

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

**Georg Wenzelburger, Reimut Zohlnhöfer & Frieder Wolf, 2013: Implications of Dataset Choice in Comparative Welfare State Research, in: Journal of European Public Policy Volume 20, Issue 8**

Table 1: Independent Variables

Table 2: Replacement Rate Levels and Rank Orders in 2000, SCIP alternative calculation

Table 3: Replacement Rate Trends: Changes between 1990 and 2000, SCIP alternative calculation

Table 4: Regression on differences between the datasets

**Supporting Information Table 1: Independent Variables**

	Expected Effect	Source
Social Democrats Cabinet Share	+ (Unem., Health) 0/- (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Christian Democrats Cabinet Share	+ (Unem., Health) 0/- (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Non-Christian Center Parties' Cabinet Share	+ (Unem., Health) 0 (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Liberal Parties' Cabinet Share	- (Unem., Health) 0 (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Conservatives Parties' Cabinet Share	- (Unem., Health) 0 (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Right Parties' Cabinet Share	- (Unem., Health) 0 (Pensions)	Schmidt et al. 2000
Institutional Constraints	+/-	Schmidt 2000
Corporatism	+	Siaroff 1999
Conservative Welfare State	+	Esping-Andersen 1990
Social Insurance State	+	Hinrichs 2000
Welfare State Regime	0= Targeted, 1=Basic Security, 2=State Corporatist, 3=Encompassing	Korpi/Palme 1998
State Corporatist Welfare State	1= State Corporatist, 0=Otherwise	Korpi/Palme 1998
State Corporatist UE Programs	1= State Corporatist UE Programs, 0= Otherwise	Sjöberg et al. 2010
Comprehensive and targeted UE Programs	1= Comprehensive and targeted UE Programs, 0= Otherwise	Sjöberg et al. 2010
Union Density	+	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Financial Openness	-	Quinn/Inclán 1997
Trade Openness [(export)/GDP]	+/-	Armingeon et al. (2010)
EU-Membership	-	1=Member, 0=Non-Member
EMU-Membership	-	1=Member, 0=Non-Member
Unemployment Rate	-	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Employment Rate	+	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Deindustrialization	+	Authors' Calculation as per Iversen/Cusack (2000); OECD-Data
Budget Balance (90-95)	+	Allan/Scruggs (2004)
Public Debt 1990	-	Allan/Scruggs (2004)
GDP Growth	+	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Population Share of the Elderly	+ (Pensions Only)	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Expected Population Share of the Elderly 2025	- (Pensions Only)	UN < <a href="http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=2">http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=2</a> >
Expected Change Population Share of the Elderly 1980-2025	- (Pensions Only)	Authors' Calculation as per UN < <a href="http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=2">http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=2</a> >
Expenditure on Pensions as Percentage of GDP	-	Armingeon et al. (2010)
Incipient Benefits	-	Scruggs 2004a, Korpi/Palme 2008

**Supporting Information Table 2: Replacement Rate Levels and Rank Orders in 2000, SCIP alternative calculation**

	<b>Unemployment(CWED)</b>	<b>Unemployment (SCIP)</b>	<b>Sick pay (CWED)</b>	<b>Sick pay (SCIP)</b>
<b>Australia</b>	0.46 (14)	0.27 (17)	0.44 (14)	0.27 (14)
<b>Austria</b>	0.64 (8)	0.40 (12)	0.85 (4)	0.72 (3)
<b>Belgium</b>	0.61 (12)	0.39 (13)	0.87 (3)	0.53 (11)
<b>Canada</b>	0.70 (4)	0.44 (11)	0.70 (10)	0.22 (15)
<b>Denmark</b>	0.64 (9)	0.53 (8)	0.64 (11)	0.53 (10)
<b>Finland</b>	0.62 (10)	0.50 (10)	0.74 (9)	0.61 (6)
<b>France</b>	0.66 (6)	0.64 (3)	0.63 (12)	0.56 (8)
<b>Germany</b>	0.66 (7)	0.50 (9)	0.93 (2)	0.65 (5)
<b>Ireland</b>	0.39 (17)	0.33 (14)	0.39 (16)	0.32 (12)
<b>Italy</b>	0.45 (15)	0.29 (15)	0.80 (7)	0.53 (9)
<b>Japan</b>	0.61 (11)	0.72 (2)	0.59 (13)	0.72 (2)
<b>Netherlands</b>	0.76 (2)	0.59 (4)	0.76 (8)	0.59 (7)
<b>New Zealand</b>	0.42 (16)	0.28 (16)	0.42 (15)	0.28 (13)
<b>Norway</b>	0.69 (5)	0.56 (7)	1.00 (1)	0.86 (1)
<b>Sweden</b>	0.70 (3)	0.56 (6)	0.82 (5)	0.70 (4)
<b>Switzerland</b>	0.77 (1)	0.75 (1)	0.81 (6)	0.11 (17)
<b>United Kingdom</b>	0.37 (18)	0.15 (18)	0.25 (17)	0.17 (16)
<b>United States</b>	0.57 (13)	0.58 (5)	--	--
<b>Mean</b>	<i>0.60</i>	<i>0.47</i>	<i>0.68</i>	<i>0.49</i>
<b>SD</b>	<i>0.13</i>	<i>0.17</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>0.22</i>

**Supporting Information Table 3: Replacement Rate Trends: Changes between 1990 and 2000, SCIP alternative calculation**

	<b>Unemployment CWED</b>	<b>Unemployment SCIP</b>	<b>Sick pay CWED</b>	<b>Sick pay SCIP</b>
<b>Australia</b>	-1.8 (→)	-11.2 (↓)	-3.4 (↓)	-11.2 (↓)
<b>Austria</b>	-0.8 (→)	-5.6 (↓)	1.6 (→)	-1.8 (→)
<b>Belgium</b>	-1.3 (→)	-4.2 (↓)	-2.4 (↓)	6.4 (↑)
<b>Canada</b>	1.6 (→)	-8.8 (↓)	1.6 (→)	-6.2 (↓)
<b>Denmark</b>	-6.4 (↓)	-8.0 (↓)	-6.6 (↓)	-8.2 (↓)
<b>Finland</b>	-5.6 (↓)	-9.1 (↓)	-13.8 (↓)	-15.5 (↓)
<b>France</b>	-0.4 (→)	8.7 (↑)	-2.2 (↓)	9.9 (↑)
<b>Germany</b>	-0.8 (→)	-13.8 (↓)	-7.2 (↓)	-42.2 (↓)
<b>Ireland</b>	-10.2 (↓)	-22.6 (↓)	-10.2 (↓)	-23.4 (↓)
<b>Italy</b>	20.9 (↑)	12.3 (↑)	3.1 (↑)	-23.6 (↓)
<b>Japan</b>	5.8 (↑)	0.4 (→)	4.6 (↑)	0.4 (→)
<b>Netherlands</b>	-0.2 (→)	-7.4 (↓)	-0.2 (→)	-7.3 (↓)
<b>New Zealand</b>	-11.3 (↓)	-7.2 (↓)	-13.5 (↓)	-10.8 (↓)
<b>Norway</b>	-1.6 (→)	-5.0 (↓)	0 (→)	3.3 (↑)
<b>Sweden</b>	-13.2 (↓)	-15.6 (↓)	-3.1 (↓)	-6.6 (↓)
<b>Switzerland</b>	0.0 (→)	5.3 (↑)	-0.3 (→)	1.9 (→)
<b>United Kingdom</b>	8.7 (↑)	-6.3 (↓)	-5.5 (↓)	-5.5 (↓)
<b>United States</b>	-1.5 (→)	12.4 (↑)		
<b>Mean</b>	<i>-1.01</i>	<i>-4.77</i>	<i>-3.38</i>	<i>-8.27</i>

Note: An upward-pointing arrow signifies an increase of more than 2 percentage points, a downward-pointing arrow a cut of more than 2 percentage points and a horizontal arrow signifies changes of no more than +/- 2 percentage points.

**Supporting Information Table 4: Regression on differences between the datasets**

	<b>Difference SCIP-CWED UE I</b>	<b>Difference SCIP-CWED UE II</b>	<b>Difference SCIP-CWED Sick Pay I</b>	<b>Difference SCIP-CWED Sick Pay II</b>	<b>Difference SCIP-CWED Pensions</b>
Constant	0,165*** (3,439)	0,037 (0,633)	0,164* (1,964)	-0,618* (-2,107)	-0,042 (-0,585)
Corporatism	-0,094*** (-4,648)	-0,082*** (-3,909)	-0,148*** (-3,924)	-0,139** (-2,754)	-0,074*** (-3,696)
EU	-0,139*** (-3,713)	-0,104** (-2,955)			
Federalism (Lijphart)			0,067*** (3,720)		
Institutional constraints				0,072** (2,594)	,024* (1,997)
Welfare state regime			0,067* (1,946)		
Trade union density	0,003** (2,615)	0,004*** (4,293)			0,002* (1,958)
Christian center parties	0,004*** (4,830)	0,003*** (3,226)			0,003** (2,867)
Conservative parties				-0,003* (-1,752)	
Social Expenditure Taxation Incidence	0,031** (3,023)		0,028* (1,878)		
Employment ratio				0,016** (3,075)	
Old age expenditure		0,014* (1,996)			0,015** (2,284)
N	17 (without CH)	18	16 (without CH)	17	18
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	0,651	0,531	0,530	0,553	0,711