom for every individual

A15 Society informed about the Senate?

15) How well do you think the society is informed about the Senate and its tasks.

- 1) very badly, nobody talks about it, no one knows anything.
- 2) rather badly, people do not know much about it
- 3) quite well, people have some idea
- 4) very well, most of people know what the Senate's task is

A16A R. informed in comparison with others?

16a) How well do you think you are informed about the Senate in comparison with other people.

- 3) I know more than others 2) I know the same as others 1) I know less than others

A16B How well R. informed?

16b) How well do you think you are informed about the Senate and its tasks.

- 1) very badly, I do not know anything about it
- 2) rather badly, I do not know much about it
- 3) quite well, I have some idea
- 4) very well, I know what the Senate's task is

- A17.1** **Information source -newspapers**
- A17.2** **Information source -radio**
- A17.3** **Information source -TV**
- A17.4** **Information source -friends**
- A17.5** **Information source -meeting**
- A17.6** **Information source -other**

17) Where did you get most of the information concerning the Senate.
Pick random number of options.

	yes	no
17.1) from newspapers (from which one:.....)	1	0
17.2) from radio (from what station:	1	0
17.3) from television (from which one:	1	0
17.4) from people I know	1	0
17.5) in an election meeting	1	0
17.6) elsewhere	1	0

A18 **R. watched interview with Havel**

18) Did you watch the interview with President Havel on Czech television last week?

- 1) yes, I watched it 2)no, but I heard about it 3) no, I know nothing about it

A19 **Interview improved information**

19) Has the interview improved your being well-informed about the Senate?

- 1) yes, considerably improved 2) yes, rather improved 3) no, has not improved at all

A20 **Interview changed Rs opinion**

20) Did your opinion about the Senate changed after this interview?

- 1) yes, considerably 2) yes, rather 3) no, not at all

A21 **Interview influenced R. to vote**

21) Has this interview influenced your decision to vote? 1) yes 0) no

A22 **Is Senate useful?**

22) Now we will focus on the Senate. Do you suppose that:

- 1) Senate is a necessary and useful institution?
- 2) Senate is an unnecessary institution, but since it is in the Constitution, it should exist.
- 3) Senate is absolutely unnecessary institution, and it should be canceled.

POHL40 SEX

40) Sex:

- 1) male
- 2) female

VZDEL41 EDUCATION

41) What is the highest level of education have you completed?

- 1) primary
- 2) vocational
- 3) secondary
- 4) university

ROK42 BIRTH YEAR

42) In what year were you born?

VRSTVA43 SOCIAL CLASS

43) What social class or strata would you classify yourself?

lower	1	none of that	6
lower middle	2	refused this concept	
middle	3	of differentiation	7
upper middle	4	refused the answer	8
upper	5	do not know	9

KRAJ44 REGION

44) Region of the respondent:

- 1) Prague
- 2) Central Bohemia
- 3) South Bohemia
- 4) West Bohemia
- 5) North Bohemia
- 6) East Bohemia
- 7) South Moravia
- 8) North Moravia

BYDL45 SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY

45) Size of community of respondent's residence:

- 1) less than 2 thousands inhabitants
- 2) 2 - 5 thousands inhabitants
- 3) 5 - 10 thousands inhabitants
- 4) 10 - 50 thousands inhabitants
- 5) 50 - 100 thousands inhabitants
- 6) more than 100 thousands inhabitants
- 7) Brno
- 8) Prague

A46 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

46) What is your employment? Pick one option.

- 1) worker
- 2) state employee
- 3) other employee
- 4) agricultural worker (collective/private)
- 5) businessman/woman
- 6) retired
- 7) housewife
- 8) student, pupil, apprentice
- 9) unemployed
- 10) other

BIS47 Vicechairman Lux-Information Service(BIS)scandal

47) Mr. Josef Lux, the vice-chairman, announced on the television that he was watched by the Protection Information service BIS. Have you heard about this scandal?

- 1) no, I have not heard it
- 2) I heard of it, but I did not pay any attention
- 3) yes, I heard it and I watched its evolution

BIS48 Scandal: Rs attitude

48) Which one of these statements corresponds with your opinion?

- A) This kind of scandals do not interest me.
- B) It is just a part of the pre-election politics.
- C) There are many scandals like that. They do not interest me.
- D) I do not believe, that something like that could happen.
- E) The news is very important. It changes the picture of our politics.

BIS49 Scandal: impact on Senate election

49) According to you, will this scandal have an impact on the upcoming vote for the Senate?

- 0) I do not know
- 1) no
- 2) yes

BIS50 Scandal: impact on Rs vote

50) Has this news influenced your decision whether to vote in the Senate election?

- 1) no, this news did not have any impact on my original decision
- 2) yes, originally I did not want to vote, but now I probably will vote.
- 3) yes, originally I wanted to vote, but I will not vote now

BIS51 Scandal: impact on people

51) In your opinion, will this scandal have an impact on people who are going to vote for to the Senate?

- 1) I do not know
- 2) definitely not
- 3) rather not
- 4) rather yes
- 5) definitely yes

BIS52 Scandal: impact on Rs decision

52) Have this news had an impact on your own decision?

- 1) no
- 2) yes

BIS53 Scandal: which party will profit

53) In your opinion, which party will profit the most from this kind of news?

T: Write your reply here from the card of the political parties (e.g. reply "no one" marked by the code 94).

party number:.....

BIS54 Scandal: which party lose

54) In your opinion, what political party will suffer the most because of this news?

T: Write in a reply here from the card of the political parties (e.g. reply "no one " marked by the code 94).

party number:.....

C.OBVODU **Number of constituency**
PRIJMENI **Name of senator - 1-st round (1-st choice)**

STRANA1 **Party of senator in 1-st round - real one**

2.00 CSSD
3.00 ODS
8.00 ODA
10.00 KDU-CSL
15.00 KSCM
17.00 SPR-RSC
95.00 other
96.00 did not vote
98.00 do not know
99.00 refused

RVEK4 **AGE - group**

1.00 < 29
2.00 30-44
3.00 45-59
4.00 60 and more

RA24 **Number of senators - recoded**

1.00 wrong answer
2.00 80 or 82
3.00 81=right answer

RA25.1 **Correct? Senate is part of Parliament**
RA25.2 **Correct? Majority:low particip.=inval.election**
RA25.3 **Correct? Senators elected for 6 years**
RA25.4 **Correct? Senate votes on confidence of government**
RA25.5 **Correct? No Senate=Constitut. not fulfilled**

0.00 wrong answer
2.00 right answer

VAHA1 **WEIGHT - results and participation**

OBVOD **Election district**

QUESTIONS FROM SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

B1 R: Participation in the 1-st round

1) Did you take part in the first round of elections to the Senate?

2)yes

1) no (continue with question # 5)

B2JMENO Voted candidate-first name
B2PRIJ Voted candidate-surname
B2.2STR Voted candidate-party

2) Could you state, which candidate did you vote for?

2.1) name:

2.2) What party do you identify him with?.....(party no. from card)

B3A When decided for candidate

3a) When did you decide for this candidate? Pick one possibility.

- 1) Before September
- 2) In September
- 3) In October
- 4) In the first week of November
- 5) In the week of the 1-st round

B3B When decided to vote in 1-st round

3b) When did you decide to take part in the first round election to the Senate. Pick one possibility.

- 1) Before September
- 2) In September
- 3) In October
- 4) In the first week of November
- 5) In the week of the 1st. round

B4 Candidate advanced to the 2-nd round

4) Has your candidate advanced to the second election round?

- 1)no
- 2)yes
- 0)Undecided

B5 Will R. vote in 2-nd round

5) Can you state if you will take part in the second round election to the Senate? For all of the respondents.

1) No, I will not vote in the second round

2) Yes, I will vote in the second round

B5A Which candidate will vote for
B5APRIJM Candidate for 2-nd: surname
B5ASTR Candidate for 2-nd: party

5a) And which candidate will you vote for?

- 1) the same as in the 1-st election round.
- 2) candidate different from the 1-st round (name, party)
- 3) I do not know who I will vote for

B6A Why will not vote

6a) Can you state the reasons of your decision? Pick just one option.

- 1) I will never take part in any election
- 2) I do not agree with the existence of the Senate
- 3) there is no party running in my election district that would be acceptable for me
- 4) there is not an acceptable candidate running in my election district
- 5) I know nothing about the Senate, so I have no reason to take part in this election
- 6) majority voting system for the Senate does not seem to be fair to me
- 7) most of my friends(relatives etc.) will not participate in election, so I will not take part as well.
- 8) other reasons

B6B Reason of decision

6b)Can you state the reason of your decision? Pick random amount of options.

- 1) I want to support a party or group of parties.
- 2) I want to support a candidate
- 3) my friends (relatives etc.) vote the same.
- 4) in this situation every vote is needed.
- 5) this is the only way to express myself to the present scandals.

B7A Party-personality 1

7a)Which one of these statements describes your decision the best? Pick one option only.

- 1) I want to support party, despite its candidate does not satisfy me.
- 2) I do not know the candidate as well, but I trust the party that appointed him.
- 3) he has a strong personality and persuaded me.
- 4) he is well known personality, that most of the people trust.

B7B Party-personality 2

7b) And which statement would you put in the second place no. from 7a).....

B8 When decided to vote in 2-nd

8) When did you decide that you will / will not vote in the 2-nd round Senate election?

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 1) In Summer | 4) In the first week of November |
| 2) In September | 5) In the week of the 1st. round |
| 3) In October | 6)I will decide this week |

- B9.1** Characteristic: independent-party interest
- B9.2** Characteristic: politician-expert
- B9.3** Characteristic: flexible-scrupulous
- B9.4** Characteristic: locality-society
- B9.5** Characteristic: equality-indiv.freedom

9) What characteristics does your candidate for Senate have? Mark, the characteristics which are closest. 1 = characteristic on the left side; 5 = characteristic on the right side; 0 = I can not judge

1) behaves independently	1	2	3	4	5	he incites interest in his party	0
2) experienced politician	1	2	3	4	5	excellent expert	0
3) flexible	1	2	3	4	5	scrupulous	0
4) places emphasis on local problems	1	2	3	4	5	places emphasis on societal problems	0
5) demands human equality	1	2	3	4	5	demands freedom for every individual	0

B10 Influence of president Havel speech

10) Was your decision to vote (1-st election round) influenced by the speech of president Havel, which was broadcast on the CT last Thursday evening?

- 1) no, I did not watch it
- 2) I watched the speech but it did not changed my decision
- 3) yes, I watched the speech and it influenced my decision

B11BIS Scandal BIS: statements

11) The scandal that was caused by the vice-chairman of the government, J. Lux, being watched by the Security Information Service, stirred things up in the politics. Which one of the statements corresponds best with your opinion about this scandal. Pick only one option.

- 1) This kind of scandals do not interest me.
- 2) It is just a part of pre-election politics.
- 3) There are many scandals like this, and they have no great meaning.
- 4) I do not believe that something like that could happen.
- 5) The news is very important. It changes the picture of our politics.

B12BIS Scandal BIS: influence to Rs vote

12) Did this scandal influence your election for the Senate? Pick only one option.

- 1) no, I do not know about it at all
- 2) I consider the scandal not to be important
- 3) no, my decision was firm
- 4) yes, I decided to vote / not to vote
- 5) yes, I have changed the election of the candidate

B13 Influence of the campaign to Rs vote

13) How did the election campaign influence your decision?

- 1) not at all, it was weak
- 2) not at all, it was boring
- 3) the campaign was interesting, but I decided myself
- 4) I was convinced by the campaign and its arguments

B14 Situation in the Czech Rep.

VRSTVA21 SOCIAL CLASS

21) What social class or strata would you classify yourself?

lower	1	none of that	6
lower middle	2	refused this concept	
middle	3	of differentiation	7
upper middle	4	refused the answer	8
upper	5	do not know	9

KRAJ22 REGION

22) Region of the respondent:

- 1) Prague
- 2) Central Bohemia
- 3) South Bohemia
- 4) West Bohemia
- 5) North Bohemia
- 6) East Bohemia
- 7) South Moravia
- 8) North Moravia

BYDL23 SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY

23) Size of community of respondent's residence:

- 1) less than 2 thousands inhabitants
- 2) 2 - 5 thousands inhabitants
- 3) 5 - 10 thousands inhabitants
- 4) 10 - 50 thousands inhabitants
- 5) 50 - 100 thousands inhabitants
- 6) more than 100 thousands inhabitants
- 7) Brno
- 8) Prague

ZAM24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

24) What is your employment? Pick one option.

- 1) worker
- 2) state employee
- 3) other employee
- 4) agricultural worker (collective/private)
- 5) businessman/woman
- 6) retired
- 7) housewife
- 8) student, pupil, apprentice
- 9) unemployed
- 10) other

VEK AGE OF THE RESPONDENT**VEK4 AGE - groups**

1.00	< 29
2.00	30-44
3.00	45-59
4.00	60 and more

STRANA2 **Party of senator in 2-nd round**

2.00	CSSD
3.00	ODS
8.00	ODA
10.00	KDU-CSL
15.00	KSCM
17.00	SPR-RSC
95.00	other
96.00	did not vote
98.00	do not know
99.00	refused

FREQUENCIES:

A1 Most appealing party

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	272	23.2	24.2	24.2
ODS	3	310	26.4	27.5	51.7
ODA	8	106	9.0	9.4	61.1
KDU-CSL	10	93	7.9	8.3	69.4
KSCM	15	72	6.1	6.4	75.8
SPR-RSC	17	66	5.6	5.9	81.6
others	95	57	4.9	5.1	86.7
not vote	96	2	.2	.2	86.9
dont know	98	110	9.4	9.8	96.6
refused	99	38	3.2	3.4	100.0
.	.	48	4.1	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1126	Missing cases	48		

A2 Least appealing party

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	85	7.2	7.5	7.5
ODS	3	277	23.6	24.4	31.9
ODA	8	24	2.0	2.1	34.0
KDU-CSL	10	21	1.8	1.9	35.9
KSCM	15	299	25.5	26.4	62.3
SPR-RSC	17	315	26.8	27.8	90.0
others	95	11	.9	1.0	91.0
not vote	96	1	.1	.1	91.1
dont know	98	74	6.3	6.5	97.6
refused	99	27	2.3	2.4	100.0
.	.	40	3.4	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1134	Missing cases	40		

A3 Party voted for Chamber of Deputies

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	257	21.9	22.5	22.5
ODS	3	304	25.9	26.6	49.1
ODA	8	84	7.2	7.3	56.4
KDU-CSL	10	86	7.3	7.5	64.0
KSCM	15	67	5.7	5.9	69.8
SPR-RSC	17	60	5.1	5.2	75.1
others	95	85	7.2	7.4	82.5
not vote	96	200	17.0	17.5	100.0
.	.	31	2.6	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

A4 Why this party?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
strong party	1	56	4.8	5.7	5.7
bothers lest	2	134	11.4	13.6	19.3
strong people	3	106	9.0	10.8	30.1
program	4	202	17.2	20.6	50.7
trust it	5	210	17.9	21.4	72.1
future	6	136	11.6	13.8	85.9
appealing people	7	50	4.3	5.1	91.0
other	8	88	7.5	9.0	100.0
.	.	192	16.4	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	982	Missing cases	192		

A5 Party voted in 1992-Czech Nat.Council

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	68	5.8	6.1	6.1
ODS	3	417	35.5	37.4	43.5
ODA	8	56	4.8	5.0	48.5

KDU-CSL	10	71	6.0	6.4	54.9
KSCM	15	86	7.3	7.7	62.6
SPR-RSC	17	35	3.0	3.1	65.7
others	95	109	9.3	9.8	75.5
not vote	96	158	13.5	14.2	89.7
dont know	98	77	6.6	6.9	96.6
refused	99	38	3.2	3.4	100.0
.	.	59	5.0	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 1115 Missing cases 59

A6 Will resp. vote for Senate?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
not at all	1	417	35.5	36.5	36.5
rather not	2	117	10.0	10.2	46.8
rather yes	3	236	20.1	20.7	67.4
definitely yes	4	372	31.7	32.6	100.0
.	.	32	2.7	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 1142 Missing cases 32

A6A Reason why will not vote

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
never vote	1	21	1.8	5.4	5.4
dont agree	2	222	18.9	56.9	62.3
no party	3	14	1.2	3.6	65.9
no candidate	4	22	1.9	5.6	71.5
knows nothing	5	40	3.4	10.3	81.8
not fair	6	4	.3	1.0	82.8
friends wont	7	9	.8	2.3	85.1
other	8	58	4.9	14.9	100.0
.	.	784	66.8	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 390 Missing cases 784

A6B When decided

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
earlier	1	470	40.0	43.6	43.6
September	2	134	11.4	12.4	56.1
October	3	201	17.1	18.7	74.7
beg.November	4	108	9.2	10.0	84.8
this week	5	74	6.3	6.9	91.6
dont know	6	90	7.7	8.4	100.0
.	.	97	8.3	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 1077 Missing cases 97

A7.2 1-st:Party

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	130	11.1	21.8	21.8
ODS	3	233	19.8	39.1	60.9
ODA	8	54	4.6	9.1	70.0
KDU-CSL	10	54	4.6	9.1	79.0
KSCM	15	45	3.8	7.6	86.6
SPR-RSC	17	2	.2	.3	86.9
others	95	50	4.3	8.4	95.3
not vote	96	1	.1	.2	95.5
dont know	98	25	2.1	4.2	99.7
refused	99	2	.2	.3	100.0
.	.	578	49.2	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 596 Missing cases 578

A7.4 2-nd:Party

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	54	4.6	15.0	15.0
ODS	3	55	4.7	15.2	30.2

ODA	8	64	5.5	17.7	47.9
KDU-CSL	10	34	2.9	9.4	57.3
KSCM	15	21	1.8	5.8	63.2
SPR-RSC	17	2	.2	.6	63.7
others	95	69	5.9	19.1	82.8
dont know	98	57	4.9	15.8	98.6
refused	99	5	.4	1.4	100.0
.		813	69.3	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 361 Missing cases 813

A8 Reason for decision

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	230	19.6	32.3	32.3
personality	2	210	17.9	29.5	61.8
both	3	272	23.2	38.2	100.0
.	.	462	39.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 712 Missing cases 462

A9A Party-Personality 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	82	7.0	11.7	11.7
trust prty	2	281	23.9	40.1	51.9
strong pers.	3	189	16.1	27.0	78.9
well known p.	4	148	12.6	21.1	100.0
.	.	474	40.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 700 Missing cases 474

A9B Party-Personality 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	186	15.8	29.0	29.0
trust prty	2	123	10.5	19.2	48.2
strong pers.	3	160	13.6	25.0	73.2
well known p.	4	172	14.7	26.8	100.0
.	.	533	45.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 641 Missing cases 533

A10.1 Expectation-local politics

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	155	13.2	21.9	21.9
yes	1	554	47.2	78.1	100.0
.	.	465	39.6	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 709 Missing cases 465

A10.2 Expectation-better lows

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	113	9.6	16.1	16.1
yes	1	590	50.3	83.9	100.0
.	.	471	40.1	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 703 Missing cases 471

A10.3 Expectation-interests of people

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	216	18.4	30.9	30.9
yes	1	484	41.2	69.1	100.0
.	.	474	40.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0
Valid cases 700 Missing cases 474

A10.4 Expectation-nothing special						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	538	45.8	77.4	77.4	
yes	1	157	13.4	22.6	100.0	
.	.	479	40.8	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	695	Missing cases	479			
A11.1 R.knows candidate -personally						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	456	38.8	81.3	81.3	
yes	1	105	8.9	18.7	100.0	
.	.	613	52.2	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	561	Missing cases	613			
A11.2 R.knows candidate -visits r.at home						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	530	45.1	97.4	97.4	
yes	1	14	1.2	2.6	100.0	
.	.	630	53.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	544	Missing cases	630			
A11.3 R.knows candidate -meeting						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	450	38.3	81.7	81.7	
yes	1	101	8.6	18.3	100.0	
.	.	623	53.1	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	551	Missing cases	623			
A11.4 R.knows candidate-well known in district						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	318	27.1	55.2	55.2	
yes	1	258	22.0	44.8	100.0	
.	.	598	50.9	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	576	Missing cases	598			
A11.5 R.knows candidate-well known in Czech R.						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	432	36.8	79.3	79.3	
yes	1	113	9.6	20.7	100.0	
.	.	629	53.6	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	545	Missing cases	629			
A11.6 R.knows candidate -political activity						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	387	33.0	70.2	70.2	
yes	1	164	14.0	29.8	100.0	
.	.	623	53.1	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	551	Missing cases	623			
A11.7 R.knows candidate -TV						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	424	36.1	77.8	77.8	
yes	1	121	10.3	22.2	100.0	
.	.	629	53.6	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	545	Missing cases	629			

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	545	Missing cases	629			

A11.8	R.knows candidate -radio					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	441	37.6	82.7	82.7
yes		1	92	7.8	17.3	100.0
		.	641	54.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	533	Missing cases	641			

A11.9	R.knows candidate -leaflet					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	152	12.9	25.0	25.0
yes		1	455	38.8	75.0	100.0
		.	567	48.3	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	607	Missing cases	567			

A11.10	R.knows candidate -advertisement					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	379	32.3	69.4	69.4
yes		1	167	14.2	30.6	100.0
		.	628	53.5	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	546	Missing cases	628			

A11.11	R.knows candidate -friends					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	339	28.9	60.9	60.9
yes		1	218	18.6	39.1	100.0
		.	617	52.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	557	Missing cases	617			

A12	Family vote					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
same		1	221	18.8	31.2	31.2
different		2	156	13.3	22.0	53.2
dont know		3	332	28.3	46.8	100.0
		.	465	39.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	709	Missing cases	465			

A13A	2-nd round: vote for the same candidate					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	118	10.1	16.7	16.7
yes		1	589	50.2	83.3	100.0
		.	467	39.8	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	707	Missing cases	467			

A13B	2-nd round: vote for other candidate					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	368	31.3	53.5	53.5
yes		1	320	27.3	46.5	100.0
		.	486	41.4	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	688	Missing cases	486			

A13BSTR	2-nd round: other party					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

CSSD	2.00	42	3.6	16.1	16.1
ODS	3.00	64	5.5	24.5	40.6
ODA	8.00	45	3.8	17.2	57.9
KDU-CSL	10.00	32	2.7	12.3	70.1
KSCM	15.00	12	1.0	4.6	74.7
SPR-RSC	17.00	2	.2	.8	75.5
others	95.00	44	3.7	16.9	92.3
dont know	98.00	17	1.4	6.5	98.9
refused	99.00	3	.3	1.1	100.0
.	.	913	77.8	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	261	Missing cases	913		

A14.1 Characteristic: independent-party intere					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
independent	1	387	33.0	34.4	34.4
	2	186	15.8	16.5	50.9
	3	251	21.4	22.3	73.2
	4	127	10.8	11.3	84.5
party	5	174	14.8	15.5	100.0
.	.	49	4.2	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1125	Missing cases	49		

A14.2 Characteristic: politician-expert					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
politician	1	203	17.3	18.1	18.1
	2	134	11.4	11.9	30.0
	3	319	27.2	28.4	58.4
	4	181	15.4	16.1	74.5
expert	5	287	24.4	25.5	100.0
.	.	50	4.3	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1124	Missing cases	50		

A14.3 Characteristic: flexible-scrupulous					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
flexible	1	78	6.6	7.0	7.0
	2	50	4.3	4.5	11.4
	3	240	20.4	21.4	32.8
	4	231	19.7	20.6	53.4
scrupulous	5	523	44.5	46.6	100.0
.	.	52	4.4	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1122	Missing cases	52		

A14.4 Characteristic: locality-society					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
locality	1	178	15.2	15.9	15.9
	2	147	12.5	13.1	28.9
	3	319	27.2	28.4	57.3
	4	149	12.7	13.3	70.6
society	5	330	28.1	29.4	100.0
.	.	51	4.3	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1123	Missing cases	51		

A14.5 Characteristic: equality-indiv.freedom					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
equality	1	241	20.5	21.4	21.4
	2	127	10.8	11.3	32.7
	3	349	29.7	31.0	63.8
	4	162	13.8	14.4	78.2
freedom	5	245	20.9	21.8	100.0
.	.	50	4.3	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases	1124	Missing cases	50		

A15	Society informed about the Senate?				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
very badly	1	202	17.2	17.9	17.9
rather badly	2	688	58.6	60.8	78.7
quite well	3	220	18.7	19.5	98.1
very well	4	21	1.8	1.9	100.0
	.	43	3.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1131	Missing cases	43		

A16A	R. informed in comparison with others?				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
more	1	253	21.6	22.4	22.4
same	2	739	62.9	65.4	87.8
less	3	138	11.8	12.2	100.0
	.	44	3.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1130	Missing cases	44		

A16B	How well R. informed?				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
very badly	1	172	14.7	15.2	15.2
rather badly	2	543	46.3	47.9	63.1
quite well	3	379	32.3	33.4	96.5
very well	4	40	3.4	3.5	100.0
	.	40	3.4	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1134	Missing cases	40		

A17.1	Information source -newspapers				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	475	40.5	44.0	44.0
yes	1	604	51.4	56.0	100.0
	.	95	8.1	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1079	Missing cases	95		

A17.2	Information source -radio				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	717	61.1	67.3	67.3
yes	1	349	29.7	32.7	100.0
	.	108	9.2	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1066	Missing cases	108		

A17.3	Information source -TV				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	237	20.2	21.5	21.5
yes	1	863	73.5	78.5	100.0
	.	74	6.3	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1100	Missing cases	74		

A17.4	Information source -friends				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	727	61.9	68.5	68.5
yes	1	335	28.5	31.5	100.0
	.	112	9.5	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1062	Missing cases	112		

A17.5 Information source -meeting						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	959	81.7	91.2	91.2	
yes	1	93	7.9	8.8	100.0	
.	.	122	10.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1052	Missing cases	122			
A17.6 Information source -other						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	872	74.3	82.6	82.6	
yes	1	184	15.7	17.4	100.0	
.	.	118	10.1	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1056	Missing cases	118			
A18 R. watched interview with Havel						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
yes	1	157	13.4	13.8	13.8	
heard	2	259	22.1	22.8	36.7	
no	3	719	61.2	63.3	100.0	
.	.	39	3.3	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1135	Missing cases	39			
A19 Interview improved information						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
considerably	1	25	2.1	4.5	4.5	
rather	2	158	13.5	28.5	33.0	
not at all	3	372	31.7	67.0	100.0	
.	.	619	52.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	555	Missing cases	619			
A20 Interview changed Rs opinion						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
considerably	1	10	.9	1.8	1.8	
rather	2	81	6.9	14.6	16.4	
not at all	3	464	39.5	83.6	100.0	
.	.	619	52.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	555	Missing cases	619			
A21 Interview influenced R. to vote						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	519	44.2	93.2	93.2	
yes	1	38	3.2	6.8	100.0	
.	.	617	52.6	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	557	Missing cases	617			
A22 Is Senate useful?						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
useful	1	260	22.1	23.5	23.5	
should exist	2	355	30.2	32.1	55.6	
unnecessary	3	492	41.9	44.4	100.0	
.	.	67	5.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1107	Missing cases	67			
A23.1 Senate -office for unemployed politician						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	

definitely disagree	1	140	11.9	12.4	12.4
disagree	2	173	14.7	15.4	27.8
neither	3	293	25.0	26.0	53.8
agree	4	207	17.6	18.4	72.1
definitely agree	5	314	26.7	27.9	100.0
.	.	47	4.0	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1127 Missing cases 47

A23.2 Senate -is unnecessary expensive

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	118	10.1	10.4	10.4
disagree	2	153	13.0	13.5	24.0
neither	3	180	15.3	15.9	39.9
agree	4	250	21.3	22.1	62.0
definitely agree	5	429	36.5	38.0	100.0
.	.	44	3.7	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1130 Missing cases 44

A23.3 Senate -needed for keeping democracy

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	256	21.8	22.8	22.8
disagree	2	253	21.6	22.5	45.2
neither	3	302	25.7	26.8	72.1
agree	4	194	16.5	17.2	89.3
definitely agree	5	120	10.2	10.7	100.0
.	.	49	4.2	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1125 Missing cases 49

A23.4 Senate -fortify influence of regions

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	237	20.2	21.2	21.2
disagree	2	225	19.2	20.1	41.3
neither	3	360	30.7	32.2	73.5
agree	4	214	18.2	19.1	92.6
definitely agree	5	83	7.1	7.4	100.0
.	.	55	4.7	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1119 Missing cases 55

A23.5 Senate -deserves public trust

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	205	17.5	18.3	18.3
disagree	2	179	15.2	16.0	34.3
neither	3	401	34.2	35.9	70.2
agree	4	231	19.7	20.7	90.9
definitely agree	5	102	8.7	9.1	100.0
.	.	56	4.8	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1118 Missing cases 56

A23.6 Senate -fortify influence of big parties

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	126	10.7	11.3	11.3
disagree	2	134	11.4	12.0	23.2
neither	3	339	28.9	30.3	53.5
agree	4	317	27.0	28.3	81.8
definitely agree	5	204	17.4	18.2	100.0
.	.	54	4.6	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1120 Missing cases 54

A24 The number of senators

Valid Cum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
	0	11	.9	1.0	1.0
	0	1	.1	.1	1.1
	1	10	.9	.9	2.0
dont know	2	604	51.4	53.7	55.6
	4	1	.1	.1	55.7
	5	2	.2	.2	55.9
	16	1	.1	.1	56.0
	17	1	.1	.1	56.1
	40	1	.1	.1	56.2
	50	3	.3	.3	56.4
	52	2	.2	.2	56.6
	54	1	.1	.1	56.7
	60	3	.3	.3	57.0
	62	1	.1	.1	57.1
	71	1	.1	.1	57.2
	75	7	.6	.6	57.8
	76	1	.1	.1	57.9
	80	62	5.3	5.5	63.4
	81	356	30.3	31.6	95.0
	82	13	1.1	1.2	96.2
	83	3	.3	.3	96.4
	84	1	.1	.1	96.5
	85	2	.2	.2	96.7
	87	3	.3	.3	97.0
	89	1	.1	.1	97.1
	90	9	.8	.8	97.9
	91	2	.2	.2	98.0
	96	1	.1	.1	98.1
	100	10	.9	.9	99.0
	101	1	.1	.1	99.1
	105	1	.1	.1	99.2
	120	3	.3	.3	99.5
	140	1	.1	.1	99.6
	150	1	.1	.1	99.6
	180	1	.1	.1	99.7
	185	1	.1	.1	99.8
	200	2	.2	.2	100.0
	.	49	4.2	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1125	Missing cases	49		

A25.1 Correct? Senate is part of Parliament

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	640	54.5	57.8	57.8
yes	1	468	39.9	42.2	100.0
.	.	66	5.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1108	Missing cases	66		

A25.2 Correct? Majority:low particip.=inval.el

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	684	58.3	61.6	61.6
yes	1	426	36.3	38.4	100.0
.	.	64	5.5	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1110	Missing cases	64		

A25.3 Correct? Senators elected for 6 years

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	692	58.9	63.8	63.8
yes	1	393	33.5	36.2	100.0
.	.	89	7.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1085	Missing cases	89		

A25.4 Correct? Senate votes on confidence of g

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no	0	699	59.5	64.5	64.5

yes	1	384	32.7	35.5	100.0
.	.	91	7.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1083	Missing cases	91		

A25.5	Correct? No Senate=Constitut. not fulfil				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
no	0	244	20.8	22.1	22.1
yes	1	859	73.2	77.9	100.0
.	.	71	6.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1103	Missing cases	71		

A26	Evaluation of campaign				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
week	1	495	42.2	44.0	44.0
boring	2	440	37.5	39.1	83.2
good	3	161	13.7	14.3	97.5
very expressive	4	28	2.4	2.5	100.0
.	.	50	4.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1124	Missing cases	50		

A27	Situation in the Czech R.				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
good direction	1	427	36.4	37.7	37.7
bad direction	2	284	24.2	25.1	62.8
nowhere	3	421	35.9	37.2	100.0
.	.	42	3.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1132	Missing cases	42		

A28	Satisfaction-election Chamber of Deputie				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
very unsatisfied	1	112	9.5	10.0	10.0
	2	147	12.5	13.1	23.1
	3	201	17.1	17.9	41.0
	4	384	32.7	34.2	75.2
	5	168	14.3	15.0	90.1
	6	83	7.1	7.4	97.5
very satisfied	7	28	2.4	2.5	100.0
.	.	51	4.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1123	Missing cases	51		

A29	Party voted if election next week				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
CSSD	2	253	21.6	28.0	28.0
ODS	3	302	25.7	33.4	61.4
ODA	8	90	7.7	10.0	71.3
KDU-CSL	10	91	7.8	10.1	81.4
KSCM	15	65	5.5	7.2	88.6
SPR-RSC	17	58	4.9	6.4	95.0
others	95	45	3.8	5.0	100.0
.	.	94	8.0	Missing	
not vote	96	55	4.7	Missing	
dont know	98	92	7.8	Missing	
refused	99	29	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	904	Missing cases	270		

A30.1	The government is too strong				
				Valid	Cum
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
definitely disagree	1	192	16.4	17.1	17.1
disagree	2	344	29.3	30.7	47.9

neither	3	351	29.9	31.3	79.2
agree	4	143	12.2	12.8	92.0
definitely agree	5	90	7.7	8.0	100.0
.	.	54	4.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1120	Missing cases	54		

A30.2 Opposition is too strong

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	135	11.5	12.0	12.0
disagree	2	316	26.9	28.2	40.2
neither	3	407	34.7	36.3	76.5
agree	4	191	16.3	17.0	93.5
definitely agree	5	73	6.2	6.5	100.0
.	.	52	4.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1122	Missing cases	52		

A30.3 The government is too weak

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	132	11.2	11.8	11.8
disagree	2	370	31.5	33.0	44.7
neither	3	422	35.9	37.6	82.4
agree	4	153	13.0	13.6	96.0
definitely agree	5	45	3.8	4.0	100.0
.	.	52	4.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1122	Missing cases	52		

A30.4 The opposition is too weak

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	137	11.7	12.2	12.2
disagree	2	344	29.3	30.7	42.9
neither	3	439	37.4	39.2	82.1
agree	4	143	12.2	12.8	94.9
definitely agree	5	57	4.9	5.1	100.0
.	.	54	4.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1120	Missing cases	54		

A31 Satisfaction with political situation

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
very unsatisfied	1	138	11.8	12.3	12.3
	2	213	18.1	18.9	31.2
	3	226	19.3	20.1	51.3
	4	333	28.4	29.6	80.9
	5	148	12.6	13.2	94.0
	6	58	4.9	5.2	99.2
very satisfied	7	9	.8	.8	100.0
.	.	49	4.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1125	Missing cases	49		

A32A Disqualification of candidates by UVK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
UVK was right	1	238	20.3	20.9	20.9
Court was right	2	523	44.5	46.0	66.9
dont know	3	377	32.1	33.1	100.0
.	.	36	3.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1138	Missing cases	36		

A32.1 Politician must set an example

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	12	1.0	1.1	1.1

disagree	2	28	2.4	2.5	3.5
neither	3	92	7.8	8.1	11.6
agree	4	290	24.7	25.5	37.1
definitely agree	5	715	60.9	62.9	100.0
.	.	37	3.2	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1137 Missing cases 37

A32.2 To forgive a politician his mistakes

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	381	32.5	33.5	33.5
disagree	2	335	28.5	29.4	62.9
neither	3	231	19.7	20.3	83.2
agree	4	150	12.8	13.2	96.4
definitely agree	5	41	3.5	3.6	100.0
.	.	36	3.1	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1138 Missing cases 36

A32.3 Bad laws should be cancelled

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	15	1.3	1.3	1.3
disagree	2	23	2.0	2.0	3.4
neither	3	72	6.1	6.3	9.7
agree	4	214	18.2	18.9	28.6
definitely agree	5	810	69.0	71.4	100.0
.	.	40	3.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1134 Missing cases 40

A32.4 Law is for everyone, politicians alike

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
definitely disagree	1	24	2.0	2.1	2.1
disagree	2	22	1.9	1.9	4.1
neither	3	61	5.2	5.4	9.4
agree	4	150	12.8	13.2	22.7
definitely agree	5	877	74.7	77.3	100.0
.	.	40	3.4	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1134 Missing cases 40

A33A 1-st priority in politics

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
security	1	352	30.0	31.0	31.0
corruption	2	172	14.7	15.1	46.1
health care	3	280	23.9	24.6	70.8
education	4	27	2.3	2.4	73.2
housing	5	143	12.2	12.6	85.7
agriculture	6	46	3.9	4.0	89.8
export	7	41	3.5	3.6	93.4
small business	8	29	2.5	2.6	96.0
banking	9	46	3.9	4.0	100.0
.	.	38	3.2	Missing	

Total 1174 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 1136 Missing cases 38

A33B 2-nd priority in politics

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
security	1	206	17.5	18.2	18.2
corruption	2	182	15.5	16.1	34.2
health care	3	275	23.4	24.3	58.5
education	4	73	6.2	6.4	65.0
housing	5	172	14.7	15.2	80.1
agriculture	6	64	5.5	5.6	85.8
export	7	35	3.0	3.1	88.9
small business	8	37	3.2	3.3	92.1
banking	9	89	7.6	7.9	100.0

					41	3.5	Missing
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1133	Missing cases	41				

A34A	What will cause ODS win						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
stability		1	488	41.6	44.7	44.7	
instability		2	323	27.5	29.6	74.3	
elections		3	281	23.9	25.7	100.0	
		.	82	7.0	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1092	Missing cases	82				

A34B	What will cause CSSD win						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
stability		1	194	16.5	17.7	17.7	
instability		2	477	40.6	43.6	61.3	
elections		3	423	36.0	38.7	100.0	
		.	80	6.8	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1094	Missing cases	80				

A34C	What will cause equal power-ODS,CSSD						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
stability		1	222	18.9	20.3	20.3	
instability		2	450	38.3	41.2	61.5	
elections		3	421	35.9	38.5	100.0	
		.	81	6.9	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1093	Missing cases	81				

A35A.1	CSSD complicates political situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no		0	391	33.3	37.2	37.2	
yes		1	661	56.3	62.8	100.0	
		.	122	10.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1052	Missing cases	122				

A35A.2	KDU-CSL complicates political situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no		0	742	63.2	73.3	73.3	
yes		1	270	23.0	26.7	100.0	
		.	162	13.8	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1012	Missing cases	162				

A35A.3	KSCM complicates political situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no		0	545	46.4	53.1	53.1	
yes		1	482	41.1	46.9	100.0	
		.	147	12.5	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1027	Missing cases	147				

A35A.4	ODA complicates political situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no		0	754	64.2	74.7	74.7	
yes		1	255	21.7	25.3	100.0	
		.	165	14.1	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1009	Missing cases	165				

A35A.5 ODS complicates political situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	499	42.5	47.8	47.8	
yes	1	544	46.3	52.2	100.0	
.	.	131	11.2	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1043	Missing cases	131			
A35A.6 SPR complicates political situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	364	31.0	34.8	34.8	
yes	1	682	58.1	65.2	100.0	
.	.	128	10.9	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1046	Missing cases	128			
A35A.7 Others complicate political situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	845	72.0	84.6	84.6	
yes	1	154	13.1	15.4	100.0	
.	.	175	14.9	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	999	Missing cases	175			
A35A.8 Parliament complicates political situati						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	532	45.3	51.6	51.6	
yes	1	500	42.6	48.4	100.0	
.	.	142	12.1	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1032	Missing cases	142			
A35A.9 Government complicates political situati						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	647	55.1	63.2	63.2	
yes	1	376	32.0	36.8	100.0	
.	.	151	12.9	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1023	Missing cases	151			
A35A.10 Media complicate political situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	576	49.1	55.5	55.5	
yes	1	462	39.4	44.5	100.0	
.	.	136	11.6	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1038	Missing cases	136			
A35B.1 CSSD resolving difficult situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	647	55.1	63.1	63.1	
yes	1	378	32.2	36.9	100.0	
.	.	149	12.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1025	Missing cases	149			
A35B.2 KDU-CSL resolving difficult situation						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	0	617	52.6	61.9	61.9	
yes	1	379	32.3	38.1	100.0	
.	.	178	15.2	Missing		

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	996	Missing cases	178			

A35B.3 KSCM resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	840	71.6	85.4	85.4
yes		1	144	12.3	14.6	100.0
		.	190	16.2	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	984	Missing cases	190			

A35B.4 ODA resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	563	48.0	56.2	56.2
yes		1	438	37.3	43.8	100.0
		.	173	14.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1001	Missing cases	173			

A35B.5 ODS resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	513	43.7	50.4	50.4
yes		1	505	43.0	49.6	100.0
		.	156	13.3	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1018	Missing cases	156			

A35B.6 SPR resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	898	76.5	91.4	91.4
yes		1	85	7.2	8.6	100.0
		.	191	16.3	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	983	Missing cases	191			

A35B.7 Others resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	818	69.7	84.5	84.5
yes		1	150	12.8	15.5	100.0
		.	206	17.5	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	968	Missing cases	206			

A35B.8 Parliament resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	690	58.8	70.3	70.3
yes		1	292	24.9	29.7	100.0
		.	192	16.4	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	982	Missing cases	192			

A35B.9 Government resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no		0	514	43.8	50.9	50.9
yes		1	495	42.2	49.1	100.0
		.	165	14.1	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1009	Missing cases	165			

A35B.10 Media resolving difficult situation						
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

no	0	759	64.7	75.8	75.8
yes	1	242	20.6	24.2	100.0
.	.	173	14.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1001	Missing cases	173		

A36	R.: Left-right political scale				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
extreme left	1	9	.8	.8	.8
	2	65	5.5	5.7	6.5
	3	134	11.4	11.8	18.4
	4	469	39.9	41.5	59.9
	5	260	22.1	23.0	82.8
	6	159	13.5	14.1	96.9
extreme right	7	35	3.0	3.1	100.0
.	.	43	3.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1131	Missing cases	43		

A37	A=individual freedom;B=equality				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
disagree	0	244	20.8	21.4	21.4
agree A	1	491	41.8	43.1	64.5
agree B	2	404	34.4	35.5	100.0
.	.	35	3.0	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1139	Missing cases	35		

A38	A=child to keep rules;B=child be free				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
disagree	0	385	32.8	33.8	33.8
agree A	1	495	42.2	43.5	77.3
agree B	2	259	22.1	22.7	100.0
.	.	35	3.0	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1139	Missing cases	35		

A39A	Which system is more fair				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
dont know	0	387	33.0	34.0	34.0
proportional	1	454	38.7	39.9	73.9
majority	2	297	25.3	26.1	100.0
.	.	36	3.1	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1138	Missing cases	36		

A39B	Which system to be more convenient for C				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
dont know	0	443	37.7	38.9	38.9
proportional	1	420	35.8	36.9	75.8
majority	2	275	23.4	24.2	100.0
.	.	36	3.1	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1138	Missing cases	36		

POHL40	SEX				
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
male	1	576	49.1	50.5	50.5
female	2	565	48.1	49.5	100.0
.	.	33	2.8	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1141	Missing cases	33		

VZDEL41	EDUCATION				

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
primary	1	124	10.6	10.9	10.9
vocational	2	366	31.2	32.2	43.1
secondary	3	475	40.5	41.7	84.8
university	4	173	14.7	15.2	100.0
.	.	36	3.1	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1138	Missing cases	36		

VRSTVA43 SOCIAL CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
lower	1	80	6.8	7.0	7.0
lower middle	2	271	23.1	23.8	30.8
middle	3	472	40.2	41.4	72.2
upper middle	4	69	5.9	6.1	78.2
upper	5	10	.9	.9	79.1
none	6	34	2.9	3.0	82.1
refused classes	7	103	8.8	9.0	91.1
refused answer	8	42	3.6	3.7	94.8
dont know	9	59	5.0	5.2	100.0
.	.	34	2.9	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1140	Missing cases	34		

KRAJ44 REGION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Prague	1	121	10.3	10.6	10.6
Centr.Bohemia	2	166	14.1	14.6	25.2
South Bohemia	3	84	7.2	7.4	32.6
West Bohemia	4	81	6.9	7.1	39.7
North Bohemia	5	129	11.0	11.3	51.0
East Bohemia	6	128	10.9	11.2	62.2
South Moravia	7	216	18.4	19.0	81.2
North Moravia	8	214	18.2	18.8	100.0
.	.	35	3.0	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1139	Missing cases	35		

BYDL45 SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
<2000	1	180	15.3	15.8	15.8
2000-5000	2	170	14.5	15.0	30.8
5000-10000	3	79	6.7	6.9	37.7
10000-50000	4	274	23.3	24.1	61.8
50000-100000	5	170	14.5	15.0	76.8
>100000	6	92	7.8	8.1	84.9
Brno	7	48	4.1	4.2	89.1
Prague	8	124	10.6	10.9	100.0
.	.	37	3.2	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1137	Missing cases	37		

A46 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
worker	1	184	15.7	17.4	17.4
state employee	2	132	11.2	12.5	29.9
other employee	3	335	28.5	31.7	61.6
agricultural w.	4	21	1.8	2.0	63.6
self-employed	5	146	12.4	13.8	77.5
retired	6	135	11.5	12.8	90.2
housewife	7	19	1.6	1.8	92.0
student	8	25	2.1	2.4	94.4
unemployed	9	16	1.4	1.5	95.9
other	10	43	3.7	4.1	100.0
.	.	118	10.1	Missing	
Total		1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1056	Missing cases	118		

BIS47 Vicechairman Lux-Information Service(BIS)						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	1	103	8.8	11.0	11.0	
no attention	2	430	36.6	46.0	57.0	
yes	3	402	34.2	43.0	100.0	
.	.	239	20.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	935	Missing cases	239			

BIS48 Scandal: Rs attitude						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
dont interest	1	191	16.3	20.4	20.4	
part of politics	2	307	26.1	32.8	53.3	
many scandals	3	163	13.9	17.4	70.7	
dont believe	4	43	3.7	4.6	75.3	
important	5	231	19.7	24.7	100.0	
.	.	239	20.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	935	Missing cases	239			

BIS49 Scandal: impact on Senate election						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
dont know	0	393	33.5	42.0	42.0	
no	1	318	27.1	34.0	76.0	
yes	2	224	19.1	24.0	100.0	
.	.	239	20.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	935	Missing cases	239			

BIS50 Scandal: impact on Rs vote						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	1	868	73.9	93.2	93.2	
will vote	2	35	3.0	3.8	97.0	
wont vote	3	28	2.4	3.0	100.0	
.	.	243	20.7	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	931	Missing cases	243			

BIS51 Scandal: impact on people						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
dont know	0	324	27.6	34.7	34.7	
definitely not	1	99	8.4	10.6	45.2	
rather not	2	283	24.1	30.3	75.5	
rather yes	3	190	16.2	20.3	95.8	
definitely yes	4	39	3.3	4.2	100.0	
.	.	239	20.4	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	935	Missing cases	239			

BIS52 Scandal: impact on Rs decision						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
no	1	891	75.9	95.5	95.5	
yes	2	42	3.6	4.5	100.0	
.	.	241	20.5	Missing		
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	933	Missing cases	241			

BIS53 Scandal: which party will profit						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent	
CSSD	2	205	17.5	22.0	22.0	
ODS	3	53	4.5	5.7	27.7	
ODA	8	8	.7	.9	28.6	
KDU-CSL	10	120	10.2	12.9	41.5	

KSCM	15	24	2.0	2.6	44.1
SPR-RSC	17	7	.6	.8	44.8
	94	355	30.2	38.2	83.0
others	95	3	.3	.3	83.3
not vote	96	2	.2	.2	83.5
dont know	98	141	12.0	15.2	98.7
refused	99	12	1.0	1.3	100.0
.	.	244	20.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	930	Missing cases	244		

BIS54 Scandal: which party lose

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	30	2.6	3.2	3.2
ODS	3	358	30.5	38.5	41.8
ODA	8	9	.8	1.0	42.7
KDU-CSL	10	58	4.9	6.2	49.0
KSCM	15	1	.1	.1	49.1
	94	325	27.7	35.0	84.1
others	95	2	.2	.2	84.3
not vote	96	2	.2	.2	84.5
dont know	98	130	11.1	14.0	98.5
refused	99	14	1.2	1.5	100.0
.	.	245	20.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	929	Missing cases	245		

STRANA1 Party of senator in 1-st round

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2.00	102	8.7	19.0	19.0
ODS	3.00	206	17.5	38.3	57.2
ODA	8.00	59	5.0	11.0	68.2
KDU-CSL	10.00	57	4.9	10.6	78.8
KSCM	15.00	39	3.3	7.2	86.1
others	95.00	75	6.4	13.9	100.0
.	.	636	54.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	538	Missing cases	636		

RVEK4 AGE - group

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
<29	1.00	276	23.5	25.6	25.6
30-44	2.00	378	32.2	35.1	60.7
45-59	3.00	307	26.1	28.5	89.2
>60	4.00	116	9.9	10.8	100.0
.	.	97	8.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1077	Missing cases	97		

RA24 Number of senators - recoded

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	712	60.6	62.3	62.3
wrong	1.00	75	6.4	6.6	68.9
80 or 82	2.00	356	30.3	31.1	100.0
.	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

RA25.1 Correct? Senate is part of Parliament

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
wrong	.00	675	57.5	59.1	59.1
right	1.00	468	39.9	40.9	100.0
.	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	1174	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

RA25.2 Correct? Majority:low particip.=inval.el					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
wrong	.00	459	39.1	40.2	40.2
right	1.00	684	58.3	59.8	100.0
	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

RA25.3 Correct? Senators elected for 6 years					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
wrong	.00	451	38.4	39.5	39.5
right	1.00	692	58.9	60.5	100.0
	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

RA25.4 Correct? Senate votes on confidence of g					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
wrong	.00	444	37.8	38.8	38.8
right	1.00	699	59.5	61.2	100.0
	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

RA25.5 Correct? No Senate=Constitut. not fulfil					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
wrong	.00	284	24.2	24.8	24.8
right	1.00	859	73.2	75.2	100.0
	.	31	2.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1143	Missing cases	31		

VAHA1 WEIGHT - results and participation					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.66	84	7.2	7.2	7.2
	.82	86	7.3	7.3	14.5
	.85	304	25.9	25.9	40.4
	.94	85	7.2	7.2	47.6
	.97	257	21.9	21.9	69.5
	1.17	60	5.1	5.1	74.6
	1.35	67	5.7	5.7	80.3
	1.35	231	19.7	19.7	100.0
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	1174	Missing cases	0		

B1 R: Participation in the 1-st round					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
yes	1	489	41.7	49.2	49.2
no	2	505	43.0	50.8	100.0
	.	180	15.3	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	994	Missing cases	180		

B2.2STR Voted candidate-party					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	96	8.2	20.9	20.9
ODS	3	185	15.8	40.3	61.2
ODA	8	41	3.5	8.9	70.2
KDU-CSL	10	63	5.4	13.7	83.9
KSCM	15	35	3.0	7.6	91.5
SPR-RSC	17	1	.1	.2	91.7
others	95	34	2.9	7.4	99.1
dont know	98	2	.2	.4	99.6
refused	99	2	.2	.4	100.0

					715	60.9	Missing
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	459	Missing cases	715				

B3A	When decided for candidate						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
earlier	1	80	6.8	15.9	15.9		
September	2	43	3.7	8.5	24.4		
October	3	120	10.2	23.8	48.2		
beg.November	4	111	9.5	22.0	70.2		
week of vote	5	150	12.8	29.8	100.0		
	.	670	57.1	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	504	Missing cases	670				

B3B	When decided to vote in 1-st round						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
earlier	1	177	15.1	35.4	35.4		
September	2	52	4.4	10.4	45.8		
October	3	124	10.6	24.8	70.6		
beg.November	4	67	5.7	13.4	84.0		
week of vote	5	80	6.8	16.0	100.0		
	.	674	57.4	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	500	Missing cases	674				

B4	Candidate advanced to the 2-nd round						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
undecided	0	140	11.9	28.1	28.1		
yes	1	119	10.1	23.8	51.9		
no	2	240	20.4	48.1	100.0		
	.	675	57.5	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	499	Missing cases	675				

B5	Will R. vote in 2-nd round						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
no	1	476	40.5	48.2	48.2		
yes	2	512	43.6	51.8	100.0		
	.	186	15.8	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	988	Missing cases	186				

B6A	Why will not vote						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
never vote	1	24	2.0	5.0	5.0		
dont agree	2	240	20.4	50.4	55.5		
no party	3	19	1.6	4.0	59.5		
no candidate	4	52	4.4	10.9	70.4		
know nothing	5	28	2.4	5.9	76.3		
not fair	6	8	.7	1.7	77.9		
friends wont	7	26	2.2	5.5	83.4		
other	8	79	6.7	16.6	100.0		
	.	698	59.5	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	476	Missing cases	698				

B5A	Which candidate will vote for						
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
same	1	311	26.5	63.2	63.2		
other	2	102	8.7	20.7	83.9		
dont know	3	79	6.7	16.1	100.0		
	.	682	58.1	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		

Valid cases		Missing cases			
492		682			

B5ASTR Candidate for 2-nd: party					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	27	2.3	35.1	35.1
ODS	3	34	2.9	44.2	79.2
ODA	8	9	.8	11.7	90.9
KDU-CSL	10	4	.3	5.2	96.1
KSCM	15	2	.2	2.6	98.7
dont know	98	1	.1	1.3	100.0
.	.	1097	93.4	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases		Missing cases			
77		1097			

Valid cases		Missing cases			
77		1097			

B6B Reason of decision					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	211	18.0	41.4	41.4
candidate	2	147	12.5	28.8	70.2
friends	3	10	.9	2.0	72.2
vote is needed	4	92	7.8	18.0	90.2
scandals	5	50	4.3	9.8	100.0
.	.	664	56.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases		Missing cases			
510		664			

Valid cases		Missing cases			
510		664			

B7A Party-personality 1					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	92	7.8	18.5	18.5
trust prty	2	219	18.7	44.1	62.6
strong pers.	3	111	9.5	22.3	84.9
well known p.	4	75	6.4	15.1	100.0
.	.	677	57.7	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases		Missing cases			
497		677			

Valid cases		Missing cases			
497		677			

B7B Party-personality 2					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
party	1	116	9.9	25.1	25.1
trust prty	2	114	9.7	24.6	49.7
strong pers.	3	73	6.2	15.8	65.4
well known p.	4	160	13.6	34.6	100.0
.	.	711	60.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases		Missing cases			
463		711			

Valid cases		Missing cases			
463		711			

B8 When decided to vote in 2-nd					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
earlier	1	241	20.5	25.0	25.0
September	2	60	5.1	6.2	31.3
October	3	130	11.1	13.5	44.8
beg.November	4	87	7.4	9.0	53.8
this week	5	303	25.8	31.5	85.3
dont know	6	142	12.1	14.7	100.0
.	.	211	18.0	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases		Missing cases			
963		211			

Valid cases		Missing cases			
963		211			

B9.1 Characteristic: independent-party intere					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
cant judge	0	293	25.0	34.2	34.2
independent	1	140	11.9	16.4	50.6
	2	93	7.9	10.9	61.4
	3	169	14.4	19.7	81.2
	4	81	6.9	9.5	90.7
party	5	80	6.8	9.3	100.0
.	.	318	27.1	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	856	Missing cases	318		

B9.2 Characteristic: politician-expert					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
cant judge		0	268	22.8	31.3
politician		1	69	5.9	8.1
		2	80	6.8	9.4
		3	187	15.9	21.9
		4	120	10.2	14.0
expert		5	131	11.2	15.3
		.	319	27.2	Missing

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	855	Missing cases	319		

B9.3 Characteristic: flexible-scrupulous					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
cant judge		0	289	24.6	33.9
flexible		1	31	2.6	3.6
		2	32	2.7	3.8
		3	162	13.8	19.0
		4	161	13.7	18.9
scrupulous		5	178	15.2	20.9
		.	321	27.3	Missing

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	853	Missing cases	321		

B9.4 Characteristic: locality-society					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
cant judge		0	271	23.1	31.7
locality		1	98	8.3	11.5
		2	107	9.1	12.5
		3	154	13.1	18.0
		4	117	10.0	13.7
society		5	107	9.1	12.5
		.	320	27.3	Missing

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	854	Missing cases	320		

B9.5 Characteristic: equality-indiv.freedom					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
cant judge		0	303	25.8	35.7
equality		1	86	7.3	10.1
		2	70	6.0	8.3
		3	188	16.0	22.2
		4	99	8.4	11.7
freedom		5	102	8.7	12.0
		.	326	27.8	Missing

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	848	Missing cases	326		

B10 Influence of president Havel speach					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
didnt watch		1	750	63.9	75.8
no influence		2	215	18.3	21.7
influence		3	24	2.0	2.4
		.	185	15.8	Missing

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	989	Missing cases	185		

B11BIS Scandal BIS: statements					
Value Label		Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
					Cum Percent
dont interest		1	260	22.1	26.3
part of politics		2	308	26.2	31.2
many scandals		3	187	15.9	18.9

dont believe	4	23	2.0	2.3	78.7
important	5	210	17.9	21.3	100.0
.	.	186	15.8	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	988	Missing cases	186		

B12BIS Scandal BIS: influence to Rs vote

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no interest	1	177	15.1	17.9	17.9
not important	2	256	21.8	25.9	43.7
firm decision	3	501	42.7	50.6	94.3
vote/dont vote	4	40	3.4	4.0	98.4
change candidate	5	16	1.4	1.6	100.0
.	.	184	15.7	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	990	Missing cases	184		

B13 Influence of the campaign to Rs vote

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
no, was week	1	532	45.3	53.7	53.7
no, was boring	2	302	25.7	30.5	84.2
no, but good	3	138	11.8	13.9	98.2
yes	4	18	1.5	1.8	100.0
.	.	184	15.7	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	990	Missing cases	184		

B14 Situation in the Czech Rep.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
good direction	1	347	29.6	35.2	35.2
bad direction	2	235	20.0	23.8	59.0
nowhere	3	405	34.5	41.0	100.0
.	.	187	15.9	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	987	Missing cases	187		

B15 Satisfaction-results of Senate election

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
very unsatisfied	1	122	10.4	12.9	12.9
	2	140	11.9	14.8	27.7
	3	130	11.1	13.7	41.4
	4	290	24.7	30.6	72.0
	5	130	11.1	13.7	85.7
	6	101	8.6	10.7	96.4
very satisfied	7	34	2.9	3.6	100.0
.	.	227	19.3	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	947	Missing cases	227		

B16 Party voted if election to Chamber next

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
CSSD	2	200	17.0	21.3	21.3
ODS	3	282	24.0	30.1	51.4
ODA	8	77	6.6	8.2	59.6
KDU-CSL	10	73	6.2	7.8	67.4
KSCM	15	47	4.0	5.0	72.4
SPR-RSC	17	41	3.5	4.4	76.8
others	95	48	4.1	5.1	81.9
not vote	96	48	4.1	5.1	87.0
dont know	98	101	8.6	10.8	97.8
refused	99	21	1.8	2.2	100.0
.	.	236	20.1	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	938	Missing cases	236		

B16A Left-right political; scale

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
extreme left	1	2	.2	.2	.2
	2	49	4.2	5.0	5.2
	3	120	10.2	12.3	17.6
	4	378	32.2	38.9	56.5
	5	271	23.1	27.9	84.4
	6	138	11.8	14.2	98.6
extreme right	7	14	1.2	1.4	100.0
	.	202	17.2	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	972	Missing cases	202		

B17 A=individual freedom;B=equality

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
disagree	0	173	14.7	17.8	17.8
agree A	1	501	42.7	51.5	69.3
agree B	2	299	25.5	30.7	100.0
	.	201	17.1	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	973	Missing cases	201		

POHL18 SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
male	1	497	42.3	50.2	50.2
female	2	494	42.1	49.8	100.0
	.	183	15.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	991	Missing cases	183		

VZDEL19 EDUCATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
primary	1	103	8.8	10.6	10.6
vocational	2	316	26.9	32.6	43.2
secondary	3	404	34.4	41.7	84.9
university	4	146	12.4	15.1	100.0
	.	205	17.5	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	969	Missing cases	205		

VRSTVA21 SOCIAL CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
lower	1	49	4.2	5.0	5.0
lower middle	2	234	19.9	23.9	28.9
middle	3	455	38.8	46.5	75.4
upper middle	4	64	5.5	6.5	81.9
upper	5	9	.8	.9	82.8
none	6	22	1.9	2.2	85.1
refused classes	7	76	6.5	7.8	92.8
refused answer	8	28	2.4	2.9	95.7
dont know	9	42	3.6	4.3	100.0
	.	195	16.6	Missing	
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	979	Missing cases	195		

KRAJ22 REGION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Prague	1	95	8.1	9.6	9.6
Centr.Bohemia	2	142	12.1	14.3	23.9
South Bohemia	3	72	6.1	7.3	31.1
West Bohemia	4	75	6.4	7.6	38.7
North Bohemia	5	94	8.0	9.5	48.2
East Bohemia	6	130	11.1	13.1	61.3
South Moravia	7	179	15.2	18.0	79.3
North Moravia	8	205	17.5	20.7	100.0
	.	182	15.5	Missing	

		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	992	Missing cases	182				

BYDL23 SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY							
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
<2000	1	168	14.3	17.0	17.0		
2000-5000	2	119	10.1	12.0	29.0		
5000-10000	3	92	7.8	9.3	38.2		
10000-50000	4	266	22.7	26.8	65.1		
50000-100000	5	126	10.7	12.7	77.8		
>100000	6	86	7.3	8.7	86.5		
Brno	7	39	3.3	3.9	90.4		
Prague	8	95	8.1	9.6	100.0		
.	.	183	15.6	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	991	Missing cases	183				

ZAM24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS							
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
worker	1	175	14.9	17.7	17.7		
state employee	2	104	8.9	10.5	28.2		
other employee	3	345	29.4	34.9	63.1		
agricultural w.	4	15	1.3	1.5	64.6		
self-employed	5	131	11.2	13.2	77.9		
retired	6	130	11.1	13.1	91.0		
housewife	7	18	1.5	1.8	92.8		
student	8	25	2.1	2.5	95.3		
unemployed	9	15	1.3	1.5	96.9		
other	10	31	2.6	3.1	100.0		
.	.	185	15.8	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	989	Missing cases	185				

VEK4 AGE - groups							
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
<29	1.00	276	23.5	25.6	25.6		
30-44	2.00	378	32.2	35.1	60.7		
45-59	3.00	307	26.1	28.5	89.2		
>60	4.00	116	9.9	10.8	100.0		
.	.	97	8.3	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	1077	Missing cases	97				

STRANA2 Party of senator in 2-nd round							
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent		
CSSD	2.00	64	5.5	22.5	22.5		
ODS	3.00	153	13.0	53.7	76.1		
ODA	8.00	19	1.6	6.7	82.8		
KDU-CSL	10.00	25	2.1	8.8	91.6		
KSCM	15.00	8	.7	2.8	94.4		
others	95.00	15	1.3	5.3	99.6		
dont know	98.00	1	.1	.4	100.0		
.	.	128	10.9	Missing			
.	-9.00	761	64.8	Missing			
		Total	1174	100.0	100.0		
Valid cases	285	Missing cases	889				