



UNIVERSITY OF
GOTHENBURG

THE QOG BASIC DATASET

Codebook

June 8, 2012

Note: Those scholars who wish to use this dataset in their research are kindly requested to cite both the original source (as stated in this codebook) and use the following citation:

Teorell, Jan, Marcus Samanni, Sören Holmberg and Bo Rothstein. 2012. The Quality of Government Basic Dataset made from The QoG Standard Dataset version 6Apr11. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, <http://www.qog.pol.gu.se>.

A brief note to the user

The QoG institute offers a range of datasets on indicators of quality of government and all things related. Our flagship has long been *the QoG standard dataset* available in both cross-section and time-series, however as the QoG standard dataset has grown so has the demand for a dataset that is easier to get an overview of, and therefore we have launched the *QoG Basic dataset*. The purpose of which is to meet this demand by offering the most used and the most qualitative variables in terms of data from the QoG standard dataset in a more accessible package.

In this codebook you will find short descriptions of all the variables in the QoG Basic dataset and on page 8 an overview of the variables in the set. Should you at any time feel that you want fuller set of indicators on quality of government we recommend you take a look at the QoG Standard dataset available on our website. Containing an additional 700 variables, the standard dataset offers more nuance and width when it comes to both causes and effects. Also, as the QoG Basic Dataset has the same case id system as the QoG standard dataset you can easily merge additional variables from the latter to the former.

If you are interested in social policy or the inner workings of bureaucracies you might also find our datasets *QoG Social Policy* or *QoG Expert Survey* useful. They are both as all the other of our datasets available for free downloads on our website.

If you are new to the field of Quality of Government research or want an overview of how other researchers have thought about cause and causality you might find the Introduction on page 7 helpful.

Should you at any time encounter problems with the dataset please feel free to contact the QoG institute data administration.

Stefan Dahlberg PhD

Dataset Manager

stefan.dahlberg@pol.gu.se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	9
VARIABLE Overview.....	10
Country and Time Coverage.....	11
Country and Case Identifier Codes.....	13
ccode Country Code Numeric.....	13
ccodealp 3-letter Country Code.....	13
cname Country Name.....	14
ccodewb Country Code World Bank The countries code in World Bank data.....	16
ccodecow Country Code Correlates of War	16
year Year	16
cname_year Country Name and Year	16
ccodealp_year 3-letter Country Code and Year	16
version Version of the Dataset.....	16
WII (What It Is) Variables	17
Bueno de Mesquita, Smith, Siverson & Morrow	17
bdm_s Selectorate Size	17
bdm_w Winning Coalition Size	17
bdm_w_s Winning Coalition Size Relative to Selectorate Size.....	17
Cingranelli & Richards – Human Rights Dataset.....	18
ciri_assn Freedom of Assembly and Association.....	18
ciri_disap Disappearance	18
ciri_empinx_old Empowerment Rights Index (Old).....	18
ciri_kill Extrajudicial Killing.....	19
ciri_move_old Freedom of Movement (Old)	19
ciri_dommov Freedom of Domestic Movement.....	19
ciri_physint Physical Integrity Rights Index.....	19
ciri_polpris Political Imprisonment	20
ciri_tort Torture	20
Coppedge, Alvarez & Maldonado	20
cam_contest Contestation (standardized version)	21
cam_inclusive Inclusiveness (standardized version)	21
Freedom House.....	21

fh_cl	Civil Liberties	21
fh_pr	Political Rights	21
fh_status	Status	22
fh_fog	Functioning of Government	22
fh_press	Freedom of the Press	22
Freedom House/Polity.....		23
fh_polity2	Democracy (Freedom House/Polity)	23
fh_ipolity2	Democracy (Freedom House/Imputed Polity).....	23
Gibney, Cornett & Wood – Political Terror Scale		23
gd_ptss	Political Terror Scale – US State Department.....	23
Index of African Governance		24
iag_iag	Index of African Governance	24
iag_rltc	Rule of Law, Transparency and Corruption	24
International Country Risk Guide – The PRS Group		24
icrg_qog	ICRG indicator of Quality of Government	24
Polity IV.....		26
p_polity2	Revised Combined Polity Score	26
p_durable	Regime Durability.....	26
p_fragment	Polity Fragmentation	27
p_sf	State Failure	27
Transparency International.....		28
ti_cpi	Corruption Perceptions Index.....	28
Vanhanen – Index of Democratization.....		28
van_part	Participation	28
World Bank – Governance Indicators (a.k.a KKZ).....		28
wbgi_vae	Voice and Accountability – Estimate	29
wbgi_pse	Political Stability - Estimate.....	29
wbgi_gee	Government Effectiveness - Estimate	29
wbgi_rqe	Regulatory Quality - Estimate	30
wbgi_rle	Rule of Law - Estimate.....	30
wbgi_cce	Control of Corruption - Estimate	30
HTG (How To Get It) Variables.....		31
Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson		31
ajr_settmort	Log Settler Mortality.....	31
Armingeon et al – Comparative Political Dataset		31
ar_li_cbi	Central bank independence	31

Barro & Lee		31
bl_asyf25	Average Schooling Years (Female).....	31
bl_asyt25	Average Schooling Years (Total).....	32
Dreher – KOF Index of Globalization		32
dr_ig	Index of Globalization	32
Fraser Institute – Economic Freedom of the World		32
fi_index	Economic Freedom of the World Index (current)	32
Golder.....		33
gol_est2	Electoral System Type 2.....	33
Hadenius, Teorell & Wahman – Types of Authoritarian Regimes		33
ht_regtype	Regime Type	33
ht_partsz	Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in Fractions).....	34
Hadenius & Teorell – Region and Colonial Origin.....		34
ht_region	The Region of the Country	34
ht_colonial	Colonial Origin	35
Henisz – The Political Constraints Index (POLCON).....		35
h_polcon3	Political Constraints Index III.....	35
h_j	Independent Judiciary.....	36
Heritage Foundation.....		36
hf_efiscore	Economic Freedom Index	36
hf_trade	Trade Freedom	36
hf_govt	Freedom from Government.....	37
hf_prights	Property Rights.....	37
hf_labor	Labor Freedom.....	37
Heston, Summers & Aten – Penn World Table		38
pwt_rgdpch	Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)	38
pwt_csg	Consumption Share of GDP (%).....	38
pwt_gsg	Government Share of GDP (%)	38
pwt_isg	Investment Share of GDP (%).....	38
pwt_openk	Openness to Trade, Constant Prices.....	39
Inter-Parliamentary Union.....		39
ipu_w_lower	Women in national parliament (lower house)	39
ipu_w_upper	Women in national parliament (upper house).....	39
Institutions and Elections Project		39
Executive-Legislature Relationship		40

iaep_evp	Executive Veto Power.....	40
iaep_lvp	Legislature Veto Power	40
iaep_bp	Banned Parties.....	40
iaep_npa	No Parties Allowed	40
iaep_osp	Official State Party.....	40
Johnson & Wallack.....		40
jw_domr	Dominant or Populous Tier.....	41
La Porta, López-de-Silanes, Shleifer & Vishny		41
lp_legor	Legal origin	41
lp_lat_abst	Latitude	42
lp_catho80	Religion: Catholic	42
lp_muslim80	Religion: Muslim.....	42
lp_protmg80	Religion: Protestant	42
lp_no_cpm80	Religion: Other Denomination	42
Maddison.....		43
mad_pop	Population (thousand)	43
Melander.....		43
m_femlead	Female State Leader.....	43
m_wominpar	Women in Parliament (percent)	43
Norris – Democracy Time-Series Dataset		43
no_pm	Parliamentary Monarchy.....	43
no_pr	Presidential Republic	44
no_rm	Ruling Monarchy	44
no_ms	Military State	44
no_ndel	No Directly Elected Legislature	44
no_pes	Proportional Electoral System.....	44
no_ces	Combined (Mixed) Electoral System	44
no_mes	Majoritarian Electoral System	44
no_ufs	Unitary or Federal State.....	45
Roeder.....		45
r_elf85	Ethnolinguistic fractionalization 1985.....	45
UNU-WIDER – World Income Inequality Database		45
uw_gini	Gini (mean)	45
World Development Indicators		46
wdi_gdp	GDP, PPP (Constant International USD)	46

wdi_gdpc	GDP per Capita, PPP (Constant International USD).....	46
wdi_ttr	Total Trade (% of GDP).....	46
wdi_aid	Net Development Assistance and Aid (Constant USD).....	46
wdi_area	Area (sq. km)	46
wdi_fe	Fuel Exports (% of Merchandise Exports).....	47
wdi_oame	Ores and Metals Exports (% of Merchandise Exports).....	47
wdi_me	Merchandise Exports (Current USD)	47
WYG (What You Get) Variables.....		48
Bueno de Mesquita, Smith, Siverson & Morrow		48
bdm_hobbes	Hobbes Index	48
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO).....		48
fao_fpic	Fish Production, Inland Capture.....	48
fao_fpmc	Fish Production, Marine Capture.....	48
Fund for Peace - Failed States Index.....		49
ffp_fsi	Failed States Index.....	49
Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation – University of Washington.....		49
ihme_nm	Neonatal Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Births)	49
ihme_fmort	Under-5 Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)	49
ihme_mmr	Maternal Mortality Ratio (per 100,000 Live Births)	50
UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset (version 3-2005)		50
ucdp_count	Number of Conflicts	50
ucdp_loc	Conflict Location.....	50
UNDP - Human Development Report		51
undp_hdi	Human Development Index	51
World Development Indicators		51
wdi_gdpgr	GDP Growth (%).....	51
wdi_gdpcgr	GDP per Capita Growth (%)	51
wdi_pb2	Population Below \$2 a Day (%)	51
wdi_pbpl	Population Below National Poverty Line (%).....	52
wdi_hec	Health Expenditure per Capita, PPP (Constant USD)	52
wdi_gr	Government Revenue (% of GDP)	52
wdi_gew	Government Expenditure on Wages and Employer Contributions (% of Expense)	52
wdi_ge	Government Expense (% of GDP)	52
wdi_co2	Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Tons per Capita).....	53

wdi_epc	Electric Power Consumption (kWh per Capita)	53
wdi_fw	Freshwater Withdrawals (% of Internal Resources)	53
wdi_aas	Access to Adequate Sanitation (% of Population)	53
wdi_ise	Industry's share of economy (% of GDP)	54
wdi_sse	Services' share of economy (% of GDP)	54
wdi_idp	Internally Displaced Persons	54
wdi_eodb	Ease of Doing Business.....	54
wdi_fr	Fertility Rate (Births per Woman)	55
wdi_gris	Gender Ratio in School (%)	55
wdi_lue	Long-Term Unemployment (% of Unemployed).....	55
World Values Survey		55
wvs_a008	Feeling of happiness	55
wvs_a009	State of health	56
wvs_a165	Most people can be trusted	56
wvs_e033	Self positioning in political scale	56
wvs_e037	Government more responsibility	57
wvs_e124	Respect for individual human rights	57
wvs_e125	Satisfaction with the people in national office	57
wvs_e128	Country is run by big interest vs. all people	57
wvs_gen	Gender Equality Scale	58
wvs_rs	Religiosity Scale	58
wvs_proud	National pride	58
wvs_tol	Tolerance of diversity	59
wvs_trust	Interpersonal trust	59
References		60

INTRODUCTION

One aim of the QoG Institute is to make publicly available cross-national comparative data on QoG and its correlates. To accomplish this objective we have compiled both a cross-sectional dataset with global coverage pertaining to the year 2002 (or the closest year available), and a cross-sectional time-series dataset with global coverage spanning the time period 1946–2010. The datasets draw on a number of freely available cross-sectional data sources, including aggregated individual-level data, and contain three types of variables:

- WII (What It Is) variables, that is, variables pertaining to the core features of QoG (such as corruption, bureaucratic quality, and democracy)
- HTG (How To Get it) variables, that is, variables posited to promote the development of QoG (such as electoral rules, forms of government, federalism, legal & colonial origin, religion and social fractionalization); and
- WYG (What You Get) variables, that is, variables pertaining to some of the posited consequences of QoG (such as economic and human development, international and domestic peace, environmental sustainability, gender equality, and satisfied, trusting and confident citizens).

Our classification of the variables into these three categories should be seen as heuristic, as the more exact causal ordering of one's variables obviously depends on the research question.

On the following page the variables are arranged according to category (HTG/WII/WYG). Due to spatial issues the original source is not listed for each variable to find the source and to find a description of the variable please consult the table of contents starting on page 3. Also in addition to the variables listed on the next page there are some functional variables such as year or country which are left out from the list but are included elsewhere in the codebook.

VARIABLE OVERVIEW

WII (What it is)

bdm_s (Selectorate size)
bdm_w (Win. Coalition size)
bdm_ws (bdm_w/bdm_s)
ciri_assn (Free. of assembly)
ciri_disap (Disappearances)
ciri_kill (Extra judiciary killings)
ciri_move_old (Free move.)
ciri_empinx_old (Rights)
ciri_dommov (Free movement)
ciri_physint (Phys. integrity)
ciri_polpris (Pol. Prisoners)
ciri_tort (Torture)
cam_contest (Contestation)
cam_inclusive (Inclusiveness)
fh_cl (Civil liberties)
fh_pr (Political rights)
fh_status (Freedom H. status)
fh_fog (Functioning of Gov.)
fh_press (Press freedom)
fh_polity2 (Democracy)
fh_ipolity2 (Democracy)
gd_ptss (Pol. Terror scale)
iag_iag (African Governance)
iag_rlte (Rule of Law)
icrg_qog (Quality of Gov.)
p_polity2 (Democracy)
p_durable (Regime change)
p_fragment (Polity fragment.)
p_sf (State failure)
ti_cpi (Corruption)
van_part (Pol. participation)
wbgi_vae (Pol. freedom)
wbgi_pse (Pol. Stability)
wbgi_gee (Gov. effectiveness)
wbgi_rqe (Regulatory Quality)
wbgi_rle (Rule of Law)
wbgi_ccc (Corruption)

HTG (How to get it)

ajr_settmort (Settler mortality)
ar_li_cbi (Central bank indep.)
bl_asyf25 (ibid. Female)
bl_asyf25 (ibid. Male)
bl_asyt25 (Mean schooling tot)
dr_ig (Globalization)
fi_clindex (Economic freedom)
gol_est2 (Electoral sys.)
ht_regtype (Regime type)
ht_partsz (Seat's/largest party)
ht_region (World region)
ht_colonial (Colonial origin)
h_polcon3 (Veto players)
h_j (Independent Judiciary)
hf_efiscore (Economic freedo.)
hf_trade (Trade freedom)
hf_govt (Gov. Econ. Activity)
hf_prights (Property rights)
hf_labor (Labour freedom)
pwt_rgdpc (GDP/capita)
pwt_csg (Consumption)
pwt_gsg (Gov. Share of GDP)
pwt_ig (Investment of GDP)
pwt_openk (Trade /GDP)
ipu_w_lower (♀ / low.chamb.)
ipu_w_upper (♀ / upp.chamb.)
iaep_evp (Executive veto pow.)
iaep_lvp (Legislature vetopow.)
iaep_bp (Banned parties)
iaep_npa (No parties allowed)
iaep_osp (State party?)
jw_domr (Dom./pop. tier)
lp_legor (Legal origin)
lp_lat_abst (Latitude)
lp_catho80 (Catholic/pop)
lp_muslim80 (Muslim/pop)
lp_protmg80 (Protestant/pop)
lp_no_cpm80 (Other rel./pop)
mad_pop (Population/1000)
m_femlead (♀-state leader?)
m_wominpar (♀/parliament)
no_pm (Monarchy?)
no_pr (Parliamentary rep?)
no_rm (Ruling monarchy?)
no_ms (Military state?)
no_ndel (Elected legislature?)
no_pes (Proportional sys.?)
no_ces (Mixed electoral sys?)
no_mes (Majoritarian sys?)
no_ufs (Unitary/federal state?)
r_elf85 (Ethno-Ling Fractionaliz.)
uw_gini (Mean Gini)
wdi_gdp (GDP, PPP)
wdi_gdpc (GDP/capita)
wdi_ttr (Total trade/GDP)
wdi_aid (Development ass.)
wdi_area (Area)
wdi_fe (Fuel export)
wdi_oame (Ore & Metal exp.)
wdi_me (Merchandise export)

WYG (What you get)

bdm_hobbes (State of Nature)
fao_fpfc (Fish production inla.)
fao_fpmc (Fish prod. marine)
ffp_fsi (Failed state index)
ihme_nm (Neonatal mortality)
ihme_fmort (Mort<5 years)
ihme_mmr (Maternal mort.)
ucdp_count (Nr of conflicts)
ucdp_loc (Conflict location)
undp_hdi (Hum Development)
wdi_gdpcr (GDP growth)
wdi_gdpcgr (Growth/capita)
wdi_pb2 (Pop. Below 2\$/day)
wdi_pbpl (Pop. in poverty)
wdi_hec (Health expend.)
wdi_gr (Gov. revenue)
wdi_gew (Gov. expend.)
wdi_ge (Gov expense)
wdi_co2 (co2 emission)
wdi_epc (Electric consumpt.)
wdi_fw (Freshwater withdraw)
wdi_aas (Sanitation access)
wdi_ise (Industry's share)
wdi_sse (Service share of econ)
wdi_idp (Displaced people)
wdi_eodb (Doing business)
wdi_fr (Fertility rate)
wdi_gris (♀ratio in schools)
wdi_lue (Unemployment)
wvs_a008 (Happiness)
wvs_a009 (Health)
wvs_a165 (Trust)
wvs_e033 (Pos. Right/Left)
wvs_e037 (Gov. responsibility)
wvs_e124 (Human rights)
wvs_e125 (Satisfied with gov.)
wvs_e128 (Big interest/People)
wvs_gen (Gender equality)
wvs_rs (Religiosity Scale)
wvs_proud (National pride)
wvs_tol (Tolerance)
wvs_trust (Trust)

COUNTRY AND TIME COVERAGE

In the cross-sectional dataset we include all countries in the world recognized by the United Nations as of the year 2002, plus Serbia, Montenegro (as separate states) and Taiwan for a total of 194 nations. We have thus included Serbia and Montenegro both as a unit and as two separate states. Although they were a unit in 2002 (they split in 2006) several sources have data for them as separate units. We have decided to leave these data sources as is, from which follows that we have included Serbia and Montenegro as separate states in the cross-sectional dataset.

Regarding the year from which we have picked the data in the cross-sectional dataset, our first choice has been 2002. The reason for this is that there is a lot less data available for later years. If data for 2002 was not available, data for 2003 is used. If 2003 was not available, we use data for 2001, and if 2001 was lacking, 2004 is used and so forth.

In the cross-sectional *time-series* dataset we include the same 194 nations, plus an addition of 13 historical countries that have ceased to exist: Tibet, Zanzibar, Pakistan pre 1972 (including East Pakistan, presently Bangladesh), North and South Vietnam, North and South Yemen, East and West Germany, Yugoslavia pre 1992 (the People's Republic of Yugoslavia), the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia pre 1993 (including Eritrea); this makes a total of 207 nations.

Unfortunately there exists no established international standard for how historical cases, resulting either from country mergers or country splits, should be treated in a cross-sectional time-series setting. In an effort to apply as flexible rules as possible, allowing for any particular user to make alterations in accordance with his or her preferences, we have applied the following principles:

- After a merger of two countries the new country is considered a new case, even when the new state thus formed could be considered as a continuation of one of the merging states. This rule applies to (1) Vietnam, which merged from North and South Vietnam in 1975-76, (2) Yemen, which merged from North and South Yemen in 1990, and (3) Germany, which merged from East and West Germany in 1990. Our treatment of (a) Tanzania and Zanzibar and (b) China and Tibet make two **exceptions** to the rule, as we do not treat Tanzania and Tanganyika (the official name of Tanzania before unification with Zanzibar in 1964) or China before and after the occupation of Tibet in 1950 as separate countries.
- If a country has split up, the resulting new countries are considered new cases, even when one of the new states thus formed could be considered as a continuation of the state that split up. This rule applies to (1) Pakistan, which was split into Pakistan and Bangladesh in 1971, (2) the USSR, which was split into 15 post-Soviet countries in 1991, (3) Yugoslavia, which was split into Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro (until 2001 continued to be called “Yugoslavia”) in 1991, (4) Czechoslovakia, which was split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1993, and (5) Ethiopia, which was split into Ethiopia and Eritrea in 1993. There is one **exception** to this rule: Indonesia is considered a continuation of the country that existed before the independence of Timor-Leste in 2002 (while Timor-Leste is considered a new country).
- Due to the mentioned lack of international standards, most of our data sources treat these cases of country mergers and splits differently. We have thus rearranged data from those sources that do not treat cases of split ups and mergers in accordance with our criteria above. Consequently, if a merger or a split has occurred and a data source does not treat the countries as different cases, we have **moved the data** for these countries so as to be consistent with our criteria. However, if a merger has occurred and a data source treats the countries as the same case even before the merger, or if a split has occurred and a data source treats the countries as different cases even before the split, we have **not moved the data**, as this is consistent with our criteria above (examples are given in the following section).

▪ To determine where to put the data for the year of the merger/split, we have relied on the “July 1st-principle”. If the merger or split occurred *after* July 1st, the data for this year will belong to the historical country. This applies to Pakistan in 1971, Vietnam in 1975,¹ Germany in 1990, and the USSR in 1991. For mergers/splits *before* July 1st, the data for this year is recorded as belonging to the new country. This applies to Yemen in 1990, Yugoslavia in 1992, Ethiopia in 1993, and Czechoslovakia in 1993.

Thus, for **example**: If Germany in a data source is treated as a continuation of West Germany, we place data up to and including 1990 on West Germany and leave Germany blank until and including 1990, since the merger of Germany occurred in October 1990 (*after* July 1st, 1990). If, on the other hand, Serbia and Montenegro in a data source is treated as a continuation of Yugoslavia, we place the data up to and including 1991 on Yugoslavia and from 1992 and onward on Serbia and Montenegro (which is left blank until and including 1991), since the split occurred from June 1991-March 1992 (*before* July 1st, 1992).

Finally, regarding Cyprus, we let this denote the Greek part of the island. Most sources probably do the same with the data they refer to “Cyprus”, but the documentation of the original data rarely specify this. Users are urged to double check this with the original sources in case this is possible.

For each variable in the cross-sectional *time-series* data we specify the period covered as well as the following statistics:

n: Number of country-year observations

N: Number of countries covered

\bar{N} : Mean number of countries per year

\bar{T} : Mean number of years per country.

¹ To place a date on the merging of South and North Vietnam remains a tricky issue that has been solved in a variety of ways by our data sources. Some rely on the invasion of Saigon in April 1975, others on the official merger in July 1976. We take the “average” of these two dates, which leads to a merging “date” *after* July 1, 1975.

COUNTRY AND CASE IDENTIFIER CODES

ccode **Country Code Numeric**

<http://www.iso.org/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/02iso-3166-code-lists/index.html>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1

Numeric country code (ISO-3166-1 numeric).

5 of the ccodes are “non-ISO”:

994 – Tibet (ccodealp also “non-ISO”)

995 – Zanzibar

997 - Pakistan (pre 1972)

998 - Vietnam, Democratic Republic of (North)

999 - Vietnam, Republic of (South)

[Back?](#)

ccodealp **3-letter Country Code**

<http://www.iso.org/iso/en/prods-services/iso3166ma/02iso-3166-code-lists/index.html>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1

3-letter country code (ISO-3166-1 alpha3).

The alpha code (ccodealp) does not uniquely identify all countries. The following pairs of countries have identical alpha codes: Ethiopia (-1993) and Ethiopia (1993-); Yemen Arab Republic and Yemen; Pakistan (-1971) and Pakistan (1972-); West Germany and Germany; North Vietnam and Vietnam. All the numeric country codes (ccode) are however unique and this is thus the variable best suitable to use when merging files.

[Back?](#)

cname		Country Name
cocode	cocodealp	cname
4	AFG	Afghanistan
8	ALB	Albania
12	DZA	Algeria
20	AND	Andorra
24	AGO	Angola
28	ATG	Antigua and Barbuda
32	ARG	Argentina
51	ARM	Armenia
36	AUS	Australia
40	AUT	Austria
31	AZE	Azerbaijan
44	BHS	Bahamas
48	BHR	Bahrain
50	BGD	Bangladesh
52	BRB	Barbados
112	BLR	Belarus
56	BEL	Belgium
84	BLZ	Belize
204	BEN	Benin
64	BTN	Bhutan
68	BOL	Bolivia
70	BIH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
72	BWA	Botswana
76	BRA	Brazil
96	BRN	Brunei
100	BGR	Bulgaria
854	BFA	Burkina Faso
108	BDI	Burundi
116	KHM	Cambodia
120	CMR	Cameroon
124	CAN	Canada
132	CPV	Cape Verde
140	CAF	Central African Republic
148	TCD	Chad
152	CHL	Chile
156	CHN	China
170	COL	Colombia
174	COM	Comoros
178	COG	Congo
180	COD	Congo, Democratic Republic
188	CRI	Costa Rica
384	CIV	Cote d'Ivoire
191	HRV	Croatia
192	CUB	Cuba
196	CYP	Cyprus
200	CSK	Czechoslovakia
203	CZE	Czech Republic
208	DNK	Denmark
262	DJI	Djibouti
212	DMA	Dominica
214	DOM	Dominican Republic
218	ECU	Ecuador
818	EGY	Egypt
222	SLV	El Salvador
226	GNQ	Equatorial Guinea
232	ERI	Eritrea
233	EST	Estonia
230	ETH	Ethiopia (-1992)
231	ETH	Ethiopia (1993-)
242	FJI	Fiji
246	FIN	Finland
250	FRA	France
266	GAB	Gabon
270	GMB	Gambia
268	GEO	Georgia
276	DEU	Germany
278	DDR	Germany, East
280	DEU	Germany, West
288	GHA	Ghana
300	GRC	Greece
308	GRD	Grenada
320	GTM	Guatemala
324	GIN	Guinea
624	GNB	Guinea-Bissau
328	GUY	Guyana
332	HTI	Haiti
340	HND	Honduras
348	HUN	Hungary
352	ISL	Iceland
356	IND	India
360	IDN	Indonesia
364	IRN	Iran
368	IRQ	Iraq
372	IRL	Ireland
376	ISR	Israel
380	ITA	Italy
388	JAM	Jamaica
392	JPN	Japan
400	JOR	Jordan
398	KAZ	Kazakhstan
404	KEN	Kenya
296	KIR	Kiribati
408	PRK	Korea, North
410	KOR	Korea, South
414	KWT	Kuwait
417	KGZ	Kyrgyzstan
418	LAO	Laos
428	LVA	Latvia
422	LBN	Lebanon
426	LSO	Lesotho
430	LBR	Liberia
434	LBY	Libya
438	LIE	Liechtenstein
440	LTU	Lithuania
442	LUX	Luxembourg
807	MKD	Macedonia
450	MDG	Madagascar
454	MWI	Malawi
458	MYS	Malaysia
462	MDV	Maldives
466	MLI	Mali
470	MLT	Malta
584	MHL	Marshall Islands
478	MRT	Mauritania
480	MUS	Mauritius

484	MEX	Mexico	706	SOM	Somalia
583	FSM	Micronesia	710	ZAF	South Africa
498	MDA	Moldova	724	ESP	Spain
492	MCO	Monaco	144	LKA	Sri Lanka
496	MNG	Mongolia	659	KNA	St Kitts and Nevis
499	MNE	Montenegro	662	LCA	St Lucia
504	MAR	Morocco	670	VCT	St Vincent and the Grenadines
508	MOZ	Mozambique	736	SDN	Sudan
104	MMR	Myanmar	740	SUR	Suriname
516	NAM	Namibia	748	SWZ	Swaziland
520	NRU	Nauru	752	SWE	Sweden
524	NPL	Nepal	756	CHE	Switzerland
528	NLD	Netherlands	760	SYR	Syria
554	NZL	New Zealand	158	TWN	Taiwan
558	NIC	Nicaragua	762	TJK	Tajikistan
562	NER	Niger	834	TZA	Tanzania
566	NGA	Nigeria	764	THA	Thailand
578	NOR	Norway	994	XTI	Tibet
512	OMN	Oman	626	TLS	Timor-Leste
997	PAK	Pakistan (-1971)	768	TGO	Togo
586	PAK	Pakistan (1972-)	776	TON	Tonga
585	PLW	Palau	780	TTO	Trinidad and Tobago
591	PAN	Panama	788	TUN	Tunisia
598	PNG	Papua New Guinea	792	TUR	Turkey
600	PRY	Paraguay	795	TKM	Turkmenistan
604	PER	Peru	798	TUV	Tuvalu
608	PHL	Philippines	800	UGA	Uganda
616	POL	Poland	804	UKR	Ukraine
620	PRT	Portugal	784	ARE	United Arab Emirates
634	QAT	Qatar	826	GBR	United Kingdom
642	ROU	Romania	840	USA	United States
643	RUS	Russia	858	URY	Uruguay
646	RWA	Rwanda	810	SUN	USSR
882	WSM	Samoa	860	UZB	Uzbekistan
674	SMR	San Marino	548	VUT	Vanuatu
678	STP	Sao Tome and Principe	862	VEN	Venezuela
682	SAU	Saudi Arabia	704	VNM	Vietnam
686	SEN	Senegal	998	VNM	Vietnam, North
688	SRB	Serbia	999	VDR	Vietnam, South
891	SCG	Serbia and Montenegro	887	YEM	Yemen
690	SYC	Seychelles	886	YEM	Yemen, North
694	SLE	Sierra Leone	720	YMD	Yemen, South
702	SGP	Singapore	890	YUG	Yugoslavia
703	SVK	Slovakia	995	EAZ	Zanzibar
705	SVN	Slovenia	894	ZMB	Zambia
90	SLB	Solomon Islands	716	ZWE	Zimbabwe

[Back?](#)

ccodewb **Country Code World Bank**

The countries code in World Bank data

ccodecow **Country Code Correlates of War**

The countries code in the Correlates of War data

year **Year**

The year for which the data applies

cname_year **Country Name and Year**

Combines name and year of the observed unit

ccodealp_year **3-letter Country Code and Year**

A 3-letter abbreviation of the country name

version **Version of the Dataset**

Identifies which version of the QoG Standard Dataset the specific QoG Basic Dataset is a version of.

[Back?](#)

WII (WHAT IT IS) VARIABLES

Bueno de Mesquita, Smith, Siverson & Morrow

<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/data/bdm2s2/Logic.htm>

(Bueno de Mesquita et al 2003)

bdm_s **Selectorate Size**

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 7247, N: 196, \bar{N} : 134, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 1999, N: 170)

Selectorate is defined as the set of people whose endowments include the qualities or characteristics institutionally required to choose the government's leadership and necessary for gaining access to private benefits doled out by the government's leadership. This variable is measured through the breadth of the selectiveness of the members of each country's legislature. A code of 0 means that there is no legislature, 0.5 that the legislature is chosen by heredity or ascription or is simply chosen by the effective executive, and 1 that the members of the legislature are directly or indirectly selected by popular election.

Original source is Banks (1996).

[Back?](#)

bdm_w **Winning Coalition Size**

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 9643, N: 199, \bar{N} : 179, \bar{T} : 48)
(Cross-section: 1999, N: 180)

The winning coalition is defined as a subset of the selectorate of sufficient size such that the subset's support endows the leadership with political power over the remainder of the selectorate as well as over the disenfranchised members of the society. This variable is measured as a composite index based on whether the regime is civil or military, the openness and competition of executive recruitment, and the competitiveness of participation. The index varies from 0 (smallest) to 1 (largest winning coalition)

Original sources are Banks (1996) and Polity IV (Marshall and Jaggers 2002).

[Back?](#)

bdm_w_s **Winning Coalition Size Relative to Selectorate Size**

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 7247, N: 196, \bar{N} : 134, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 1999, N: 170)

The Winning Coalition size relative to Selectorate size. W/S is transformed to avoid division by zero: $bdm_w / (\log((bdm_s+1)*10)/3)$.

[Back?](#)

Cingranelli & Richards – Human Rights Dataset

(Cingranelli and Richards 2010)

<http://www.humanrightsdata.org> (Dataset version: 2010.05.17)

ciri_assn **Freedom of Assembly and Association**

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4366, N: 199, \bar{N} : 156, \bar{T} : 22)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Citizens' rights to freedom of assembly and association are:

- (0) Severely restricted or denied completely to all citizens
- (1) Limited for all citizens or severely restricted or denied for selected groups
- (2) Virtually unrestricted and freely enjoyed by practically all citizens

[Back?](#)

ciri_disap **Disappearance**

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4353, N: 199, \bar{N} : 155, \bar{T} : 22)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Disappearances:

- (0) Have occurred frequently
- (1) Have occurred occasionally
- (2) Have not occurred

[Back?](#)

ciri_empinx_old **Empowerment Rights Index (Old)**

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 3970, N: 199, \bar{N} : 153, \bar{T} : 20)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

This is an additive index constructed from the Freedom of Movement, Freedom of Speech, Worker's Rights, Political Participation, and Freedom of Religion indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these five rights) to 10 (full government respect for these five rights). (Details on its construction and use can be found in Richards et al 2001).

Note: Starting with the 2007 coding, this variable was retired in favor of the newer index `ciri_empinx_new` (see below).

[Back?](#)

ciri_kill Extrajudicial Killing

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4351, N: 199, \bar{N} : 155, \bar{T} : 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Political or Extrajudicial Killings are:

- (0) Practiced frequently
- (1) Practiced occasionally
- (2) Have not occurred

[Back?](#)

ciri_move_old Freedom of Movement (Old)

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 3983, N: 199, \bar{N} : 153, \bar{T} : 20)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Domestic and foreign travel is:

- (0) Restricted
- (1) Generally unrestricted

Note: Starting with the 2007 coding, this variable was retired and became two separate variables, Freedom of Foreign Movement and Freedom of Domestic Movement, *ciri_formov* and *ciri_dommov* (see below).

[Back?](#)

ciri_dommov Freedom of Domestic Movement

(Time-series: 2006-2008, n: 385, N: 192, \bar{N} : 128, \bar{T} : 2)
(Cross-section: 2006-2007 (varies by country), N: 192)

Citizens' freedom to travel within their own country is:

- (0) Severely restricted
- (1) Somewhat restricted
- (2) Unrestricted

[Back?](#)

ciri_physint Physical Integrity Rights Index

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4336, N: 199, \bar{N} : 155, \bar{T} : 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

This is an additive index constructed from the Torture (*ciri_tort*), Extrajudicial Killing (*ciri_kill*), Political Imprisonment (*ciri_polpris*), and Disappearance indicators (*ciri_disap*). It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these four rights) to 8 (full government respect for these four rights). (Details on its construction and use can be found in Cingranelli and Richards 1999).

[Back?](#)

ciri_polpris Political Imprisonment

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4359, N: 199, \bar{N} : 156, \bar{T} : 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Are there any people imprisoned because of their political, religious, or other beliefs?

- (0) Yes, many
- (1) Yes, but few
- (2) None

[Back?](#)

ciri_tort Torture

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4357, N: 199, \bar{N} : 156, \bar{T} : 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Torture is:

- (0) Practiced frequently
- (1) Practiced occasionally
- (2) Have not occurred

[Back?](#)

Coppedge, Alvarez & Maldonado

(Time-series: 1950-2000, n: 7534, N: 203, \bar{N} : 148, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 192)

<http://www.nd.edu/~mcoppedg/crd/datacrd.htm>

(Coppedge et al. 2008)

Robert Dahl (1971) defined two dimensions of polyarchy – contestation and inclusiveness. There is contestation when citizens have unimpaired opportunities to:

- formulate their preferences
- signify their preferences to their fellow citizens and the government by individual and collective action
- have their preferences weighed equally in the conduct of the government

Inclusiveness is variation in the proportion of the population entitled to participate on a more or less equal plane in controlling and contesting the conduct of the government. These data reflect an effort to measure these two dimensions of polyarchy independently on a cross-section of countries over time.

Both dimensions are measured as a principal component factor index using three overlapping samples of country years: 1950-1971, 1972-1988, and 1981-2000. Each principal component analysis is repeated in each of the three pooled samples. Then the means and standard deviations for contestation and inclusiveness are calculated by year. The standardized score on each dimension is then the original score multiplied by the annual standard deviation, plus the annual mean score. For the years with overlapping samples (1981-1988), the means and standard deviations were chained forward from the 1981 scores based on the average changes in both samples, and from the 1988 scores based on the changes in the most recent sample.

[Back?](#)

cam_contest Contestation (standardized version)

A principal component factor index of a number of indicators of contestation. The exact nature and data sources for these indicators vary by country year sample; see Coppedge et al. (2008) for more detailed information.

[Back?](#)

cam_inclusive Inclusiveness (standardized version)

A principal component factor index of a number of indicators of contestation. The exact nature and data sources for these indicators vary by country year sample; see Coppedge et al. (2008) for more detailed information.

[Back?](#)

Freedom House

<http://www.freedomhouse.org>

Freedom in the World

(Time-series: 1972-2009, n: 6518, N: 204, \bar{N} : 172, \bar{T} : 32)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

Note: The 1982 edition of *Freedom in the World* covers the period Jan 1981- Aug 1982 (=1981 in our dataset). The 1983-84 edition covers the period Aug 1982 – Nov 1983 (=1983 in our dataset). This leaves 1982 empty.

For 1972, South Africa was in the original data rated as “White” (fh_cl: 3, fh_pr: 2, fh_status: Free) and “Black” (fh_cl: 6, fh_pr: 5, fh_status: Not Free). We treat South Africa 1972 as missing.

[Back?](#)

fh_cl Civil Liberties

Civil liberties allow for the freedoms of expression and belief, associational and organizational rights, rule of law, and personal autonomy without interference from the state. The more specific list of rights considered vary over the years. For the years 2005-2008 Freedom House has published the scores for the sub-categories (see below). Countries are graded between 1 (most free) and 7 (least free).

[Back?](#)

fh_pr Political Rights

Political rights enable people to participate freely in the political process, including the right to vote freely for distinct alternatives in legitimate elections, compete for public office, join political parties and organizations, and elect representatives who have a decisive impact on public policies and are accountable to the electorate. The specific list of rights considered varies over the years. For the year 2005-2008 Freedom House has published the scores for the sub-categories (see below). Countries are graded between 1 (most free) and 7 (least free).

[Back?](#)

fh_status Status

- (1) Free
- (2) Partly Free
- (3) Not Free

Until 2003, countries whose combined average ratings for Political Rights and Civil Liberties fell between 1.0 and 2.5 were designated “Free”; between 3.0 and 5.5 “Partly Free”, and between 5.5 and 7.0 “Not Free”. Since then, countries whose ratings average 1.0 to 2.5 are considered “Free”, 3.0 to 5.0 “Partly Free”, and 5.5 to 7.0 “Not Free”.

[Back?](#)

fh_fog Functioning of Government

The variable examines in what extent the freely elected head of government and a national legislative representative determine the policies of the government; if the government is free from pervasive corruption; and if the government is accountable to the electorate between elections and operates with openness and transparency. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

[Back?](#)

fh_press Freedom of the Press

(Time-series: 1993-2009, n: 3211, N: 194, N : 189, T : 17)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

The press freedom index is computed by adding four (three) component ratings: Laws and regulations, Political pressures and controls, Economic Influences and Repressive actions (the latter is since 2001 not assessed as a separate component, see below). The scale ranges from 0 (most free) to 100 (least free).

[Back?](#)

fh_law Laws and Regulations that Influence

(Time-series: 1993-2007, n: 2823, N: 194, N : 188, T : 15)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

The variable encompasses an examination of both the laws and regulations that could influence media content and the government’s inclination to use these laws and legal institutions to restrict the media’s ability to operate. Freedom House assesses the positive impact of legal and constitutional guarantees for freedom of expression; the potentially negative aspects of security legislation, the penal code, and other criminal statutes; penalties for libel and defamation; the existence of and ability to use freedom of information legislation; the independence of the judiciary and of official media regulatory bodies; registration requirements for both media outlets and journalists; and the ability of journalists’ groups to operate freely. In 1993-1995 the scale varied from 0-20, in 1996 and onwards from 0-30. 0 indicates *more* freedom.

[Back?](#)

Freedom House/Polity

fh_polity2 Democracy (Freedom House/Polity)

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 5333, N: 173, \bar{N} : 144, \bar{T} : 31)
(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 162)

[Back?](#)

fh_ipolity2 Democracy (Freedom House/Imputed Polity)

(Time-series: 1972-2009, n: 6518, N: 204, \bar{N} : 172, \bar{T} : 32)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

Scale ranges from 0-10 where 0 is least democratic and 10 most democratic. Average of Freedom House (fh_pr and fh_cl) is transformed to a scale 0-10 and Polity (p_polity2) is transformed to a scale 0-10. These variables are averaged into fh_polity2. The imputed version has imputed values for countries where data on Polity is missing by regressing Polity on the average Freedom House measure. Hadenius & Teorell (2005) show that this average index performs better both in terms of validity and reliability than its constituent parts.

[Back?](#)

Gibney, Cornett & Wood – Political Terror Scale

<http://www.politicalterrorsscale.org>

(Gibney, Cornett and Wood 2010; Gibney and Dalton 1996)

gd_ptss Political Terror Scale – US State Department

(Time-series: 1976-2008, n: 5241, N: 186, \bar{N} : 159, \bar{T} : 28)
(Cross-section: 2002-2007 (varies by country), N: 178)

Human rights score (1 to 5 scale):

- Level 1: Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their view, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.

- Level 2: There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few persons are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare.

- Level 3: There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.

- Level 4: Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas.

- Level 5: Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.

[Back?](#)

Index of African Governance

(Time-series: 2000-2007, n: 265, N: 53, \bar{N} : 33, \bar{T} : 5)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 53)

<http://www.worldpeacefoundation.org/africangovernance.html>

(Rotberg and Gisselquist 2009)

The Index of African Governance measures to which degree five categories of political goods are provided within Africa's fifty-three countries. Please refer to the original documentation for detailed information on how the indexes are constructed.

[Back?](#)

iag_iag Index of African Governance

The index is based on five sub-indicators: safety and security; rule of law, transparency and corruption; participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity; human development. In the calculation of the overall index each category is weighted equally. For more information on how the sub-categories are constructed, see below. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

[Back?](#)

iag_rltc Rule of Law, Transparency and Corruption

This category is based on e.g. indicators on ratification of core international human rights conventions, public sector corruption, judicial independence and efficiency of the courts. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

[Back?](#)

International Country Risk Guide – The PRS Group

(Time-series: 1984-2008, n: 3271, N: 145, \bar{N} : 131, \bar{T} : 23)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 139)

<http://www.prsgroup.com/ICRG.aspx>

<http://www.prsgroup.com/CountryData.aspx>

icrg_qog ICRG indicator of Quality of Government

The mean value of the ICRG variables “Corruption”, “Law and Order” and “Bureaucracy Quality”, scaled 0-1. Higher values indicate higher quality of government.

Corruption (originally 6 points)

This is an assessment of corruption within the political system. Such corruption is a threat to foreign investment for several reasons: it distorts the economic and financial environment; it reduces the efficiency of government and business by enabling people to

assume positions of power through patronage rather than ability; and, last but not least, it introduces an inherent instability into the political process.

The most common form of corruption met directly by business is financial corruption in the form of demands for special payments and bribes connected with import and export licenses, exchange controls, tax assessments, police protection, or loans. Such corruption can make it difficult to conduct business effectively, and in some cases may force the withdrawal or withholding of an investment.

Although the measure takes such corruption into account, it is more concerned with actual or potential corruption in the form of excessive patronage, nepotism, job reservations, 'favor-for-favors', secret party funding, and suspiciously close ties between politics and business. According to ICRG, these insidious sorts of corruption are potentially of much greater risk to foreign business in that they can lead to popular discontent, unrealistic and inefficient controls on the state economy, and encourage the development of the black market.

The greatest risk in such corruption is that at some time it will become so overweening, or some major scandal will be suddenly revealed, so as to provoke a popular backlash, resulting in a fall or overthrow of the government, a major reorganizing or restructuring of the country's political institutions, or, at worst, a breakdown in law and order, rendering the country ungovernable.

(Note: In the original data, the value for Iceland 1985 is "6.1667". We have replaced this presumably incorrect value with the value "6").

Law and order (originally 6 points)

Law and Order are assessed separately, with each sub-component comprising zero to three points. The Law sub-component is an assessment of the strength and impartiality of the legal system, while the Order sub-component is an assessment of popular observance of the law. Thus, a country can enjoy a high rating – 3 – in terms of its judicial system, but a low rating – 1 – if it suffers from a very high crime rate / if the law is routinely ignored without effective sanction (for example, widespread illegal strikes).

Bureaucracy Quality (originally 4 points)

The institutional strength and quality of the bureaucracy is another shock absorber that tends to minimize revisions of policy when governments change. Therefore, high points are given to countries where the bureaucracy has the strength and expertise to govern without drastic changes in policy or interruptions in government services. In these low-risk countries, the bureaucracy tends to be somewhat autonomous from political pressure and to have an established mechanism for recruitment and training. Countries that lack the cushioning effect of a strong bureaucracy receive low points because a change in government tends to be traumatic in terms of policy formulation and day-to-day administrative functions.

The component variables can be purchased at <http://www.countrydata.com>

[Back?](#)

Polity IV

<http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>

(Marshall and Jaggers 2002)

Missing codes:

- (-66) Interruption periods.
- (-77) Interregnum periods.
- (-88) Transition periods.

p_polity2 **Revised Combined Polity Score**

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8070, N: 174, \bar{N} : 130, \bar{T} : 47)

(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 162)

The polity score is computed by subtracting the p_autoc score from the p_democ score; the resulting unified polity scale ranges from +10 (strongly democratic) to -10 (strongly autocratic). The revised version of the polity variable is designed to facilitate the use of the polity regime measure in time-series analyses. It modifies the combined annual polity score by applying a simple treatment, or “fix,” to convert instances of “standardized authority scores” (i.e., -66, -77, and -88) to conventional polity scores (i.e., within the range, -10 to +10). The values have been converted according to the following rule set:

(-66) Cases of foreign “interruption” are treated as “system missing.”

(-77) Cases of “interregnum,” or anarchy, are converted to a “neutral” Polity score of “0.”

(-88) Cases of “transition” are prorated across the span of the transition.

For example, country X has a p_polity score of -7 in 1957, followed by three years of -88 and, finally, a score of +5 in 1961. The change (+12) would be prorated over the intervening three years at a rate of per year, so that the converted scores would be as follow: 1957 -7; 1958 -4; 1959 -1; 1960 +2; and 1961 +5.

Note: Ongoing (-88) transitions in the most recent year are converted to “system missing” values. Transitions (-88) following a year of independence, interruption (-66), or interregnum (-77) are prorated from the value “0”.

[Back?](#)

p_durable **Regime Durability**

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8134, N: 174, \bar{N} : 129, \bar{T} : 47)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

The number of years since the most recent regime change (defined by a three point change in the p_polity score over a period of three years or less) or the end of transition period defined by the lack of stable political institutions (denoted by a standardized authority score). In calculating the p_durable value, the first year during which a new (post-change) polity is established is coded as the baseline “year zero” (value = 0) and each subsequent year adds one to the value of the p_durable variable consecutively until a new regime change or transition period occurs.

[Back?](#)

p_fragment Polity Fragmentation

(Time-series: 1978-2008, n: 1473, N: 163, \bar{N} : 48, \bar{T} : 9)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

This variable codes the operational existence of a separate polity, or polities, comprising substantial territory and population within the recognized borders of the state and over which the coded polity exercises no effective authority (effective authority may be participatory or coercive). Local autonomy arrangements voluntarily established and accepted by both central and local authorities are not considered fragmentation. A polity that cannot exercise effective authority over at least 50 percent of its established territory is necessarily considered to be in a condition of “state failure” (i.e., interruption or interregnum, see below, or civil war). Polity fragmentation may result from open warfare (active or latent) or foreign occupation and may continue in the absence of open warfare if a situation of de facto separation remains unresolved and unchallenged by the state.

(0) **No overt fragmentation**

- (1) **Slight fragmentation:** Less than ten percent of the country’s territory is effectively under local authority and actively separated from the central authority of the regime.
- (2) **Moderate fragmentation:** Ten to twenty-five percent of the country’s territory is effectively ruled by local authority and actively separated from the central authority of the regime.
- (3) **Serious fragmentation:** Over twenty-five percent (and up to fifty percent) of the country’s territory is effectively ruled by local authority and actively separated from the central authority of the regime.

[Back?](#)

p_sf State Failure

(Time-series: 1949-2008, n: 146, N: 31, \bar{N} : 2, \bar{T} : 5)
(Cross-section: 1995-2003 (varies by country), N: 13)

Variable p_sf is a flag variable that designates (by code “1”) every year during which a Polity is considered to be in a condition of “complete collapse of central authority” or “state failure” (i.e., -77). The variable p_sf is also coded “1” for years when a state disintegrates and when a profound revolutionary change in political authority occurs (during which the authority of the previous Polity is assumed to have collapsed completely prior to the revolutionary seizure of power and subsequent restructuring of authority). Using the p_sf variable to select regime information will facilitate identification of periods of state failure.

[Back?](#)

Transparency International

<http://www.transparency.org/>

ti_cpi **Corruption Perceptions Index**

(Time-series: 1995-2010, n: 1906, N: 181, \bar{N} : 119, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2000-2009 (varies by country), N: 181)

The CPI focuses on corruption in the public sector and defines corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain. The surveys used in compiling the CPI tend to ask questions in line with the misuse of public power for private benefit, with a focus, for example, on bribe-taking by public officials in public procurement. The sources do not distinguish between administrative and political corruption. The CPI Score relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, risk analysts and the general public and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

WARNING: The time-series information in the CPI scores can only be used if interpreted with caution. Year-to-year shifts in a country's score can result not only from a changing perception of a country's performance but also from a changing sample and methodology. That is, with differing respondents and slightly differing methodologies, a change in a country's score may also relate to the fact that different viewpoints have been collected and different questions have been asked. Moreover, each country's CPI score is composed as a 3-year moving average, implying that if changes occur they only gradually affect a country's score. For a more detailed discussion of comparability over time in the CPI, see Lambsdorff 2005.

[Back?](#)

Vanhanen – Index of Democratization

<http://www.fsd.uta.fi/english/data/catalogue/FSD1289/index.html>

(Vanhanen 2000; 2005)

van_part **Participation**

(Time-series: 1946-2004, n: 8246, N: 197, \bar{N} : 140, \bar{T} : 42)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 186)

The percentage of the total population who actually voted in the election.

[Back?](#)

World Bank – Governance Indicators (a.k.a KKZ)

<http://www.govindicators.org>

(Kaufmann et al 2009)

These indicators are based on several hundred individual variables measuring perceptions of governance, drawn from 31 separate data sources constructed by 25 different organizations. These individual measures of governance are assigned to categories capturing key dimensions of governance. An unobserved component model is used to construct six aggregate governance indicators. Point estimates of the dimensions of governance, the margins of error as well as the number of sources are presented for each country.

The governance estimates are normally distributed with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one each year of measurement. This implies that virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 , with higher scores corresponding to better outcomes.

WARNING: Since the estimates are standardized (with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one) each year of measurement, they are not directly suitable for over-time comparisons within countries. Kaufmann et al. (2006) however find no systematic time-trends in a selection of indicators that do allow for comparisons over time, which suggests that time-series information in the WBGI scores can be used if interpreted with caution.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_vae Voice and Accountability – Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2114, N: 194, \bar{N} : 151, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

“Voice and Accountability” includes a number of indicators measuring various aspects of the political process, civil liberties and political rights. These indicators measure the extent to which citizens of a country are able to participate in the selection of governments. This category also includes indicators measuring the independence of the media, which serves an important role in monitoring those in authority and holding them accountable for their actions.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_pse Political Stability - Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2070, N: 194, \bar{N} : 148, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

“Political Stability” combines several indicators which measure perceptions of the likelihood that the government in power will be destabilized or overthrown by possibly unconstitutional and/or violent means, including domestic violence and terrorism.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_gee Government Effectiveness - Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2090, N: 194, \bar{N} : 149, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

“Government Effectiveness” combines into a single grouping responses on the quality of public service provision, the quality of the bureaucracy, the competence of civil servants, the independence of the civil service from political pressures, and the credibility of the government’s commitment to policies. The main focus of this index is on “inputs” required for the government to be able to produce and implement good policies and deliver public goods.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_rqe Regulatory Quality - Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2066, N: 192, \bar{N} : 148, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2008 (varies by country), N: 192)

“Regulatory Quality” includes measures of the incidence of market-unfriendly policies such as price controls or inadequate bank supervision, as well as perceptions of the burdens imposed by excessive regulation in areas such as foreign trade and business development.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_rle Rule of Law - Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2077, N: 194, \bar{N} : 148, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

“Rule of Law” includes several indicators which measure the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society. These include perceptions of the incidence of crime, the effectiveness and predictability of the judiciary, and the enforceability of contracts. Together, these indicators measure the success of a society in developing an environment in which fair and predictable rules form the basis for economic and social interactions and the extent to which property rights are protected.

[Back?](#)

wbgi_cce Control of Corruption - Estimate

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2037, N: 192, \bar{N} : 146, \bar{T} : 11)
(Cross-section: 2002-2008 (varies by country), N: 192)

“Control of Corruption” measures perceptions of corruption, conventionally defined as the exercise of public power for private gain. The particular aspect of corruption measured by the various sources differs somewhat, ranging from the frequency of “additional payments to get things done”, to the effects of corruption on the business environment, to measuring “grand corruption” in the political arena or in the tendency of elite forms to engage in “state capture”.

[Back?](#)

HTG (HOW TO GET IT) VARIABLES

Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 79)

(Cross-section: NA, N: 79)

http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/shleifer/Data/politics_data.xls

(Acemoglu et al 2001 as used in La Porta et al 2004)

ajr_settmort Log Settler Mortality

Log of the mortality rate faced by European settlers at the time of colonization.

[Back?](#)

Armingeon et al – Comparative Political Dataset

(Armingeon et al 2008)

http://www.ipw.unibe.ch/content/team/klaus_armingeon/comparative_political_data_sets/index_ger.html

ar_li_cbi Central bank independence

(Time-series: 1946-1996, n: 1124, N: 24, \bar{N} : 22, \bar{T} : 47)

(Cross-section: 1996, N: 23)

Index of central bank independence. Higher values indicate a more independent central bank.

The variable originally comes from Lijphart (1999). The variable has two values for each country: one representing the period 1945-1970, and the other value representing the period 1971-1996.

[Back?](#)

Barro & Lee

<http://www.cid.harvard.edu/ciddata/ciddata.html>

(Barro & Lee 2000)

bl_asyf25 Average Schooling Years (Female)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 920, N: 108, \bar{N} : 102, \bar{T} : 9)

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 103)

Average schooling years in the female population aged 25 and over.

[Back?](#)

bl_asym25 Average Schooling Years (Male)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 920, N: 108, \bar{N} : 102, \bar{T} : 9)

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 103)

Average schooling years in the male population aged 25 and over.

[Back?](#)

bl_asyt25 Average Schooling Years (Total)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 921, N: 108, \bar{N} : 102, \bar{T} : 9)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 103)

Average schooling years in the total population aged 25 and over.

[Back?](#)

Dreher – KOF Index of Globalization

<http://globalization.kof.ethz.ch/>
(Dreher 2006; Dreher et al 2008)

All indexes below range between 0 and 100, where higher values indicate a higher degree of globalization.

[Back?](#)

dr_ig Index of Globalization

(Time-series: 1970-2006, n: 5520, N: 155, \bar{N} : 149, \bar{T} : 36)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 155)

The overall index of globalization is the weighted average of the following variables: economic globalization, social globalization and political globalization (dr_eg, dr_sg and dr_pg). Most weight has been given to economic followed by social globalization.

[Back?](#)

Fraser Institute – Economic Freedom of the World

<http://www.freetheworld.com/>
(Gwartney and Lawson 2006)

fi_index Economic Freedom of the World Index (current)

(Time-series: 1970-2004, n: 1193, N: 129, \bar{N} : 109, \bar{T} : 9)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index is founded upon objective components that reflect the presence (or absence) of economic freedom. The index comprises 21 components designed to identify the consistency of institutional arrangements and policies with economic freedom in five major areas:

- size of government (fi_sog)
- legal structure and security of property rights (fi_legprop)
- access to sound money (fi_sm)
- freedom to trade internationally (fi_ftradeint)
- regulation of credit, labor and business (fi_reg)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'less economic freedom' and 10 to 'more economic freedom'. This is the version of the index published at the current year of measurement, without taking methodological changes over time into account.

[Back?](#)

Golder

<http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/elections.html>
(Golder 2005)

Golder's data cover electoral institutions used in democratic legislative (lower chamber) and presidential elections, where democracy is defined according to `gol_polreg` below. Note that data (with the exception of `gol_legal` and `gol_preel`) for 'non-democratic regimes' is coded as 'missing'. There are some countries that had two elections (legislative or presidential) in the same year: Argentina 1973, Bangladesh 1996, Denmark 1953, Greece 1989, Iceland 1959, Ireland 1982, Saint Lucia 1987, Sri Lanka 1960, Thailand 1992, and United Kingdom 1974. As a result, it is not possible to provide data for both elections that occurred in the same year in the country-year data format. In those cases where there were two elections, data is from the second election. Those interested in data for the first elections should consult Golder's original data.

[Back?](#)

`gol_est2` Electoral System Type 2

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2847, N: 124, \bar{N} : 52, \bar{T} : 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 108)

Variable constructed by the authors of the QoG dataset indicating the type of electoral system used, where multi-tier systems are recoded as being majoritarian (only concerns Papua New Guinea and Mauritius) or proportional (concerns all others):

- (1) Majoritarian
- (2) Proportional
- (3) Mixed

[Back?](#)

Hadenius, Teorell & Wahman – Types of Authoritarian Regimes

http://www.svet.lu.se/Dynamic/personal_page/Personal_homepage.lasso?token.kod=JTE
(Hadenius, Teorell & Wahman 2010; Hadenius & Teorell 2007)

`ht_regtype` Regime Type

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 6317, N: 198, \bar{N} : 171, \bar{T} : 32)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006, N: 188)

This typology of authoritarian regimes is based on a distinction between three modes of political power maintenance (probably the three most widely used throughout history): hereditary succession (lineage), corresponding to *monarchies*; the actual or threatened use of military force, corresponding to *military* regimes; and popular elections, designating electoral regimes. Among the latter we distinguish among *no-party* regimes (where all parties are prohibited), *one-party* regimes (where all but one party is prohibited), and *limited multiparty regimes* (where multiple parties are allowed but the system still does not pass as democratic); a subtype of these regimes where no parties are present, although not being prohibited, are coded as "partyless" regimes. A subtype of military regimes are coded "rebel regimes", where a rebel movement has taken power by military means. We also code hybrids (or amalgams) combining elements from more than one regime type, as well as several minor types of regimes: "theocracies", "transitional" regimes, "civil war", foreign "occupation", and a residual "other" category. Using the mean of the Freedom House and Polity scales (`fh_ipolity2`), the line between democracies and autocracies is drawn at 7.5. This threshold value was chosen by estimating the mean cutoff point separating democracy from autocracy in five well-known categorical measures of democracy: those of Przeworski et al. (2000),

Mainwaring et al. (2001), and Reich (2002), together with Freedom House's and Polity's own categorical thresholds for democracy.

(1)	Limited Multiparty	(17)	Monarchy
(2)	Partyless	(18)	Rebel Regime
(3)	No-Party	(19)	Civil War
(4)	Military	(20)	Occupation
(5)	Military No-Party	(21)	Theocracy
(6)	Military Multiparty	(22)	Transitional Regime
(7)	Military One-party	(23)	No-Party Monarchy
(8)	One-Party	(24)	Multiparty Monarchy
(9)	Other	(25)	Multiparty Occupied
(16)	One-Party Monarchy	(100)	Democracy

[Back?](#)

ht_partsz Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in Fractions)

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 6228, N: 198, N : 168, T : 31)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006, N: 188)

Counts the largest parties' number of seats divided by the legislative assemblies' total number of seats expressed in fractions. In countries with a two-chamber parliament the lower house is counted.

[Back?](#)

Hadenius & Teorell – Region and Colonial Origin

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 205)

(Cross-section: NA, N: 192)

(Teorell and Hadenius 2005)

ht_region The Region of the Country

This is a tenfold politico-geographic classification of world regions, based on a mixture of two considerations: geographical proximity (with the partial exception of category 5 below) and demarcation by area specialists having contributed to a regional understanding of democratization. The categories are as follow:

- (1) Eastern Europe and post Soviet Union (including Central Asia)
- (2) Latin America (including Cuba, Haiti & the Dominican Republic)
- (3) North Africa & the Middle East (including Israel, Turkey & Cyprus)
- (4) Sub-Saharan Africa
- (5) Western Europe and North America (including Australia & New Zealand)
- (6) East Asia (including Japan & Mongolia)
- (7) South-East Asia
- (8) South Asia
- (9) The Pacific (excluding Australia & New Zealand)
- (10) The Caribbean (including Belize, Guyana & Suriname, but excluding Cuba, Haiti & the Dominican Republic)

[Back?](#)

ht_colonial Colonial Origin

This is a tenfold classification of the former colonial ruler of the country. Following Bernard et al (2004), we have excluded the British settler colonies (the US, Canada, Australia, Israel and New Zealand), and exclusively focused on "Western overseas" colonialism. This implies that only Western colonizers (e.g. excluding Japanese colonialism), and only countries located in the non-Western hemisphere "overseas" (e.g. excluding Ireland & Malta), have been coded. Each country that has been colonized since 1700 is coded. In cases of several colonial powers, the last one is counted, if it lasted for 10 years or longer. The categories are the following:

- (0) Never colonized by a Western overseas colonial power
- (1) Dutch
- (2) Spanish
- (3) Italian
- (4) US
- (5) British
- (6) French
- (7) Portuguese
- (8) Belgian
- (9) British-French
- (10) Australian

[Back?](#)

Henisz – The Political Constraints Index (POLCON)

http://www-management.wharton.upenn.edu/henisz/vti_bin/shtml.dll/POLCON/ContactInfo.html

(Henisz 2000; 2002)

h_polcon3 Political Constraints Index III

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 8786, N: 204, \bar{N} : 142, \bar{T} : 43)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

This index measures the feasibility of policy change, i.e. the extent to which a change in the preferences of any one political actor may lead to a change in government policy. The index is composed from the following information: the number of independent branches of government with veto power over policy change, counting the executive and the presence of an effective lower and upper house in the legislature (more branches leading to more constraint); the extent of party alignment across branches of government, measured as the extent to which the same party or coalition of parties control each branch (decreasing the level of constraint); and the extent of preference heterogeneity within each legislative branch, measured as legislative fractionalization in the relevant house (increasing constraint for aligned executives, decreasing it for opposed executives). The index scores are derived from a simple spatial model and theoretically ranges from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating more political constraint and thus less feasibility of policy change. Note that the coding reflects information as of January 1 in any given year. Henisz (2002) uses this index to demonstrate that political environments that limit the feasibility of policy change are an important determinant of investment in infrastructure.

[Back?](#)

h_j Independent Judiciary

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 7084, N: 180, \bar{N} : 114, \bar{T} : 39)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 169)

Dummy variable coded 1 if there is an independent judiciary (based on information from Polity's Executive Constraints, p_xconst) and - where available - on ICRG's index of Law & Order).

[Back?](#)

Heritage Foundation

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 1949, N: 163, \bar{N} : 150, \bar{T} : 12)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 154)

<http://www.heritage.org/index/>

hf_efiscore Economic Freedom Index

The Economic Freedom index uses 10 specific freedoms, some as composites of even further detailed and quantifiable components:

- Business freedom (hf_business)
- Trade freedom (hf_trade)
- Fiscal freedom (hf_fiscal)
- Freedom from government (hf_govt)
- Monetary freedom (hf_monetary)
- Investment freedom (hf_invest)
- Financial freedom (hf_financ)
- Property rights (hf_prights)
- Freedom from corruption (hf_corrupt)
- Labor freedom (hf_labor)

Each of these freedoms is weighted equally and turned into an index ranging from 0 to 100, where 100 represents the maximum economic freedom. Although changes in methodology have been undertaken throughout the measurement period, continuous backtracking has been used to maximize comparability over time.

[Back?](#)

hf_trade Trade Freedom

The trade freedom score is based on two inputs:

- The trade-weighted average tariff rate
- Non-tariff barriers (NTBs)

Weighted average tariffs is a purely quantitative measure and accounts for the basic calculation of the score. The presence of NTBs in a country affects its trade freedom score by incurring a penalty of up to 20 percentage points, or one-fifth of the maximum score. The country's trade freedom ranges between 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of trade freedom.

[Back?](#)

hf_govt Freedom from Government

Scoring of the freedom from government factor is based on two components:

- Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP
- Revenues generated by state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and property as a percentage of total government revenue.

Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP is weighted as two-thirds of the freedom from government factor score, and revenue from SOEs is weighted as one-third. In cases where SOE data does not exist, the data is excluded from the factor score. The country's freedom from government ranges between 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of freedom from government.

[Back?](#)

hf_prights Property Rights

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 1949, N: 163, \bar{N} : 150, \bar{T} : 12)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 155)

This factor scores the degree to which a country's laws protect private property rights and the degree to which its government enforces those laws. It also accounts for the possibility that private property will be expropriated. In addition, it analyzes the independence of the judiciary, the existence of corruption within the judiciary, and the ability of individuals and businesses to enforce contracts. The less certain the legal protection of property is and the greater the chances of government expropriation of property are, the higher a country's score is. The country's property rights score ranges from 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of protection of property rights.

[Back?](#)

hf_labor Labor Freedom

(Time-series: 2004-2006, n: 466, N: 156, \bar{N} : 155, \bar{T} : 3)

The new labor freedom factor is a quantitative factor based on objective data from the World Bank's *Doing Business* study. It provides reliable cross-country data on regulations concerning minimum wages, laws inhibiting layoffs, severance requirements, and measurable regulatory burdens on hiring, hours, and so on. Specifically, four quantitative components are equally weighted as 25 percent of the labor freedom factor:

- Minimum wage
- Rigidity of hours
- Difficulty of firing redundant employees
- Cost of firing redundant employees

The country's labor freedom score ranges from 0 to 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of labor freedom.

[Back?](#)

Heston, Summers & Aten – Penn World Table

http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt_index.php

(Heston, Summers and Aten 2009)

Note: In Penn World Table version 6.3 the users are offered two different series of data for China. “China Version 1” uses the official growth rates for the whole period. “China Version 2” uses the recent modifications of official Chinese growth rates contained in Maddison and Wu (2007) for the period before 1990, and apply the modification of the official rate from 1995-2000 to the official rate after 2000. “China Version 2” provides a more consistent recent economic history of China relative to other countries, according to the authors of the Penn World Table. We have thus included the data from “China Version 2”.

[Back?](#)

pwt_rgdpc Real GDP per capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, \bar{N} : 141, \bar{T} : 44)

(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

Real GDP per capita (Chain) is a chain index obtained by first applying the component growth rates between each pair of consecutive years, ‘t-1’ and ‘t’ (t=1951 to 2007), to the current price component shares in year ‘t-1’ to obtain the domestic absorption (DA) growth rate for each year. This DA growth rate for each year ‘t’ is then applied backwards and forwards from 2005, and summed to the constant price net foreign balance to obtain the Chain GDP series.

[Back?](#)

pwt_csg Consumption Share of GDP (%)

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, \bar{N} : 141, \bar{T} : 44)

(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

The consumption share of GDP, in percent.

[Back?](#)

pwt_gsg Government Share of GDP (%)

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, \bar{N} : 141, \bar{T} : 44)

(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

The share of government spending as a percentage of GDP.

[Back?](#)

pwt_isg Investment Share of GDP (%)

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, \bar{N} : 141, \bar{T} : 44)

(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

The share of investment as a percentage of GDP.

[Back?](#)

pwt_openk Openness to Trade, Constant Prices

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, \bar{N} : 141, \bar{T} : 44)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

Total trade (exports plus imports) as a percentage of GDP in constant prices, with a reference year of 2005. GDP is obtained by adding up consumption, investment, government and exports, and subtracting imports in any given year.

[Back?](#)

Inter-Parliamentary Union

<http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world-arc.htm>

ipu_w_lower Women in national parliament (lower house)

(Time-series: 1997-2005 (December or latest available), n: 1508, N: 188, \bar{N} : 168, \bar{T} : 8)
(Cross-section: Dec. 2002, N: 162)

Percentage women in single house or lower house. (Also see m_wominpar below.)

[Back?](#)

ipu_w_upper Women in national parliament (upper house)

(Time-series: 1997-2005 (December or latest available), n: 552, N: 83, \bar{N} : 61, \bar{T} : 7)
(Cross-section: Dec. 2002, N: 57)

Percentage women in upper house or senate. (Also see m_wominpar below.)

[Back?](#)

Institutions and Elections Project

<http://www2.binghamton.edu/political-science/institutions-and-elections-project.html>

(Regan and Clark 2010)

The objective of the data from the Institutions and Elections Project (IAEP) is to describe the formal institutions that are in place, even if practice does not comport with those formal rules. The data refers to the situation January 1st each year.

Please also note that according to the documentation of the data many of the cases “have more than one executive; [...] the executive referred to may be any one of the executives established in a country.” We urge users to refer to the documentation at the IAEP web site for information about which executive each particular case refers to.

[Back?](#)

Executive-Legislature Relationship

iaep_evp Executive Veto Power

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4389, N: 171, \bar{N} : 129, \bar{T} : 26)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 155)

Equals 1 if there is an executive with constitutional veto power over laws passed by the legislature, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

iaep_lvp Legislature Veto Power

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4282, N: 171, \bar{N} : 126, \bar{T} : 25)

Equals 1 if the legislature has constitutional veto power to stop executive action, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

iaep_bp Banned Parties

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4897, N: 171, \bar{N} : 144, \bar{T} : 29)
(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 159)

Equals 1 if there are banned parties, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

iaep_npa No Parties Allowed

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 5002, N: 171, \bar{N} : 147, \bar{T} : 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if no parties are allowed, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

iaep_osp Official State Party

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4905, N: 171, \bar{N} : 144, \bar{T} : 29)
(Cross-section: 1999-2003 (varies by country), N: 160)

Equals 1 if there is an official state party, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

Johnson & Wallack

<http://dss.ucsd.edu/~jwjohnso/espv.htm>

([Johnson & Wallack 2006](#))

This database updates, expands and (to some extent) corrects the electoral systems coding presented in Wallack et al. (2003). As in the original database, the underlying rationale for coding is derived from Carey & Shugart (1995) and it takes into account four dimensions of the electoral system: ballot, vote, pool, and district magnitude.

[Back?](#)

Summary indices

jw_domr **Dominant or Populous Tier**

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2237, N: 126, \bar{N} : 80, \bar{T} : 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 121)

This variable ranks countries in increasing order of incentives to cultivate a personal vote according to their most dominant or populous tier (or tier with the greater number of legislators). The variable varies from 1 to 13, corresponding to the thirteen positions in Carey & Shugart's (1995) ranking. For example, a country with a ranking of 1 would have a tier with the lowest possible rank of personal vote incentives, and that tier would account for the majority of the members in the assembly.

Ballot variables

The ballot variables focus on the amount of party control over candidates' access to a competitive position on the ballot. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives):

- (0) where parties control access to ballots as well as the order in which individuals will fill the seats that the party wins (closed list multi-member districts, open list multi-member districts with little or no de facto change in list order);
- (1) where parties control access to the ballot, but not the order in which candidates will receive seats (open lists where intra-party preference votes seem to have a significant influence on which candidates are selected, and single-member districts where parties control access to the list);
- (2) where there are few or no impediments to individual candidates' ability to appear on the ballot (single-member districts where parties do not control access, e.g. allowing independent candidates and/or use primaries to select candidates).

[Back?](#)

La Porta, López-de-Silanes, Shleifer & Vishny

<http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/rafael.laporta/publications/LaPorta%20PDF%20Papers-ALL/Quality%20of%20Govt-All/Quality%20of%20Govt.xls>
(La Porta et al 1999)

lp_legor **Legal origin**

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 190)
(Cross-section: NA, N: 189)

Identifies the legal origin of the Company Law or Commercial code of each country. There are five possible origins:

- (1) English Common Law
- (2) French Commercial Code
- (3) Socialist/Communist Laws
- (4) German Commercial Code
- (5) Scandinavian Commercial Code

[Back?](#)

lp_lat_abst Latitude

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 187)
(Cross-section: NA, N: 187)

The absolute value of the latitude of the capital city, divided by 90 (to take values between 0 and 1).

[Back?](#)

Original sources: Barrett (1982), Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations (1995), Statistical Abstract of the World (1995), United Nations (1995) and CIA (1996).

[Back?](#)

lp_catho80 Religion: Catholic

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 187)
(Cross-section: 1980 (1990-1995 for countries of recent formation), N: 187)

Catholics as percentage of population in 1980.

[Back?](#)

lp_muslim80 Religion: Muslim

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 187)
(Cross-section: 1980 (1990-1995 for countries of recent formation), N: 187)

Muslims as percentage of population in 1980.

[Back?](#)

lp_protmg80 Religion: Protestant

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 184)
(Cross-section: 1980 (1990-1995 for countries of recent formation), N: 184)

Protestants as percentage of population in 1980.

[Back?](#)

lp_no_cpm80 Religion: Other Denomination

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 184)
(Cross-section: 1980 (1990-1995 for countries of recent formation), N: 184)

Percentage of population belonging to other denominations in 1980. Defined as $100 - lp_catho80 - lp_muslim80 - lp_protmg80$.

[Back?](#)

Maddison

<http://www.ggdcc.net/maddison/>
(Maddison 2003)

mad_pop **Population (thousand)**

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 11304, N: 197, \bar{N} : 185, \bar{T} : 57)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 190)

Population (1000's at mid-year).

Note: Although Serbia and Montenegro split into two separate states in 2006,

Maddison's dataset considers the population for the two states combined.

[Back?](#)

Melander

<http://www.pcr.uu.se/personal/anstallda/melander.htm>

(Melander 2005)

m_femlead **Female State Leader**

(Time-series: 1965-2002, n: 5740, N: 180, \bar{N} : 151, \bar{T} : 32)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 169)

Dummy variable taking value: (1) Female leader (0) Male leader. Female leaders during the 20th century defined as "the president, prime minister, or any other decision maker who is essentially the 'decision maker of last resort'". Original source: Caprioli & Boyer (2001), Melander has extended the data using the information available in Schemmel (2004).

[Back?](#)

m_wominpar **Women in Parliament (percent)**

(Time-series: 1965-2002, n: 4767, N: 175, \bar{N} : 125, \bar{T} : 27)

(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 159)

Percentage of women holding seats in the legislature. Original source: Inter-Parliamentary Union (1995; 2005). Note: if the parliament is not unicameral the upper house is used.

[Back?](#)

Norris – Democracy Time-Series Dataset

<http://www.pippanorris.com>

(Norris 2009)

Note: The Democracy Time-Series Dataset has data for Germany even before the unification in 1990. The same applies to Yemen. We have decided to leave the data as is.

no_pm **Parliamentary Monarchy**

Equals 1 if the country is a parliamentary monarchy and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

no_pr Presidential Republic

Equals 1 if the country is a presidential republic and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

no_rm Ruling Monarchy

Equals 1 if the country is a ruling monarchy and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

no_ms Military State

Equals 1 if the country is a military state, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

Electoral Systems

The following variables have IDEA as original source of data.

[Back?](#)

no_ndel No Directly Elected Legislature

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5975, N: 193, \bar{N} : 181, \bar{T} : 31)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

Equals 1 if the country lacks a directly elected legislature, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

no_pes Proportional Electoral System

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5975, N: 193, \bar{N} : 181, \bar{T} : 31)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

Equals 1 if the country has a proportional electoral system, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

no_ces Combined (Mixed) Electoral System

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5975, N: 193, \bar{N} : 181, \bar{T} : 31)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

Equals 1 if the country has a combined (mixed) electoral system, and 0 otherwise

[Back?](#)

no_mes Majoritarian Electoral System

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5975, N: 193, \bar{N} : 181, \bar{T} : 31)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

Equals 1 if the country has a majoritarian electoral system, and 0 otherwise.

[Back?](#)

Decentralization

no_ufs **Unitary or Federal State**

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5541, N: 193, \bar{N} : 168, \bar{T} : 29)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

(0) Non-unitary
(1) Unitary

[Back?](#)

Roeder

<http://weber.ucsd.edu/~proeder/elf.htm>

(Roeder 2001)

r_elf85 **Ethnolinguistic fractionalization 1985**

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 179)
(Cross-section: 1985, N: 171)

Reflects probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same ethnolinguistic group, where the latter is defined without collapsing any sub-groups in the sources. (For original sources, see Roeder 2001.)

[Back?](#)

UNU-WIDER – World Income Inequality Database

(United Nations University 2008)

http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/Database/en_GB/database/

uw_gini **Gini (mean)**

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 2309, N: 155, \bar{N} : 38, \bar{T} : 15)
(Cross-section: 1957-2005 (varies by country), N: 151)

This variable measures the Gini index of income inequality as reported by UNU-WIDER (version WIID2c). The Gini coefficient varies theoretically from 0 (perfectly equal distribution of income) to 100 (the society's total income accrues to only one person/household unit). In case a country in the original data has multiple observations for a given year, we include the mean of the highest quality observations (as measured by uw_quality). Note: Both within- and cross-country comparisons are to be handled with care as these Gini coefficients are based on varying sources of information and refer to a variety of income and population concepts, sample sizes and statistical methods.

[Back?](#)

World Development Indicators

<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog>

wdi_gdp **GDP, PPP (Constant International USD)**

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 4704, N: 178, \bar{N} : 162, \bar{T} : 26)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 178)

GDP converted to constant 2005 international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the US dollar has in the United States. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_gdpc **GDP per Capita, PPP (Constant International USD)**

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 4687, N: 178, \bar{N} : 162, \bar{T} : 26)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 178)

GDP per capita, PPP adjusted. (See wdi_gdp above for explanation.) Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_ttr **Total Trade (% of GDP)**

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6730, N: 181, \bar{N} : 137, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 1997-2002 (varies by country), N: 179)

Trade is the sum of exports and imports of goods and services measured as a percentage of GDP. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

Other

wdi_aid **Net Development Assistance and Aid (Constant USD)**

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6580, N: 164, \bar{N} : 134, \bar{T} : 40)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 164)

Official development assistance (ODA) and official aid flows, net of repayments. Data are in constant 2008 US dollars. Source: OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_area **Area (sq. km)**

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 9120, N: 190, \bar{N} : 190, \bar{T} : 48)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 190)

A country's total area, excluding area under inland water bodies, national claims to continental shelf, and exclusive economic zones. In most cases the definition of inland water bodies includes major rivers and lakes. Source: Food and Agriculture Organization.

[Back?](#)

wdi_fe Fuel Exports (% of Merchandise Exports)

(Time-series: 1962-2009, n: 4960, N: 182, \bar{N} : 103, \bar{T} : 27)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 170)

Fuel exports as a percentage of merchandise exports. Source: World Bank staff estimates from the Comtrade database maintained by the United Nations Statistics Division.

[Back?](#)

wdi_ome Ores and Metals Exports (% of Merchandise Exports)

(Time-series: 1962-2008, n: 5078, N: 181, \bar{N} : 108, \bar{T} : 28)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 170)

Ores and metals exports as a percentage of merchandise exports. Source: World Bank staff estimates from the Comtrade database maintained by the United Nations Statistics Division.

[Back?](#)

wdi_me Merchandise Exports (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 7918, N: 184, \bar{N} : 162, \bar{T} : 43)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 184)

The value of goods provided to the rest of the world in current US dollars. Source: World Trade Organization.

[Back?](#)

WYG (WHAT YOU GET) VARIABLES

Bueno de Mesquita, Smith, Siverson & Morrow

<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/data/bdm2s2/Logic.htm>

(Bueno de Mesquita et al 2003)

Hobbes-index

This index reflects an attempt to measure how far nations have come from the state of nature, which Hobbes (in Leviathan, 1651) describes as a state where life is short, nasty, solitary, poor and brutish. To capture these miseries of life, the Hobbes index ranges from 0 to 100 by combining cross-national indicators of the number of deaths per capita (short), the presence of civil liberties (nasty), media communications (solitary), national income (poor), and the annual experience with civil war, revolution, and international war (brutish). Higher values indicate a longer distance from the state of nature.

bdm_hobbes Hobbes Index

(Time-series: 1972-1997, n: 1865, N: 145, \bar{N} : 72, \bar{T} : 13)

(Cross-section: 1997, N: 142)

[Back?](#)

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Fish Production

<http://www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/en>

(FAO 2008)

The data shows the volume of fish caught measured in tons, and excludes other aquatic animals and plants. The data is divided by capture and aquaculture, and marine and inland waters. Capture for all purposes are included: commercial, recreational etc.

[Back?](#)

fao_fpic Fish Production, Inland Capture

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8002, N: 160, \bar{N} : 138, \bar{T} : 51)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 157)

Inland captured fish production, in tons.

[Back?](#)

fao_fpmc Fish Production, Marine Capture

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8374, N: 156, \bar{N} : 144, \bar{T} : 54)

(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 153)

Marine captured fish production, in tons.

[Back?](#)

Fund for Peace - Failed States Index

http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=140

ffp_fsi Failed States Index

(Time-series: 2004-2007, n: 576, N: 178, \bar{N} : 144, \bar{T} : 3)
(Cross-section: 2004-2006 (varies by country), N: 178)

The Failed States Index includes an examination of the pressures on states, their vulnerability to internal conflict and societal deterioration.

The country ratings are based on the total scores of 12 indicators: *Social Indicators* – (1) Mounting Demographic Pressures; (2) Massive Movement of Refugees or Internally Displaced Persons creating Complex Humanitarian Emergencies; (3) Legacy of Vengeance-Seeking Group Grievance or Group Paranoia; and (4) Chronic and Sustained Human Flight. *Economic Indicators* – (5) Uneven Economic Development along Group Lines; and (6) Sharp and/or Severe Economic Decline. *Political Indicators* – (7) Criminalization and/or Delegitimization of the State; (8) Progressive Deterioration of Public Services; (9) Suspension or Arbitrary Application of the Rule of Law and Widespread Violation of Human Rights; (10) Security Apparatus Operates as a “State Within a State” (11) Rise of Factionalized Elites; and (12) Intervention of Other States or External Political Actors.

For each indicator, the ratings are placed on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being the lowest intensity (most stable) and 10 being the highest intensity (least stable). The total score is the sum of the 12 indicators and is on a scale of 0-120

[Back?](#)

Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation – University of Washington

<http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/>

(Rajaratnam et al. 2010; Hogan et al. 2010)

ihme_nm Neonatal Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Births)

(Time-series: 1970-2010, n: 7602, N: 188, \bar{N} : 185, \bar{T} : 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 186)

Probability of death from birth to age 1 month, expressed as deaths per 1,000.

[Back?](#)

ihme_fmort Under-5 Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)

(Time-series: 1970-2010, n: 7602, N: 188, \bar{N} : 185, \bar{T} : 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 186)

Probability of death from birth to age 5, expressed as deaths per 1,000 live births.

[Back?](#)

ihme_mmr Maternal Mortality Ratio (per 100,000 Live Births)

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 5220, N: 181, \bar{N} : 180, \bar{T} : 29)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 180)

Number of maternal deaths per 100,000 live Births.

[Back?](#)

UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset (version 3-2005)

(Time-series: 1946-2004, n: 7889, N: 183, \bar{N} : 134, \bar{T} : 43)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 171)

<http://www.prio.no/cwp/armedconflict>

(Gleditsch et al. 2002)

The UCDP/PRIO Conflict Database is a free resource of information on armed conflicts of the world. The project records all armed conflicts following the definitions of Uppsala Conflict Data Program. All variables in the database follow strict definitions presented in a codebook (see <http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/index.php>).

Classifications of armed conflicts:

- Minor armed conflict: At least 25 battle-related deaths per year for every year in the period.
- Intermediate armed conflict: More than 25 battle-related deaths per year and a total conflict history of more than 1000 battle-related deaths, but fewer than 1000 per year.
- War: At least 1000 battle-related deaths per year.

ucdp_count Number of Conflicts

The number of conflicts in which the government of the country is involved.

[Back?](#)

ucdp_loc Conflict Location

Consists of four indicators:

- (0) Country is not listed as location of a conflict
- (1) Country is listed as location of a minor armed conflict
- (2) Country is listed as location of an intermediate armed conflict
- (3) Country is listed as location of a war

[Back?](#)

UNDP - Human Development Report

<http://hdr.undp.org/>
(UNDP 2004)

undp_hdi Human Development Index

(Time-series: 1975-2003, n: 1079, N: 177, \bar{N} : 135, \bar{T} : 6)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth; knowledge, as measured by the adult literacy rate and the combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools; and a decent standard of living, as measured by GDP per capita in purchasing power parity (PPP) US dollars.

[Back?](#)

World Development Indicators

<http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog>

GDP Growth

wdi_gdpgr GDP Growth (%)

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 6947, N: 188, \bar{N} : 145, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 187)

Annual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices based on constant local currency. Aggregates are based on constant 2000 US dollars. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_gdpcgr GDP per Capita Growth (%)

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 6947, N: 188, \bar{N} : 145, \bar{T} : 37)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 187)

Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

Poverty

wdi_pb2 Population Below \$2 a Day (%)

(Time-series: 1978-2008, n: 584, N: 120, \bar{N} : 19, \bar{T} : 5)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 117)

Percentage of the population living on less than \$2.00 a day at 2005 international prices. Data are based on primary household survey data obtained from government statistical agencies and World Bank country departments. Data for high-income economies are from the Luxembourg Income Study database.

[Back?](#)

wdi_pbpl Population Below National Poverty Line (%)

(Time-series: 1985-2008, n: 216, N: 100, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 89)

The percentage of the population living below the national poverty line. National estimates are based on population-weighted subgroup estimates from household surveys. Data are based on World Bank's country poverty assessments and country Poverty Reduction Strategies.

[Back?](#)

Health Expenditure

wdi_hec Health Expenditure per Capita, PPP (Constant USD)

(Time-series: 2003-2007, n: 926, N: 187, \bar{N} : 185, \bar{T} : 5)
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 187)

The sum of public and private health expenditures as a ratio of total population. Data are in converted international dollars using 2005 purchasing power parity (PPP) rates. Source: WHO, supplemented by country data.

[Back?](#)

wdi_gr Government Revenue (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1492, N: 146, \bar{N} : 79, \bar{T} : 10)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 141)

Revenue is cash receipts from taxes, social contributions and other revenues. Grants are excluded here. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Source: International Monetary Fund. (World Bank and OECD for GDP estimates.)

[Back?](#)

wdi_gew Government Expenditure on Wages and Employer Contributions (% of Expense)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1352, N: 141, \bar{N} : 71, \bar{T} : 10)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 138)

Compensation to employees consists of all payments in cash, as well as in kind (such as food and housing), and government contributions to social insurance schemes such as social security and pensions that provide benefits to employees. Source: International Monetary Fund.

[Back?](#)

wdi_ge Government Expense (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1377, N: 144, \bar{N} : 72, \bar{T} : 10)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 140)

Expense is cash payments for operating activities of the government in providing goods and services. It includes compensation to employees (such as wages and salaries), interest and subsidies, grants, social benefits, and other expenses such as rent and dividends. Source: International Monetary Fund. (World Bank and OECD for GDP estimates)

[Back?](#)

Energy and Environment

wdi_co2 Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Tons per Capita)

(Time-series: 1960-2006, n: 7504, N: 182, \bar{N} : 160, \bar{T} : 41)
(Cross-section: 1999-2003 (varies by country), N: 179)

Carbon dioxide emissions in metric tons per capita. Source: Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, in the US state of Tennessee.

[Back?](#)

wdi_epc Electric Power Consumption (kWh per Capita)

(Time-series: 1960-2007, n: 4714, N: 132, \bar{N} : 98, \bar{T} : 36)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 129)

Electric power consumption measures in kWh per capita. Sources: International Energy Agency, Energy Statistics and Balances of Non-OECD Countries and Energy Statistics of OECD Countries.

[Back?](#)

wdi_fw Freshwater Withdrawals (% of Internal Resources)

(Time-series: 1982-2007, n: 208, N: 155, \bar{N} : 8, \bar{T} : 1)
(Cross-section: 2002-2007 (varies by country), N: 154)

Annual freshwater withdrawals refer to total water withdrawals, not counting evaporation losses from storage basins. Withdrawals also include water from desalination plants in countries where they are a significant source. Withdrawals can exceed 100 percent of total renewable resources where extraction from nonrenewable aquifers or desalination plants is considerable or where there is significant water reuse. Data are for the most recent year available for 1987-2002. Sources: World Resources Institute, supplemented by the FAO's AQUASTAT data.

[Back?](#)

Other

wdi_aas Access to Adequate Sanitation (% of Population)

(Time-series: 1990-2006, n: 629, N: 168, \bar{N} : 37, \bar{T} : 4)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 168)

Access to improved sanitation facilities refers to the percentage of the population with at least adequate access to excreta disposal facilities that can effectively prevent human, animal, and insect contact with excreta. Sources: World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund.

[Back?](#)

wdi_ise Industry's share of economy (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 5927, N: 181, \bar{N} : 121, \bar{T} : 33)

(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 179)

The share of the economy that stems from industrial production as a percentage of GDP. Industry includes mining, manufacturing, construction, electricity, water, and gas. The variable is calculated as the net output of the sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.

Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_sse Services' share of economy (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 5930, N: 181, \bar{N} : 121, \bar{T} : 33)

(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 179)

The share of the economy that stems from services as a percentage of GDP. Services include wholesale and retail trade (including hotels and restaurants), transport, and government, financial, professional, and personal services such as education, health care, and real estate services. Also included are imputed bank service charges and import duties. The variable is calculated as the net output of the sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

[Back?](#)

wdi_idp Internally Displaced Persons

(Time-series: 2000-2008, n: 262, N: 45, \bar{N} : 29, \bar{T} : 6)

(Cross-section: 2002-2008 (varies by country), N: 45)

Number of individuals who have been forced to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of, or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural- or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an international border. Source: UNHCR.

[Back?](#)

wdi_eodb Ease of Doing Business

(Time-series: 2008-2009, n: 356, N: 178, \bar{N} : 178, \bar{T} : 2)

(Cross-section: 2008, N: 178)

Ease of doing business index ranks economies from 1 to 183, with first place being the best. A high ranking means that the regulatory environment is conducive to business operation. The index ranks the simple average of the country's percentile rankings on 10 topics covered in the World Bank's Doing Business. The ranking on each topic is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. Source: World Bank, Doing Business project.

[Back?](#)

wdi_fr Fertility Rate (Births per Woman)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 8560, N: 189, \bar{N} : 175, \bar{T} : 45)
(Cross-section: 2000-2005 (varies by country), N: 189)

Total fertility rate represents the number of children that would be born to a woman if she were to live to the end of her childbearing years and bear children in accordance with current age-specific fertility rates. Sources: The United Nations Population Division's World Population Prospects, national statistical offices, Eurostat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, US Census Survey, and household surveys conducted by national agencies, Macro International and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[Back?](#)

wdi_gris Gender Ratio in School (%)

(Time-series: 1991-2009, n: 1555, N: 182, \bar{N} : 82, \bar{T} : 9)
(Cross-section: 1998-2009 (varies by country), N: 179)

The percentage of girls to boys enrolled at primary and secondary levels in public and private schools. Source: UNESCO.

[Back?](#)

wdi_lue Long-Term Unemployment (% of Unemployed)

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 887, N: 55, \bar{N} : 31, \bar{T} : 16)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 55)

Long-term unemployment refers to the number of people with continuous periods of unemployment extending for a year or longer, expressed as a percentage of the total unemployed. Source: ILO.

[Back?](#)

World Values Survey

<http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org>

(World Values Survey Association 2009; European Values Study Group and World Values Survey Association 2006)

In this section we have aggregated individual level World Values Survey data to the country level. The value of each observation is thus the country mean of the variable in question.

wvs_a008 Feeling of happiness

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 241, N: 96, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

Taking all things together, how happy would you say you are?

- (1) Very happy
- (2) Quite happy
- (3) Not very happy
- (4) Not at all happy

[Back?](#)

wvs_a009 State of health

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 207, N: 92, \bar{N} : 7, \bar{T} : 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 83)

All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days? Would you say it is...

- (1) Very good
- (2) Good
- (3) Fair
- (4) Poor
- (5) Very poor

[Back?](#)

wvs_a165 Most people can be trusted

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 243, N: 96, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?

- (1) Most people can be trusted
- (2) Can't be too careful

[Back?](#)

Ideology

wvs_e033 Self positioning in political scale

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 226, N: 92, \bar{N} : 8, \bar{T} : 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

In political matters, people talk of the left and the right. How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking?

- (1) Left
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)
- (6)
- (7)
- (8)
- (9)
- (10) Right

[Back?](#)

Now I'd like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between.

wvs_e037 Government more responsibility

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 218, N: 96, \bar{N} : 11, \bar{T} : 2)
 (Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

The Government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for

People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

[Back?](#)

wvs_e124 Respect for individual human rights

(Time-series: 1996-2008, n: 126, N: 89, \bar{N} : 10, \bar{T} : 1)
 (Cross-section: 1997-2008 (varies by country), N: 89)

How much respect is there for individual human rights nowadays (in our country)? Do you feel there is:

- (1) A lot of respect for individual human rights
- (2) Some respect
- (3) Not much respect
- (4) No respect at all

[Back?](#)

wvs_e125 Satisfaction with the people in national office

(Time-series: 1994-2005, n: 87, N: 65, \bar{N} : 7, \bar{T} : 1)
 Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 64)

How satisfied are you with the way the people now in national office are handling the country's affairs? Would you say you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

- (1) Very satisfied
- (2) Fairly satisfied
- (3) Fairly dissatisfied
- (4) Very dissatisfied

[Back?](#)

wvs_e128 Country is run by big interest vs. all people

(Time-series: 1990-2007, n: 100, N: 68, \bar{N} : 6, \bar{T} : 1)
 (Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 67)

Generally speaking, would you say that this country is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

- (1) Run by few big interests
- (2) Run for all people

[Back?](#)

wvs_gen Gender Equality Scale

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 242, N: 95, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
 (Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 93)

(Inglehart and Norris 2003).

Gender Equality Scale is a 0-100 scale composed of five items:

- “On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do,” (agree coded low).
- “When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women,” (agree coded low).
- “A university education is more important for a boy than a girl,” (agree coded low).
- “Do you think that a woman has to have children in order to be fulfilled or is this not necessary?” (agree coded low).
- If a woman wants to have a child as a single parent but she doesn’t want to have a stable relationship with a man, do you approve or disapprove?” (disapprove coded low).

[Back?](#)

wvs_rs Religiosity Scale

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 242, N: 96, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
 (Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

(Inglehart and Norris 2003)

Religiosity Scale is a 0-100 scale composed of six items:

- “Independently of whether you go to church or not, would you say you are...a religious person, not a religious person, or a convinced atheist?” (% religious).
- “Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often do you attend religious services these days?” (% once a week or more).
- “How important is God in your life?” (% “very” scaled 6-10)
- “Do you believe in God?” (% Yes).
- “Do you believe in life after death?” (% Yes).
- “Do you find that you get comfort and strength from religion?”

[Back?](#)

wvs_proud National pride

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 240, N: 96, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
 (Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

How proud are you to be (NATIONALITY)?

- (1) Very proud
- (2) Quite proud
- (3) Not very proud
- (4) Not at all proud

[Back?](#)

wvs_tol Tolerance of diversity

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 206, N: 93, \bar{N} : 11, \bar{T} : 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbors?

- A. People who have AIDS.
 - B. Homosexuals
- (0) Mentioned
(1) Not mentioned

Scores added for neighbors with AIDS and homosexual neighbors to create a 0-2 scale (where 2 means tolerant).

WARNING: Some inconsistencies found in the original data. Two examples: In Iran only 0.5 percent in wave 4 mentioned that they would not like to have people with AIDS as neighbors while 86 percent in Iran in wave 5 mentioned this. This can be compared with Jordan where 95 percent in wave 4 mentioned that they would not like to have people with AIDS as neighbors. In Bangladesh only 4.9 percent of the people in wave 4 said that they would not like homosexuals as neighbors, while 83.7 percent said this in Bangladesh in wave 3.

[Back?](#)

wvs_trust Interpersonal trust

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 243, N: 96, \bar{N} : 9, \bar{T} : 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?

- (0) Need to be very careful
(1) Most people can be trusted

(=wvs_a165 recoded).

[Back?](#)

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., and Robinson, J.A. 2001. "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *The American Economic Review*, 91(5): 1369-1401.
- Armingeon, K. et al. 2008. Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2005. Institute of Political Science, University of Berne.
http://www.ipw.unibe.ch/content/team/klaus_armingeon/comparative_political_data_sets/index_ger.html
- Atlas Narodov Mira*. 1964. Moscow: Miklukho-Maklai Ethnological Institute at the Department of Geodesy and Cartography of the State Geological Committee of the Soviet Union.
- Banks, A. S. 1996. *Cross-National Time-Series Data Archive*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Social Analysis, State University of New York at Binghamton.
- Barrett, D. B., ed. 1982. *World Christian Encyclopedia: a Comparative Study of Churches and Religions in the Modern World, AD 1900-2000*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barro, Robert J. & Jong-Wha Lee, 2000. "International Data on Educational Attainment Updates and Implications," NBER Working Papers 7911, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Bernard, M., Reenock, C., and Nordstrom, T. 2004. "The Legacy of Western Overseas Colonialism on Democratic Survival." *International Studies Quarterly*, 48: 225-50.
- Botero, J.C., Djankov, S., La Porta, R., López-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. 2004. "The Regulation of Labor." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 119(4): 1339-1382.
- Bueno De Mesquita, B., Smith, A., Siverson, R. M. and Morrow, J. D. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003.
- Caprioli, Mary & Mark A. Boyer. 2001. "Gender, Violence, and International Crisis." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45: 503-518.
- Carey, J. and Shugart, M. S. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote." *Electoral Studies*, 14(4): 417-439.
- Central Intelligence Agency. 1996. *CLA World Factbook*, published online.
- Cingranelli, D. L. and Richards, D. L. 2010. *The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset*. Version 2010.05.17. <http://www.humanrightsdata.org>.
- Cingranelli, D. L. and Richards, D. L. 1999. "Measuring the Level, Pattern, and Sequence of Government Respect for Physical Integrity Rights." *International Studies Quarterly*, 43(2): 407-418.
- Clark, D. and Regan, P. 2010. *Institutions and Elections Project. Institutions data in STATA*. <http://www2.binghamton.edu/political-science/institutions-and-elections-project.html>. Downloaded March 3rd 2010.
- Coppedge, M. and Reinicke, W. 1990. "Measuring Polyarchy." *Studies in Comparative International Development* No. 25(1): 51-72.

Coppedge, M. and Alvarez, A., Maldonado, C. 2008. "Two Persistent Dimensions of Democracy: Contestation and Inclusiveness." *Journal of Politics*, 70(3).

Dahl, Robert A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dreher, A. 2006. "Does Globalization Affect Growth? Evidence from a New Index of Globalization." *Applied Economics*, 38(10): 1091-1110.

Dreher, A., Gaston, N. and Martens, P. 2008. *Measuring Globalization – Gauging its Consequences*. New York: Springer.

European Values Study Group and World Values Survey Association 2006. *European and World Values Surveys four-wave integrated data file, 1981-2004, v.20060423*. File Producers: ASEP/JDS, Madrid, Spain and Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands. File Distributors: ASEP/JDS and GESIS, Cologne, Germany.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 2008. Global Statistical Collections of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Department.
<http://www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/en>

Gibney, M., and Dalton, M. 1996. "The Political Terror Scale." *Policy Studies and Developing Nation*, 4: 73-84.

Gibney, M., Cornett, L., And Wood, R. 2010. *Political Terror Scale 1976-2008*. Retrieved April 21, 2010 from the Political Terror Scale web site: <http://www.politicalterrorsscale.org>

Gleditsch, K. S. 2002. "Expanded Trade and GDP Data." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46: 712-724.

Gleditsch, N. P., Wallensteen, P., Eriksson, M., Sollenberg, M., and Strand, H. 2002. Armed Conflict 1946–2001: A New Dataset. *Journal of Peace Research*, 39(5): 615–637.

Global Integrity. 2007. *The Global Integrity Report 2007. Methodology Whitepaper*.
<http://report.globalintegrity.org/methodology/whitepaper.cfm> April 17, 2008.

Golder, M. 2005. "Democratic Electoral Systems around the World." *Electoral Studies*, 24: 103-121.

Gwartney, J. and Lawson, R. 2004. *Economic Freedom of the World: 2004 Annual Report*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.

Gwartney, J. and Lawson, R. 2005. *Economic Freedom of the World: 2005 Annual Report*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.

Gwartney, J. and Lawson, R. 2006. *Economic Freedom of the World: 2006 Annual Report*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.

Hadenius, A. and Teorell, J. 2005. "Assessing Alternative Indices of Democracy", C&M Working Papers 6, IPSA, August 2005 (http://www.concepts-methods.org/working_papers/20050812_16_PC%206%20Hadenius%20&%20Teorell.pdf).

- Hadenius, A and Teorell, J.. "Pathways from Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 18(1): 143-156, 2007.
- Hadenius, A, Teorell, J. and Wahman, M. *Authoritarian Regimes Data Set*, version 3.0. Department of Political Science, Lund University.
- Henisz, W. J. 2000. "The Institutional Environment for Economic Growth." *Economics and Politics*, 12(1): 1-31.
- Henisz, W. J. 2002. "The Institutional Environment for Infrastructure Investment." *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(2): 355-389
- Heston, A., Summers, R. and Aten, B. August 2009. *Penn World Table* Version 6.3, Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania.
- Hogan, M. C. et al. 2010. "Maternal mortality for 181 countries, 1980–2008: a systematic analysis of progress towards Millennium Development Goal 5". *Lancet*, 375: 1609-1623.
- Inglehart, R., and Norris, P. 2003. *Rising Tide, Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. 1995. *Women in Parliaments 1945-1995*. A World Statistical Survey, Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. 2005. *Women in National Parliaments*. <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm> 2004, 20 December.
- Johnson, J. W., Wallack, J. S. 2006. "Electoral Systems and the Personal Vote: Update of database from 'Particularism Around the World'", 2003. San Diego: University of California.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. 2006. "Governance Matters V: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators for 1996–2005", The World Bank.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. 2009. "Governance Matters VIII: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators for 1996–2008". World Bank Policy Research Paper No. 4978. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1424591>
- Keefer, P. 2009. DPI2009. "Database of Political Institutions: Changes and Variable Definitions." Development Research Group, World Bank.
- Lambsdorff, J. G. 2005. "Determining Trends for Perceived Levels of Corruption". Discussion Paper of the Economics Department, Passau University, No 38-05, October 2005.
- La Porta, R., López-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. 1999. The Quality of Government. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 15(1): 222-279.
- La Porta, R., Glaeser, F., López-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. 2004. Do Institutions Cause Growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 9(3): 271-303.
- La Porta, R., López-de-Silanes, F., Pop-Eleches, C. and Shleifer, A. 2004. *Judicial Checks and Balances*. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(2): 445-470.
- Lijphart, A. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy - Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

- Maddison, Angus. 2003. *The World Economy: Historical Statistics*, Paris: OECD Development Centre.
- Maddison, A. and Wu, H.X. 2007. *Measuring China's economic performance: how fast has its economy grown and how big is it compared with the USA?* Penn World Table Research Papers.
[http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/papers/Maddison-Wu%20\(Harry%27s%20draft%20version%2029%20Jan%2007\).pdf](http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/papers/Maddison-Wu%20(Harry%27s%20draft%20version%2029%20Jan%2007).pdf)
- Mainwaring, S. and Brinks, D., Pérez-Liñán, A. 2001. "Classifying Political Regimes in Latin America, 1945–1999." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36(1): 37–65.
- Marshall, M. G. and Jaggers, K. 2002. 'Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2002: Dataset Users' Manual. Maryland: University of Maryland.
- Melander, Erik. 2005. "Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 49(4): 695-714.
- Norris, P. 2009. *Democracy Time-Series Dataset*, release 3.0, January 2009.
<http://www.pippanorris.com>
- OECD. 2009. *The Gender, Institutions and Development Database*. Data downloaded from <http://stats.oecd.org> May 12 2009. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation And Development.
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M.E., Cheibub, J. A. and Fernando, L. 2000. "Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Material Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990". New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rajaratnam, J.K. et al. 2010. "Neonatal, postneonatal, childhood, and under-5 mortality for 187 countries, 1970–2010: a systematic analysis of progress towards Millennium Development Goal 4." *Lancet*, 375: 1988-2008.
- Reich, G. 2002. "Categorizing Political Regimes: New Data for Old Problems." *Democratization* 9: 1–24.
- Regan, P and Clark, D. 2010. The Institutions and Elections Project data collection.
<http://www2.binghamton.edu/political-science/institutions-and-elections-project.html>
- Roeder, P. G. 2001. Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization (ELF) Indices, 1961 and 1985.
<http://weber.ucsd.edu/~proeder/elf.htm>
- Rotberg, R. I. and Gisselquist, R. M. 2009. *Strengthening African Governance. Index of African Governance Results and Rankings. 2009*. The World Peace Foundation and the Program on Intrastate Conflict and Conflict Resolution, the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
http://www.worldpeacefoundation.org/2009Index_FinalBookv4_FINAL10.9.pdf
- Schemmel, Benjamin. 2004. Rulers. <http://www.rulers.org> 2004, 18 December.
- Statistical Abstract of the World* .1995. New York, NY: Gale Research, Inc.

Teorell, J. and Hadenius, A. 2005 "Determinants of Democratization: Taking Stock of the Large-N Evidence", mimeo., Department of Government, Uppsala University.

United Nations. 1995. *Demographic Yearbook*, New York, NY: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistical Office, United Nations.

UNDP 2004. Human Development Report 2004 : Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2010. Montreal. <http://www.uis.unesco.org>

United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). 2004. *World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)*. CD-ROM. Available on-line at: <http://sea.unep-wcmc.org/wdbpa/download/wdpa2004/index.html>. Cambridge, U.K

United Nations Statistics Division, Economic Statistics Branch. 2009. *National Accounts Statistics Database*. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama>

United Nations University. 2008. UNU-WIDER World Income Inequality Database, Version 2.0c, May 2008.

Vanhanen, T. 2000. "A New Dataset for Measuring Democracy, 1810-1998." *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(2): 252-65.

Vanhanen, T. 2003a. *Democratization: A Comparative Analysis of 170 Countries*. London: Routledge.

Vanhanen, T. 2003b. *Democratization and Power Resources 1850-2000* [computer file]. FSD1216, version 1.0 (2003-03-10). Tampere : Finnish Social Science Data Archive [distributor].

Vanhanen, T. 2005. *Measures of Democracy 1810-2004* [computer file]. FSD1289, version 2.0 (2005-08-17). Tampere: Finnish Social Science Data Archive [distributor].

Wallack, J., Gaviria, A., Panizza, U and Stein, E. 2003. "Political Particularism Around the World". *World Bank Economic Review*, 17 (1): 133-143.

World Bank 2006. *Doing Business 2007: How to Reform*. Washington DC: The World Bank Group

World Values Survey Association 2009. *World Values Survey 1981-2008 Official Aggregate v.20090901*. Aggregate File Producer: ASEP/JDS, Madrid. www.worldvaluessurvey.org.

Worldmark Encyclopedia of the Nations, 8th ed. 1995. Detroit: Gale Research

