

Voting in times of economic crisis: The Danish Election Study 2010/11

Rune Stubager

Enclosure 1

Project Description

Keystrokes: 31,877

For representative democracies like Denmark, the present economic crisis has, with its unprecedented strength, raised a number of important questions about the voters' behaviour: How do they perceive the parties' abilities to handle the crisis (i.e. the parties *issue ownership*)? How will they react to the various policy measures suggested to counter the crisis? And will any of this have an impact on them on Election Day? These are among the questions investigated by the proposed study of the 2010/11 election.

Thus, the study has two main theoretical focus areas: *economic voting* and *issue ownership*. Both areas have been measured in previous election studies, and with the present project we intend to combine previous studies with new measures and theoretical perspectives in order to subject the two areas to more thorough analyses. Thereby we will contribute to answering new empirical and theoretical questions that have arisen in the international literature in recent years (cf. below).

Empirically, the economic crisis offers unique possibilities for examining the impact of the economy on the vote. New aspects in this area include studying economic issues as position issues, so-called *patrimonial economic voting*, and the impact of crisis consciousness on voting and on political attitudes toward welfare reforms. The main research question of this component is how developments in the voters' wealth and crisis consciousness – two variables that have previously been neglected in the economic voting tradition – condition the impact of their economic evaluations on the vote.

As regards *issue ownership*, the concept has over the past two decades been subject to much attention primarily from research into party behaviour (e.g. Green-Pedersen 2007; Green-Pedersen & Stubager 2010; Petrocik 1996; Petrocik et al. 2003). However, the definition, contents and effects of the concept at the individual level remain highly ambiguous thereby constituting a shaky foundation for research drawing on the concept, e.g., in relation to the economic crisis. Thus, the main research question of this component pertains to the aspects of issue ownership and their internal relationships as well as their relationship with voting.

The project also intends to continue the core *time series* of the election project. Going back four decades, these series provide a powerful tool for testing theoretical propositions about electoral behaviour and public opinion just as they serve as key sources of modern Danish history. This is reflected in the fact that the data by far are the most frequently ordered data sets from the Danish Data Archive by both researchers around the world and social science students and in the popularity

of the online version (at www.surveybank.dk) which has become an invaluable tool for high school students, journalists, etc.

Finally, we will continue the integration of the Danish project into the international Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES, www.cses.org) and the newly established Nordic network programme (NORED, www.nored.dk) just as the project will benefit from discussions with an *advisory board* with key researchers in the field.

In sum, the project contains four main components:

1 The core time series

2 Economic voting during an economic crisis

3 Issue ownership

4 International collaboration

We shall discuss each component in detail below after briefly presenting the overarching theoretical framework of the project.

Theoretical Framework

Across Western countries the bulk of electoral research during the past two decades has been conducted within the issue voting tradition (Bartels 2008a; Borre 2001). The fundamental premise is that voters choose between the parties based on their preferences on the various political issues. In this field, both the international literature (e.g. Rabinowitz & MacDonald 1989; Westholm 1997; Adams et al. 2005) and the Danish election studies (e.g. Borre 1997; Thomsen 2003; 2009) have devoted considerable attention to the impact of so-called “position issues” (Stokes 1963) where voters and parties disagree over the preferred policy. More recently, however, attention has also turned to “valence issues” on which there is a relative consensus about desired outcomes (e.g. low unemployment or a prosperous economy), but disagreement over which party (or parties) is most competent at delivering it.

Here the *issue ownership* theory (Budge & Farlie 1983; Petrocik 1996) has highlighted the tendency for voters to perceive certain parties/government alternatives as better at handling certain issues – i.e. the parties ‘own’ these issues. Since such ownerships are expected to confer electoral advantages on parties when ‘their’ issues are on the agenda, voters’ agenda and their perceptions of

the parties' competences to handle issues are important variables to consider analytically as well as theoretically (cf. Goul Andersen 2007). Regarding the agenda, voters' perceptions of which issues are of political importance have been found to exert a powerful influence on their political judgements and behaviour: Parties that either own an issue or have particularly strong positions on it generally gain when the issue is considered important (cf., e.g., Bélanger & Meguid 2008; Togeby 2007). So far, most research has primarily considered ownership of *valence* issues (Martinsson 2009), thereby neglecting the *positional* element. A small step towards remedying this neglect was taken with the inclusion of a set of new measures in the 2007 election survey (Stubager 2009; Stubager & Slothuus 2009) but the topic is examined more comprehensively by the research agenda proposed below. Here, focus is directed towards the questions of what components make up issue ownership – with a particular focus on the role of position issues – how these components are related, and how they influence voting.

An even stronger focus on valence elements has dominated research on *economic voting* (Andersen, Borre et al. 1999; Borre 1997; Duch & Stevenson 2008; Lewis-Beck & Stegmaier 2007; Nannestad & Paldam 2000; van der Brug et al. 2007) which constitutes a separate (often somewhat isolated) branch within the issue voting framework. The core idea of theories of economic voting is that voters make up their minds on the basis of their evaluations of whether the government has been able to deliver (the almost unanimously desired outcome of) economic prosperity. If it has, they vote for it; if not, they vote for the opposition. As detailed below, the present project seeks to expand on a number of neglected aspects of this tradition. Not least, it takes issue with the one-sided focus on the economy as a valence issue (cf. Lewis-Beck & Nadeau 2009). Thus, in addition to studying evaluations of performance it seems essential to also study evaluations of proposed economic policies over which there may be disagreement.

The four special focus areas

1: The core election study time series

The Danish Election Study is among the longest running and has conducted surveys of each of the 15 Folketing-elections since 1971 and the maintenance of the core of questions that have been included in previous surveys constitutes a separate component of the project. Apart from the historical interest in maintaining a record of the public's attitudes etc., the *time series* of questions offers highly valuable opportunities for examining electoral behaviour and attitudinal development

in a longitudinal perspective – a possibility not offered by the individual cross-sectional survey. The research questions that can be examined by means of this data series are numerous. Recent research based on the data illustrate the range of such questions: Developments in the impact of the voters' level of political knowledge on the factors affecting electoral behaviour (Hansen 2009); the contents of the voters' agenda and their evaluations of issue ownership (e.g. Goul Andersen 2003a; 2008); developments in and reasons for voters' positions on the fundamental ideological dimensions (Borre 1995; 2007); reasons for the decline in votes for socialist parties (van der Brugge and Voss 2007); and the development of the strength of cleavages – including the education cleavage – in Danish politics (Stubager 2003; 2006; 2010).

Many more such longitudinal questions involving also contextual information putting each election into a theoretical context can be examined by means of the data as their real value is only just beginning to manifest itself with the accumulation of a sufficiently broad range of measures from the 1990's onwards (cf. also Franklin & Wlezien 2002). On this point, hence, the project should also be viewed as an investment in future research the precise focus of which cannot be foreseen at present.

As mentioned, both issue ownership and economic voting have been included in previous surveys. These studies therefore provide a background to the one proposed here. First, the proposed study takes its point of departure in the measures used and results obtained previously, but adds both new measures and analyses. Second, the previous studies permit us to conduct longitudinal comparisons as a supplement to the analyses based on the new measures to be developed.

2: The economic crisis and (new) aspects of economic voting

A key purpose of the proposed project is to exploit the unique empirical circumstances offered by the sudden onset of a national and international economic crisis to study a number of aspects concerning the impact of the economy on electoral behaviour. In this field, the *economic voting* literature has produced a string of interesting results concerning the relationship between the state of the economy and the voters' behaviour on Election Day. The core results of extant research within the economic voting tradition may be summarized in four points:

- 1 Voters are typically found to react according to the classic reward-punishment paradigm, where they tend to support the incumbent in case of (perceived) good economic performance, but defect under bad (Nadeau, Foucault, and Lewis-Beck 2009).

- 2 This also implies that voters typically base their evaluations on the government's handling of the economy rather than its promises for the future (i.e. voting is based more on retrospective than on prospective evaluations; Lewis-Beck & Paldam 2000; Alvarez et al. 2000).
- 3 Voters focus more on the state of the economy of the entire society than on their own pocketbook (i.e. they make sociotropic rather than egotropic evaluations; Kinder & Kiewiet 1979; Kiewiet 1983).
- 4 The effect on the vote is largest for so-called mediated evaluations involving an assessment of the government's policies. Simple evaluations of the state of the economy exert less influence (Fiorina 1981; Lewis-Beck 1988).

In the present project we will focus on three different areas that remain unexplored within the overall economic voting paradigm:

2.1 The micro foundation of the reward/punishment logic: How do voters evaluate the government's responsibility?

2.2 What role do other egotropic aspects of the economy – personal wealth in particular – play to voters?

2.3 Do voters develop a crisis consciousness involving a willingness to make sacrifices and acceptance of otherwise unpopular reform proposals?

We shall deal with each area in turn.

2.1 The micro foundation of the reward/punishment logic: How do voters evaluate the government's responsibility?

In its simple version, the reward/punishment logic would dictate that the public should desert the incumbent government due to the present economic downturn. However, the Danish experience so far leaves behind a different picture where the government is not held (co-)responsible for the crisis. Until mid-2009, thus, the crisis was not considered very serious and Denmark seemed to be the country (among 20 countries studied) where the government was considered *least* responsible (Goul Andersen 2010). Further, public debate has until now focused primarily on the prospects for getting the country out of the crisis rather than on responsibility for the crisis – i.e., on prospective rather than retrospective factors. This calls in question the primacy of mediated retrospective evaluations (cf. above) and opens the possibility that an incumbent government might even benefit electorally if

voters see it as better at handling the crisis than the opposition. So far however, the micro mechanisms underlying these evaluations have not been fleshed out. It remains unclear, that is, how voters in fact evaluate the causes of the crisis and the responsibility of the government. We intend to answer this question by developing measures of the voters' (retrospective) assignment of blame for the crisis as well as their (prospective) evaluations of the parties' proposals for combating the crisis. These measures can serve both as dependent variables when analysing the factors behind them and as independent variables in (logistic) regression models examining their relative influences on vote choice.

2.2 What role do other egotropic aspects of the economy – personal wealth in particular – play to voters?

Over and above the impact of the standard set of retrospective evaluations of the economy as well as prospective policy evaluations and personal income an emerging literature has documented the influence of a hitherto neglected economic element – personal wealth – in both France and the US (Lewis-Beck & Nadeau 2009; Nadeau, Foucault & Lewis-Beck forthcoming). In these countries, thus, researchers have found what has been dubbed a '*patrimonial effect*' on electoral behaviour which induces the wealthy to vote for rightist parties in order to increase the return on their wealth. While this simple statement of the theory may not seem surprising in a Danish context the developing literature opens a number of interesting questions from both a Danish and a comparative perspective.

In the Danish context, the boom and decline in the housing and stock markets over the past decade has brought renewed focus on implications of owning wealth – real estate (first and second homes) as well as stock. Previously it has been found that, in spite of (or because of?) numerous tax reforms, debates over tax stop policy etc., political differences between homeowners and tenants are very small (Goul Andersen 2003b). However, the economic downturn since mid-2007 has reduced the wealth of homeowners significantly. Therefore, the question arises as to how voters will react to this decline in wealth: Will they, in accordance with the reward-punishment logic, desert the government coalition. Or will the patrimonial effect establish an alignment between homeowners and the bourgeois parties that has been observed previously?

Comparatively, the previous Danish results seem to question the existence of the patrimonial effect. As suggested by the work of Pacek and Radcliff (1996) the weakness of the effect might be due to the universal (as opposed to the more conservative and liberal, respectively, French and US

systems; cf. Esping-Andersen 1990) Danish welfare state which alleviates some of the economic tensions that exist in other countries (for the US see, e.g., Bartels 2008b). Denmark may therefore be seen as an important test case for the patrimonial effect. To exploit the opportunity entailed herein, the applicants are collaborating with Professors Michael Lewis-Beck (University of Iowa) and Richard Nadeau (University of Montreal) who have done pioneering work in the field and are preparing further comparative analyses in which Denmark will be included in order to examine the generalizability of the results from France and the US. Operationally, it is the intention to include in the proposed survey a set of measures of various forms of wealth developed by Lewis-Beck and Nadeau (2009). These measures can then be included alongside appropriate controls in logistic regression models testing the strength of the patrimonial effect.

2.3 Do voters develop a crisis consciousness involving a willingness to make sacrifices and acceptance of otherwise unpopular reform proposals?

Another issue which has been somewhat neglected by economic voting theory is the impact of a mobilization of *crisis awareness* or *crisis consciousness* during an economic crisis. It is often underlined, e.g. in the literature on welfare retrenchment (cf., e.g., Pierson 1994), that voters' crisis consciousness can enable governments to adopt measures of retrenchment that would normally appear suicidal. This was evident in Denmark in the 1980s when a number of unpopular reforms (e.g. suspension and abolition of the automatic indexation of wages) were carried through without much resistance. A more recent example is the acceptance of the higher age brackets of retirement in the 2006 welfare reform (Goul Andersen 2009). As there is a price to be paid for the economic crisis and for the remedies against it, the question regarding the voters' degree of willingness to accept reforms is critical. As part of the project, therefore, we intend to test the proposition that otherwise unpopular proposals (from higher retirement age to higher taxes) may be accepted by the voters if crisis consciousness is high and if they believe these would be efficient solutions. Operationally, this involves the development of new measures of crisis consciousness which can be included in models predicting attitudes to, e.g., welfare spending and taxation. Such measures will permit exploring the causal mechanisms at the micro level much more adequately than has been done previously.

3: The foundations and impact of issue ownership

Recently, research into party competition (cf., e.g., Green & Hobolt 2008; Green-Pedersen 2007; Green-Pedersen & Stubager 2010; Hayes 2008; Jerit 2008; Sides 2006; Sigelman & Buell 2004) has

placed great emphasis on *issue ownership* as a determinant of parties' electoral strategies. The basic idea derived, e.g., from Petrocik's (1996; Petrocik et al. 2003) work is that parties will emphasize owned issues both in their communication to the voters as well as in parliament simply because talking about these issues is expected to increase electoral support: When a given issue is at the top of the agenda, voters will flock to the party that has the best reputation on the issue. To this literature, hence, issue ownership is a central concept – it is the foundation of many of the theoretical propositions advanced. However, tests of these propositions have produced mixed results indicating that the ownership logic does not (always) prevail (cf., e.g., Green-Pedersen & Mortensen 2010). Likewise, the few studies that have tried to integrate issue ownership in models of individual level electoral behaviour have also produced only mixed support for the idea that voters base their decisions on considerations of issue ownership (cf. Bélanger & Meguid 2008; Green & Hobolt 2008; van der Brug 2004). From the perspective of research into both party competition and electoral behaviour, thus, issue ownership is an important variable, but at the same time a variable of which the individual level foundation is poorly understood. Since issue ownership plays an increasing role in the international literature it is clear that the more thorough investigation of the concept proposed here will be of interest to a wide audience.

Part of the reason for the mixed findings of previous research might be that the concept of issue ownership is plagued by ambiguity. One indication hereof is that issue ownership has been defined in two different ways. First and clearly most dominant in the literature, Party (or government alternative) A's ownership over issue X is seen as equivalent to the voters' perception that Party A is best at 'handling' issue X, i.e. to solve problems in the issue domain. This definition is found in both Budge and Farlie's (1983) and Petrocik's (1996) discussions of the concept and is clearly based on a *valence* conception: (Most) Voters agree about the desired outcome on issue X; what differs is only the parties' abilities to deliver (cf. also Clarke et al. 2009). However, Petrocik (1996) also points to a second type of issue ownership: constituency based ownership. The foundation hereof is '(1) the relatively stable, but different social bases, that distinguish party constituencies in modern party systems and (2) the link between political conflict and social structure' (ibid. 827). Entailed in this conception of issue ownership is obviously a *positional* element: Issue ownership is based on Party A's association with Group Z which is in conflict with other groups. There is, in other words, disagreement over the desired outcomes.

So far, the relationship among the valence and position perspectives on issue ownership has not been investigated. Nor, in fact, has the tenability of each perspective – is it, for instance, possible for a party to own a position issue, or does ownership on such issues relate to specific positions

rather than the issue itself? It is questions like these that we propose to investigate. The main research question may be divided into three subsections:

- 3.1** This subsection focuses on the theoretical ambiguity of the issue ownership concept, particularly the question of whether position issues can be owned. The main objective will be to determine how (if at all) voters perceive issue ownership on positional as compared to valence issues, and whether such ownership pertains to the issue as such or rather a position thereon.
- 3.2** This subsection focuses on the relationship between ownership of valence and positional issues. It seems a straightforward hypothesis, thus, that ownership over a given (position on a?) positional issue (e.g. the level of unemployment benefits) may spill over into ownership of related valence issues (e.g. fighting unemployment), but this has never been investigated.
- 3.3** Third, the influence of issue ownership on voting also needs examination. The few studies in the area have indicated that the impact of issue ownership on voting is conditional on the ideological convergence of the parties as well as voters' perceptions of issue saliency (Bélanger & Meguid 2008; Green & Hobolt 2008). Following these results and recent research into voter heterogeneity (Basinger & Lavine 2005), the main hypothesis of this part of the project is that issue ownership considerations and the valence aspect in particular will matter more to voters that hold less distinct images of the parties. For voters who are less certain about differences in the ideological and policy positions of the parties, issue ownership can serve as a shortcut to the electoral decision (cf. Clarke et al. 2009; Green & Hobolt 2008).

The main methodological challenge of this component lies in the development of new measures that tap into the various aspects of issue ownership, thereby permitting an examination of their interrelationships and effects on voting. Thus, the traditional approach to measuring issue ownership in Denmark was (as in the US two-party system) to ask respondents who is better at 'handling' a given issue: a Social Democratic led or a bourgeois government (cf., e.g., Goul Andersen 2003a; 2008). To progress, innovations are needed on two levels. First, it is necessary to develop measures that tap the perceived issue ownership of each individual party – i.e. to introduce the Danish multiparty reality to the measure. In this respect survey items from the Swedish and Norwegian election studies where such measures have been included for a number of years can serve as inspiration (Holmberg & Oscarsson 2004; Aardal 2007) just as the 2007 election study contained a small first step in this direction (Stubager 2009; Stubager & Slothuus 2009).

Second and somewhat more challenging, we need to develop measures that tap ownership of positional issues, or possibly positions on such issues. One way to achieve this is the new measures in the 2007 study where we asked respondents to indicate which party best represents various social groups. A parallel approach will be attempted in the present study in relation to position issues (e.g. the level of taxation) as well as specific positions on these issues (e.g. lowering or increasing taxes on the wealthiest). In order to validate these new measures before including them in the main survey, we intend to conduct two small web-based validation studies on smaller samples (cf. enclosure 5).

4: International network cooperation

The Danish Election Study has over the past decade begun a process of integration into relevant international networks. First, the election studies of the five Nordic countries have begun an integration process which involves the adaptation and adoption of questions in the respective surveys. The collaboration takes place within the Nordic Elections and Democracy Network (www.nored.dk) financed by a grant from the Council to co-applicant Jørgen Goul Andersen. Presently, the first collaborative book project *Withered ties, new relations? A study of the relation between citizens and parties in Nordic welfare democracies* (edited by Åsa Bengtsson, Åbo Akademi, co-applicant Kasper Møller Hansen, Hanne Marthe Narud, Oslo University, and Henrik Oscarsson, Gothenburg University) is on its way to print. In relation to the present project it is intended to continue the work with respect to including central items from the other countries in the Danish questionnaire, thereby further expanding the basis for comparison between the five countries. The exact questions to be adopted will be decided in collaboration with representatives from the other countries.

Second, the Danish Election Study is part of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES, www.cses.org) which encompasses well over 50 countries around the world. CSES develops modules of questions to be included in the national election surveys of the participating countries. So far Denmark has been part of the first and second waves and it is intended to include the third module in the present project. CSES Module 3 contains questions focusing on the meaningfulness of the choices available to the voters and whether they see the electoral process as making a difference. These questions will fit very well with the proposed focus on issue ownership thereby contributing to strengthening this particular element while also facilitating the comparison of Denmark to other countries in accordance with the wider goal of the CSES project.

Methods

Following the approach of all previous Danish election studies as well as similar studies around the world we intend to field a large face-to-face post-election survey of a representative sample of 2,000 voters drawn from the CPR-register. We include two bids for conducting the survey as enclosures 3 and 4. The bid from SFI-Survey is the cheapest and is also the one we prefer on quality grounds. Over the past years, the main problem for this type of data collection has been to obtain a satisfactory response rate. While the studies from 2001 and 2005 acquired rates in the 50-60% range, the result for the 2007 study was outright disastrous with a rate of 32% for the main sample. This result primarily reflected the unprofessional conduct of the polling agency which did not devote enough qualified resources to the task (a fact that has also delayed the process of data analysis and publication). To avoid a similar situation we have contacted other agencies in which we have more faith and the aim is to reach a response rate between 60 and 70% which will be at the level presently reached in e.g. the Netherlands. In order to achieve this we plan to take a number of steps: Contact letters to respondents will be targeted different age-groups; a large number of interviewers will be engaged in the survey; and a lottery will provide incentives for difficult-to-reach groups to participate (cf. enclosure 3). Together, we are confident these measures will result in a good response rate and a short fieldwork period.

In recent years, much of survey research has moved from face-to-face or telephone interviewing to conducting all interviews on-line. This method has many merits – not least in terms of lower cost – but it also has drawbacks that make it unsatisfying from the perspective of an election study. The largest worry pertains to the representativeness of the respondents. Thus, none of the operators in the Danish market have yet succeeded in establishing a representative pool of email addresses from which a sample can be drawn. Preliminary studies conducted by the applicants have shown that individuals in the existing pools report much higher levels of political interest and appear more ideologically coherent than average voters. In addition, it should be mentioned that face-to-face interviewing is still the preferred mode of collection for all major election study programmes including the British, German, and American studies.

In recent years it has become common for some of the larger national election studies (such as, e.g., the German and British) to include a campaign study alongside the main post-election survey to investigate specific campaign dynamics. Such a campaign study is not part of the present proposal which directs focus at other factors influencing voters than campaign dynamics. However, the

proposed project may benefit from some of the insights that will emanate from the Online Panel of Electoral Campaigning project run by co-applicant Kasper Møller Hansen and supported by the Council. It should be underlined, however, that the theoretical foci of the two projects are different.

Organization

The team behind the project consists of

Associate Professor Rune Stubager, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University (main applicant)

Professor Kasper Møller Hansen, Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen

Professor Jørgen Goul Andersen, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University

The applicants will be co-responsible for the part of the project focusing on the impact of the economic crisis, while Goul Andersen and Stubager will be responsible for the part regarding issue ownership.

In addition, it is the intention to invite members of the Danish election study network to work on the data. This will include Professors Søren Risbjerg Thomsen, Jørgen Elklit, and Ole Borre (all Aarhus University) and Associate Professor Johannes Andersen (Aalborg University).

The following have agreed to serve as the project's *advisory board*:

Lecturer Sara Binzer Hobolt, Oxford University

Professor Michael Lewis-Beck, University of Iowa

Professor Richard Nadeau, University of Montreal

Professor Henrik Oscarsson, University of Gothenburg

Professor Stefaan Walgrave, University of Antwerp

The advisory board will provide comments and feedback on survey measures and papers from the different parts of the project. Lewis-Beck, Nadeau, and Oscarsson will contribute mainly to the economic component while Hobolt and Walgrave will contribute to the issue ownership component.

Budget

The overall budget (excl. overhead) for the project is as follows:

- Main survey: kr. 2,195,000
- Validation surveys: kr. 52,526
- Researcher salaries:
 - o Stubager: 1 year in the period 2011-13
 - o Goul Andersen: 6 months in the period 2011-13
 - o Hansen: 6 months in the period 2012-13
 - o In total: kr. 1,315,419
- Student research assistants*
 - o Coding (incl. training) of open-ended questions
 - o Preparation of codebook and data file for analysis
 - o Preparation of booklet presenting the central time series of the project (cf. below)
 - o Development and maintenance of an Election Study web-page
 - o In total: (app. 770 hrs.): kr. 100,000
- Project meetings incl. travel: kr. 50,000
- Konference participation: kr. 30,000
- Research materials etc.: kr. 15,000
- Language revision: kr. 20,000
- Publication support: kr. 50,000
- In total: kr. 3,827,945

*: It is the applicants' experience that coding of the survey's open ended questions (e.g. agenda, occupation, and education) as well as preparation of the codebook and data file for analysis are time consuming enterprises for which ample resources for student assistance are therefore needed.

See enclosure 6 for the detailed budget.

Of the three researchers, only Hansen has other grants covering his salary in parts of the project period. This pertains to 10.5 months in 2011.

Schedule and publications

As the exact date of the 2010/11 Folketing-election is unknown it is impossible to provide an exact start data for the project. However, the work schedule will be as follows:

Immediately after funding has been obtained	Preparation of questionnaire including validation studies
During election campaign	Finalization of questionnaire
Election day +1	Survey fieldwork begins
Election day + (app.) 90	Survey fieldwork ends
Election day + (app.) 105	Data and fieldwork report delivered to applicants
Following 2½ years	Analysis and publication

The following publications are planned:

- A peer-reviewed Danish book, tentatively titled *Krisevalg* focusing on the impact of the economic crisis on the Danish electorate (the research questions in sections 2.1-2.3)
- A Danish booklet presenting and updating the central time series of the project
- 4-6 articles in international peer-reviewed journals:
 - o 1-2 on the impact of the economic crisis on electoral behaviour (sections 2.1 and 2.3)
 - o 1-2 on the patrimonial effect in Denmark and in comparative perspective (section 2.2)
 - o 1 on the components of issue ownership (sections 3.1-3.2)
 - o 1 on the impact of these components on voting (section 3.3)