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By creating new spaces for the instantaneous exchange of information and social movement organization, information communication technologies (ICTs) can challenge traditional participation and deepen a democratic framework through the protest activity they may incite, providing marginalized groups with a new channel for representation and governments with a phenomenon difficult to evade—one that allows the individual to take control of political discussion and subsequently organize to make political demands in any state or region (Stepanova 2011, Weldon 2011).Considering the interactive features that characterize ICTs while recognizing their ability to rapidly disperse information across extensive geographic spaces, scholars have started to analyze how these technologies can impact various forms of protest activity and affect the individual’s degree of civic engagement (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Carty 2011; Dalton 2008; Smith et al. 2009; Stepanova 2011). Although different regional contexts and socio-economic factors can affect this relationship, multiple scholars suggest that ICTs encourage and facilitate extra-representational forms of political participation (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Dalton 2008; Stepanova 2011). By challenging bureaucratic structures and encouraging organization at the community level, citizens can vocalize the concerns of society from below, significantly affect policy making, and create a democratic system that moves closer toward its theoretical goals of fostering direct citizen participation. (Carter 2012, Dalton 2008, Weldon 2011).

Taking this context into account, I hypothesize that in a comparison of individuals, those who utilize ICTs will be more likely to engage in higher levels of protest activity than those who rarely or do not use ICTs at all. In what follows I will analyze scholarly literature that both supports and refutes this conjecture. In order to quantify my hypothesis, I will use a 2007 Spanish dataset collected by the Centre for Sociological Investigations (CIS) that surveyed 3716 adults 18 and older in Spain in order to understand how technology and the Internet affects the individual’s level of offline political participation. My main explanatory variable will be represented by frequency of Internet use and my dependent variable will be represented by whether or not individuals participate in one of three forms of protesting listed by CIS. I will then conclude with a discussion of the implications of the findings derived from a logistics regression that controls for socio-economic factors and allows us to assess the likelihood that an individual will protest when Internet use serves as our independent variable.

If Information Communication Technologies do, in fact, affect protesting, we must understand the role that social movements, strikes, sit-ins, and other protest activities have on political representation in both democracies and other governmental systems in order to assess the political impact ICTs can create. S. Laurel Weldon argues that although marginalized groups are formally integrated in democratic procedures, discrimination, social inequalities, and other similar factors can mitigate their representation and create biased procedures in favor of those groups that maintain greater representation in democracies (2011). A lack of formal processes, such as elections, combined with the inclusivity of sub-groups allows for social movements to become more successful and increase the representation of marginalized groups; thus, their accessibility and direct defiance of power structures make them considerably effective at influencing policy, sometimes trumping the impact of formal procedures (Euchner 1996, Weldon 2011). April Carter argues that the nonviolent nature of protests has increased in regions where individuals seek to deepen democracy or combat authoritarian regimes, claiming that social movements typically occur in democratic regions and “people power movements” occur in regions ruled by authoritarian regimes—a term Carter uses to describe the unification of people as a strategy to demand a more democratic system of governance (2012). Both of these examples demonstrate the efforts individuals make to gain a greater voice in political deliberation and affect policymaking. Both Carter and Euchner agree that “people power” or “extraordinary politics” in which the ordinary individual participates in strikes or protests—processes that require great strength and perseverance—can cause significant policy shifts; one can look to the Civil Rights Movement, the strikes and protests after the stock market crash of 1929, the feminist movements of the seventies, and the 2011 uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt to see how demonstrations can pressure governments to listen to civil society or completely overthrow authoritarian regimes (2012, 1996). Considering the impact of these movements, we should study the ways in which ICT’s encourage, inform, or facilitate protest activities.

Information Communication Technologies refer to digital media that create interactive networks and allow for the exchange of information among various users (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Carty 2011; Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009; Stepanova 2011). These technologies vary greatly and may include the Internet, cell phones, text messages, e-mails, blogs, online forums, chat or instant messaging, webpages, and online social networks such as Facebook or Twitter (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Carty 2011; Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009; Shah et al. 2005; Stepanova 2011). These devices accordingly manipulate spatial distance by transmitting information across geographic boundaries and doing so with great speed (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Stepanova 2011; Youniss et al. 2002). Bennett, Segerberg, and Wilkins discuss the role of media in allowing for individuals to defy further national borders through the dispersion of information that promotes unification (2012; 2008). Digital media used in the 2003 global antiwar protests, for example, allowed people of different communities and affiliations to become internationally unified against one political issue (Bennett and Segerber 2012; Carty 2011). Anduiza, Jensen, Jorba and other scholars view ICTs as mediums that allow for the horizontal distribution ofinformation and considerably decrease the cost of sharing this content, encouraging further the use of the Internet in political coordination (2012; Chadwick 2006; della Porta 2012; Jiménez Sánchez 2008; Shah et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2009). It can therefore be noted that ICTs significantly aid transparency by increasing the individual’s accessibility to political information and publicizing news that might otherwise be censored, as demonstrated by the Arab Spring protests of 2011 (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Carty 2011; Dalton 2008; della Porta 2012; Miladi 2011; Stepanova 2011; Youniss 2002). These technologies additionally allow for the individual to share personal political expressions and subsequently participate politically by publicizing his or her stance on a given issue (Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009; Shah et al. 2005). Through these channels, a person who is not typically politically engaged can easily stumble upon political updates and information (Cantijoch 2012). These unplanned encounters, again, demonstrate how ICTs can diffuse information to a wider audience, even when such information is unsolicited.

Not only can digital media create online spaces for new forms of political participation, but it has also been shown to encourage offline action that takes the form of extra- representational civic engagement (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Aouragh 2012; Dalton 2008). This activity can include boycotts, sit-ins, marches, and protests—all of which combat traditional forms of political participation such as voting (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Aouragh 2012; Dalton 2008). Dalton suggests that advanced industrial democracies are entering a new wave of democratization, characterized by unprecedented levels of extra-representational activity as technology increases the individual’s accessibility to information (2008; della Porta 2012). ICTs essentially tear down hierarchical structures associated with an institutional framework (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Youniss et al. 2002). With the use of technology, the elite driven discussion of politics diminishes, allowing for any person to participate in political dialogue (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Youniss et al. 2002).

By reaching out to larger audiences, the inclusive nature of ICTs can greatly affect social movement organization and allow interest groups to recruit members (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Carty 2011; Shah et al. 2005; Stepanova 2011; Wilkins 2008). Great emphasis has been placed on the tools that ICTs provide in assisting the organization of protest activity and social movements (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Bennett and Segerberg 2012; Carty 2011; Shah et al. 2005; Stepanova 2011; Wilkins 2008). Through digital media, people can share information and become informed about protest plans or other events by looking at calendars posted by organizations on webpages and social networking sites (della Porta 2012).

In analyzing the effects of ICTs on political participation, scholars agree that we must study the context of the different regions in which they are used and recognize that the impacts of ICTs in one nation may not be generalizable to others (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Stepanova 2011). Scholars additionally state that by analyzing data focused on one time period, we must be cautious in applying conclusions across time and space because context can continually change (Cantijoch 2012; Shah et al. 2005). By analyzing data during a presidential campaign, for example, civic engagement rates might differ from a year without this campaign activity (Shah et al. 2005). Analyzing different case studies can help us understand how the power of ICTs varies across nations and time periods.

Spain, for example, has traditionally demonstrated high rates of protest activity and involvement in extra-representational forms of participation (Cantijoch 2012; Jiménez Sánchez 2008). Taking this environment into consideration, ICTs may reinforce political behavior among already politically active individuals as opposed to mobilizing the general population (Cantijoch 2012). Cantijoch presents us with three categories under which the individual can fall based on political attitudes and expected participatory behavior (2012). A person classified as *disaffected* usually has low trust in political institutions and a poor sense of political efficacy (Cantijoch 2012). These individuals are typically inactive, emitting low rates of participation in representational or extra-representational activity (Cantijoch 2012). A person who falls under the *critical* category is generally dissatisfied with institutional representation but has a higher sense of efficacy which results in his or her likelihood to participate in extra-representational activity (Cantijoch 2012). The last profile, labeled as *institutional*, characterizes a person who has low levels of dissatisfaction with politics and tends to participate in traditional activities such as voting (Cantijoch 2012). In analyzing CIS’s 2007 Spanish data focused on ICT use and political participation, Cantijoch finds that Internet utilization has a positive mobilization effect on those that fall under the critical and institutional profile (2012). Frequent Internet use by these individuals leads to higher rates of engagement in extra-representational forms of participation and not on traditional forms (Cantijoch 2012). Dalton concurrently states that while electoral participation is low in many advanced industrial democracies, media consumption changes the forms in which citizens participate, heading towards extra-representational activity (2008).

Extending our analysis further to examine the Middle Eastern region, we see a much more apparent relationship between ICTs and protest activity. Hussain, Howard, Miladi, and Stepanova, highlight the importance of ICTs in allowing for the rapid diffusion of information and organizational efforts that propelled the instigation of the Arab Spring (2012; 2011; 2011). Online social networks such as Facebook and Twitter were crucial in sparking the wave of protests that led to the overthrow of the Tunisian and Egyptian regimes, as these networks created spaces in which events could be publicized and escape censorship (Miladi 2011; Stepanova 2011). Stepanova and Miladi importantly emphasize that the socioeconomic factors of the region could predict the occurrence of this upheaval, however, these scholars also recognize the fact that ICTs were responsible for allowing these events to take place sooner than expected (2011; 2011). Stepanova additionally addresses the fact that ICTs had become available to a large sector of the population: from 2000 to 2010, Egypt saw a 3,697 percent increase in the amount of Internet users (2011). Stepanova and Miladi highlight the specificity of this context: the combination of a surge in Internet access, political instability, public alienation from government, and years of political oppression demonstrate that the overarching context contributed to the creation of a powerful relationship between Internet use and protest activity (2011). Stepanova also mentions that in the case of Tunisia and Egypt, Internet use contributed to nonviolent forms of protest activity (2011). She compares this to the situation in Libya and Yemen, where low ICT availability can lead to violent political manifestations (Stepanova 2011).

Although these cases demonstrate that a positive relationship between ICTs and political participation may exist, many scholars are hesitant to readily make this assertion and point to other factors that encourage civic engagement. Socioeconomic status can play a large role in determining who uses the Internet (Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009; Smith et al. 2009; Wilkins 2008). We find that education levels and income may also correlate with ICT use or protest activity (Dalton 2008; Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009; Smith et al. 2009; Wilkins 2008). In the case of the U.S., Smith et al. conclude that higher education and income will encourage both offline and online political participation (2009). The importance of context can similarly refute this statement. In Spain, 85% of people between the ages of 18-30 use the Internet while only 41% of adults between the ages of 50-59 utilize this resource (Anduiza et al. 2010). A 2010 report from CIS reveals that socioeconomic factors and gender do not tend to affect Internet utilization for users between the ages of 18-30 in Spain (Anduiza et al. 2010). Socioeconomic factors may, therefore, not strictly determine who uses the Internet in the Spanish case when solely analyzing the youth population. 2009 survey data additionally shows that the Internet is more widely used by young adults in the U.S. (Smith et al.). Russell Dalton suggests that younger generations in advanced industrial democracies are predominantly involved in protests, and states that media is particularly important in affecting political activism for this group of technologically wired individuals (2008). Euchner argues that the youth population is more inclined to challenge mainstream values and has more time to participate in these movements because the nature of youth responsibilities differs greatly from those of an older adult (1996).

Still, other negative observations have been made regarding the effects that ICTs can have on mobilization efforts. Bennett and Segerberg discuss the ability of individuals to easily join and opt out of online social networks, claiming that this flexibility can foster low levels of commitment on behalf of participating members (2012). Scholars have also raised questions regarding the issue of social disintegration, asserting that the Internet allows a person to avoid face-to-face interactions and effectively become disassociated from others (Nie and Erbring 2000; Rojas and Puig-i-Abril 2009). This would undoubtedly reject the notion that high rates of Internet use lead to participation in protests—an activity that requires collective organization and human interaction. José Marichal opposes further the benefits that online social networks can provide for the public, proposing that Facebook allows individuals to “control interaction,” create a space where people are left to take away meaning from a text, and essentially create a partial network for the individual (2012). A person can *defriend* individuals he or she does not agree with and support people who have his or her similar political perspective (Marichal 2012). Chadwick and Shah et al. refute notions of disintegration as a result of Internet use by stating that these claims rest on the idea that physical interaction aids group identity, emphasizing the fact that these reports do not focus on the manner in which technology is used but rather center on the quantity of digital media consumed by the individual (2006; 2005). Additionally, Chadwick argues that online networks may reduce inhibition by creating a space in which a person feels safe enough to express his or her true political opinions (2006).

Although further investigation should be conducted focusing on the relationship between ICTs and protest activity that accounts for factors including the individual’s level of education, party affiliation, and other socio-economic factors, a vast amount of literature points to the positive tools that ICTs can provide for political organization across distance and time. In addition, the high utilization of technology employed by younger generations in the U.S. and Spain, for example, raises questions regarding the future of these Internet users and their continued or discontinued technological practices. In any case, ICTs should be included in the discussion of extra-representational forms of participation as the utilization of technology can facilitate the organization of such activity and defy the institutional framework of advanced industrial democracies (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Bennett and Segerberg 2012; Carty 2011; Shah et al. 2005; Stepanova 2011; Wilkins 2008). The various case studies demonstrate that Information Communication Technologies have played a major role in the organization of social movements on a local, national, and international scale which provides some insight regarding their power and value in promoting civic engagement.

Considering previous findings, I hypothesize that protest activity is affected by Internet use such that an increase in levels of Internet use has a positive effect on protest activity. Conversely, my null hypothesis states that protest activity is not affected by levels of Internet use such that an increase in Internet use has no effect on protest activity. In order to test my hypothesis, I will use a 2007 study called Internet and Political Participation, collected by CIS as a part of the center’s *Opinion and Attitudes* survey collection.[[1]](#footnote-1) The data surveyed 3,716 individuals 18 and older in Spain in October 2007. The survey asks questions regarding political participation, trust in institutions, protest activity, interest in politics, and perspectives on technological power. By conducting a logistics regression using this public opinion data, I can analyze the strength and magnitude of this ordinal-level relationship.

To evaluate respondents’ participation in protest activities, I created an index of three political actions measuring the following behaviors: attending a protest, participating in a strike, or participating in illegal protest activity such as blocking traffic, participating in sit-ins or chaining oneself to a particular spot. Respondents could reply with yes or no to each of the three questions. I then recoded the index of political activities into 1 for all respondents who said they had participated in 1 of the 3 political activities. Then I coded as 0 the individuals who had not participated in any of these activities. With the intention of facilitating a logistics regression, I coded my main independent variable into five categories of Internet use with no use coded as 0, low frequency coded as 1, a few times a month coded as 2, 1-2 days per week coded as 3, 3-5 days per week coded as 4, and 6-7 days per week coded as 5. As my analysis controls for socio-economic factors, I decided to create a dummy variable for gender, coding males as 0 and females as 1. The trust in institutions variable only focuses on the individual’s trust in the central government and city councils which I computed into one variable, coded on a 0-10 scale. Confidence in political parties, non-governmental organizations, unions, and media were excluded from this question. The citizenship variable is a computation of four questions: how important a person feels that voting in elections, not evading taxes, complying with laws and norms, thinking of others more than thinking in oneself, and forming own opinions are to being a good citizen, which is measured on a 0-10 scale, where zero indicates no importance and 10 indicates total importance. I additionally recoded question seven which assesses how much interest the individual has for politics. I coded no interest as 1, little interest as 2, some interest as 3, and great interest as 4. As the original coding was inverted, the new codes better facilitate our analysis of these responses. I additionally included a variable measuring a person’s placement on a left to right political scale with numbers accordingly ranging from 0 to 10. A person’s satisfaction with democracy in Spain is coded on a similar 0-10 spectrum, where 0 means completely unsatisfied and 10 indicates complete satisfaction. For education, I coded less than 5 years of education as 1, primary education as 2, compulsory secondary school as 3, middle grade training as 4, Baccalaureate diploma as 5, and superior training as 6. I then combined the categories technical architect, technical engineer, and bachelor’s degree as these titles require the same amount of schooling, recoding them all as 7. I similarly recoded as 8 the following categories: master’s degree, architect, and engineer which require the same approximate amount of schooling. Those individuals with postgraduate studies were coded as 9. Question 56 was also included in the analysis, measuring the net income the individual received in his or her household per month, arranged in 10 units with 1 representing the lowest income and 10 representing an income of over 6000 euros. Finally, the age variable was not recoded as there were no missing values. Missing cases were excluded from the final analysis.

Table 1 analyzes the impact of Internet use on the three specific forms of protest activity mentioned above. Because the dependent variable is dichotomous, a logistics regression explains the ways in which each independent variable affects the odds of protesting. Table 1 demonstrates that Internet use is statistically significant, producing a p-value of .002, significant at the .05 level. This model additionally produces a fit statistic equal to .075. As units of Internet use increase, the odds of protesting also increase by 9.9% when controlling for age, gender, perceptions of politics and politicians, the individual’s level of being politically informed, personal placement on a political spectrum, satisfaction with democracy, trust in institutions, and conceptions of citizenship.

Table 1 also demonstrates that education, gender, interest in politics, and trust in institutions are each statistically significant when controlling for other variables. As a person’s level of education increases, the odds of protesting increase by 9.9%. Gender is also statistically significant at the .05 level. The gender variable, coded 0 for males and 1 for females indicates that difference in gender increases the odds of protesting by 33.8%. Interest in politics produces the greatest figure for percentage change in odds and is significant at the .001 level. As interest in politics increases, the odds of protesting also increase by 49.2%. As interest in politics is typically associated with higher degrees of participation and scholars suggest that protesting may require a committed, ardent, and efficacious individual who makes the effort to attend protests or challenge a regime, the figure may explain why interest in politics is substantially important to participation in social movements, strikes, and protest activity (Carter 2012, Jiménez Sánchez 2008). If person’s interest in politics and efficacy is low, the individual may not feel that his or her actions will truly affect change and subsequently remain politically inactive (Cantijoch 2012, Van Aelst and Walgrave 2001). Jiménez Sánchez additionally remarks that an increase in communication technologies may also increase interest in politics among protestors, allowing us to understand how these factors may work together to contribute to participation in manifestations (2008). The final significant variable, trust in institutions, demonstrates that as confidence increases, the odds of protesting decrease by 2.8%.

**Table1. Effect of Internet Use on Protest Activity**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Regression Coefficient | Percent Changein Odds |
| Y-Intercept | -1.632(.767) |  |
| Internet | .094\*(.031) | 9.9 |
| Education | .094\*(.031) | 9.9 |
| Age | -.076(.387) | -7.3 |
| Gender | .291\*(.102) | 33.833.76 |
| Politicians Don’t Care About My Opinion | -.022(.046) | -2.2 |
| Politics Are Too Complicated | -.061(.041) | -5.9 |
| Any Politician in Power Seeks Personal Interest | .044(.048) | 4.57 |
| I am Better Politically Informed than Others | -.063(.037) | -6.1 |
| Interest in Politics | .4\*\*(.068) | 49.2 |
| Left to Right Political Scale | -.026(.026) | -2.5 |
| Satisfaction with Democracy | -.007(.027) | -.7 |
| Trust in Institutions | -.029\*(.015) | -2.8 |
| Citizenship | .000(.007) | 0 |
| Income | .006(.034) | .6 |
| n | 3716 |  |
| Cox and Snell R² | .075 |  |

 \*P-Value <.05 \*\*P-Value <.001

Because the data focuses on Spain and scholars emphasize the importance of context in analyzing Internet utilization, we must be cautious in applying these results to other regions; however, in light of these figures, we can make some conjectures about the importance of Internet use and its effect on protest activity. While multiple factors are significant in this analysis, the Internet provides a tool that can cut across boundaries to open up a public space in which any individual can participate in the decision-making process and organize horizontally (Anduiza, Jensen, and Jorba 2012; Youniss et al. 2002). As the Internet reduces the cost associated with communication across great distance and makes information increasingly accessible, the vital role that the Internet can play in future protest activity may become important for those individuals who want to make political demands on their government (Chadwick 2006; della Porta 2012; Jiménez Sánchez 2008; Shah et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2009). The dependent variable in this analysis includes activities that are all citizen-initiated and the model controls for a great variety of socio-economic factors; thus we can begin to understand how the Internet can provide a tool that transcends such socio-economic divisions and allows for dissent that governments cannot then easily evade (Dalton 2008, Stepanova 2011, Weldon 2011). As demonstrated by the Spanish case, the recently initiated Indignant Movement was able to develop through the utilization of ICTs that aided in organizing massive protests across Spain to address economic concerns and the inadequacy of the governmental system (Cantijoch 2012). Considering this phenomenon, the Arab Spring, and other historical social movements, we recognize the ways in which ICTs can unify people to challenge formal institutions with the purpose gaining representation. Once recognized, participants and coordinators can take advantage of this emerging and developing tool to engage in political participation and successively affect policy change.
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Appendix A. CIS 2736 Survey Questions

**Q4** Would you be able to tell me how satisfied you are with the way democracy in Spain is functioning? Use a scale from 0-10 where 0 indicates that you are “completely unsatisfied” and 10 indicates that you are “completely satisfied.”

**Q6** How much confidence do you have in the following institutions? Use a 0-10 scale in which 0 signifies that you have “no confidence” and 10 indicates that you have “total confidence.”

Trust in city council

Trust in the Central Government

**Q7** Would you say that politics interests you a lot, somewhat, a little, or not at all?

A lot (recoded as 4)

Somewhat (recoded as 3)

A little (recoded as 2)

Not at all (recoded as 1)

**Q8** For each of the following affirmations, tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Politicians don’t worry about what people like me think.

Generally, politics are so complicated that people like me cannot understand what is going on.

Whoever is in power will always seek his or her personal interests.

I am better informed about politics than most people.

Strongly Agree (recoded as 5)

Agree (recoded as 4)

Neither agree nor disagree (recoded as 3)

Agree (recoded as 2)

Strongly Disagree (recoded as 1)

**Q11** In the past 12 months, have you participated in one of the activities that I am going to mention? (yes=1, no=0)

A. Sign a petition

B. Attend a protest

C. Participate in a strike

**Q22** Disregarding the location from which you access the Internet, how often do you do so?

6-7 days per week (5)

3-5 days per week (4)

1-2 days per week (3)

A few times a month (2)

With low frequency (1)

Never (0)

**Q33** As you know, there are different opinions regarding what it means to be a good citizen. How important are the following aspects to being a good citizen? Use a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 indicates “no importance” and 10 indicates “great importance.”

Vote in elections

Do not evade taxes

Comply with laws and norms

Think of others more than in self

Form your own opinion independent of what others think

**Q35** When speaking about politics, the expressions left and right are utilized. On this card there is a series of blocks [from 0-10] that read from the left to right. In which square would you place yourself?

**Q 44** Sex:

Male (recoded a 0)

Female (recoded as 1)

**Q45** How old did you turn on your last birthday?

**P48a** What are the highest official studies you have taken (independent from whether or not you have completed them)? Please specify as much as possible, telling me the course in which you were when you finished and the name of those studies: (example: 3 years primary education, 5° High School, Master’s Degree, College Prep, 4° General Basic Education, Bachelor’s Degree, Doctorate, etc.).(Interviewer: If respondent is still studying, note the last course he or she has completed. If he or she has not completed primary education, note the number of years he or she attended school.)

**Coding**

Less than 5 years of education (1)

Primary Education (2)

Compulsory Secondary School (3)

Middle Grade Training (4)

Baccalaureate Diploma (5)

Superior Training (6)

Technical Architect or Engineer, Bachelor’s degree (recoded as 7)

Master’s degree, Architect, Engineer (recoded as 8)

Postgraduate Studies (recoded as 9)

**P56** Between all members in your household, including yourself, what is the average net income your household makes each month? In which of the following divisions would your income fall?

Less or equal to 300 Euros (01)

301 to 600 Euros (02)

601 to 900 Euros (03)

901 to 1,200 Euros (04)

1,201 to 1,800 Euros (05)

1,801 to 2,400 Euros (06)

2,401 to 3,000 Euros (07)

3,001 to 4,500 Euros (08)

4,501 to 6,000 Euros (09)

More than 6,000 Euros (10)

1. http://www.cis.es/cis/opencm/ES/1\_encuestas/estudios/ver.jsp?estudio=8760&cuestionario=10114&muestra=15545 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)