

**BRIDGE (FCT 2023.12063.PEX):
SCOPING LITERATURE REVIEW CODEBOOK**

Databases: SCOPUS, Google Scholar & APSA Preprints

Timeframe: since 1950-2025(June)

Questions the SLR aims to answer: How has the citizen-parliament relationship been conceptualized and measured in existing literature, and what dimensions beyond trust and satisfaction have been explored?

<i>Variable Name</i>	<i>Values and Labels / Description</i>
Study_ID	Unique alphanumeric identifier assigned to each study (e.g., SLR001).
Coder_Initials	Initials of the coder responsible for data extraction: AM= Ana Matias RO= Rui Oliveira
Author_LastNames	Last names of the authors as listed in the publication.
Full_Citation	Complete bibliographic citation
Year_Publication	Year when the publication was published (numeric).
Type_Publication	Type of publication: (Single selection) 1 = Article 2 = Report 3 = Thesis 4 = Book Chapter 5 = Other
Language	Language in which the publication is written: (Single selection) 1 = English 2 = Portuguese 3 = Spanish
Type_Publication/Study	(Single selection) 1 = Empirical 2 = Theoretical Note: Clarification: Empirical articles are those with clearly established data collection and data analysis procedures that aim at describing phenomena or/and testing hypotheses/explanations/

	<p>arguments. Empirical articles are those with clearly established data collection and data analysis procedures that aim to describe phenomena and/or test hypotheses, explanations, or arguments. This category also includes evidence syntheses such as meta-analyses and scoping reviews. (If in doubt, classify as empirical when the study systematically extracts or analyses data, even if secondary). Theoretical articles focus on concept definition and formation, and theory building and normally do not include empirical research.</p>
Type_Parliament	<p>Type of parliaments covered in the study (Single selection)</p> <p>1 = National 2 = Sub-national 3 = Both 98 = Unclear</p>
Attitudes_MainFocus	<p>Does the study focus primarily on attitudes/perceptions/opinions towards parliament?</p> <p>(Single selection)</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = Partially 3 = No 98 = Unclear.</p>
Research_Questions1 Research_Questions2...	<p>As stated by the authors.</p> <p>Note: Use 99='Not reported' if not present or 98= 'Unclear' if ambiguous or 97= Not applicable.</p>
Behavioral_Engagement1 Behavioral_Engagement2...	<p>Forms of citizen behavior toward parliaments examined in the study?</p> <p>(Multiple selection)</p> <p>0 = None 1 = Petitioning (signing/submitting petitions to parliament) 2 = Contacting MPs (letters, emails, constituency visits) 3 = Voting in parliamentary elections (when explicitly linked to parliamentary representation)</p>

	<p>4 = Participation in formal consultations/hearings (inquiries, public submissions)</p> <p>5 = Parliamentary visits/events (open days, tours, educational activities)</p> <p>6 = Social media engagement with parliament (following, liking, commenting, sharing)</p> <p>7 = Consumption of parliamentary information (watching debates, reading official sites/reports)</p> <p>8 = Protest/demonstration directed toward parliament</p> <p>9 = Other</p>
Attitudinal_Engagement1 Attitudinal_Engagement2...	<p>Attitudes and evaluations of citizens toward parliaments examined in the study?</p> <p>(Multiple selection)</p> <p>0 = None</p> <p>1 = Trust/confidence in parliament</p> <p>2 = Satisfaction with parliament</p> <p>3 = Perceived legitimacy of parliament</p> <p>4 = Perceptions of responsiveness (parliament listening/acting on citizens' concerns)</p> <p>5 = Perceptions of accessibility/usability (ease of understanding or interacting with parliament)</p> <p>6 = Identification/attachment to parliament (sense of belonging, representativeness)</p> <p>7 = Perceived transparency/openness of parliament</p> <p>8 = Other</p> <p>Note: Always code based on the operational measure (the variable measured), not the label the authors assign. If it says confidence in parliament, treat this as Trust, since "trust" and "confidence" are conceptually interchangeable in the literature (Norris, 2011).</p>
Conceptual_Definition1 Conceptual_Definition2...	If possible, extract definitions to explore how the main concepts are framed (in their own words).

	(all that apply are selected) Note: If authors are not clear about the definitions they use, code as 98. This may occur when authors present several conceptualizations in a state-of-the-art section without explicitly stating their own definition.
Research_Design1 Research_Design2...	Applicable only for empirical studies (from this point onward). (Multiple choice, all that apply are selected) 1 = Case-study (single case) 2 = Comparative (two or more cases) 3 = Experimental or quasi-experimental 4 = Evidence synthesis (meta-analysis, scoping reviews)
Time_Frame	Time period analyzed. E.g., 2015–2020 or 99='Not reported'. Note: It might be a point in time (e.g. "2008"), or a period (e.g. 2009-2020). When the time periods differ between descriptive and multivariate analyses, for instance, record the longest time frame.
Country	Country. If multiple countries, separate with semicolons.
Data_Collection_Techniques1 Data_Collection_Techniques2...	Research techniques used to collect data: (Multiple choice, all that apply are selected) 1 = Surveys 2 = Interviews 3 = Focus groups 4 = Ethnography 5 = Content analysis 6 = Experimental surveys 7= Secondary data extraction (meta-analysis, scoping reviews) 8 = Other
Data_Source	Data Sources (Single choice) 1 = Primary 2 = Secondary 3 = Mixed

	99 = Not Reported.
Data_Analysis1 Data_Analysis2	<p>Data Analysis</p> <p>(Multiple choice, all that apply are selected)</p> <p>1= Quantitative (descriptive, bivariate, statistical aggregation) 2= Quantitative (statistical modelling, regression analysis, computer assisted text analysis) 3= Qualitative (content analysis, discourse analysis, ethnographic methods, interviews, qualitative synthesis) 4= Quantitative and qualitative</p>
Key_Findings	Brief summary of main findings relevant to citizens' attitudes or views of parliaments (Check the conclusion and what authors highlight as the main findings).
Notes_Comments	Any additional comments, coding difficulties, or points of clarification.

Standard values/labels to use across all variables:

To ensure inter-coder consistency, always use the following terms when applicable:

99 = Not Reported – If the information is missing or not discussed.

98 = Unclear – If the information is presented ambiguously.

97= Not Applicable – If the variable does not apply to the specific study.