THE QOG INSTITUTE

QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT

UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

The Quality of Government Dataset Codebook

April 6, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11

14

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. We have made a particular effort to compile the best available sources for measuring the following concepts (sources indicated within parentheses):

> ▪ Democracy (Cheibub, Gandhi & Vreeland; Freedom House; Polity, Vanhanen; World Bank Governance Indicators; Bertelsmann Transformation Index; Economist Intelligence Unit)
> ▪ Human Rights (Cingranelli & Richards; Freedom House; Gibney & Dalton; Economist Intelligence Unit)
> ▪ Security of Contract & Property Rights (Fraser Institute; Heritage Foundation; World Bank Governance Indicators; Bertelsmann Transformation Index)
> ▪ Quality of Bureaucracy (Evans & Rauch; ICRG; World Bank Governance Indicators; Freedom House; Global Integrity Report; Economist Intelligence Unit; Bertelsmann Transformation Index; the QoG Survey)
> ▪ Corruption (Transparency International; ICRG; World Bank Governance Indicators; Global Integrity Report; Economist Intelligence Unit; Bertelsmann Transformation Index; the QoG Survey)
> ▪ Electoral Systems (Gerring et al; Golder; IDEA; Persson & Tabellini; Database of Political Institutions; Johnson & Wallack)
> ▪ Party System Fractionalization (Database of Political Institutions; Golder; Henisz)
> ▪ Forms of Government/Presidentialism vs. Parliamentarism (Cheibub, Gandhi & Vreeland; Gerring et al; Persson & Tabellini; Database of Political Institutions)
> ▪ Federalism vs. Unitarism (Gerring et al; Persson & Tabellini; Database of Political Institutions)
> ▪ Ethno-Linguistic and/or Religious Fractionalization (Alesina et al.; Easterly & Levine; Fearon; Roeder)

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

$\overline{N}$: Mean number of countries per year

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

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

---

[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.

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)

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.

cname   Country Name

ccode	ccodealp	cname	ccode	ccodealp	cname
4	AFG	Afghanistan	140	CAF	Central African Republic
8	ALB	Albania	148	TCD	Chad
12	DZA	Algeria	152	CHL	Chile
20	AND	Andorra	156	CHN	China
24	AGO	Angola	170	COL	Colombia
28	ATG	Antigua and Barbuda	174	COM	Comoros
32	ARG	Argentina	178	COG	Congo
51	ARM	Armenia	180	COD	Congo, Democratic Republic
36	AUS	Australia	188	CRI	Costa Rica
40	AUT	Austria	384	CIV	Cote d'Ivoire
31	AZE	Azerbaijan	191	HRV	Croatia
44	BHS	Bahamas	192	CUB	Cuba
48	BHR	Bahrain	196	CYP	Cyprus
50	BGD	Bangladesh	200	CSK	Czechoslovakia
52	BRB	Barbados	203	CZE	Czech Republic
112	BLR	Belarus	208	DNK	Denmark
56	BEL	Belgium	262	DJI	Djibouti
84	BLZ	Belize	212	DMA	Dominica
204	BEN	Benin	214	DOM	Dominican Republic
64	BTN	Bhutan	218	ECU	Ecuador
68	BOL	Bolivia	818	EGY	Egypt
70	BIH	Bosnia and Herzegovina	222	SLV	El Salvador
72	BWA	Botswana	226	GNQ	Equatorial Guinea
76	BRA	Brazil	232	ERI	Eritrea
96	BRN	Brunei	233	EST	Estonia
100	BGR	Bulgaria	230	ETH	Ethiopia (-1992)
854	BFA	Burkina Faso	231	ETH	Ethiopia (1993-)
108	BDI	Burundi	242	FJI	Fiji
116	KHM	Cambodia	246	FIN	Finland
120	CMR	Cameroon	250	FRA	France
124	CAN	Canada	266	GAB	Gabon
132	CPV	Cape Verde	270	GMB	Gambia

268	GEO	Georgia	516	NAM	Namibia
276	DEU	Germany	520	NRU	Nauru
278	DDR	Germany, East	524	NPL	Nepal
280	DEU	Germany, West	528	NLD	Netherlands
288	GHA	Ghana	554	NZL	New Zealand
300	GRC	Greece	558	NIC	Nicaragua
308	GRD	Grenada	562	NER	Niger
320	GTM	Guatemala	566	NGA	Nigeria
324	GIN	Guinea	578	NOR	Norway
624	GNB	Guinea-Bissau	512	OMN	Oman
328	GUY	Guyana	997	PAK	Pakistan (-1971)
332	HTI	Haiti	586	PAK	Pakistan (1972-)
340	HND	Honduras	585	PLW	Palau
348	HUN	Hungary	591	PAN	Panama
352	ISL	Iceland	598	PNG	Papua New Guinea
356	IND	India	600	PRY	Paraguay
360	IDN	Indonesia	604	PER	Peru
364	IRN	Iran	608	PHL	Philippines
368	IRQ	Iraq	616	POL	Poland
372	IRL	Ireland	620	PRT	Portugal
376	ISR	Israel	634	QAT	Qatar
380	ITA	Italy	642	ROU	Romania
388	JAM	Jamaica	643	RUS	Russia
392	JPN	Japan	646	RWA	Rwanda
400	JOR	Jordan	882	WSM	Samoa
398	KAZ	Kazakhstan	674	SMR	San Marino
404	KEN	Kenya	678	STP	Sao Tome and Principe
296	KIR	Kiribati	682	SAU	Saudi Arabia
408	PRK	Korea, North	686	SEN	Senegal
410	KOR	Korea, South	688	SRB	Serbia
414	KWT	Kuwait	891	SCG	Serbia and Montenegro
417	KGZ	Kyrgyzstan	690	SYC	Seychelles
418	LAO	Laos	694	SLE	Sierra Leone
428	LVA	Latvia	702	SGP	Singapore
422	LBN	Lebanon	703	SVK	Slovakia
426	LSO	Lesotho	705	SVN	Slovenia
430	LBR	Liberia	90	SLB	Solomon Islands
434	LBY	Libya	706	SOM	Somalia
438	LIE	Liechtenstein	710	ZAF	South Africa
440	LTU	Lithuania	724	ESP	Spain
442	LUX	Luxembourg	144	LKA	Sri Lanka
807	MKD	Macedonia	659	KNA	St Kitts and Nevis
450	MDG	Madagascar	662	LCA	St Lucia
454	MWI	Malawi	670	VCT	St Vincent and the Grenadines
458	MYS	Malaysia	736	SDN	Sudan
462	MDV	Maldives	740	SUR	Suriname
466	MLI	Mali	748	SWZ	Swaziland
470	MLT	Malta	752	SWE	Sweden
584	MHL	Marshall Islands	756	CHE	Switzerland
478	MRT	Mauritania	760	SYR	Syria
480	MUS	Mauritius	158	TWN	Taiwan
484	MEX	Mexico	762	TJK	Tajikistan
583	FSM	Micronesia	834	TZA	Tanzania
498	MDA	Moldova	764	THA	Thailand
492	MCO	Monaco	994	XTI	Tibet
496	MNG	Mongolia	626	TLS	Timor-Leste
499	MNE	Montenegro	768	TGO	Togo
504	MAR	Morocco	776	TON	Tonga
508	MOZ	Mozambique	780	TTO	Trinidad and Tobago
104	MMR	Myanmar	788	TUN	Tunisia

792	TUR	Turkey	862	VEN	Venezuela
795	TKM	Turkmenistan	704	VNM	Vietnam
798	TUV	Tuvalu	998	VNM	Vietnam, North
800	UGA	Uganda	999	VDR	Vietnam, South
804	UKR	Ukraine	887	YEM	Yemen
784	ARE	United Arab Emirates	886	YEM	Yemen, North
826	GBR	United Kingdom	720	YMD	Yemen, South
840	USA	United States	890	YUG	Yugoslavia
858	URY	Uruguay	995	EAZ	Zanzibar
810	SUN	USSR	894	ZMB	Zambia
860	UZB	Uzbekistan	716	ZWE	Zimbabwe
548	VUT	Vanuatu			

ccodewb   **Country Code World Bank**

ccodecow   **Country Code Correlates of War**

year   **Year**

cname_year   **Country Name and Year**

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

Version Identifier

version   **Version of the Dataset**

WII (What It Is) Variables

Bertelsmann Transformation Index

(Cross-section: 2006, N: 119)

http://bti2006.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/

Democracy Status

bti_ds   Democracy Status

The score for Democracy Status is obtained by calculating the mean value of the ratings for the following variables: stateness, political participation, rule of law, stability of democratic institutions and political and social integration.

Note: There also exists a Bertelsmann "Status Index", which is the mean of Democracy Status (bti_ds) and Market Economy Status (bti_mes, listed below under "How To Get It"), which we have not included in the data.

bti_st   Stateness

The variable measures to what extent the state's monopoly on the use of force covers the entire territory; to what extent all relevant groups in society agree about citizenship and accept the nation-state as legitimate; to what extent the state's legitimacy and its legal order is defined without inference by religious dogmas; and to what extent basic administrative structures exist.

bti_pp   Political Participation

The variable examines if rulers are determined by general, free and fair elections; if democratically elected leaders have the effective power to govern or if there are veto powers and political enclaves; if independent political and civic groups can associate freely; and to what extent citizens, organizations and the mass media can express opinions freely.

bt _rol   Rule of Law

The variable measures to what extent a working separation of powers exists; to what extent an independent judiciary exists, to what extent there are legal or political penalties for officeholders who abuse their positions; and to what extent civil liberties are guaranteed and protected.

bti_sdi   Stability of Democratic Institutions

The variable measures to what extent the democratic institutions, including the administrative and judicial systems, are capable of performing, and the extent to which the democratic institutions are accepted or supported by the relevant actors.

bti_psi   Political and Social Integration

The variable examines to what extent there is a stable, moderate and socially rooted party system to articulate and aggregate societal interests; to what extent there is a network of cooperative associations or interest groups to mediate between society and the political system; how strong citizen consent is to democratic norms and

procedures; and to what extent social self-organization and the construction of social capital have advanced.

Management Index

bti_mi   Management Index

The Management Index is based on Level of Difficulty (bti_lod) and Management Performance (bti_mp), as defined below. The Level of Difficulty criterion accounts for the fact that the quality transformation management is shaped by each state's unique structural conditions. The more adverse a state's structural conditions and the more limited its available resources, the higher the good governance is scored in the Management Index.

bti_lod   Level of Difficulty

The variable measures to what extent structural difficulties constrain the political leadership's governance capacity; to what extent there are traditions of civil society; how serious ethnic, religious and social conflicts are; per capita GNI PPP (2005); UN Education Index as a measure of the educational level; and Stateness and Rule of Law (average of BTI variables above).

bti_mp   Management Performance

The score for Management Performance is obtained by calculating the mean value of the ratings for the following criteria: Steering Capability, Resource Efficiency, Consensus-Building and International Cooperation.

bti_sc   Steering Capability

The variable evaluates to what extent the political leadership sets and maintains strategic priorities; how effective the government is in implementing reform policy; how flexible and innovative the political leadership is; and if the political leadership learns from past errors.

bti_re   Resource Efficiency

The variable measures to what extent the government makes efficient use of available economic and human resources; to what extent the government can coordinate conflicting objectives into a coherent policy; and to what extent government successfully contains corruption.

bti_cb   Consensus-Building

The variable measures to what extent the major political actors agree on a market economy and democracy as strategic long-term aims; to what extent the reformers can exclude or co-opt anti-democratic veto actors; to what extent the political leadership can manage political cleavages so that they do not escalate into irreconcilable conflicts; to what extent the political leadership enables the participation of civil society in the political process; and to what extent the political leadership can bring about reconciliation between the victims and perpetrators of past injustices.

bti_ic   International Cooperation

The variable evaluates to what extent the political leadership uses the support of international partners to improve its domestic reform policies; to what extent the government acts as a credible and reliable partner in its relations with the international

community; and to what extent the political leadership is willing to cooperate with neighboring countries in regional and international organizations

Botero, Djankov, La Porta, López-de-Silanes & Shleifer – Regulation of Labor

(Cross-section: covers the 1997-2002 period, N: 84)
http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/rafael.laporta/working_papers/Regulation%20of%20Labor-All/Regulation%20of%20Labor.xls
(Botero et al 2004)

Unless otherwise specified, higher values indicate higher worker protection. All dummy variables are equal to one or zero. All normalized variables lie between 0 and 1, where 0 (1) is the minimum (maximum) actual value in the sample of countries.

Employment Laws

bdlls_eli   Employment Laws Index
Measures the protection of labor and employment laws as the average of the four variables following below.

bdlls_aeci   Alternative Employment Contracts Index
Measures the existence and cost of alternatives to the standard employment contract, computed as the average of: (1) a dummy variable equal to one if part-time workers enjoy the mandatory benefits of full-time workers, (2) a dummy variable equal to one if terminating part-time workers is at least as costly as terminating full time workers, (3) a dummy variable equal to one if fixed-term contracts are only allowed for fixed-term tasks, and (4) the normalized maximum duration of fixed-term contracts.

bdlls_cihw   Cost of Increasing Hour Worked
Measures the cost of increasing the number of hours worked. Botero et al. first calculate the "maximum number of hours of work in a year before overtime" per year in each country (excluding overtime, vacations, holidays, etc.). Normal hours range from 1,758 in Denmark to 2,418 in Kenya. Then Botero et al. assume that firms need to increase the hours worked by their employees from 1,758 to 2,418 hours during one year. A firm first increases the number of hours worked until it reaches the country's maximum normal hours of work, and then uses overtime. If existing employees are not allowed to increase the hours worked to 2,418 hours in a year, perhaps because overtime is capped, Botero et al. assume that the firm doubles its workforce and each worker is paid 1,758 hours, doubling the wage bill of the firm. The cost of increasing hours worked is computed as the ratio of the final wage bill to the initial one.

bdlls_cofw   Cost of Firing Workers
Measures the cost of firing 20 percent of the firm's workers (10% are fired for redundancy and 10% without cause). The cost of firing a worker is calculated as the sum of the notice period, severance pay, and any mandatory penalties established by law or mandatory collective agreements for a worker with three years of tenure with the firm. If dismissal is illegal, Botero et al. set the cost of firing equal to the annual wage. The new wage bill incorporates the normal wage of the remaining workers and

the cost of firing workers. The cost of firing workers is computed as the ratio of the new wage bill to the old one.

bdlls_dpi   Dismissal Procedures Index

Measures worker protection granted by law or mandatory collective agreements against dismissal. It is the average of the following seven dummy variables which equal one: (1) if the employer must notify a third party before dismissing more than one worker, (2) if the employer needs the approval of a third party prior to dismissing more than one worker, (3) if the employer must notify a third party before dismissing one redundant worker, (4) if the employer needs the approval of a third party to dismiss one redundant worker, (5) if the employer must provide relocation or retraining alternatives for redundant employees prior to dismissal, (6) if there are priority rules applying to dismissal or lay-offs, and (7) if there are priority rules applying to re-employment.

Collective Relations Laws

bdlls_crli   Collective Relations Laws Index

Measures the protection of collective relations laws as the average of the two variables following below.

bdlls_lupi   Labor Union Power Index

Measures the statutory protection and power of unions as the average of the following seven dummy variables which equal one: (1) if employees have the right to unionize; (2) if employees have the right to collective bargaining; (3) if employees have the legal duty to bargain with unions; (4) if collective contracts are extended to third parties by law; (5) if the law allows closed shops; (6) if workers, or unions, or both have a right to appoint members to the Boards of Directors; and (7) if workers' councils are mandated by law.

bdlls_cdi   Collective Disputes Index

Measures the protection of workers during collective disputes as the average of the following eight variables, (1) if wildcat, political and sympathy/solidarity/secondary strikes are legal (legal strikes), (2) if employer lockouts are illegal, (3) if workers have the right to industrial action, (4) if there is no mandatory waiting period or notification requirement before strikes can occur, (5) if striking is legal even if there is a collective agreement in force, (6) if laws do not mandate conciliation procedures before a strike, (7) if third-party arbitration during a labor dispute is mandated by law, and (8) if it is illegal to fire or replace striking workers.

Social Security Laws

bdlls_ssli   Social Security Laws Index

Measures social security benefits as the average of the three variables following below.

bdlls_oadbi   Old Age, Disability and Death Benefit Index

Measures the level of old age, disability and death benefits as the average of the following four normalized variables: (1) the difference between retirement age and life expectancy at birth, (2) the number of months of contributions or employment

required for normal retirement by law, (3) the percentage of the worker's monthly salary deducted by law to cover old-age, disability, and death benefits, and (4) the percentage of the net pre-retirement salary covered by the net old-age cash-benefit pension.

bdlls_shbi   Sickness and Health Benefits Index

Measures the level of sickness and health benefits as the average of the following four normalized variables: (1) the number of months of contributions or employment required to qualify for sickness benefits by law, (2) the percentage of the worker's monthly salary deducted by law to cover sickness and health benefits, (3) the waiting period for sickness benefits, and (4) the percentage of the net salary covered by the net sickness cash benefit for a two-month sickness spell.

bdlls_ubi   Unemployment Benefits Index

Measures the level of unemployment benefits as the average of the following four normalized variables: (1) the number of months of contributions or employment required to qualify for unemployment benefits by law, (2) the percentage of the worker's monthly salary deducted by law to cover unemployment benefits, (3) the waiting period for unemployment benefits, and (4) the percentage of the net salary covered by the net unemployment benefits in case of a one-year unemployment spell.

Civil Rights

bdlls_cri   Civil Rights Index

Measures the degree of protection of vulnerable groups against employment discrimination as the average of the five variables following below.

bdlls_drace   Labor Discrimination on Grounds of Race

Equals 1 if there is an affirmative statement prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of race, color or ethnicity in: (1) the constitution; (2) the labor code; (3) a law dealing specifically with racial equality. The variable equals zero otherwise. A general statement regarding the equality of citizens is not considered an affirmative statement.

bdlls_dsex   Labor Discrimination on Grounds of Sex

Equals 1 if there is an affirmative statement prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sex in: (1) the constitution; (2) the labor code; (3) a law dealing specifically with the equality of the sexes. The variable equals zero otherwise. We consider an affirmative statement as one which expresses the equality of man and woman or the prohibition of discrimination based on sex or gender. A general statement regarding the equality of citizens is not considered an affirmative statement.

bdlls_stoml   Statutory Duration of Maternity Leave

Measures the length of the statutory duration of maternity leave for normal delivery/birth of a normal child with 100% of earnings. The variable is normalized from 0 to 1, where higher values mean longer maternity leave (higher protection). Equals zero if maternity leave is unpaid. If payment for maternity leave is less than 100% of previous wages, the time is reduced proportionally. The highest observation in our sample is 12 months and the lowest observation is 0.

bdlls_mwa   Minimum Working Age

Measures the age at which a child can be employed in an apprenticeship or in a full-time, non-farm, non-hazardous, non-night time job outside of the family business without requiring the permission of a public entity. The variable is normalized from 0 to 1, where higher values mean higher protection. The highest value in our sample is 18 years and the lowest is 12 years.

bdlls_mmw   Mandatory Minimum Wage

Equals one if: (1) there is a mandatory minimum wage defined by statute; or (2) there is a minimum wage established by mandatory (administratively extended) collective agreement, which is legally binding for most sectors of the economy. We ignore variations in the minimum wage laws stemming from: (1) reduced or sub minimum rates for youth, apprentices, students and disabled employees; (2) adjustments for regional cost of living; (3) exemptions for public employees and those serving in the armed forces; (4) the experience and marital status of the employee and; (5) specific exemptions for certain groups.

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, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 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).

bdm_w   Winning Coalition Size

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 9643, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 179, $\overline{T}$: 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).

bdm_w_s Winning Coalition Size Relative to Selectorate Size

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 7247, N: 196, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 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).

Cheibub, Gandhi & Vreeland

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 9115, N: 202, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 45)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)
https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/cheibub/www/DD_page.html
(Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland 2009)

chga_demo Democracy

Coded 1 if democracy, 0 otherwise. A regime is considered a democracy if the executive and the legislature is directly or indirectly elected by popular vote, multiple parties are allowed, there is de facto existence of multiple parties outside of regime front, there are multiple parties within the legislature, and there has been no consolidation of incumbent advantage (e.g. unconstitutional closing of the lower house or extension of incumbent's term by postponing of subsequent elections). Transition years are coded as the regime that emerges in that year.

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, $\overline{N}$: 156, $\overline{T}$: 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

ciri_disap Disappearance

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4353, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Disappearances:
(0) Have occurred frequently
(1) Have occurred occasionally
(2) Have not occurred

ciri_empinx_old Empowerment Rights Index (Old)

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 3970, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 153, $\overline{T}$: 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).

ciri_empinx_new   Empowerment Rights Index (New)

(Time-series: 2007-2008, n: 384, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 192, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 2007, N: 192)

This is an additive index constructed from the Foreign Movement, Domestic Movement, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Assembly & Association, Workers' Rights, Electoral Self-Determination, and Freedom of Religion indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these seven rights) to 14 (full government respect for these seven rights).

ciri_kill   Extrajudicial Killing

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4351, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 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

ciri_move_old   Freedom of Movement (Old)

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 3983, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 153, $\overline{T}$: 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).

ciri_formov   Freedom of Foreign Movement

(Time-series: 2007-2008, n: 384, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 192, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 2007, N: 192)

Citizens' freedom to leave and return to their country is:
(0)   Severely restricted

(1)   Somewhat restricted
(2)   Unrestricted

ciri_dommov Freedom of Domestic Movement

(Time-series: 2006-2008, n: 385, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 128, $\overline{T}$: 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

ciri_physint   Physical Integrity Rights Index

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4336, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 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).

ciri_elecsd   Electoral Self-Determination

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4366, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 156, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

This variable indicates to what extent citizens enjoy freedom of political choice and the legal right and ability in practice to change the laws and officials that govern them through free and fair elections. This right is sometimes known as the right to self-determination.

A score of 0 indicates that the right to self-determination through free and fair elections did not exist in law or practice during the year in question. A score of 1 indicates that while citizens had the legal right to self-determination, there were some limitations to the fulfillment of this right in practice. Therefore, in states receiving a 1, political participation was only moderately free and open. A score of 2 indicates that political participation was very free and open during the year in question and citizens had the right to self-determination through free and fair elections in both law and practice.

ciri_polpris   Political Imprisonment

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4359, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 156, $\overline{T}$: 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

ciri_relfre_old   Freedom of Religion (Old)

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 3982, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 153, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

There are restrictions on some religious practices by the government:
(0)   Yes
(1)   No

Note: Starting with the 2007 coding, this variable was retired and replaced with ciri_relfre_new (see below).

ciri_relfre_new   Freedom of Religion (New)

(Time-series: 2007-2008, n: 384, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 192, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 2007, N: 192)

Government restrictions on religious practices are:
(0)   Severe and widespread
(1)   Moderate
(2)   Practically absent

ciri_speech   Freedom of Speech

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4366, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 156, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Government censorship and/or ownership of the media (including radio, TV, Internet, and domestic news agencies) is:
(0)   Complete
(1)   Some
(2)   None

ciri_tort   Torture

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

Torture is:
(0)   Practiced frequently
(1)   Practiced occasionally
(2)   Have not occurred

ciri_wecon   Women's Economic Rights

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4297, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 153, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

In measuring women's economic rights we are primarily interested in two things: one, the extensiveness of flaws pertaining to women's economic rights; and two, *government practices* towards women or how effectively the government enforces the laws.

Regarding the economic equality of women:

(0)   There are no economic rights for women under law and systematic discrimination based on sex may be built into the law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.

(1)   There are some economic rights for women under law. However, in practice, the government DOES NOT enforce the laws effectively or enforcement of laws is weak. The government tolerates a *moderate level* of discrimination against women.

(2)   There are some economic rights for women under law. In practice, the government DOES enforce these laws effectively. However, the government still tolerates a *low level* of discrimination against women.

(3)   All or nearly all of women's economic rights are guaranteed by law. In practice, the government fully and vigorously enforces these laws. The government tolerates none or almost no discrimination against women.

ciri_wopol   Women's Political Rights

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4348, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Regarding the political equality of women:

(0)   None of women's political rights are guaranteed by law. There are laws that completely restrict the participation of women in the political process.

(1)   Political equality is guaranteed by law. However, there are significant limitations in practice. Women hold *less than* five percent of seats in the national legislature and in other high-ranking government positions.

(2)   Political equality is guaranteed by law. Women hold *more than* five percent but *less than* thirty percent of seats in the national legislature and/or in other high-ranking government positions.

(3)   Political equality is guaranteed by law and in practice. Women hold *more than* thirty percent of seats in the national legislature and/or in other high-ranking government positions.

ciri_worker   Workers Rights

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 4365, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 156, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Worker's rights are:
(0)   Severely restricted
(1)   Somewhat restricted
(2)   Fully protected

ciri_wosoc   Women's Social Rights

(Time-series: 1981-2007, n: 3654, N: 199, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002-2007 (varies by country), N: 193)

In measuring women's social rights we are primarily interested in two things: one, the extensiveness of laws pertaining to women's social rights; and two, *government practices* towards women or how effectively the government enforces the law.

Regarding the social equality of women:
(0)   There are no social rights for women under law and systematic discrimination based on sex may be built into the law. The government tolerates a high level of discrimination against women.
(1)   There are some social rights for women under law. However, in practice, the government DOES NOT enforce the laws effectively or enforcement of laws is weak. The government tolerates a *moderate level* of discrimination against women.
(2)   There are some social rights for women under law. In practice, the government DOES enforce these laws effectively. However, the government still tolerates a *low level* of discrimination against women.
(3)   All or nearly all of women's social rights are guaranteed by law. In practice, the government fully and vigorously enforces these laws. The government tolerates none or almost no discrimination against women.

ciri_injud   Independence of the Judiciary

(Time-series: 2007-2008, n: 384, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 192, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 2007, N: 192)

This variable indicates the extent to which the judiciary is independent of control from other sources, such as another branch of the government or the military.

(0)   Not independent
(1)   Partially independent
(2)   Generally independent

Coppedge

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 189)
http://www.nd.edu/~mcoppedg/crd/datacrd.htm

copp_poly   Polyarchy Scale

The Polyarchy scale was documented in Michael Coppedge and Wolfgang Reinicke, "Measuring Polyarchy," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 25:1 (Spring 1990): 51-72; and used in Manus Midlarsky, ed., *Inequality, Democracy, and Economic Development*, pp. 177-201 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997). This has now been updated for 2000. The scale varies between 0 and 10, with the lowest score representing the most democratic level.

Coppedge, Alvarez & Maldonado

(Time-series: 1950-2000, n: 7534, N: 203, $\overline{N}$: 148, $\overline{T}$: 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 measures 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.

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.

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.

Djankov, La Porta, López-de-Silanes & Shleifer – Regulation of Entry

(Cross-section: 1999, N: 84)
http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/shleifer/Data/registration_new.dta
(Djankov et al 2002)

dlls_proc   Number of Procedures

The number of different procedures that a start-up firm has to comply with in order to obtain a legal status, i.e. to start operating as a legal entity.

dlls_time   Time

The time it takes to obtain legal status to operate a firm, in business days. A week has five business days and a month has twenty two.

dlls_cost   Cost

(Cross-section: 1999, N: 83)

The cost to obtain legal status to operate a firm as a share of per capita GDP in 1999. Includes all identifiable official expenses (fees, costs of procedures and forms, photocopies, fiscal stamps, legal and notary charges, etc). The company is assumed to have a start-up capital of ten times per capita GDP in 1999.

Djankov, La Porta, López-de-Silanes & Shleifer – Courts

(Cross-section: the year vary, N: 101)
http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/shleifer/Data/courts_dataset_july06.xls
(Djankov et al 2003)

dlls1_fie   Formalism Index (Eviction)

dlls1_fic   Formalism Index (Check)

The index measures substantive and procedural statutory intervention in two forms of judicial cases at lower-level civil trial courts: the **eviction** of a residential tenant for nonpayment of rent, and the collection of a **check** returned for nonpayment. The index is formed by adding up separate indices measuring: (1) whether the resolution of the case relies on the work of professional judges and attorneys, as opposed to other types of adjudicators and lay people; (2) the number of stages carried out mostly in written (as opposed to oral) form over the total number of applicable stages; (3) the level of legal justification (use of legal language) required in the process, (4) the level of statutory control or intervention of the administration, admissibility, evaluation, and recording of evidence; (5) the level of control or intervention of the appellate (superior) court's review of the first-instance judgment; (6) the formalities required to engage someone in the procedure or to hold him/her accountable of the judgment; and (7) the normalized number of independent procedural actions, i.e. steps of the procedure, mandated by law or court regulation, that demands interaction between the parties or between them and the judge or court officer. The index ranges from 0 to 7, where 7 means a higher level of control or intervention in the judicial process.

dlls1_tde   Total Duration (Eviction)

dlls1_tdc   Total Duration (Check)

The total estimated duration in calendar days of the procedure under the factual and procedural assumptions provided. The index equals the estimated duration, in calendar days, between the moment the plaintiff files the complaint until the moment the landlord repossesses the property (for the **eviction** case) or the creditor obtains payment (for the **check** collection case).

Economist Intelligence Unit – Index of Democracy

(Cross-section: 2006, N: 165)
http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_INDEX_2007_v3.pdf
(Kekic 2007)

eiu_iod   Index of Democracy

The index of democracy is based on the ratings for 60 indicators grouped into the five following categories. Each category has a rating on a 0 to 10 scale, and the overall index of democracy is the simple average of these variables:

eiu_cl   Civil Liberties

Civil liberties include freedom of speech, expression and the press; freedom of religion; freedom of assembly and association; and the right to due judicial process.

eiu_dpc   Democratic Political Culture

The Democratic Political Culture index measures the extent to which there is a societal consensus supporting democratic principles.

eiu_epp   Electoral Process and Pluralism

This category is based on indicators relating to the condition of having free and fair competitive elections, and satisfying related aspects of political freedom.

eiu_fog   Functioning of Government

The Functioning of Government category is based on indicators relating to e.g. the extent to which control over government is exercised by elected representatives, the capability of the civil service, and the pervasiveness of corruption.

eiu_pp   Political Participation

The Political Participation index measures among other things the adult literacy rate, the amount of women in parliament, and the extent to which citizens freely choose to elect representatives and join political parties.

Evans & Rauch

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 34)
(Cross-section: Questions cover the 1970-1990 period, N: 34)
http://weber.ucsd.edu/~jrauch/research_bureaucracy.html
(Rauch and Evans 2000)

er_career   Career Opportunities

The respondents were asked to choose 'the four most important agencies in the central state bureaucracy in order of their power to shape overall economic policy'.

"Career Opportunities" is an equal-weight index, ranging from 0 to 1, of the following five questions:

- Roughly how many of the top levels in these agencies are political appointees (e.g. appointed by the President or Chief Executive)?
("none", "just agency chiefs", "agency chiefs and vice-chiefs", "all of top 2 or 3 levels").

- Of political appointees to these positions, what proportion is likely to already be members of the higher civil service?
("less than 30%", "30–70%", "more than 70%")

- Of those promoted to the top 2 or 3 levels in these agencies (whether or not they are political appointees), what proportion come from within the agency itself or its associated ministry(ies) if the agency is not itself a ministry?
("less than 50%", "50–70%", "70–90%", "over 90%")

- What is roughly the modal number of years spent by a typical higher level official in one of these agencies during his career?
("1–5 years", "5–10 years", "10–20 years", "entire career")

- What prospects for promotion can someone who enters one of these agencies through a higher civil service examination early in his / her career reasonably expect? Assuming that there are at least a half dozen steps or levels between an entry-level position and the head of the agency, how would you characterize the possibilities for moving up in the agency? (if respondent circled 'if performance is superior, moving up several levels to the level just below political appointees is not an unreasonable expectation' or 'in at least a few cases, could expect to move up several levels within the civil service and then move up to the very top of the agency on the basis of political appointments' and not 'in most cases, will move up one or two levels but no more' or 'in most cases, will move up three or four levels, but unlikely to reach the level just below political appointees').

er_salary   Bureaucratic Compensation

Bureaucratic Compensation concerns the change of bureaucratic compensation relative to the private sector. It is an equal-weight index of the following two questions:

- How would you estimate the salaries (and perquisites, not including bribes or other extralegal sources of income) of higher officials in these agencies relative to those of private sector managers with roughly comparable training and responsibilities?
("less than 50%", "50–80%", "80–90%", "Comparable", "Higher")

- Over the period in question (roughly 1970–1990) what was the movement of legal income in these agencies relative to salaries in the private sector?
("declined dramatically", "declined slightly", "maintained the same position",
"improved their position").

er_merit   Meritocratic Recruitment

Meritocratic Recruitment addresses the extent to which recruitment is meritocratic at the entry level. It is an equal-weight index of two questions, where each question and the index itself has been normalized to lie in the range 0–1.

- Approximately what proportion of the higher officials in these agencies enters the civil service via a formal examination system?
("less than 30%", "30–60%", "60–90%," "more than 90%")

- Of those that do *not* enter via examinations, what proportion has university or postgraduate degrees?
("less than 30%", "30–60%", "60–90%", "more than 90%").

Feld & Voigt – Judicial Independence

(Feld and Voigt 2003)

The Feld and Voigt indicators on judicial independence focus exclusively on the highest court in each country. The variables can take on values between 0 and 1, where greater values imply a higher degree of judicial independence

fv_jidj   Judicial Independence (*de jure*)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 69)

The *de jure* indicator of judicial independence is solely based on the legal foundations as found in legal documents. The variable is based on up to 12 sub-variables, and fv_jidj is the mean value of these. The sub-categories include, e.g., an evaluation of the appointment procedure of judges; judicial tenure; if terms are renewable; the salary of the judges; and the accessibility of the court and its ability to initiate proceedings.

fv_jidf   Judicial Independence (*de facto*)

(Cross-section: 1960-2002, N: 60)

The *de facto* indicator of judicial independence is based on a long period, between 1960 and 2002. This means it will be very sticky compared to the *de jure* indicator. The variable is the mean value of 8 sub-variables, including: the effective average term length of the judges; how many times the number of judges has been changed since 1960; whether the income of judges have at least remained constant in real terms; whether there are frequent changes to the legal foundations of the highest court; and whether the implementation of the decisions of the highest court depend on some action of other branches of government and this cooperation is not granted.

Freedom House

http://www.freedomhouse.org

Freedom in the World

(Time-series: 1972-2009, n: 6518, N: 204, $\overline{N}$: 172, $\overline{T}$: 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.

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).

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).

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".

Freedom in the World Sub-Categories: Civil Liberties

(Time-series: 2005-2008, n: 771, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 193, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 2005-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

fh_feb   Freedom of Expression and Belief

The variable measures the freedom and independence of the media and other cultural expressions; the freedom of religious groups to practice their faith and express themselves; the academic freedom and freedom from extensive political indoctrination in the educational system; and the ability of the people to engage in private (political) discussions without fear of harassment or arrest by the authorities. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

fh_aor   Associational and Organizational Rights

The variable evaluates the freedom of assembly, demonstrations and open public discussion; the freedom for nongovernmental organization; and the freedom for trade unions, peasant organizations and other professional and private organizations. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

fh_rol   Rule of Law

The variable measures the independence of the judiciary; the extent to which rule of law prevails in civil and criminal matters; the existence of direct civil control over the police; the protection from political terror, unjustified imprisonment, exile and torture; absence of war and insurgencies; and the extent to which laws, policies and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

fh_pair   Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights

The variable evaluates the extent of state control over travel, choice of residence, employment or institution of higher education; the right of citizens to own property and establish private businesses; the private business' freedom from unduly influence by government officials, security forces, political parties or organized crime; gender equality, freedom of choice of marriage partners and size of family; equality of opportunity and absence of economic exploitation. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

Freedom in the World Sub-Categories: Political Rights

(Time-series: 2005-2008, n: 771, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 193, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 2005-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

fh_ep   Electoral Process

The variable measures to what extent the national legislative representatives and the national chief authority are elected through free and fair elections. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 12 (best).

fh_ppp   Political Pluralism and Participation

This variable encompasses an examination of the right of the people to freely organize in political parties; the existence of an opposition with a realistic possibility to increase its support; the ability of the people to make political choices free from domination by the military, totalitarian parties or other powerful groups; and the existence of full political rights for all minorities. Countries are graded between 0 (worst) and 16 (best).

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).

Freedom of the Press

fh_press   Freedom of the Press

(Time-series: 1993-2009, n: 3211, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 189, $\overline{T}$: 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).

fh_law   Laws and Regulations that Influence Media Content

(Time-series: 1993-2007, n: 2823, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 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.

fh_pol   Political Pressures and Controls on Media Content
(Time-series: 1993-2007, n: 2826, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

The variable evaluates the degree of political control over the content of news media. Issues examined include the editorial independence of both state-owned and privately owned media; access to information and sources; official censorship and self-censorship; the vibrancy of the media; the ability of both foreign and local reporters to cover the news freely and without harassment; and the intimidation of journalists by the state or other actors, including arbitrary detention and imprisonment, violent assaults, and other threats. In 1993-1995 the scale varied from 0-20, in 1996-2000 from 0-30, and from 2001 and onwards from 0-40. 0 indicates *more* freedom.

fh_econ   Economic Influences over Media Content
(Time-series: 1993-2007, n: 2826, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 194)

The third sub-category examines the economic environment for the media. This includes the structure of media ownership; transparency and concentration of ownership; the costs of establishing media as well as of production and distribution; the selective withholding of advertising or subsidies by the state or other actors; the impact of corruption and bribery on content; and the extent to which the economic situation in a country impacts the development of the media. In 1993-1995 the scale varied from 0-20, from 1996 and onwards from 0-30. 0 indicates *more* freedom.

fh_repres   Repressive Actions
(Time-series: 1993-2000, n: 1487, N: 186, $\overline{N}$: 186, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 186)

This variable reflects actual press-freedom violations (killing of journalists, physical violence against journalists or facilities, censorship, self-censorship, harassment, expulsions, etc). In 1993-1995 the scale varied from 0-40, in 1996-2000 from 0-10. Since 2001 the Freedom House includes such violations within the respective fh_pol and fh_econ categories as cases of actual political or economic pressure on the content of information. 0 indicates *more* freedom.

Freedom House/Polity

fh_polity2   Democracy (Freedom House/Polity)

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

fh_ipolity2   Democracy (Freedom House/Imputed Polity)

(Time-series: 1972-2009, n: 6518, N: 204, $\overline{N}$: 172, $\overline{T}$: 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.

Gibney, Cornett & Wood – Political Terror Scale

http://www.politicalterrorscale.org
(Gibney, Cornett and Wood 2010; Gibney and Dalton 1996)

gd_ptsa   Political Terror Scale – Amnesty International

(Time-series: 1976-2008, n: 4328, N: 184, $\overline{N}$: 131, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 171)

gd_ptss   Political Terror Scale – US State Department

(Time-series: 1976-2008, n: 5241, N: 186, $\overline{N}$: 159, $\overline{T}$: 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, forpolitical 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.

Global Integrity Report

(Cross-section: June 2006 to June 2007, N: 48)
http://www.globalintegrity.org
(Global Integrity 2007)

gir_gii   Global Integrity Index

The Global Integrity Index assesses the existence, effectiveness, and citizen access to key anti-corruption mechanisms at the national level in a country. It does not measure corruption per se or perceptions of corruption. Nor does it measure governance "outputs". Instead, the index quantitatively assesses the opposite of corruption, that is, the access that citizens and businesses have to a country's government, their ability to monitor its behavior, and their ability to seek redress and advocate for improved governance. In-country teams of social scientists and journalists report on the *de jure* as well as *de facto* reality of corruption and anticorruption mechanisms.

The index grades countries on a 0 to 100 scale, with 0 being the worst score and 100 the best. The overall index is the average of the following six variables (which in turn are built on more than 300 indicators):

gir_csmai   Civil Society, Media, Access to Information

This category examines civil society organizations working on anti-corruption issues, the media's effectiveness in reporting on corruption (including licensing requirements), and public access to information.

gir_e   Elections

This category assesses voting and elections integrity as well as regulations governing the financing of political parties and candidates.

gir_ga   Government Accountability

This category explores the existence and effectiveness of conflicts of interest regulations, "cooling off" periods for former government officials, and asset disclosure requirements in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Budget transparency is also assessed.

gir_acs   Administration and Civil Service

This category examines administration and civil service regulations, whistleblower protections, and transparency around government procurement and privatization.

gir_or   Oversight and Regulation

This category assesses the effectiveness of the national ombudsman (or equivalent mechanism), supreme audit institution, taxes and customs agencies, transparency surrounding state-owned enterprises, and business licensing requirements.

gir_acrl   Anti-Corruption and Rule of Law

This category examines a country's anti-corruption laws, the country's anti-corruption agency (or equivalent mechanism), citizen access to justice, and law enforcement accountability.

IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI)

(Cross-section: 2005, N: 76)
http://go.worldbank.org/FHNU4A23U0

The World Bank's IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI) is based on the results of the annual Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) exercise that covers the IDA eligible countries. The criteria are focused on balancing the capture of the key factors that foster growth and poverty reduction, with the need to avoid undue burden on the assessment process. The IDA Resource Allocation Index measures the quality of a country's present policy and institutional framework. "Quality" refers to how conducive that framework is to fostering poverty reduction, sustainable growth, and the effective use of development assistance. The 16 criteria to be assessed are grouped into four clusters: Economic Management (3 criteria), Structural Policies (3 criteria), Policies for Social Inclusion/Equity (5 criteria), and Public Sector Management and Institutions (5 criteria) (see below). For each criterion, countries are rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high). A 1 rating corresponds to a very weak performance, and a 6 rating to a very strong performance. Intermediate scores of 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5 and 5.5 may also be given (this is also known as Country Policy and Institutional Assessment Index, CPIA).

(Not all IRAI variables fit well under the "What It Is" section, but since they all form an index they are kept together.)

irai_index   IDA Resource Allocation Index

IRAI is calculated as the mean of the score of four clusters. The index ranges between 1 (lowest) and 6 (highest).

Economic Management

irai_mm   Macroeconomic Management

This criterion assesses the quality of the monetary/exchange rate and aggregate demand policy framework. A high quality policy framework is one that is favorable to sustained medium-term economic growth. Critical components are: a monetary/exchange rate policy with clearly defined price stability objectives; aggregate demand policies that focus on maintaining short and medium-term external balance (under the current and foreseeable external environment); and avoid crowding out private investment. Fiscal issues, including sustainability, are covered in *cpia_fp*, and debt issues are covered in *cpia_dp*.

irai_fp   Fiscal Policy

This criterion assesses the short- and medium-term sustainability of fiscal policy (taking into account monetary and exchange rate policy and the sustainability of the public debt) and its impact on growth. Fiscal policy is not sustainable if it results in a continuous increase in the debt to GDP ratio and/or creates financing needs that cannot be adequately met by the supply of funds available to the public sector. This criterion covers the extent to which: (a) the primary balance is managed to ensure sustainability of the public finances; (b) public expenditure/revenue can be adjusted to absorb shocks if necessary; and (c) the provision of public goods, including infrastructure, is consistent with medium-term growth. Sustainability is defined inclusive of off-budget government spending items and contingent liabilities. The impact of fiscal policy on economic growth depends on the marginal productivity of government spending and on the distortions introduced by taxes collected to finance this spending.

irai_dp   Debt Policy

This criterion assesses whether the debt management strategy is conducive to minimize budgetary risks and ensure long-term debt sustainability. The criterion evaluates the extent to which external and domestic debts are contracted with a view to achieving/maintaining debt sustainability, and the degree of co-ordination between debt management and other macroeconomic policies. This criterion covers the adequacy of the debt recording systems, the timelines of the public debt data, and the effectiveness of the debt management unit.

Structural Policies

irai_t   Trade

This criterion assesses how the policy framework fosters trade in goods. Two areas are covered: (a) trade regime restrictiveness focusing on the height of tariffs barriers, the extent to which non-tariff barriers (NTBs) are used, and the transparency and predictability of the trade regime; and (b) customs and trade facilitation, including the extent to which the customs service is free of corruption, relies on risk management, processes duty collections and refunds promptly, and operates transparently. The overall score is a weighted average of the scores for the two components: (a) trade restrictiveness (0.75) and (b) customs/trade facilitation (0.25).

irai_fs   Financial Sector

This criterion assesses the structure of the financial sector and the policies and regulations that affect it. Three dimensions are covered; (a) financial stability; (b) the sector's efficiency, depth, and resource mobilization strength; and (c) access to financial services. These are areas that are fundamental to support successful and sustainable reforms and development. The first dimension assesses the sector's vulnerability to shocks, the banking system's soundness, and the adequacy of relevant institutional elements, such as the degree of adherence to the Basel Core Principles and the quality of risk management and supervision. The second dimension assesses efficiency, the degree of competition, and the ownership structure of the financial system, as well as its depth and resource mobilization strength. The third dimension covers institutional factors, (such as the adequacy of payment and credit reporting systems) the regulatory framework affecting financial transactions (including

collateral and bankruptcy laws and their enforcement) and the extent to which consumers and firms have access to financial services.

irai_bre   Business Regulatory Environment

This criterion assesses the extent to which the legal, regulatory, and policy environment helps or hinders private business in investing, creating jobs, and becoming more productive. The emphasis is on direct regulations of business activity and regulation of goods and factor markets. Three subcomponents are measured: (a) regulations affecting entry, exit, and competition; (b) regulations of ongoing business operations; and (c) regulations of factor markets (labor and land). These three components should be considered separately and equally weighted.

Policies for Social Inclusion/Equity

irai_ge   Gender Equality

This criterion assesses the extent to which the country has enacted and put in place institutions and programs to enforce laws and policies that (a) promote equal access for men and women to human capital development; (b) promote equal access for men and women to productive and economic resources; and (c) give men and women equal status and protection under the law.

irai_epru   Equity of Public Resource Use

This criterion assesses the extent to which the pattern of public expenditures and revenue collection affects the poor and is consistent with national poverty reduction priorities. The assessment of the consistency of government spending with the poverty reduction priorities takes into account the extent to which: (a) individuals, groups, or localities that are poor, vulnerable, or have unequal access to services and opportunities are identified; (b) a national development strategy with explicit interventions to assist the groups identified in (a) has been adopted; and (c) the composition and incidence of public expenditures are tracked systematically and their results feedback into subsequent resource allocation decisions. The assessment of the revenue collection dimension takes into account the incidence of major taxes, e.g., whether they are progressive or regressive, and their alignment with the poverty reduction priorities.

irai_bhr   Building Human Resources

This criterion assesses the national policies and public and private sector service delivery that affect access to and quality of: (a) health and nutrition services, including population and reproductive health, (b) education, ECD, training and literacy programs, and (c) prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. ECD refers to Early Child Development programs, including both formal and non-formal programs (which may combine education, health and nutrition interventions) aimed at children aged 0-6.

irai_spl   Social Protection and Labor

This criterion assesses government policies in the area of social protection and labor market regulation, which reduce the risk of becoming poor, assist those who are poor to better manage further risks, and ensure a minimal level of welfare to all people. Interventions include: social safety net programs, pension and old age savings

programs; protection of basic labor standards; regulations to reduce segmentation and inequity in labor markets; active labor market programs, such as public works or job training; and community driven initiatives. In interpreting the guidelines it is important to take into account the size of the economy and its level of development. This criterion is a composite indicator of five different areas of social protection and labor policy: (a) social safety net programs; (b) protection of basic labor standards; (c) labor market regulations; (d) community driven initiatives; and (e) pension and old age savings programs.

irai_pies   Policies and Institutions for Environmental Sustainability

This criterion assesses the extent to which environmental policies foster the protection and sustainable use of natural resources and the management of pollution. Assessment of environmental sustainability requires multi-dimension criteria (i.e. for air, water, waste, conservation management, coastal zones management, natural resources management).

Public Sector Management and Institutions

irai_prrg   Property Rights and Rule-based Governance

This criterion assesses the extent to which private economic activity is facilitated by an effective legal system and rule-based governance structure in which property and contract rights are reliably respected and enforced. Each of three dimensions should be rated separately: (a) legal basis for secure property and contract rights; (b) predictability, transparency, and impartiality of laws and regulations affecting economic activity, and their enforcement by the legal and judicial system; and (c) crime and violence as an impediment to economic activity.

irai_qbfm   Quality of Budgetary and Financial Management

This criterion assesses the extent to which there is: (a) a comprehensive and credible budget, linked to policy priorities; (b) effective financial management systems to ensure that the budget is implemented as intended in a controlled and predictable way; and (c) timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts and effective arrangements for follow up.

irai_erm   Efficiency of Revenue Mobilization

This criterion assesses the overall pattern of revenue mobilization, not only the tax structure as it exists on paper, but revenue from all sources as they are actually collected.

irai_qpa   Quality of Public Administration

This criterion assesses the extent to which civilian central government staffs (including teachers, health workers, and police) are structured to design and implement government policy and deliver services effectively. Civilian central government staffs include the central executive together with all other ministries and administrative departments, including autonomous agencies. It excludes the armed forces, state-owned enterprises, and sub-national government.

irai_tac **Transparency, Accountability, and Corruption in the Public Sector**

This criterion assesses the extent to which the executive can be held accountable for its use of funds and the results of its actions by the electorate and by the legislature and judiciary, and the extent to which public employees within the executive are required to account for the use of resources, administrative decisions, and results obtained. Both levels of accountability are enhanced by transparency in decision-making, public audit institutions, access to relevant and timely information, and public and media scrutiny. A high degree of accountability and transparency discourages corruption, or the abuse of public office for private gain. National and sub-national governments should be appropriately weighted. Each of three dimensions should be rated separately: (a) the accountability of the executive to oversight institutions and of public employees for their performance; (b) access of civil society to information on public affairs; and (c) state capture by narrow vested interests.

Index of African Governance

(Time-series: 2000-2007, n: 265, N: 53, $\overline{N}$: 33, $\overline{T}$: 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.

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.

iag_ss **Safety and Security**

This category is based on e.g. indicators on homicide rate, government involvement in armed conflict and refugees and asylum seekers originating from the country. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

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.

iag_prh   Participation and Human Rights

This category is based on e.g. indicators on free and fair elections, respect for civil rights, press freedom and women's rights. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

iag_seo   Sustainable Economic Opportunity

This category is based on e.g. indicators on GDP per capita, inflation, government deficit/surplus and phone subscribers per capita. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

iag_hd   Human Development

This category is based on e.g. indicators on economic inequality, life expectancy, access to drinking water and literacy rate. The index varies between 0 and 100 where higher values indicate better governance.

International Country Risk Guide – The PRS Group

(Time-series: 1984-2008, n: 3271, N: 145, $\overline{N}$: 131, $\overline{T}$: 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 my 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

Knack & Kugler

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 180)
http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/FlagshipCourse2003/SecondGenerationIndicators.pdf
(Knack and Kugler 2002)

kk_gg   Index of Objective Indicators of Good Governance
The Index is built on nine indicators: the regulation of entry, contract enforcement, contract intensive money, international trade tax revenue, budgetary volatility, revenue source volatility, telephone wait times, phone faults, and the percentage of revenues paid to public officials in bribes, as reported in surveys of business firms. The index is computed by first normalizing each indicator using the standard normal distribution, and then aggregating these scores through a percentile matching procedure. Larger numbers indicate better governance.

(Note: In the original data Samoa is given two different values. We do not include any of the values in our dataset.)

La Porta, López-de-Silanes, Pop-Eleches & Shleifer– Judicial Independence

http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/shleifer/Data/jcb_data.xls
(La Porta et al 2004)

llps_tensc   Tenure of Supreme Court Judges

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 70)

This variable measures the tenure of Supreme Court judges (highest court in any country). The variable takes three possible values:
(0)   if tenure is less than six years
(1)   if tenure is more than six years but not lifelong
(2)   if tenure is lifelong

llps_tenac   Tenure of Administrative Court Judges

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 70)

This variable measures the tenure of the highest ranked judges ruling on administrative cases. The variable takes three possible values:
(0)   if tenure is less than six years
(1)   if tenure is more than six years but not lifelong
(2)   if tenure is lifelong.

llps_cl   Case Law

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 69)

This variable is a dummy taking value:
(1)   if judicial decisions in a given country are a source of law
(0)   otherwise.

llps_ji   Judicial Independence

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 69)

Judicial independence is computed as the normalized sum of Tenure of Supreme Court Judges (llps_tensc), Tenure of the Administrative Court Judges (llps_tenac), and Case Law (llps_cl).

llps_roc   Rigidity of Constitution

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 71)

This variable measures (on a scale from 1 to 4) how hard it is to change the constitution in a given country. One point each is given if the approval of the majority of the legislature, the chief of state and a referendum is necessary in order to change the constitution. An additional point is given for each of the following: if a supermajority in the legislature (more than 66% of votes) is needed, if both houses of the legislature have to approve, if the legislature has to approve the amendment in two consecutive legislative terms or if the approval of a majority of state legislature is required.

llps_jr   Judicial Review

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 71)

This variable measures the extent to which judges (either Supreme Court or Constitutional Court) have the power to review the constitutionality of laws in a given country. The variable takes three values: (0) if there is no review of constitutionality of laws, (1) if there is limited review of constitutionality of laws, and (2) if there is full review of constitutionality of laws.

llps_cr   Constitutional Review

(Cross-section: the year varies, N: 71)

Constitutional review is computed as the normalized sum of Judicial Review (llps_jr) and Rigidity of Constitution (llps_roc).

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_democ   Institutionalized Democracy

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 7800, N: 173, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 45)
(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 161)

Range = 0-10 (0 = low; 10 = high)

Democracy is conceived as three essential, interdependent elements. One is the presence of institutions and procedures through which citizens can express effective preferences about alternative policies and leaders. Second is the existence of institutionalized constraints on the exercise of power by the executive. Third is the guarantee of civil liberties to all citizens in their daily lives and in acts of political participation. Other aspects of plural democracy, such as the rule of law, systems of checks and balances, freedom of the press, and so on are means to, or specific manifestations of, these general principles. We do not include coded data on civil liberties.

The Democracy indicator is an additive eleven-point scale (0-10). The operational indicator of democracy is derived from coding of the competitiveness of political participation (variable p_parcomp), the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment (variables p_xropen and p_xrcomp), and constraints on the chief executive (variable p_xconst).

p_autoc   Institutionalized Autocracy

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 7800, N: 173, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 45)

(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country, N: 161)

Range = 0-10 (0 = low; 10 = high)

"Authoritarian regime" in Western political discourse is a pejorative term for some very diverse kinds of political systems whose common properties are a lack of regularized political competition and concern for political freedoms. We use the more neutral term Autocracy and define it operationally in terms of the presence of a distinctive set of political characteristics. In mature form, autocracies sharply restrict or suppress competitive political participation. Their chief executives are chosen in a regularized process of selection within the political elite, and once in office they exercise power with few institutional constraints. Most modern autocracies also exercise a high degree of directiveness over social and economic activity, but we regard this as a function of political ideology and choice, not a defining property of autocracy. Social democracies also exercise relatively high degrees of directiveness. We prefer to leave open for empirical investigation the question of how Autocracy, Democracy, and Directiveness (performance) have covaried over time.

An eleven-point Autocracy scale is constructed additively. Our operational indicator of autocracy is derived from codings of the competitiveness of political participation (variable p_parcomp), the regulation of participation (variable p_parreg), the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment (variables p_xropen and p_xrcomp), and constraints on the chief executive (variable p_xconst).

p_polity   Combined Polity Score

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

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).

p_polity2   Revised Combined Polity Score

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8070, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 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".

p_parreg   Regulation of Participation

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

Participation is regulated to the extent that there are binding rules on when, whether, and how political preferences are expressed. One-party states and Western democracies both regulate participation but they do so in different ways; the former by channeling participation through a single party structure, with sharp limits on diversity of opinion, and the latter by allowing relatively stable and enduring groups to compete nonviolently for political influence. The polar opposite is unregulated participation, in which there are no enduring national political organizations and no effective regime controls on political activity. In such situations political competition is fluid and often characterized by recurring coercion among shifting coalitions of partisan groups. A five-category scale is used to code this dimension:

(1)   **Unregulated**: Political participation is fluid; there are no enduring national political organizations and no systematic regime controls on political activity. Political groupings tend to form around particular leaders, regional interests, religious or ethnic or clan groups, etc.; but the number and relative importance of such groups in national political life varies substantially over time.

(2)   **Multiple Identities**: There are relatively stable and enduring political groups which compete for political influence at the national level – parties, regional groups, or ethnic groups, not necessarily elected – but there are few recognized, overlapping (common) interests.

(3)   **Sectarian**: Political demands are characterized by incompatible interests and intransigent posturing among multiple identity groups and oscillate more or less regularly between intense factionalism and government favoritism, that is, when one identity group secures central power it favors group members in central allocations and restricts competing groups' political activities, until it is displaced in turn (i.e., active factionalism). Also coded here are polities in which political groups are based on restricted membership and significant portions of the population historically have been excluded from access to positions of power (latent factionalism, e.g., indigenous peoples in some South American countries).

(4)   **Restricted**: Some organized political participation is permitted without intense factionalism, but significant groups, issues, and/or types of conventional participation are regularly excluded from the political process.

(5)   **Regulated**: Relatively stable and enduring political groups regularly compete for political influence and positions with little use of coercion. No significant groups, issues, or types of conventional political action are regularly excluded from the political process.

p_parcomp   The Competitiveness of Participation

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

The competitiveness of participation refers to the extent to which alternative preferences for policy and leadership can be pursued in the political arena. Political competition implies a significant degree of civil interaction, so polities which are coded Unregulated ("1") on Regulation of Participation are coded "0" (Not Applicable) for competitiveness. Competitiveness is coded on a five category scale:

(0)   **Not Applicable**: This is used for polities that are coded as Unregulated, or moving to/from that position, in Regulation of Political Participation (variable p_parreg).

(1)   **Repressed**: No significant oppositional activity is permitted outside the ranks of the regime and ruling party. Totalitarian party systems, authoritarian military dictatorships, and despotic monarchies are typically coded here. However, the mere existence of these structures is not sufficient for a Repressed coding. The regime's institutional structure must also be matched by its demonstrated ability to repress oppositional competition.

(2)   **Suppressed**: Some organized, political competition occurs outside government, without serious factionalism; but the regime systematically and sharply limits its form, extent, or both in ways that exclude substantial groups (20% or more of the adult population) from participation. Suppressed competition is distinguished from Factional competition (below) by the systematic, persisting nature of the restrictions: large classes of people, groups, or types of peaceful political competition are continuously excluded from the political process. As an operational rule, the banning of a political party which received more than 10% of the vote in a recent national election is sufficient evidence that competition is "suppressed." However, other information is required to determine whether the appropriate coding is (2) Suppressed or (3) Factional competition. This category is also used to characterize transitions between Factional and Repressed competition. Examples of "suppression" are:
i. Prohibiting some kinds of political organizations, either by type or group of people involved (e.g., no national political parties or no ethnic political organizations).
ii. Prohibiting some kinds of political action (e.g., Communist parties may organize but are prohibited from competing in elections).
iii. Systematic harassment of political opposition (leaders killed, jailed, or sent into exile; candidates regularly ruled off ballots; opposition media banned, etc.). This is evidence for Factional, Suppressed, or Repressed, depending on the nature of the regime, the opposition, and the persistence of political groups.

(3)   **Factional**: Polities with parochial or ethnic-based political factions that regularly compete for political influence in order to promote particularistic agendas and favor group members to the detriment of common, secular, or cross-cutting agendas.

(4)   **Transitional**: Any transitional arrangement from Restricted or Factional patterns to fully competitive patterns, or vice versa. Transitional arrangements are accommodative of competing, parochial interests but have not fully linked parochial with broader, general interests. Sectarian and secular interest groups coexist.

(5) **Competitive**: There are relatively stable and enduring, secular political groups which regularly compete for political influence at the national level; ruling groups and coalitions regularly, voluntarily transfer central power to competing groups. Competition among groups seldom involves coercion or disruption. Small parties or political groups may be restricted in the Competitive pattern.

p_xrreg   Regulation of Chief Executive Recruitment

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

In considering recruitment, we must first determine whether there are any established modes at all by which chief executives are selected. Regulation refers to the extent to which a polity has institutionalized procedures for transferring executive power. Three categories are used to differentiate the extent of institutionalization:

(1) **Unregulated**: Changes in chief executive occur through forceful seizures of power. Such caesaristic transfers of power are sometimes legitimized after the fact in noncompetitive elections or by legislative enactment. Despite these "legitimization" techniques, a polity remains unregulated until the de facto leader of the coup has been replaced as head of government either by designative or competitive modes of executive selection. However, unregulated recruitment does not include the occasional forceful ouster of a chief executive if elections are called within a reasonable time and the previous pattern continues.

(2) **Designational/Transitional**: Chief executives are chosen by designation within the political elite, without formal competition (i.e., one-party systems or "rigged" multiparty elections). Also coded here are transitional arrangements intended to regularize future power transitions after an initial unregulated seizure of power (i.e., after constitutional legitimization of military rule or during periods when the leader of the coup steps down as head of state but retains unrivaled power within the political realm as head of the military). This category also includes polities in transition from designative to elective modes of executive selection (i.e., the period of "guided democracy" often exhibited during the transition from military to civilian rule) or vice versa (i.e., regimes ensuring electoral victory through the intimidation of oppositional leaders or the promulgation of a "state of emergency" before executive elections).

(3) **Regulated**: Chief executives are determined by hereditary succession or in competitive elections. Ascriptive/designative and ascriptive/elective selections (i.e., an effective king and premier) are also coded as regulated. The fundamental difference between regulated selection and unregulated recruitment is that regulated structures require the existence of institutionalized modes of executive recruitment, either through constitutional decree or lineage. Moreover, in regulated competitive systems, unlike the designational/transitional mode, the method of future executive selection is not dependent on the particular party or regime currently holding power.

p_xrcomp   Competitiveness of Executive Recruitment

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

Competitiveness refers to "the extent that prevailing modes of advancement give subordinates equal opportunities to become superordinates (Gurr 1974, p.1483)." For example, selection of chief executives through popular elections involving two or more viable parties or candidates is regarded as competitive. If power transfers are coded Unregulated ("1") in the Regulation of Executive Recruitment (variable p_xrreg), or involve a transition to/from unregulated, Competitiveness is coded "0" (Not Applicable). Four categories are used to measure this concept:

(0) **Not Applicable**: This is used for polities that are coded as Unregulated, or moving to/from that position, in Regulation of Chief Executive Recruitment (variable p_xrreg).

(1) **Selection**: Chief executives are determined by hereditary succession, designation, or by a combination of both, as in monarchies whose chief minister is chosen by king or court. Examples of pure designative selection are: rigged, unopposed elections; repeated replacement of presidents before their terms end; recurrent military selection of civilian executives; selection within an institutionalized single party; recurrent incumbent selection of successors; repeated election boycotts by the major opposition parties, etc.

(2) **Dual/Transitional**: Dual executives in which one is chosen by hereditary succession, the other by competitive election. Also used for transitional arrangements between selection (ascription and/or designation) and competitive election.

(3) **Election**: Chief executives are typically chosen in or through competitive elections involving two or more major parties or candidates. (Elections may be popular or by an elected assembly.)

p_xropen   Openness of Executive Recruitment

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

Recruitment of the chief executive is "open" to the extent that all the politically active population has an opportunity, in principle, to attain the position through a regularized process. If power transfers are coded Unregulated (1) in the Regulation of Executive Recruitment (p_xrreg), or involve a transition to/from Unregulated, Openness is coded "0" (Not Applicable). Five categories are used:

(0) **Not Applicable**: This is used for polities that are coded as Unregulated, or moving to/from that position, in Regulation of Chief Executive Recruitment (variable p_xrreg).

(1) **Closed**: Chief executives are determined by hereditary succession, e.g. kings, emperors, beys, emirs, etc., who assume executive powers by right of descent. An executive selected by other means may proclaim himself a monarch but the polity he governs is not coded "closed" unless a relative actually succeeds him as ruler.

(2) **Dual Executive–Designation**: Hereditary succession plus executive or court selection of an effective chief minister.

(3) **Dual Executive–Election**: Hereditary succession plus electoral selection of an effective chief minister.

(4)   **Open**: Chief executives are chosen by elite designation, competitive election, or transitional arrangements between designation and election.

p_xconst   Executive Constraints (Decision Rules)

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

According to Eckstein and Gurr, decision rules are defined in the following manner: "Superordinate structures in action make decisions concerning the direction of social units. Making such decisions requires that supers and subs be able to recognize when decision-processes have been concluded, especially "properly" concluded. An indispensable ingredient of the processes, therefore, is the existence of Decision Rules that provide basic criteria under which decisions are considered to have been taken." (Eckstein and Gurr 1975, p.121) Operationally, this variable refers to the extent of institutionalized constraints on the decision-making powers of chief executives, whether individuals or collectivities. Such limitations may be imposed by any "accountability groups". In Western democracies these are usually legislatures. Other kinds of accountability groups are the ruling party in a one-party state; councils of nobles or powerful advisors in monarchies; the military in coup-prone polities; and in many states a strong, independent judiciary. The concern is therefore with the checks and balances between the various parts of the decision-making process. A seven-category scale is used.

(1)   **Unlimited Authority**: There are no regular limitations on the executive's actions (as distinct from irregular limitations such as the threat or actuality of coups and assassinations). Examples of evidence:
i. Constitutional restrictions on executive action are ignored.
ii. Constitution is frequently revised or suspended at the executive's initiative.
iii. There is no legislative assembly, or there is one but it is called and dismissed at the executive's pleasure.
iv. The executive appoints a majority of members of any accountability group and can remove them at will.
v. The legislature cannot initiate legislation or veto or suspend acts of the executive.
vi. Rule by decree is repeatedly used.
Note: If the executive is given limited or unlimited power by a legislature to cope with an emergency and relents this power after the emergency has passed, this is not a change to unlimited authority.

(2)   **Intermediate Category**

(3)   **Slight to Moderate Limitation on Executive Authority**: There are some real but limited restraints on the executive. Evidence:
i. The legislature initiates some categories of legislation.
ii. The legislature blocks implementation of executive acts and decrees.
iii. Attempts by the executive to change some constitutional restrictions, such as prohibitions on succeeding himself, or extending his term, fail and are not adopted.
iv. The ruling party initiates some legislation or takes some administrative action independently of the executive.
v. The legislature or party approves some categories of appointments nominated by the executive.

vi. There is an independent judiciary.

vii. Situations in which there exists a civilian executive, but in which policy decisions, for all practical purposes, reflect the demands of the military.

(4)   **Intermediate Category**

(5)   **Substantial Limitations on Executive Authority**: The executive has more effective authority than any accountability group but is subject to substantial constraints by them.

Examples:

i. A legislature or party council often modifies or defeats executive proposals for action.

ii. A council or legislature sometimes refuses funds to the executive.

iii. The accountability group makes important appointments to administrative posts.

iv. The legislature refuses the executive permission to leave the country.

(6)   **Intermediate Category**

(7)   **Executive Parity or Subordination**: Accountability groups have effective authority equal to or greater than the executive in most areas of activity. Examples of evidence:

i. A legislature, ruling party, or council of nobles initiates much or most important legislation.

ii. The executive (president, premier, king, cabinet, council) is chosen by the accountability group and is dependent on its continued support to remain in office (as in most parliamentary systems).

iii. In multi-party democracies, there is chronic "cabinet instability".

p_durable   Regime Durability

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8134, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 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.

p_flag   Tentative Coding

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 8163, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 47)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 163)

Trichotomous "flag" variable indicating confidence of codings (recent year codings only).

(0)   **Confident**: Reasonably confident coding of established authority patterns that have been "artificially smoothed" to present consistency over time between substantive polity changes.

(1)   **Tentative**: Reasonably confident coding of emerging authority patterns that have not been smoothed over time; these codes are "free floating," that is, they

are based on information available in the case-year and are not tied to prior year coding(s). Codes are considered tentative for up to five years following a substantive polity change.

(2) **Tenuous**: Best judgment coding based on limited information and/or insufficient time span since a substantive polity change and the emergence of new authority patterns.

p_fragment   Polity Fragmentation

(Time-series: 1978-2008, n: 1473, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 48, $\overline{T}$: 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.

p_sf   State Failure

(Time-series: 1949-2008, n: 146, N: 31, $\overline{N}$: 2, $\overline{T}$: 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.

QoG Survey

(Cross-section: 2008-2009 (varies by country), N: 52)
http://www.qog.pol.gu.se
(Dahlström, Lapuente and Teorell 2010; Teorell 2009)

The QoG Survey is a unique data set on the structure and behavior of public administration, based on a web survey of 528 country experts from 58 countries around the world (although advanced industrialized and post-communist countries carry the weight of countries covered). The dataset covers key dimensions of quality of government, such as politicization, professionalization, openness, and impartiality.

Included in the QoG dataset are three indexes, each based on a group of questions from the survey. When constructing the indexes we excluded countries with less than three responding experts (which left us with 52 countries in the sample). (One index is listed below. The other two are listed in the "How To Get It" section.)

The confidence interval variables give the higher and lower limits of the 95% confidence interval.

qs_impar   Impartial Public Administration

qs_impar_cih Impartial Public Administration – Confidence Interval (High)

qs_impar_cil Impartial Public Administration – Confidence Interval (Low)

The index measures to what extent government institutions exercise their power impartially. The impartiality norm is defined as: "When implementing laws and policies, government officials shall not take into consideration anything about the citizen/case that is not beforehand stipulated in the policy or the law." (Rothstein and Teorell 2008, p. 170)

The index is built on five items from the survey:

- By a common definition, impartiality implies that when implementing policies, public sector employees should not take anything about the citizen/case into consideration that is not stipulated in the policy. Generally speaking, how often would you say that public sector employees today, in your chosen country, act impartially when deciding how to implement a policy in an individual case?

(Response categories from 1-7, "hardly ever" to "almost always")

- Hypothetically, let's say that a typical public employee was given the task to distribute an amount equivalent to 1000 USD per capita to the needy poor in your country. According to your judgment, please state the percentage that would reach:

(Six response categories for which the respondents could fill in a number from 0 to 100 percent. The percentage reaching "the needy poor" was here used as the indicator of how impartial the policy would be implemented.)

Thinking about the country you have chosen, how often would you say the

following occurs today?

- Firms that provide the most favorable kickbacks to senior officials are awarded public procurement contracts in favor of firms making the lowest bid?
- When deciding how to implement policies in individual cases, public sector employees treat some groups in society unfairly?
- When granting licenses to start up private firms, public sector employees favor applicants with which they have strong personal contacts?

(Response categories from 1-7, from "hardly ever" to "almost always".)

The index is constructed by adding each measure weighted by the factor loading obtained from a principle components factor analysis. Missing values on one or more of the questions have been imputed on the individual expert level. After that, aggregation to the country level has been made (mean value of all experts per country).

Reporters Sans Frontières

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 135)
http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=4116

rsf_pfi   Press Freedom Index

The Press Freedom index measures the amount of freedom journalists and the media have in each country and the efforts made by governments to see that press freedom is respected. It does not take account of all human rights violations, only those that affect press freedom. Neither is it an indicator of the quality of a country's media. The index ranges between 0 (total press freedom) and 100 (no press freedom).

Transparency International

http://www.transparency.org/

ti_cpi   Corruption Perceptions Index

(Time-series: 1995-2010, n: 1906, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 119, $\overline{T}$: 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.

ti_cpi_max   Corruption Perceptions Index – Max Range

ti_cpi_min   Corruption Perceptions Index – Min Range

(Time-series: 2004-2010, n: 1168, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 167, $\overline{T}$: 6)
(Cross-section: 2004-2009 (varies by country), N: 49)

The CPI score is accompanied by a 90 confidence range determined by a bootstrap (non-parametric) methodology, which allows inferences to be drawn on the underlying precision of the results. A 90% confidence range is established, where there is 5% probability that the value is below the minimum range (ti_cpi_min) and 5% probability that the value is above the maximum range (ti_cpi_max). However, particularly when only few sources are available, an unbiased estimate of the mean coverage probability is lower than the nominal value of 90%.

ti_cpi_sd   Corruption Perceptions Index – Standard Deviation

(Time-series: 1998-2010, n: 1280, N: 180, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 2000-2009 (varies by country), N: 142)

This is the standard deviation in the values of the sources underlying the CPI: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

Treisman

http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/treisman/
(Treisman 2007)

t_bribe   Have paid a bribe in any form

http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2005
(Cross-section: 2005, N: 66)

Percentage of the population who answered "Yes" to the question: "In the past 12 months, have you or anyone living in your household paid a bribe in any form?" Original source: Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer (2005).

t_corr   Common to pay irregular additional payments

http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/economics.nsf/Content/ic-wbes
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 79)

Country averages of business representatives' answers to the question: "It is common for firms in my line of business to have to pay some irregular 'additional payments' to get things done." (ranges from 1 = always to 6 = never). Original source: World Business Environment Survey (2000).

t_unicri   Bribery to Government Officials

http://www.bus.lsu.edu/mocan/publication.htm

(Cross-section: 1991-1999, N: 49)

Percentage of the population that had been asked or expected to pay bribe by government officials in last year, late 1990s (if more than one year available for late 1990s, averaged). Original source: Mocan (2007).

Vanhanen – Index of Democratization

http://www.fsd.uta.fi/english/data/catalogue/FSD1289/index.html
(Vanhanen 2000; 2005)

van_index   Index of Democratization

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

This index combines two basic dimensions of democracy – competition and participation – measured as the percentage of votes not cast for the largest party (Competition) times the percentage of the population who actually voted in the election (Participation). This product is divided by 100 to form an index that in principle could vary from 0 (no democracy) to 100 (full democracy). (Empirically, however, the largest value is 49.)

van_comp   Competition

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

The competition variable portrays the electoral success of smaller parties, that is, the percentage of votes gained by the smaller parties in parliamentary and/or presidential elections. The variable is calculated by subtracting from 100 the percentage of votes won by the largest party (the party which wins most votes) in parliamentary elections or by the party of the successful candidate in presidential elections. The variable thus theoretically ranges from 0 (only one party received 100 % of votes) to 100 (each voter cast a vote for a distinct party).

van_part   Participation

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

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

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.

wbgi_vae   Voice and Accountability – Estimate

wbgi_vas   Voice and Accountability – Standard Errors

wbgi_van   Voice and Accountability – Number of Sources

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2114, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 151, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wbgi_pse   Political Stability - Estimate

wbgi_pss   Political Stability – Standard Errors

wbgi_psn   Political Stability – Number of sources

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2070, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 148, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wbgi_gee   Government Effectiveness - Estimate

wbgi_ges   Government Effectiveness – Standard Errors

wbgi_gen   Government Effectiveness – Number of Sources

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2090, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 149, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wbgi_rqe   **Regulatory Quality - Estimate**

wbgi_rqs   **Regulatory Quality – Standard Errors**

wbgi_rqn   **Regulatory Quality – Number of Sources**

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2066, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 148, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wbgi_rle   **Rule of Law - Estimate**

wbgi_rls   **Rule of Law – Standard Errors**

wbgi_rln   **Rule of Law – Number of Sources**

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2077, N: 194, $\overline{N}$: 148, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wbgi_cce   **Control of Corruption - Estimate**

wbgi_ccs   **Control of Corruption – Standard Errors**

wbgi_ccn   **Control of Corruption – Number of Sources**

(Time-series: 1996-2009, n: 2037, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 146, $\overline{T}$: 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".

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.

Alesina, Devleeschauwer, Easterly, Kurlat & Wacziarg

http://www.anderson.ucla.edu/faculty_pages/romain.wacziarg/downloads/fractionalization.xls
(Alesina et al 2003)

al_ethnic   Ethnic fractionalization

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 189)
(Cross-section: 1979-2001 (varies by country), N: 187)

Reflects probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same ethnolinguistic group. The higher the number, the more fractionalized society. The definition of ethnicity involves a combination of racial and linguistic characteristics. The result is a higher degree of fractionalization than the commonly used ELF-index (see el_elf60) in for example Latin America, where people of many races speak the same language.

al_ethn_yom Year of Measurement

(Cross-section: 1979-2001 (varies by country), N: 187)

The latest year available for each country of the al_ethnic measurement in the cross-sectional dataset.

al_language   Linguistic fractionalization

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 182)
(Cross-section: 2001, N: 181)

Reflects probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same linguistic group. The higher the number, the more fractionalized society.

al_religion   Religious fractionalization

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 191)
(Cross-section: 2001, N: 190)

Reflects probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same religious group. The higher the number, the more fractionalized society.

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_cbi   Central bank independence

(Time-series: 1960-1998, n: 770, N: 22, $\overline{N}$: 20, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 1998, N: 21)

Index of central bank independence constructed by Freitag (1999). The index ranges from 1 to 3, where 1 indicates maximum central bank independence, and 3 maximum central bank dependence.

ar_li_cbi   Central bank independence

(Time-series: 1946-1996, n: 1124, N: 24, $\overline{N}$: 22, $\overline{T}$: 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.

Barro & Lee

http://www.cid.harvard.edu/ciddata/ciddata.html
(Barro & Lee 2000)

bl_asyf15   Average Schooling Years (Female)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 928, N: 110, $\overline{N}$: 103, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 104)

Average schooling years in the female population aged 15 and over.

bl_asyf25   Average Schooling Years (Female)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 920, N: 108, $\overline{N}$: 102, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 103)

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

bl_asym15   Average Schooling Years (Male)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 928, N: 110, $\overline{N}$: 103, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 104)

Average schooling years in the male population aged 15 and over.

bl_asym25   Average Schooling Years (Male)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 920, N: 108, $\overline{N}$: 102, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 103)

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

bl_asyt15   Average Schooling Years (Total)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 928, N: 110, $\overline{N}$: 103, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 104)

Average schooling years in the total population aged 15 and over.

bl_asyt25   Average Schooling Years (Total)

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

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

Bertelsmann Transformation Index

(Cross-section: 2006, N: 119)
http://bti2006.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/

Market Economy Status

bti_mes   Market Economy Status
The score for Market Economy Status is obtained by calculating the mean value of the ratings for the following criteria: socioeconomic level, market organization, currency and price stability, private property, welfare regime, economic performance and sustainability.

Note: There also exists a Bertelsmann "Status Index", which is the mean of Market Economy Status (bti_mes) and Democracy Status (bti_ds, listed above under "What It Is"), which we have not included in the data.

bti_sl   Socioeconomic Level
The variable measures to what extent significant parts of the population are fundamentally excluded from society due to poverty and inequality combined (income gaps, gender, education, religion, ethnicity).

bti_mo   Market Organization
The variable measures to what level the fundamentals of market-based competition have developed; to what extent safeguards exist to prevent the development of economic monopolies and cartels; to what extent foreign trade has been liberalized; and to what extent a solid banking system and a capital market have been established.

bti_cps   Currency and Price Stability

The variable measures to what extent the country pursues a consistent inflation policy and an appropriate foreign exchange policy; if there is an independent central bank; and to what extent the government's fiscal and debt policies support macroeconomic stability.

bti_prp   Private Property

Measures to what extent government authorities ensure well-defined rights of private property and regulate the acquisition of property, and to what extent private companies are permitted; and if state companies are undergoing a process of privatization consistent with market principles.

bti_wr   Welfare Regime

The variable measures to what extent social safety nets exist to compensate for poverty and other risks such as old age, illness, unemployment or disability, and to what extent equality of opportunity exists.

bti_ep   Economic Performance

Measures how the economy performs according to a set of quantitative indicators.

bti_su   Sustainability

The variable measures to what extent environmental concerns are taken into account in both macro- and microeconomic terms, and to what extent there are solid institutions for basic, secondary and tertiary education, as well as for research and development.

Cheibub, Gandhi & Vreeland

(Time-series: 1946-2008, n: 9115, N: 202, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 45)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)
https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/cheibub/www/DD_page.html
(Cheibub, Gandhi and Vreeland 2009)

chga_hinst   Regime Institutions

Six-fold classification of political regimes, coded:
(0)   Parliamentary democracy
(1)   Mixed (semi-presidential) democracy
(2)   Presidential democracy
(3)   Civilian dictatorship
(4)   Military dictatorship
(5)   Royal dictatorship

Crowe and Meade – Central Bank Governance

http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2008/data/wp08119.zip
(Crowe and Meade 2007, 2008; Cukierman et al 1992)

cm_cbi80_89 Central Bank Independence 1980-1989

(Cross-section (1980-1989), N: 72)

The index varies theoretically between 0 and 1, where higher values indicate greater central bank independence.

The variable is based on central bank laws from the years 1980-1989. Sixteen legal characteristics are considered and they relate to the following areas: the central bank management's insulation from political pressure by secure tenure and independent appointment for the head of the bank; the government's ability to participate or overturn the bank's policy decisions; the clarity of the defined objective for monetary policy specified in the central bank's legal mandate; restrictions that limit lending to the government.

Each legal characteristic was scored according to the authors' numerical coding on a range from zero (least independent) to one (most independent). The characteristics were then weighted to obtain an overall independence measure.

For more information, see Cukierman et al (1992).

cm_cbi80_89u   Central Bank Independence 1980-1989, unweighted
(Cross-section (1980-1989), N: 72)

Same as cm_cbi80_89, but the unweighted instead of the weighted average.

cm_cbi03   Central Bank Independence 2003
(Cross-section (2003), N: 96)

The index varies theoretically between 0 and 1, where higher values indicate greater central bank independence.

The variable is based on IMF data pertaining to the year 2003. It is a replication done by Crowe and Meade, using the methodology from Cukierman et al (1992). See the description of cmi_cbi80_89.

cm_cbi03u   Central Bank Independence 2003, unweighted
(Cross-section (2003), N: 96)

Same as cm_cbi03, but the unweighted average instead of the weighted average.

cm_cbt98   Central Bank Transparency 1998
(Cross-section (1998), N: 87)

The index varies theoretically between 0 and 1, where higher values indicate greater central bank transparency.

The variable is based on information from 1998. It is constructed as the unweighted average of ten indicators from five categories: the clarity of the central bank's legal mandate; the publication of the data used by the central bank as basis for its decisions; the communication of the explicit policy strategy and information on the decision-making process; timely announcements on policy actions and indications of likely future actions; discussion of economic disturbances and policy errors.

cm_cbt06   Central Bank Transparency 2006
(Cross-section (2006), N: 39)

Same as cm_cbt98, but based on data from 2006.

cm_cbgt80_89   Central Bank Governor Turnover 1980-1989
(Cross-section (1980-1989), N: 71)

This is the average number of changes of the central bank's governor per year from 1980 to 1989. Higher values indicate *lower* independence of the central bank.

The turnover rate is sometimes considered to be a better measure of the de facto bank independence than the legal measures above. "The reasoning is that with higher turnover, the central bank governor's term in office would shorten relative to that of the executive making the governor more susceptible to political interference from the government and reducing the independence of the central bank." (Crowe and Meade 2008: 75).

cm_cbgt95_04   Central Bank Governor Turnover 1995-2004
(Cross-section (1995-2004), N: 114)

Same as cm_cbgt80_89, but for the period 1995-2004.

Database of Political Institutions
http://go.worldbank.org/2EAGGLRZ40
(Beck et al 2000; 2001; Keefer 2009)

The data is from DPI2009 (updated March 2010).

Note: The data from the DPI refers to January 1 of each year.

In the original data "not applicable" is coded as -999. We have replaced these observations with missing.

dpi_system   Regime Type

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5701, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

The variable captures whether countries are presidential, assembly-elected presidential, or parliamentary:
(0)   Direct presidential
(1)   Strong president elected by assembly
(2)   Parliamentary

dpi_yio   Year in Office

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5706, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

The number of years in office of the chief executive.

dpi_finter   Finite Term in Office

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5618, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 161, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2000-2004 (varies by country), N: 175)

Dummy variable, 1 if there is a finite term in office for the chief executive, 0 if there is no such term limit or if a limit is not explicitly stated.

dpi_yct   Years left in Current Term

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4491, N: 168, $\overline{N}$: 128, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 1999-2007 (varies by country), N: 161)

The number of years left in current term of chief executive. Thus, scored 0 in an election year and n-1 in the year after an election, where n is the length of the term

dpi_mt   Multiple Terms

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4347, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1998-2007 (varies by country), N: 159)

Dummy variable, 1 if the chief executive's term is constitutionally limited (dpi_finter=1) and (s)he may serve additional terms following the current one, also in cases where this is not explicitly stated; and 0 if (s)he may not serve additional terms.

dpi_cemo   Chief Executive a Military Officer

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5696, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Dummy variable, 1if the chief executive is a military officer.

dpi_dmmo   Defense Minister a Military Officer

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5011, N: 173, $\overline{N}$: 143, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2000-2008 (varies by country), N: 162)

Dummy variable, 1if the defense minister is a military officer.

dpi_pvor   Votes for the President in the first/only round

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 1902, N: 99, $\overline{N}$: 54, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 1996-2007 (varies by country), N: 97)

Percentage of votes for the president in the first/only round.

dpi_pvfr   Votes for the President in the final round

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 402, N: 45, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 45)

Percentage of votes for the President in the final round.

dpi_hlio   Party of Chief Executive: How Long in Office

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4516, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 158)

The number of years the party of the chief executive has been in office.

dpi_erlc   Party of Chief Executive: Right, Left or Center

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3441, N: 144, $\overline{N}$: 98, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 123)

The variable captures whether the party is right, left or center oriented:
(1)   Right
(2)   Left
(3)   Center

Right: for parties that are defined as conservative, Christian democratic, or right-wing; Left: for parties that are defined as communist, socialist, social democratic, or left-wing; Center: for parties that are defined as centrist or when party position can best be described as centrist (e.g. the party advocates strengthening private enterprise in a social-liberal context); *not* described as centrist if competing factions "average out" to a centrist position (e.g. a party of "right-wing Muslims and Beijing-oriented Marxists"). The primary source of these codings is the party's name.

Note: Some observations had the value 0, which means "No information" according to the codebook. We replaced these values with missing.

dpi_eage   Party of Chief Executive: Age

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4325, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 156)

Time since formation under current name of the party of the Chief Executive.

dpi_seats   Total Seats in the Legislature

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6198, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 177, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

Total seats in the legislature, or in the case of bicameral legislatures, the total seats in the lower house. This variable includes appointed and elected seats.

dpi_gf   Government Fractionalization

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4808, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1996-2009 (varies by country), N: 171)

Government fractionalization measures the probability that two randomly chosen deputies from among the government parties will be of different parties.

dpi_gs   Number of Government Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6198, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 177, $\overline{T}$: 34)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the parties in government.

dpi_gvs   Government Vote Share (%)
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6198, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 177, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

The total vote share of all government parties in percent.

dpi_gps1   Largest Government Party: Seats
(Time-series: 1975-2006, n: 5571, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 174, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 174)

Number of seats in the legislature of the largest government party.

dpi_gpvs1   Largest Government Party: Vote Share (%)
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6097, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 174, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 167)

Vote share of the largest government party, in percent.

dpi_gprlc1   Largest Government Party: Right, Left or Center
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3460, N: 142 $\overline{N}$: 99, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 124)

Codes whether the largest government party is right, left or center oriented (see variable dpi_erlc for more information).

Note: Some observations had the value 0, which means "No information" according to the codebook. We replaced these values with missing.

dpi_gpage1   Largest Government Party: Age
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4458, N: 173, $\overline{N}$: 127, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 158)

Time since formation under this name of largest government party.

dpi_gps2   2nd Largest Government Party: Seats
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6130, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 175, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the 2nd largest government party.

dpi_gpvs2   2nd Largest Government Party: Vote Share (%)
(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5549, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 159, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 1999-2007 (varies by country), N: 174)

Vote share of 2nd largest government party, in percent.

dpi_gprlc2   2nd Largest Government Party: Right, Left or Center

(Time-series: 1975-2006, n: 1232, N: 99, $\overline{N}$: 35, $\overline{T}$: 12)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 87)

Codes whether the 2nd largest government party is right, left or center oriented (see variable dpi_erlc for more information).

Note: Some observations had the value 0, which means "No information" according to the codebook. We replaced these values with missing.

dpi_gpage2   2nd Largest Government Party: Age

(Time-series: 1975-2006, n: 1520, N: 123, $\overline{N}$: 43, $\overline{T}$: 12)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 114)

Time since formation under this name of 2nd largest government party.

dpi_gps3   3rd Largest Government Party: Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6149, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 176, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the 3rd largest government party.

dpi_gpvs3   3rd Largest Government Party: Vote Share (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2006, n: 5726, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 164, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 1997-2005 (varies by country), N: 175)

Vote share of 3rd largest government party, in percent.

dpi_gprlc3   3rd Largest Government Party: Right, Left or Center

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 647, N: 74, $\overline{N}$: 18, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 91)

Codes whether the 3rd largest government party is right, left or center oriented (see variable dpi_erlc for more information).

Note: Some observations had the value 0, which means "No information" according to the codebook. We replaced these values with missing.

dpi_gpage3   3rd Largest Government Party: Age

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 833, N: 89, $\overline{N}$: 24, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 84)

Time since formation under this name of 3rd largest government party.

dpi_nogp   Number of other Government Parties

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4898, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 140, $\overline{T}$: 27)

(Cross-section: 2001-2009 (varies by country), N: 169)

Number of government parties other than the 3 largest.

dpi_nogps   Number of other Government Party Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6133, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 175, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of government parties other than the 3 largest.

dpi_ogpvs   Other Government Parties' Vote Share (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5764, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 165, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 175)

Vote share for the parties other than the 3 largest, in percent.

dpi_opf   Opposition Fractionalization

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3513, N: 157, $\overline{N}$: 100, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 1997-2007 (varies by country), N: 154)

Opposition fractionalization measures the probability that two randomly chosen deputies belonging to the parties in the opposition will be of different parties.

dpi_nos   Number of Oppositional Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6198, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 177, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of all the parties in opposition.

dpi_ovs   Opposition Vote Share (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6198, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 177, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 175)

Total vote share of all the parties in opposition, in percent.

dpi_slop1   Largest Opposition Party: Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6095, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 174 $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the largest opposition party.

dpi_vslop1   Largest Opposition Party: Vote Share (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5138, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 147, $\overline{T}$: 28)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 167)

Share of votes of the largest opposition party, in percent.

dpi_oprlc1 **Largest Opposition Party: Right, Left or Center**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 2652, N: 135, $\overline{N}$: 76, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 130)

Codes whether the largest opposition party is right, left or center oriented (see variable dpi_erlc for more information).

Note: Some observations had the value 0, which means "No information" according to the codebook. We replaced these values with missing.

dpi_opage1 **Largest Opposition Party: Age**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3169, N: 155, $\overline{N}$: 91, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 150)

Time since formation under this name of largest opposition party.

dpi_slop2 **2nd Largest Opposition Party: Seats**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6137, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 175, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the 2nd largest opposition party.

dpi_vslop2 **2nd Largest Opposition Party: Vote Share (%)**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5247, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 150, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 169)

Share of votes of the 2nd largest opposition party, in percent.

dpi_slop3 **3rd Largest Opposition Party: Seats**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6154, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 176, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of the 3rd largest opposition party.

dpi_vslop3 **3rd Largest Opposition Party: Vote Share (%)**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5367, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 153, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 172)

Share of votes of the 3rd largest opposition party, in percent.

dpi_noop **Number of other Opposition Parties**

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4829, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 138, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 2001-2009 (varies by country), N: 170)

Number of opposition parties other than the 3 largest.

dpi_noops   Number of other Opposition Party Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2006, n: 6150, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 176, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of seats in the legislature of opposition parties other than the 3 largest.

dpi_vsoop   Vote Share of other Opposition Parties (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5414, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 1995-2009 (varies by country), N: 172)

Vote share of opposition parties other than the 3 largest, in percent.

dpi_ulprty   Number of Parties non-aligned/allegiance unknown

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4845, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 138, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 2001-2009 (varies by country), N: 171)

Number of Parties non-aligned/allegiance unknown.

dpi_numul   Number of Seats non-aligned/allegiance unknown

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 6148, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 176, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 175)

Number of Seats non-aligned/allegiance unknown.

dpi_vsul   Vote Share non-aligned/allegiance unknown (%)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5769, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 165, $\overline{T}$: 32)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 173)

Vote share non-aligned/allegiance unknown, in percent.

dpi_tf   Total Fractionalization

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4749, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1996-2009 (varies by country), N: 171)

Total fractionalization measures the probability that two randomly chosen deputies in the legislature belong to different parties.

dpi_maj   Majority Seats

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4805, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1996-2009 (varies by country), N: 171)

Number of government seats divided by total seats in the legislature.

dpi_legelec   Legislative Election

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5728, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 164, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2002 (varies by country), N: 174)

Dummy variable, 1 if there is a legislative election held this year.

dpi_exelec   Executive Election

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5729, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 164, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2002 (varies by country), N: 174)

Dummy variable, 1 if there is an executive election held this year.

dpi_lipc   Legislative Index of Political Competitiveness

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5692, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2003 (varies by country), N: 174)

This variable captures the degree of political competitiveness in the legislature as
follows:

(1)   No legislature
(2)   Unelected legislature
(3)   Elected legislature with single candidates (like in many Communist countries)
(3,5)   Unclear whether there is competition among elected legislators in a single-
         party system
(4)   Single party with multiple candidates
(5)   Multiple parties are legal but only one party won seats
(5,5)   Not clear whether multiple parties ran and only one party won or multiple
         parties ran and won more than 75% of the seats
(6)   Multiple parties won seats but the largest party received more than 75% of the
         seats
(6,5)   Multiple parties won seats but it is unclear how many the largest party got
(7)   Largest party got less than 75%

dpi_eipc   Executive Index of Political Competitiveness

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5692, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2003 (varies by country), N: 174)

Uses the same scale as the Legislative Index of Political Competitiveness (dpi_lipc)
but applies for executive elections instead.

dpi_mdmh   Mean District Magnitude (House)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3945, N: 175, $\overline{N}$: 113, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2001-2008 (varies by country), N: 171)

dpi_mdms   Mean District Magnitude (Senate)

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 1308, N: 66, $\overline{N}$: 37, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 1997-2009 (varies by country), N: 62)

The average number of representatives elected by each electoral district in a country. If
information is available, the average is weighted by constituency size.

Note: For both variables dpi_mdmh and dpi_mdms, a value of 888 means that that the legislature is appointed or that members are indirectly elected.

dpi_ssh   Relative Size of Senate

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 1694, N: 80, $\overline{N}$: 48, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 72)

Number of senate seats/ (number of house seats + number of senate seats).

dpi_plurality Plurality

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4232, N: 170, $\overline{N}$: 121, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1997-2008 (varies by country), N: 164)

Dummy variable, 1 if plurality is used as electoral rule to select any candidate in any house, or if there is competition for the seats in a one-party state (dpi_lipc=4).

dpi_pr   Proportional Representation

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3769, N: 168, $\overline{N}$: 108, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 1997-2008 (varies by country), N: 164)

Dummy variable, 1 if Proportional Representation (PR) is used as electoral rule to select any candidate in any house.

dpi_housesys House: Plurality or Proportional?

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4182, N: 170, $\overline{N}$: 119, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1997-2008 (varies by country), N: 163)

If Plurality and Proportional Representation - which governs the majority/all of the House seats? (1 if Plurality, 0.5 if 50% Plurality and 50% Proportional, and 0 if Proportional).

dpi_sensys   Senate: Plurality or Proportional?

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 646, N: 34, $\overline{N}$: 18, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2000-2008 (varies by country), N: 33)

If Plurality and Proportional Representation - which governs the majority/all of the Senate seats? (1 if Plurality, 0.5 if 50% Plurality and 50% Proportional, and 0 if Proportional).

dpi_thresh   Vote Threshold for Representation

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 2222, N: 106, $\overline{N}$: 63, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2001-2009 (varies by country), N: 101)

Records the minimum vote share that a party must obtain in order to take at least one seat in PR systems, in percent. If there is more than one threshold, the variable denotes the one that governs the most seats.

dpi_dhondt   D'Hondt

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 2146, N: 102, $\overline{N}$: 61, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2000-2008 (varies by country), N: 100)

Dummy variable, 1 if the D'Hondt rule is used to allocate seats in a PR system.

dpi_cl   Closed Lists

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 2504, N: 114, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 1996-2009 (varies by country), N: 109)

Dummy variable, 1 when PR is used (dpi_pr) and voters cannot express preferences for candidates within a party list.

dpi_fraud   Fraud or Candidate Intimidation Affection

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4704, N: 175, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 2001-2008 (varies by country), N: 163)

Dummy variable, 1 when opposition is officially legal but reported vote fraud or candidate intimidation were serious enough to affect the outcome of elections. If not an election year, or if elected government has been deposed, records to the most recent election.

dpi_checks   Number of Veto Players

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5548, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 159, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 174)

Equals one if the Legislative Index of Political Competitiveness (dpi_lipc) or the Executive Index of Political Competitiveness (dpi_eipc) is less than 6. In countries where dpi_lipc and dpi_eipc are greater than or equal to 6, dpi_checks is incremented by one if there is a chief executive, by a further one if the chief executive is competitively elected (dpi_eipc greater than six), and by a further one if the opposition controls the legislature.

In presidential systems, dpi_checks is incremented by one for each chamber of the legislature (unless the president's party has a majority in the lower house and a closed-list system is in effect), and by one for each party coded as allied with the president's party and which has an ideological (left-right) orientation closer to that of the main opposition party than to that of the president's party.

In parliamentary systems dpi_checks is incremented by one for every party in the government coalition as long as the parties are needed to maintain a majority, and by one for every party in the government coalition that has a position on economic issues closer to the largest opposition party than to the party of the executive. (The prime minister's party is *not* counted as a check if there is a closed rule in place.)

dpi_polariz   Maximum Difference of Orientation

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5195, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 148, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 1997-2005 (varies by country), N: 171)

The maximum difference between the left-right-center orientation of the chief executive's party and the placement of the three largest government parties and the largest opposition party. Is coded (0) if the Legislative Index of Political Competitiveness (dpi_lipc) or the Executive Index of Political Competitiveness (dpi_eipc) are less than 6 (elections are not competitive), and if the chief executive's party has an absolute majority in the legislature. Ranges between 0 and 2.

dpi_auton   Autonomous Regions

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 5684, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 162, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2001-2007 (varies by country), N: 174)

Dummy variable, 1 if there are autonomous regions.

Note that the codebook states that no information is coded as 0.

Autonomous regions are not the same as states, provinces, etc. An autonomous region is recorded if a source explicitly mentions a region, area, or district that is autonomous or self-governing. Furthermore, they must be constitutionally designated as "autonomous" or "independent" or "special". Federal Districts or Capital Districts do not count as autonomous regions. Disputed autonomy is not recorded. Indian reservations are not counted as autonomous.

dpi_state   Election of State/Province Government

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 4266, N: 157, $\overline{N}$: 122, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 143)

One dimension of information on sub-national governments is whether state/provincial governments are locally elected. Coded 0 if neither the local executive nor the local legislature are directly elected by the local population that they govern; 1 if either is directly elected and the other is indirectly elected (e.g., by councils at subsidiary levels of government) or appointed; and 2 if they are both directly and locally elected. If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, we consider the highest level as the "state/province" level.

dpi_muni   Election of Municipal Government

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 3274, N: 130, $\overline{N}$: 94, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 2001-2007 (varies by country), N: 123)

Are the municipal governments locally elected? Coded the same as the state/provincial government, dpi_state above (0-2). If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, the lowest level is considered as the "municipal" level.

dpi_author   Authority of Sub-national Governments

(Time-series: 1975-2009, n: 1958, N: 75, $\overline{N}$: 56, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1995-2003 (varies by country), N: 67)

Dummy variable, 1 if sub-national governments have extensive taxing, spending or regulatory authority.

Deininger & Squire

(Deininger & Squire 1996)

ds_gini   Gini Index

(Time-series: 1947-1996, n: 682, N: 112, $\overline{N}$: 14, $\overline{T}$: 6)
(Cross-section: 1968-1996 (varies by country), N: 109)

The variable measures the Gini index of income inequality from observations with highest quality (quality="accept") in the original Deininger & Squire (1996) dataset (higher values indicate more inequality). 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). Note: Both within- and cross-country comparisons should be handled with care, as these Gini coefficients are based on varying sources of information: income or expenditure, gross or net of taxes, individual or household recipient units.

ds_yom   Year of Measurement

(Cross-section: 1968-1996 (varies by country), N: 109)

The latest year available for each country of the ds_gini measurement in the cross-sectional dataset.

Djankov, McLeish, Nenova & Shleifer – Who Owns the Media

(Cross-section 1999, N: 97)
http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/shleifer/files/media_data_final.xls
(Djankov et al 2003)

Djankov et al. (2003) measure state and private ownership of a country's top five media firms, where the top five are measured by share in the total circulation of all dailies (for newspapers) or by share of viewing (for television stations). They provide two types of measurers for both newspapers and television stations: by count (where the number of private/state owned firms is divided by 5) and by weighting for market share. For example, in the Philippines the two state owned newspapers account for 22.2% and 21.3% of circulation for the top 5 newspapers respectively, so the newspapers are 40.0 % state owned when measured by count and 43.5% when measured by market share. In television, the three state owned Philippine stations account for only 17.5% of the share of viewing for the top 5 television stations, so the television market is 60.0% state owned when measured by count but only 17.5% as measured by market share. The market share variables, while more precise as a metric of state control, have the disadvantage that, in the countries with regional newspapers, such as the United States, the market share of any single firm is small. As a consequence, the variables they define are not properly compared to those in countries with national newspapers. Note: The 'other'-category (e.g. employee organizations, trade unions, political parties, churches, not-for-profit foundations, and business

associations) is excluded in the original dataset, which is the reason why the percentages do not sum to 100%.

dmns_pbcs   Press by Count (State)

The percentage of state-owned newspapers out of the five largest daily newspapers (by circulation).

dmns_pbcp   Press by Count (Private)

The percentage of private-owned newspapers out of the five largest daily newspapers (by circulation).

dmns_pbss   Press by Share (State)

The market share of state-owned newspapers out of the aggregate market share of the five largest daily newspapers (by circulation).

dmns_pbsp   Press by Share (Private)

The market share of private-owned newspapers out of the aggregate market share of the five largest daily newspapers (by circulation).

dmns_tbcs   TV by Count (State)

The percentage of state-owned TV stations out of the five largest TV stations (by viewership).

dmns_tbcp   TV by Count (Private)

The percentage of private-owned TV stations out of the five largest TV stations (by viewership).

dmns_tbss   TV by Share (State)

The market share of state-owned TV stations out of the aggregate market share of the five largest TV stations (by viewership).

dmns_tbsp   TV by Share (Private)

The market share of private-owned TV stations out of the aggregate market share of the five largest TV stations (by viewership).

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.

dr_ig   Index of Globalization

(Time-series: 1970-2006, n: 5520, N: 155, $\overline{N}$: 149, $\overline{T}$: 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.

dr_eg   Economic Globalization

(Time-series: 1970-2006, n: 4928, N: 139, $\overline{N}$: 133, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 139)

Economic globalization is here defined as the long distance flows of goods, capital and services as well as information and perceptions that accompany market exchanges. It is measured by actual flows of trade and investments, and by restrictions on trade and capital such as tariff rates.

dr_pg   Political Globalization

(Time-series: 1970-2006, n: 6778, N: 189, $\overline{N}$: 183, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 189)

Political globalization is measured by the number of embassies and high commissions in a country, the number of international organizations of which the country is a member, the number of UN peace missions the country has participated in, and the number of international treaties that the country has signed since 1945

dr_sg   Social Globalization

(Time-series: 1970-2006, n: 5594, N: 157, $\overline{N}$: 151, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 157)

Social globalization is measured by three categories of indicators. The first is personal contacts, such as telephone traffic and tourism. The second is information flows, e.g. number of Internet users. The third is cultural proximity, e.g. trade in books and number of Ikea warehouses per capita.

Easterly & Levine

http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/0,,contentMDK:20700002%7EpagePK:64214825%7EpiPK:64214943%7EtheSitePK:469382,00.html
(Easterly and Levine 1997)

el_gunn1   Percentage of Population not Speaking the Official Language

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 148)
(Cross-section: 1990, N: 143)

The share of the population of each country for whom the language spoken at home is not the official language of the country.
Original source: Gunnemark (1991).

el_gunn2   Percentage of Population not Speaking the Most Widely Used Language

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 149)

(Cross-section: 1990, N: 144)

The share of the population not speaking the most widely used language.
Original source: Gunnemark (1991).

el_avelf   Average Value of Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 152)
(Cross-section: NA, N: 146)

Average value of el_gunn1, el_gunn2 and three other ethnolinguistic fractionalization variables taken from Muller (1964), Roberts (1962) and Atlas Narodov Mira (1964).

Fearon

fe_etfra   Ethnic Fractionalization

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 161)
(Cross-section: 1990, N: 153)

Restricting attention to groups that had at least 1 percent of country population in the 1990s, Fearon identifies 822 ethnic and "ethnoreligious" groups in 160 countries. This variable reflects the probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will belong to different such groups. The variable thus ranges from 0 (perfectly homogeneous) to 1 (highly fragmented).

fe_plural   Plurality Group

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 160)
(Cross-section: 1990, N: 152)

Based on the same set of groups, this variable reflects the population share of the largest group (plurality group) in the country.

fe_lmin   Largest Minority

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 151)
(Cross-section: 1990, N: 144)

Based on the same set of groups, this variable reflects the population share of the second largest group (largest minority)

fe_cultdiv   Cultural Diversity

(Time-series: Country constant, N: 160)
(Cross-section: 1990, N: 152)

This measure modifies fractionalization (fe_etfra) so as to take some account of cultural distances between groups, measured as the structural distance between languages spoken by different groups in a country. If the groups in a country speak structurally unrelated languages, their cultural diversity index will be the same as their level of

ethnic fractionalization (fe_etfra). The more similar are the languages spoken by different ethnic groups, however, the more will this measure be reduced below the level of ethnic fractionalization for that country.

Fish and Kroenig – The Parliamentary Powers Index

(Cross-section: 2007, N: 158)
http://polisci.berkeley.edu/faculty/bio/permanent/Fish,M
(Fish and Kroenig 2009)

fk_ppi   Parliamentary Powers Index

The Parliamentary Powers Index assesses the strength of the national legislature. The index, based on 32 underlying dummy variables, gauges the legislature's sway of the executive, its institutional autonomy, its authority in specific areas, and its institutional capacity. (For a complete list of the variables, see Fish and Kroenig 2009 or http://polisci.berkeley.edu/faculty/bio/permanent/Fish,M.)

The data was generated by means of international an survey of experts, a study of secondary sources, and analyses of constitutions and other relevant documents

The variable ranges from 0 (least powerful) to 1 (most powerful). The score is calculated by summing up the number of powers that the national legislature possesses and dividing it by 32. For example, a country with a national legislature that possesses 16 of the 32 parliamentary powers has a PPI of .50

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, $\overline{N}$: 109, $\overline{T}$: 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.

fi_clindex   Economic Freedom of the World Index (chain-linked)

(Time-series: 1970-2004, n: 1174, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 107, $\overline{T}$: 10)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

One problem with the current version of the index of economic freedom (fi_index) is that the underlying data is more complete in recent years than in earlier years. As a result, changes in the index ratings over time may reflect the fact that some components are missing in some years but not in others. The problem of missing components threatens the comparability of the index ratings over time. In order to correct for this problem, the Fraser Institute has constructed a chain-linked summary index of economic freedom that is based on the 2000 rating as a base year. Changes to the index going backward (and forward) in time are then based only on changes in components that were present in adjacent years. The chain-linked methodology means that a country's rating will change across time periods only when there is a change in ratings for components present during both of the over-lapping years. This is precisely what one would want when making comparisons across time periods.

fi_sog   Size of Government: Expenditures, Taxes, and Enterprises
(Time-series: 1970-2004, n: 1268, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 115, $\overline{T}$: 10)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'large general government consumption', 'large transfer sector', 'many government enterprises', and 'high marginal tax rates and low income thresholds', and 10 to 'small general government consumption', 'small transfer sector', 'few government enterprises', and 'low marginal tax rates and high income thresholds'.

The index consists of the following indicators:
- General government consumption spending as a percentage of total consumption
- Transfers and subsidies as a percentage of GDP
- Government enterprises and investment as a percentage of total investment
- Top marginal tax rate (and income threshold to which it applies)

fi_legprop   Legal Structure and Security of Property Rights
(Time-series: 1970-2004, n: 1140, N: 129, $\overline{N}$: 104, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'no judicial independence', 'no trusted legal framework exists', 'no protection of intellectual property', 'military interference in rule of law', and 'no integrity of the legal system' and 10 corresponds to 'high judicial independence', 'trusted legal framework exists', 'protection of intellectual property', 'no military interference in rule of law', and 'integrity of the legal system'.

The index consists of the following indicators:
- Judicial independence: The judiciary is independent and not subject to interference by the government or parties in dispute
- Impartial courts: A trusted legal framework exists for private businesses to challenge the legality of government actions or regulations
- Protection of intellectual property

- Military interference in rule of law and the political process
- Integrity of the legal system

fi_sm   Access to Sound Money

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 1295, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 11)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'high annual money growth', 'high variation in the annual rate of inflation', 'high inflation rate', and 'restricted foreign currency bank accounts' and 10 corresponds to 'low annual money growth', 'low or no variation in the annual rate of inflation', 'low inflation rate', and 'foreign currency bank accounts are permissible without restrictions'.

The index consists of the following indicators:
- Average annual growth of the money supply in the last five years minus average annual growth of real GDP in the last ten years
- Standard inflation variability in the last five years
- Recent inflation rate
- Freedom to own foreign currency bank accounts domestically and abroad

fi_ftradeint   Freedom to Trade Internationally

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 1211, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 110, $\overline{T}$: 10)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'increasing tax rate on international trade', 'slow import or export process', 'small trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size', 'exchange rate controls are present and a black-market exists', and 'restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners' and 10 corresponds to 'no specific taxes on international trade', 'swift import or export process', 'large trade sectors relative to the population and geographic size', 'no black-market exchange rate', and 'no restrictions on the freedom of citizens to engage in capital market exchange with foreigners'.

The index consists of the following indicators:
- Taxes on international trade
- Regulatory trade barriers
- Actual size of trade sector compared to expected size
- Difference between official exchange rate and black market rate
- International capital market controls

fi_reg   Regulation of Credit, Labor and Business

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 1173, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 107, $\overline{T}$: 10)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

The index ranges from 0-10 where 0 corresponds to 'low percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks', 'high foreign bank license denial rate', 'private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-minimum', 'deposit and lending rates is fixed by the government and real rates is persistently negative', 'high impact of minimum wage', 'widespread use of price controls throughout various sectors of the economy',

and 'starting a new business is generally complicated' and 10 corresponds to 'high percentage of deposits held in privately owned banks', 'low foreign bank license denial rate', 'private sector's share of credit is close to the base-year-maximum', 'interest rates is determined primarily by market forces and the real rates is positive', 'low impact of minimum wage', 'no price controls or marketing boards', and 'starting a new business is generally easy'.

The index consists of the following indicators:
- Credit Market Regulations
- Labor Market Regulations
- Business Regulations

Gerring, Thacker & Moreno

http://www.bu.edu/sthacker/data.htm
(Gerring et al 2005)

Gerring, Thacker and Moreno only include country-years that obtains a score greater than zero on the Polity democracy indicator (p_polity2). (For details, see Gerring et al. 2005: p.572)

gtm_centrip   Centripetalism

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 2981, N: 142, $\overline{N}$: 73, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 124)

Sum of Unitarism (gtm_unit), Parliamentarism (gtm_parl), and Proportional Representation (gtm_pr).

gtm_centrip2 Centripetalism (weighted)

(Time-series: 1960-2000, n: 2981, N: 142, $\overline{N}$: 73, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 124)

The variable is a moving weighted sum of Unitarism (gtm_unit), Parliamentarism (gtm_parl), and Proportional Representation (gtm_pr), beginning in 1901 and ending in 2000. For details, see Gerring et al (2005).

gtm_unit   Unitarism

(Time-series: 1960-2001, n: 3710, N: 161, $\overline{N}$: 88, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 146)

Average of Nonfederalism and Nonbicameralism:

- Nonfederalism is coded as 0 = federal (elective regional legislatures plus conditional recognition of subnational authority), 1 = semifederal (where there are elective legislatures at the regional level but in which constitutional sovereignty is reserved to the national government), or 2 = nonfederal.

- Nonbicameralism is coded as 0 = strong bicameral (upper house has some effective veto power; the two houses are incongruent), 1 = weak bicameral (upper house has

some effective veto power, though not necessarily a formal veto; the two houses are congruent), or 2 = unicameral (no upper house or weak upper house).

gtm_parl   **Parliamentarism**

(Time-series: 1960-2001, n: 3710, N: 161, $\overline{N}$: 88, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 146)

The parliamentary/presidential distinction is conceptualized as a continuum with two dimensions: (a) the *degree of separation* (independence) between president and parliament (unity = parliamentary, separation = presidential) and, if there is any separation at all, (b) the *relative power* of the two players (the more power the president possesses, the more presidential is the resulting system). This complex reality is captured with a three-part coding scheme:
(0)   Presidential
(1)   Semi-presidential
(2)   Parliamentary

gtm_pr   **Proportional Representation**

(Time-series: 1960-2001, n: 3711, N: 162, $\overline{N}$: 88, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 146)

The centripetal theory of democratic governance emphasizes the following three features of an electoral system: (a) district magnitude (M), (b) seat allocation rules (majoritarian or proportional), and (c) candidate selection rules. The centripetal ideal type is defined by M>1, proportional seat allocation rules, and party-controlled candidate selection. This is the *closed-list-PR* electoral system. Other systems are ranked lower in this coding according to their deviation from this ideal type. Thus, the coding for the list-PR variable is as follows:
(0)   Majoritarian or Preferential-vote
(1)   Mixed-member majority or Block vote
(2)   Closed-list-PR

Gleditsch – Expanded Trade and GDP Data

http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~ksg/exptradegdp.html
(Gleditsch, K. S. 2002)

In order to fill in gaps in the Direction of Trade (DOT) data reported by the IMF for pairs of countries in the world, Gleditsch has imputed missing data using the following techniques: drawing on an alternative source of data; substitution based on reversed trade flows; estimates of exports to another country based on imports from that country, and vice versa; linear interpolation within and extrapolation beyond available time-series; and, by assuming remaining dyads with no observed data to have a trade exchange rate of zero.

gle_imp   **Total Import**

(Time-series: 1948-2000, n: 7633, N: 203, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 190)

This amounts to the total import of a country, in millions of current year US dollars, estimated as the sum of all dyadic import figures to that country using the imputation technique described above.

gle_exp**Total Export**

(Time-series: 1948-2000, n: 7633, N: 203, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 190)

This amounts to the total export of a country, in millions of current year US dollars, estimated as the sum of all dyadic export figures to that country using the imputation technique described above.

gle_trade**Total Trade**

(Time-series: 1948-2000, n: 7633, N: 203, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 190)

This amounts to the sum of import and export of a country, in millions of current year US dollars, estimated as the sum of all dyadic import and export figures of that country using the imputation technique described above.

gle_pop**Population (1000's)**

(Time-series: 1946-2004, n: 8584, N: 205, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 42)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

Size of the population in 1000's.

gle_gdp**GDP per Capita**

(Time-series: 1950-2004, n: 8264, N: 205, $\overline{N}$: 150, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

In order to fill in gaps in the Penn World Table's mark 5.6 and 6.2 data (see below: Heston, Summers & Aten), Gleditsch has imputed missing data by using an alternative source of data (the CIA *World Fact Book*), and through extrapolation beyond available time-series. This is his estimate of GDP per Capita in US dollars at current year international prices.

gle_rgdp**Real GDP per Capita**

(Time-series: 1950-2004, n: 8264, N: 205, $\overline{N}$: 150, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

This is the estimate of real GDP per Capita in constant US dollars at base year 2000, based on the imputation technique described above.

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_legel 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.

gol_adm   Average District Magnitude

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2813, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 51, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 109)

Average district magnitude in the lowest electoral tier. This is calculated as the total number of seats allocated in the lowest tier divided by the total number of districts in that tier. For example, gol_adm=7.94 in Denmark after 1971 since there are 135 seats allocated in the lowest tier between 17 districts.

gol_dist   Districts

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2814, N: 122, $\overline{N}$: 51, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 109)

Number of electoral districts or constituencies in the lowest electoral tier for the lower house of the legislature.

gol_enep   Effective Number of Electoral Parties

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2619, N: 113, $\overline{N}$: 48, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 100)

Effective number of electoral parties based on formula from Laakso and Taagepera (1979).

gol_enepo   Effective Number of Electoral Parties (Others)

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2605, N: 113, $\overline{N}$: 47, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 100)

This is the percentage of the vote going to parties that are collectively known as 'others' in official electoral results.

gol_enep1   Effective Number of Electoral Parties1

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2603, N: 113, $\overline{N}$: 47, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 100)

Effective number of electoral parties once the 'other' category has been corrected for by using the least component method of bounds suggested by Taagepera (1997). The method of bounds essentially requires, first, calculating the effective number of parties treating the 'other' category as a single party; this estimate corresponds to the minimum effective number of parties. Second, the effective number of parties is recalculated as if every vote in the 'other' category belonged to different parties; this estimate corresponds to the maximum effective number of parties. Finally, one takes the mean of these minimum and maximum estimates.

gol_enpp   Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2758, N: 119, $\overline{N}$: 50, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 104)

Effective number of parliamentary or legislative parties constructed using the formula from Laakso and Taagepera (1979).

gol_enppo   Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties (Others)

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2713, N: 117, $\overline{N}$: 49, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 102)

This is the percentage of the seats going to parties that are collectively known as 'others' in official electoral results.

gol_enpp1   Effective Number of Parliamentary or Legislative Parties1

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2713, N: 117, $\overline{N}$: 49, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 102)

Effective number of parliamentary or legislative parties once the 'other' category has been corrected for by using the least component method of bounds suggested by Taagepera (1997).

gol_enpres   Effective Number of Presidential Candidates

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2865, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 52, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 109)

Effective number of presidential candidates based on the formula from Amorim Neto and Cox (1997).

gol_est   Electoral System Type

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

Variable indicating the type of electoral system used:
(1)   Majoritarian (employs plurality, absolute majority, qualified majority, limited vote, alternative vote, single non-transferable vote or modified Borda count in a single electoral tier)
(2)   Proportional (employs party list or single transferable vote in a single electoral tier)

(3)   Multi-tier (employs a single electoral formula, majoritarian or proportional, across multiple tiers)

(4)   Mixed (employs a mixture of majoritarian and proportional electoral rules in one or more electoral tiers)

gol_est2   Electoral System Type 2

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2847, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 52, $\overline{T}$: 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

gol_inst   Institution

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 7490, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 188)

Classification of political regimes in which democracies are distinguished by the type of executive as given below:

(0)   Dictatorship

(1)   Parliamentary Democracy

(2)   Mixed Democracy

(3)   Presidential Democracy

Transition years are coded as the regime that emerges. On the criteria for determining whether a regime is a dictatorship, see Political Regimes (gol_polreg). A presidential regime is one in which the government serves under the elected president. The president may be directly elected or indirectly elected; the important feature is that the president selects and determines the survival of the government. A parliamentary system is one in which the government serves so long as it maintains the confidence of the legislature. A system in which the government must respond to both the legislative assembly and to an elected president is classified as mixed. Typically, these mixed systems are characterized by a president who is elected for a fixed term with some executive powers and a government that serves under the direction of the legislature. This classification scheme follows the recommendations of Przeworski et al. (2000).

gol_legel   Legislative Elections

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 7490, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 188)

Indicates the number of elections for the national lower chamber of the legislature held in that year. Partial elections such as those taking place in Costa Rica 1946, Poland 1989, Laos 1958, or Luxembourg 1948, 1951 are coded 0. This variable does not include elections to constituent assemblies such as those in Pakistan 1955, Nicaragua 1984, Sudan 1965, 1968, Italy 1946, or France 1946. It also excludes the

1960 election in Somalia, as this was only a legislative election for Somaliland (later to become the northern region of Somalia). 18 democratic legislative elections occur in years where gol_polreg is coded as a dictatorship (Argentina 1962, Bolivia 1980, Chile 1973, Colombia 1949, Congo 1963, Costa Rica 1948, Guatemala 1982, Nigeria 1983, Pakistan 1977, Panama 1968, Peru 1962, 1990, Philippines 1965, Sierra Leone 1967, Somalia 1969, Sri Lanka 1977, Sudan 1958, Thailand 1976). This apparent anomaly arises because the classification of gol_polreg is based on the regime as of December 31st in the given year. The elections mentioned above occurred prior to the transition to dictatorship in these years and should be considered democratic.

gol_legro   Runoff

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2741, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 50, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 107)

Dummy variable coded 0 if there is no legislative runoff; 1 if there is.

gol_maj   Majoritarian Type

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 1172, N: 57, $\overline{N}$: 21, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 43)

Classification, constructed by the authors of the QoG dataset (but based on Golder's underlying data), indicating the type of majoritarian electoral system used in legislative elections as given below:
(1)   Plurality
(2)   Absolute majority
(3)   Qualified majority
(4)   Limited vote
(5)   Alternative vote
(6)   Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV)
(7)   Modified Borda

gol_mdm   Median District Magnitude

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2354, N: 116, $\overline{N}$: 43, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 105)

Median district magnitude in the lowest electoral tier. This is the district magnitude associated with the median legislator in the lowest tier. The median legislator is determined by finding the number of legislators elected in the lower tier and dividing this figure by two. For further details on this variable, see Amorim Neto and Cox (1997).

gol_mix   Mixed Type

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 386, N: 32, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 12)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 28)

Classification, constructed by the authors of the QoG dataset (but based on Golder's underlying data), indicating the type of mixed electoral system used in legislative elections as given below:
(1)   Coexistence, independent

(2)   Superposition, independent
(3)   Fusion, independent
(4)   Correction, dependent
(5)   Conditional, dependent

A dependent mixed system is one in which the application of one formula is dependent on the outcome produced by the other formula. There are three types of independent mixed systems: coexistence (where some districts use a majoritarian, while others employ a proportional formula), superposition (where two different electoral formulas are applied nationwide), and fusion (where majoritarian and proportional formulas are used within a single district) systems. An independent mixed system is one in which the two electoral formulas are implemented independently of each other. There are two types of dependent mixed systems: correction (where seats distributed by proportional representation in one set of districts are used to correct for the distortions created by the majoritarian formula in another) and conditional (where the actual use or not of one formula depends on the outcome produced by the other) systems.

gol_mt   Multi-Tier Type

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 596, N: 27, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 25)

Classification, constructed by the authors of the QoG dataset (but based on Golder's underlying data), indicating the type of multi-tier electoral system used in legislative elections as given below:
(1)   Linked
(2)   Unlinked

A multi-tier system is linked whenever unused votes from one electoral tier are used at another level, or if the allocation of seats in one tier is conditional on the seats received in another tier.

gol_nos   Number of Seats

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2853, N: 123, $\overline{N}$: 52, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 109)

Total number of seats in the lower house of the legislature during the election year.

gol_pest   Presidential Electoral System Type

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 290, N: 61, $\overline{N}$: 5, $\overline{T}$: 5)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 15)

Variable that indicates the type of electoral system used in presidential elections:
(1)   Plurality
(2)   Absolute majority
(3)   Qualified majority
(4)   Electoral College
(5)   Single Transferable Vote (STV)

gol_polreg   Political Regimes

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 7441, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 188)

Transition years are coded as the regime that exists (0 Democracy, 1 Dictatorship) as of December 31st in that year. A regime is considered a dictatorship if the chief executive is not elected, the legislature is not elected, there is no more than one party, or there has been no alternation in power (Przeworski et al. 2000). A regime is democratic if those who govern are selected through contested elections.

gol_pr   PR Type

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 1583, N: 60, $\overline{N}$: 29, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 56)

Classification, constructed by the authors of the QoG dataset (but based on Golder's underlying data), indicating the type of proportional formula used in legislative elections:

(1)   Hare
(2)   Droop
(3)   Imperiali
(4)   Reinforced Imperiali
(5)   Modified Hare
(6)   D'Hondt
(7)   Saint-Laguë
(8)   Modified Saint-Laguë
(9)   Single Transferable Vote (STV)

gol_preel   Presidential Election

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 7428, N: 197, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 188)

Indicates the number of direct presidential elections held in that year. Note: This variable does not signify that the election chose either the nominal or effective head of government. For example, gol_preel=1 if there is an election for president in mixed systems, even though the nominal and effective head of government is the prime minister. This variable does not include plebiscites or referenda as have occurred in countries like Taiwan and the Maldives.

18 democratic presidential elections occur in years where gol_polreg is coded as a dictatorship (Argentina 1962, Bolivia 1980, Chile 1973, Colombia 1949, Congo 1963, Costa Rica 1948, Guatemala 1982, Nigeria 1983, Pakistan 1977, Panama 1968, Peru 1962, 1990, Philippines 1965, Sierra Leone 1967, Somalia 1969, Sri Lanka 1977, Sudan 1958, Thailand 1976). This apparent anomaly arises because the classification of gol_polreg is based on the regime as of December 31st in the given year. The elections mentioned above occurred prior to the transition to dictatorship in these years and should be considered democratic.

gol_prero   Presidential Runoff

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2888, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 53, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 109)

Dummy variable coded 0 if there is no presidential runoff; 1 if there is a presidential runoff. Presidential elections are coded as having runoff provisions if a successful candidate must win an absolute or qualified majority of the vote to become president.

gol_upseat   Upper Seats

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2712, N: 119, $\overline{N}$: 49, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 105)

The number of seats allocated in electoral districts or constituencies above the lowest tier. This variable may include seats allocated in several different upper tiers.

gol_uptier   Upper Tier

(Time-series: 1946-2000, n: 2712, N: 119, $\overline{N}$: 49, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 105)

Percentage of seats allocated in electoral districts above the lowest tier.

Grimes – Civil Society Organizations

(Grimes 2008)

gr_cso   Development Civil Society Organizations

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 191)

Grimes has collected the data on the number of civil society organizations from CIVICUS, a global network of civil society organizations active in the area of social and economic development. The directory is compiled for the development community and does not purport to be an exhaustive register of all organizations.

Grimes has tried to validate the data by comparing it to the results of a comprehensive analysis conducted at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies of a much smaller subset of countries (Salamon, Sokolowski and List 2003).Though the latter employs a broader definition of civil society and measures civil society as the proportion of a country's workforce active in civil society, the Johns Hopkins and CIVCUS measures correlate respectably (Pearson's r=0.63, p<0.001, N=35)

gr_csopop   CSOs per Population

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 170)

Number of civil society organizations per million inhabitants. Population data was taken from Gleditsch. For more information on the construction of the variable, see gr_cso above.

Hadenius, Teorell & Wahman – Types of Authoritarian Regimes

(Hadenius, Teorell & Wahman 2010; Hadenius & Teorell 2007)

ht_regtype   Regime Type

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 6317, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 171, $\overline{T}$: 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

ht_regspec   Regime Type (Separating Dominant Multiparty Systems)

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

ht_regspec corresponds to *ht_regtype* in every aspect apart from its separation of the dominant multiparty regime. This regime type is a subcategory for the multiparty system adhering to countries where the largest parties' share of parliament is larger

than 67% but less than 100% (i.e. *partsz*>0.67 but<1); this threshold corresponds to Geddes (1999) classification of the same.

(1)	Limited Multiparty		(18)	Rebel Regime
(2)	Partyless		(19)	Civil War
(3)	No-Party		(20)	Occupation
(4)	Military		(21)	Theocracy
(5)	Military No-Party		(22)	Transitional Regime
(6)	Military Multiparty		(23)	No-Party Monarchy
(7)	Military One-party		(24)	Multiparty Monarchy
(8)	One-Party		(25)	Dominant Multiparty
(9)	Other		(26)	Multiparty Occupied
(16)	One-Party Monarchy		(100)	Democracy
(17)	Monarchy			

ht_regtype1   Regime Type (Collapsed)

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

A simplified, collapsed version of *ht_regtype*, where all monarchical regimes with amalgams [*ht_regtype* =16, 17, 23 or 24] are treated as monarchies, all military regimes with sub-types and amalgams [*ht_regtype*=4, 5, 6, 7 or 18] are treated as military regimes, and multiparty regimes with sub-types are treated as multiparty regimes [*ht_regtype*=1 or 2]. Only pure noparty [*ht_regtype*=3] and one-party [*ht_regtype*=8] regimes are treated as no-party and one-party regimes, respectively. The minor types [*ht_regtype*=9, 19, 20, 21, 22 or 25] are treated as other.

(1)   Monarchy
(2)   Military
(3)   One party
(4)   Multi-party
(9)   No-party
(99)   Other
(100) Democracy

ht_partsz   Size of Largest Party in Legislature (in Fractions)

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 6228, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 168, $\overline{T}$: 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.

ht_partsz1   Size of Largest Party (in Fractions), Zero for One-Party Regimes

(Time-series: 1972-2008, n: 6228, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 168, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006, N: 188)

Codes all one-party regimes as 0 instead of 1 as is done in *ht_partsz*, otherwise this variable corresponds to the former variable *ht_partsz.* When the degree of "dominantness" of the largest party *within multiparty regimes* is to be controlled for, this variable should be used.

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 Zeeland)
(6)   East Asia (including Japan & Mongolia)
(7)   South-East Asia
(8)   South Asia
(9)   The Pacific (excluding Australia & New Zeeland)
(10)   The Caribbean (including Belize, Guyana & Suriname, but excluding Cuba, Haiti & the Dominican Republic)

ht_region2   The Region of the Country (alternative)

To flag some of the most contested cases, we have in the alternative variable, ht_region2, coded Cyprus (considering the Greek majority of their population) as belonging to category (5), Haiti (considering their non-Spanish colonial legacy and membership in Caricom) as belonging to category (10), and Mongolia (considering their post-communist legacy) as belonging to category (1).

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 Zeeland), 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

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, $\overline{N}$: 142, $\overline{T}$: 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.

h_polcon5   Political Constraints Index V

(Time-series: 1960-2007, n: 7141, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 149, $\overline{T}$: 39)
(Cross-section: 1998-2006 (varies by country), N: 171)

This index follows the same logic as Political Constraints Index III (h_polcon3) but
also includes two additional veto points: the judiciary and sub-federal entities. Note that
the coding reflects information as of January 1 in any given year. Henisz (2000) uses
this index to measure the impact on cross-national growth rates of a government's
ability to provide credible commitment.

h_l1   Legislative Chamber

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 8988, N: 204, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 44)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Dummy variable coded 1 if there is an effective legislative chamber (based on information from Polity's Executive Constraints, p_xconst).

h_l2   **2nd Legislative Chamber**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 8988, N: 204, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 44)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 193)

Dummy variable coded 1 if there is an effective second legislative chamber, namely, where h_l1=1 and records on the composition of a second chamber exist - where that chamber is elected under a distinct electoral system *and* has a substantive (not merely delaying) role in the implementation of fiscal policy.

h_j   **Independent Judiciary**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 7084, N: 180, $\overline{N}$: 114, $\overline{T}$: 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).

h_f   **Independent Sub-Federal Unit**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 7450, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 120, $\overline{T}$: 39)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 179)

Dummy variable coded 1 if there are independent sub-federal units (states, provinces, regions etc.) that impose substantive constraints on national fiscal policy.

h_alignl1   **Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (lower)**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 5651, N: 178, $\overline{N}$: 91, $\overline{T}$: 32)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 165)

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the executive and the lower legislative chamber, coded 1 when the party controlling the executive branch is either the largest party in the lower legislative chamber or is a member of a ruling coalition in that chamber.

h_alignl2   **Alignment Executive/Legislative Chamber (upper)**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 1500, N: 60, $\overline{N}$: 24, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1996-2007 (varies by country), N: 44)

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the executive and the upper legislative chamber, coded 1 when the party controlling the executive branch is either the largest party in the upper legislative chamber or is a member of a ruling coalition in that chamber.

h_alignl1l2   **Alignment Lower/Upper Legislative Chamber**

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 1500, N: 60, $\overline{N}$: 24, $\overline{T}$: 25)

(Cross-section: 1996-2007 (varies by country), N: 44)

Dummy variable indicating alignment between the legislative chambers, coded 1 when the same party or a coalition of parties (when available) control a majority in both legislative chambers.

h_lflo   Legislative Fractionalization (lower)

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 6813, N: 192, $\overline{N}$: 110, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002-2007 (varies by country), N: 184)

Legislative fractionalization is approximately the probability that two random draws from the lower legislative chamber will be from different parties.

h_lfup   Legislative Fractionalization (upper)

(Time-series: 1946-2007, n: 1684, N: 68, $\overline{N}$: 27, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1997-2007 (varies by country), N: 55)

Legislative fractionalization is approximately the probability that two random draws from the upper legislative chamber will be from different parties.

Heritage Foundation

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 1949, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 150, $\overline{T}$: 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.

hf_business   Business Freedom
The business freedom score encompasses 10 components, all weighted equally, based on objective data from the World Bank's *Doing Business* study (in 2005-2006; previously other data sources were being used):

- Starting a business - procedures (number)
- Starting a business - time (days)
- Starting a business - cost (% of income per capita)
- Starting a business - minimum capital (% of income per capita)
- Obtaining a license - procedures (number)
- Obtaining a license - time (days)
- Obtaining a license - cost (% of income per capita)
- Closing a business - time (years)
- Closing a business - cost (% of estate)
- Closing a business - recovery rate (cents on the dollar)

Each of these raw components is converted into a scale graded from 0 to 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of business freedom.

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.

hf_fiscal   Fiscal Freedom

Fiscal freedom is composed of three quantitative components in equal measure:
- The top tax rate on individual income
- The top tax rate on corporate income
- Total tax revenue as a percentage of GDP

In scoring the fiscal freedom factor, each of these numerical variables is weighted equally as one-third of the factor. This equal weighting allows a country to achieve a score as high as 67 percent based on two of the components even if it receives a score of 0 percent on the third. The country's fiscal freedom ranges between 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of fiscal freedom.

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.

hf_monetary Monetary Freedom

The score for the monetary freedom factor is based on two components:
- The weighted average inflation rate for the three most recent years
- Price controls.

The weighted average inflation (WAI) rate for the three most recent years serves as the primary input into an equation that generates the base score for monetary freedom (MF). The extent of price controls is then assessed as a penalty of up to 20 percent subtracted from the base score. The country's monetary freedom ranges between 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of monetary freedom.

hf_invest   Investment Freedom

This factor scrutinizes each country's policies toward foreign investment, as well as its policies toward capital flows internally, in order to determine its overall investment climate. The country's investment freedom ranges between 0 and 100, where 100 represents the maximum degree of investment freedom.

hf_financ   Financial Freedom

The financial freedom factor measures the relative openness of each country's banking and financial system by determining: the extent of government regulation of financial services; the extent of state intervention in banks and other financial services; the difficulty of opening and operating financial services firms (for both domestic and foreign individuals); and government influence on the allocation of credit. The country's financial climate is measured as an overall score between 0 and 100, where 100 represent the maximum degree of financial freedom.

hf_prights   Property Rights

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 1949, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 150, $\overline{T}$: 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.

hf_corrupt   Freedom from Corruption

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

This factor relies on Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), which measures the level of corruption in 152 countries, to determine the freedom from corruption scores of countries that are also listed in the *Index of Economic Freedom*. The CPI is based on a 10-point scale in which a score of 10 indicates very little corruption and a score of 0 indicates a very corrupt government. In scoring

freedom from corruption, the authors convert each of these raw CPI data to a 0-100 scale by multiplying the CPI scores by 10.

hf_labor   Labor Freedom

(Time-series: 2004-2006, n: 466, N: 156, $\overline{N}$: 155, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 153)

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.

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".

pwt_er   Exchange Rate

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 9437, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 163, $\overline{T}$: 51)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 185)

The amount of local currency units per US dollar.

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

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 141, $\overline{T}$: 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-l' 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.

pwt_csg   Consumption Share of GDP (%)

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

The consumption share of GDP, in percent.

pwt_gsg   Government Share of GDP (%)

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

The share of government spending as a percentage of GDP.

pwt_isg   Investment Share of GDP (%)

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

The share of investment as a percentage of GDP.

pwt_openk   Openness to Trade, Constant Prices

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8187, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 141, $\overline{T}$: 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.

pwt_openc   Openness to Trade, Current Prices

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8214, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 142, $\overline{T}$: 44)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 185)

Same as pwt_openk, but in current prices.

pwt_pop   Population (Thousands)

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 10730, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 185, $\overline{T}$: 58)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 185)

Population, thousands.

IDEA (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance)
http://www.idea.int/

idea_esd   Electoral System Design (ESD)
http://www.idea.int/esd/index.cfm

(Cross-section: 1969-2001 (varies by country), N: 191)

The ESD-categories are the following:
(1)   Alternative Vote (AV)
(2)   Borda Count (BC)
(3)   Block Vote (BV)
(4)   First Past The Post (FPTP)
(5)   List Proportional Representation (List PR)
(6)   Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP)
(7)   No provisions for direct elections (N)
(8)   Party Block Vote (PBV)
(9)   Parallel Systems
(10)   Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV)
(11)   Single Transferable Vote (STV)
(12)   Two-Round System (TRS)
(13)   Limited Vote (LV)

Election Turnouts

The total number of registered voters (Registered Voters, RV) and voting age population (Voting Age Population, VAP) can both be used as indicators for electoral turnout. Data are only given for election years.

idea_parvap   Turnout in Parliamentary Elections (VAP)

(Time-series: 1946-2002, n: 1207, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 21, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 80)

Turnout in parliamentary elections measured as the total number of votes cast divided by the voting age population (VAP).

idea_parrv   Turnout in Parliamentary Elections (RV)

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 1277, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 21, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 156)

Turnout in parliamentary elections measured as the total number of votes cast divided by the number of registered voters (RV).

idea_presvap Turnout in Presidential Elections (VAP)

(Time-series: 1946-2001, n: 366, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 67)

Turnout in presidential elections measured as the total number of votes cast divided by the voting age population (VAP).

idea_presrv   Turnout in Presidential Elections (RV)

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 401, N: 103, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 162)

Turnout in presidential elections measured as the total number of votes cast divided by the number of registered voters (RV).

idea_yoepar   Year of Election (Parliamentary)
(Cross-section: 1969-2005, N: 172)

The latest observed year of parliamentary elections available.

idea_yoepre   Year of Election (Presidential)
(Cross-section: 1986-2005, N: 102)

The latest observed year of presidential elections available.

Electoral Quotas for Women
http://www.quotaproject.org/

Electoral quotas are defined as mandatory or targeted percentages of women candidates for public elections. The electoral quota may be constitutional, legislative or take the form of a political party quota. It may apply to the number of women proposed by a party for election, or take the form of reserved seats in the legislature.

If a country is not listed in this dataset as having quotas, it is to IDEA's knowledge that no quotas for women have been adopted.

idea_cq   Constitutional Quota for National Parliament
(Cross-section: 2003-2007 (varies by country), N: 14)

Equals 1 if women quota provisions are mandated in the constitution, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_elq   Election Law Quota for National Parliament
(Cross-section: 2003-2007 (varies by country), N: 41)

Equals 1 if women quotas are provided for in election laws or other relevant laws, such as general laws for political parties in the country, and 0 if otherwise..

idea_ppq   Political Party Quota for Candidates
(Cross-section: 2003-2007 (varies by country), N: 68)

Equals 1 if there exists rules or targets set by political parties to include a certain percentage of women as election candidates, and 0 if otherwise.. This does not include quotas for internal party structures

Political Finance Laws and Regulations Database
http://www.idea.int/parties/finance/db/index.cfm
(Austin and Tjernström 2003)

Current information in the database is from December 2002.

It is important to stress that the information in the database concerns only the letter of the laws and regulations. There are many laws that are enacted but for different reasons never enforced. The information is also restricted to political *party* finances. This means that a "No" in answer to the question of public funding of political parties in a country does not necessarily mean that *candidates* cannot receive public funding. Finally, the information is limited to legislation at the national and federal level, and does not take into account regulation that might exist on other levels of government.

idea_rfp   Regulation for the Financing of Parties
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 116)

Equals 1 if there exists a system of regulation of the financing of political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_dctp   Disclosure of Contributions to Parties
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 111)

Equals 1 if there is any provision of disclosure of contributions to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_dcd   Disclosure of Contributions for Donors
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 112)

Equals 1 if donors have to disclose contributions made to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_dcfp   Disclosure of Contributions for Parties
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 112)

Equals 1 if political parties have to disclose contributions made, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_ccp   Ceiling on Contributions to Parties
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 111)

Equals 1 if there is a ceiling on contributions to political parties, and 0 if otherwise. The level of the ceiling can be found on the IDEA website and in Austin and Tjernström (2003).

idea_ccd   Ceiling on Contributions for Donors
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 111)

Equals 1 if there is a ceiling on how much a donor can contribute to political parties, and 0 if otherwise. The level of the ceiling can be found on the IDEA website and in Austin and Tjernström (2003).

idea_crp   Ceiling on Raisings by Parties
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 111)

Equals 1 if there is a ceiling on how much a party can raise, and 0 if otherwise. The level of the ceiling can be found on the IDEA website and in Austin and Tjernström (2003).

idea_bdp   Ban on Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 111)

Equals 1 if there is any type of ban on donations to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_bfdp   Ban on Foreign Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 114)

Equals 1 if there is a ban on foreign donations to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_bcdp   Ban on Corporate Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 115)

Equals 1 if there is a ban on corporate donations to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_bgcdp   Ban on Government Contractors Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 115)

Equals 1 if there is a ban on donations from government contractors to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_btudp   Ban on Trade Union Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 115)

Equals 1 if there is a ban on trade union donations to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_badp   Ban on Anonymous Donations to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 113)

Equals 1 if there is a ban on anonymous donations to political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_dep   Disclosure of Expenditure by Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 115)

Equals 1 if there is provision for public disclosure of expenditure by political parties, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_cpee   Ceiling on Party Election Expenditure

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 112)

Equals 1 if there is a ceiling on party election expenditure, and 0 if otherwise. The level of the ceiling can be found on the IDEA website and in Austin and Tjernström (2003).

idea_dpfp   Direct Public Funding of Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 144)

Equals 1 if political parties receive direct public funding, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_ipfp   Indirect Public Funding of Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 115)

Equals 1 if political parties receive indirect public funding, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_fmap   Free Media Access for Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 114)

Equals 1 if political parties are entitled to free media access, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_stsp   Special Taxation Status for Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 114)

Equals 1 if political parties are entitled to special taxation status, and 0 if otherwise.

idea_trdp   Tax Relief for Donors to Parties

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 114)

Equals 1 if donors to political parties are entitled to any tax relief, and 0 if otherwise.

Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation – University of Washington

http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org/
(Gakidou et al. 2010)

ihme_ayef   Average Years of Education (Female)

(Time-series: 1970-2009, n: 6960, N: 176, $\overline{N}$: 174, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 174)

Average number of years of education of women aged 25 and older.

ihme_ayem   Average Years of Education (Male)

(Time-series: 1970-2009, n: 6960, N: 176, $\overline{N}$: 174, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 174)

Average number of years of education of men aged 25 and older.

Inter-Parliamentary Union

ipu_w_lower Women in national parliament (lower house)

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

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

ipu_w_upper Women in national parliament (upper house)

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

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

Institutions and Elections Project

(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.

Executive-Legislature Relationship

iaep_evp   Executive Veto Power

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4389, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 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.

iaep_lvp   Legislature Veto Power

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4282, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 126, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1997-2005 (varies by country), N: 153)

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

iaep_lcre   Legislature Can Remove Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4418, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 130, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 156)

Equals 1 if the legislature according to the constitution can remove an executive from office, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_ecdl   Executive Can Dissolve Legislature

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4382, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 156)

Equals 1 if an executive according to the constitution can dissolve the legislature, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_lrit   Legislature's Ratification of International Treaties

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4203, N: 168, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 151)

Does the legislature have the constitutional authority to ratify international treaties negotiated by an executive?

(1)   No authority
(2)   One chamber's approval necessary
(3)   Both chambers' approval necessary

iaep_epmf   Executive Power over Military Force

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4324, N: 170, $\overline{N}$: 127, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 154)

Equals 1 if an executive has the power to use military force abroad without legislative approval, and 0 otherwise

iaep_eccdt   Executive Can Change Domestic Taxes

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4207, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 154)

Equals 1 if an executive can change domestic taxes (excluding import/export tariffs) without legislative approval, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_lap   Legislature Approves Budget

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4377, N: 169, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 26)
(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 157)

Equals 1 if an executive has to secure legislative approval for the budget, and 0 otherwise.

Judiciary

iaep_cc   Constitutional Court

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4881, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 1999-2004 (varies by country), N: 160)

Equals 1 if the country according to the constitution has a national constitutional court, and 0 otherwise. In some cases, a council with powers of a constitutional court may exist, though it may not be part of the formal judiciary. In such cases, this non-judicial council with powers of a constitutional court is coded as the constitutional court.

iaep_aecc   Appointments/Elections to Constitutional Court

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 3180, N: 144, $\overline{N}$: 94, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 1997-2005 (varies by country), N: 133)

Are members of the constitutional court appointed or elected? "Elected" here refers to popular elections. Elections by legislative bodies are considered appointments

(1)   Appointed
(2)   Elected

iaep_rmcc   Removal of Members of Constitutional Court

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 2843, N: 137, $\overline{N}$: 84, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 119)

Equals 1 if members of the constitutional court can be removed, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_wrmcc   Who Removes Members of Constitutional Court

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 2151, N: 112, $\overline{N}$: 63, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 94)

If members of the constitutional court can be removed, by whom? Here, the term "court itself" may refer to another court in the judiciary, not necessarily the constitutional court itself.

(1)   Legislature
(2)   Executive
(3)   Requires both legislature and executive action
(4)   Vote of general public
(5)   Court itself

iaep_alcc   Appointment for Life to Constitutional Court

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 2798, N: 132, $\overline{N}$: 82, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 124)

Equals 1 if the members of the constitutional court are appointed for life, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_ccrea   Constitutional Court Rules on Executive Actions

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 2961, N: 136, $\bar{N}$: 87, $\bar{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 124)

Equals 1 if the constitutional court can rule on executive actions, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_ccrla   Constitutional Court Rules on Legislative Actions

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 3067, N: 141, $\bar{N}$: 90, $\bar{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 130)

Equals 1 if the constitutional court can rule on legislative actions, and 0 otherwise.

Government Centralization

The data in this section is on the relationship between the central and those regional governments which are immediately below the central government. The data is exclusively on states or provincial levels of government, municipalities are not coded.

iaep_ufs   Unitary or Federal State

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4950, N: 171, $\bar{N}$: 146, $\bar{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 161)

(1)   Unitary system
(2)   Confederation
(3)   Federal system

iaep_arr   Appointment of Regional Representatives

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4838, N: 171, $\bar{N}$: 142, $\bar{T}$: 28)
(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 158)

In practice, do regions or provinces:

(1)   Appoint, elect or otherwise choose their own representatives autonomous from decisions by the central government.
(2)   Have their administrators appointed by the central government.
(3)   No regional/provincial governments.

Elections and Electoral Outcomes

iaep_nee   National Elections for an Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4989, N: 171, $\bar{N}$: 147, $\bar{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if the country holds national elections for an executive, and 0 otherwise. These elections must involve subjecting the executive to some form of popular plebiscite. This electoral process may or may not bear any relationship to the ultimate appointment of the executive. Executive council elections that select an executive are not considered national elections.

iaep_nel   National Elections for the Legislature

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4938, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if the country holds national elections for the legislature, and 0 otherwise. These elections must involve subjecting the legislature to some form of popular plebiscite. While seats may be divided into districts, national elections are considered to occur when district-wide elections are organized at the national level.

iaep_nr   National Referendums

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4698, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 138, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 154)

Equals 1 if the country holds national elections on referendum items, and 0 otherwise.

Selection of the Executive

iaep_eml   Executive is Member of Legislature

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4516, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 133, $\overline{T}$: 28)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 148)

Equals 1 if there is an executive who is also a member of the legislature, and 0 otherwise. The value 1 is given if their either is an explicit rule which requires an executive to maintain a seat in the legislature, or if practice or convention determines membership.

iaep_ise   Independence of Selection of Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4969, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 146, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if an executive is chosen independently of the legislature (e.g. like a president), and 0 otherwise. If the process that selects the executive is distinct from that which selects the legislature, then the two are considered independent.

iaep_ae   Appointment of Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4949, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 146, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if there is an executive that is appointed either by a PM (that is, an executive who is also a member of the legislature) or a president (an independently selected executive), and 0 otherwise.

iaep_d   Dictator

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4989, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 147, $\overline{T}$: 29)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 161)

Equals 1 if there is a dictator, and 0 otherwise. A dictator is here defined as someone who rules without the normal set of political constraints and whose support and

continued rule is guaranteed by coercion, either the actual resort to force or the threat to do so. A dictator rules without voluntary support of a wide selectorate, his or her ability to remain in power is a function of the coercive capability to do so, and he or she may have come to power through coercion.

Rules Governing Elections – the Nomination Process

iaep_pnlc   Party Nomination of Legislature Candidates

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

Equals 1 if party nomination (party list, convention etc.) establishes how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_pvelc   Party Vote Establish Legislature Candidates

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

Equals 1 if members of party vote (primary) to establish how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_snlc   Self-Nomination of Legislature Candidates

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

Equals 1 if self-nomination establishes how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_pselc   Petition Signatures Establish Legislature Candidates

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

Equals 1 if petition signatures establish how the field of candidates who stand for elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_enlc   Executive Nomination of Legislature Candidates

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 5002, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 147, $\overline{T}$: 29)
Equals 1 if executive nomination establishes how the field of candidates who stand for legislative elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_pnec   Party Nomination of Executive Candidates

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

Equals 1 if party nomination (party list, convention etc.) establishes how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_pveec   Party Vote Establish Executive Candidates

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

Equals 1 if members of party vote (primary) to establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_snec   Self-Nomination of Executive Candidates

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

Equals 1 if self-nomination establishes how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_pseec   Petition Signatures Establish Executive Candidates

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

Equals 1 if petition signatures establish how the field of candidates who stand for executive elections is determined, and 0 otherwise.

Rules Governing Elections – the Outcome

iaep_es   Electoral System

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4057, N: 162, $\overline{N}$: 119, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 151)

The type of electoral system for legislative elections.

(1)   Plurality (first past the post)
(2)   Majority
(3)   Proportional representation
(4)   Mixed systems

Mixed systems includes situations in which a single chamber contains seats selected by different methods, and situations in which all of the seats in a chamber are chosen with the same method, but each chamber is selected through different methods.

iaep_ee   Election of the Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4393, N: 165, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 27)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 146)

The executive is elected by:

(1)   Directly elected by public vote
(2)   Elected through legislative action by members of the legislature
(3)   Chosen through party process strictly by a party
(4)   Indirect public vote

(5)   Appointed

iaep_ese   Electoral System for the Executive

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 3355, N: 144, $\overline{N}$: 99, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 2002-2005 (varies by country), N: 127)

Election rules governing the determination of electoral outcomes for the executive. The variable records the data on the electoral requirements for winning executive elections, specifically, the sorts of vote required for winners. If the executive is appointed or otherwise comes to power via non-electoral processes, this is coded as missing.

(1)   Majority rule (50% + 1). Where run-offs are held, "majority rule" is selected, as the intention of a run-off election is to have one candidate receive a majority of the votes.
(2)   Plurality
(3)   No official, explicit rule governing the outcome
(4)   Party leader of majority party/coalition legislature automatically selected without additional process.

iaep_pm5p   Parties with More than 5 Percent

(Time-series: 1972-2005, n: 4031, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 119, $\overline{T}$: 25)
(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 149)

How many parties hold at least 5% of seats in the legislature?

(1)   One
(2)   Two
(3)   More than two

Rules Governing Party Participation

iaep_bp   Banned Parties

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

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

iaep_ebbp   Ethnicity Based Banning of Parties

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

Equals 1 if ethnic makeup determines the banning of parties, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_rbbp   Religion Based Banning of Parties

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

Equals 1 if religious affiliation determines the banning of parties, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_basp   Banning of "Anti-System" Parties

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

Equals 1 if an anti-system platform determines the banning of parties, and 0 otherwise.

iaep_npa   No Parties Allowed

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

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

iaep_osp   Official State Party

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

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

Johnson & Wallack

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.

Summary indices

jw_persr   Personalistic Tier

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2267, N: 127, $\overline{N}$: 81, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 122)

This variable ranks countries in increasing order of incentives to cultivate a personal vote according to their more personalistic tier (or tier with the greater incentives to cultivate a personal vote). 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 13 would have a tier with the highest possible rank of incentives to cultivate a personal vote, although that tier may only account for a minority or small fraction of its members.

jw_domr   Dominant or Populous Tier

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2237, N: 126, $\overline{N}$: 80, $\overline{T}$: 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).

jw_smdballot Party Control over Ballot – SMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1086, N: 71, $\overline{N}$: 39, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 66)

Ballot (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_smdballot2 Party Control over Ballot – SMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 129, N: 8, $\overline{N}$: 5, $\overline{T}$: 16)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 7)

Ballot (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_mmdballot Party Control over Ballot – MMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1621, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 58, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 89)

Ballot (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_mmdballot2 Party Control over Ballot – MMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 298, N: 16, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 14)

Ballot (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_avgballot Party Control over Ballot (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2369, N: 133, $\overline{N}$: 85, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 127)

Country-level weighted averages of Party Control over Ballot – SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdballot) and Party Control over Ballot – MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdballot), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of ballots for the average member sitting in the lower house.

jw_avgballot2 Party Control over Ballot (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 473, N: 24, $\overline{N}$: 17, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 23)

Country-level weighted averages of Party Control over Ballot – SMD (upper house) (jw_smdballot2) and Party Control over Ballot – MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdballot2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of ballots for the average member sitting in the upper house.

jw_indy   Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1989, N: 106, $\overline{N}$: 71, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 103)

Equals 1 wherever independent candidates are legally allowed (even where the legal requirements are strict), and 0 otherwise. This complements the cases where the ballot variables above equal 1 or 2, since they are adjusted to capture *de facto* practice. jw_indy instead captures the *de jure* rules. A user could adjust the ballot variables above to be *de jure* if (s)he replaced values of 2 with values of 1 when jw_indy = 0. Refers to lower house elections.

jw_indy2   Ballot Access for Independent Candidates (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 424, N: 21, $\overline{N}$: 15, $\overline{T}$: 20)
 (Cross-section: 2002, N: 20)

Same as jw_indy, but for upper house elections.

Vote Variables:

The Vote variables focus attention on the distinction between casting votes for either parties or individual candidates. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives):
(0)   where voters have only one vote for a party;
(1)   where voters can vote for a party or a candidate (as in open lists), where voters have multiple votes for multiple candidates (as in runoff or single-transferable vote systems), or where votes for a party or candidate are observationally equivalent (as in single-member districts);
(2)   where voters have one vote for an individual candidate.

jw_smdvote   Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – SMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1111, N: 73, $\overline{N}$: 40, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 68)

Vote (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_smdvote2 Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – SMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 129, N: 8, $\overline{N}$: 5, $\overline{T}$: 16)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 7)

Vote (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_mmdvote Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – MMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1574, N: 90, $\overline{N}$: 56, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 86)

Vote (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_mmdvote2 Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – MMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 298, N: 16, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 14)

Vote (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_avgvote   Candidate- or Party-specific Voting (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2347, N: 131, $\overline{N}$: 84, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 126)

Country-level weighted averages of Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdvote) and Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdvote), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of votes for the average member sitting in the lower house.

jw_avgvote2 Candidate- or Party-specific Voting (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 473, N: 24, $\overline{N}$: 17, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 23)

Country-level weighted averages of Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – SMD (upper house) (jw_smdvote2) and Candidate- or Party-specific Voting – MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdvote2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of votes for the average member sitting in the upper house.

Pool Variables:

The Pool variables measure the extent to which votes among candidates from the same party are shared. The variables equal (in order of increasing personal vote incentives):

(0)   where pooling of votes occurs across all candidates in a party in a district;

(1)   where pooling of votes occurs across some, but not all, candidates in a party in a district, or, where there is vote pooling across all candidates in a party in a district, but where the average district accounts for 5% or less of a legislature's membership;

(2)   where no pooling of votes occurs across candidates in a party (including single-member districts).

jw_smdpool   Sharing of Votes among Candidates – SMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1111, N: 73, $\overline{N}$: 40, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 68)

Pool (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_smdpool2 Sharing of Votes among Candidates – SMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 129, N: 8, $\overline{N}$: 5, $\overline{T}$: 16)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 7)

Pool (coded as above) for single-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_mmdpool Sharing of Votes among Candidates – MMD (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1601, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 57, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 88)

Pool (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the lower house.

jw_mmdpool2 Sharing of Votes among Candidates – MMD (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 304, N: 17, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 15)

Pool (coded as above) for multi-member district tiers in elections to the upper house.

jw_avgpool   Sharing of Votes among Candidates (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2374, N: 135, $\overline{N}$: 85, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 128)

Country-level weighted averages of Sharing of Votes among Candidates – SMD (lower/only house) (jw_smdpool) and Sharing of Votes among Candidates – MMD (lower/only house) (jw_mmdpool), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of the pooling of votes for the average member sitting in the lower house.

jw_avgpool2 Sharing of Votes among Candidates (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 473, N: 24, $\overline{N}$: 17, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 23)

Country-level weighted averages of Sharing of Votes among Candidates – SMD (upper house) (jw_smdpool2) and Sharing of Votes among Candidates – MMD (upper house) (jw_mmdpool2), where the weights are the percentage of members that originate from each tier. This variable thus reflects the value of the pooling of votes for the average member sitting in the upper house.

District Magnitude Variables:

jw_mcand   District Magnitude of Average Legislator (lower/only house)
(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2138, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 76, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 103)

In keeping with the emphasis on the incentives faced by individual legislators, this variable measures the district magnitude considering the viewpoint of the average legislator in the lower house. It is scored as a weighted average of the various district sizes, where weights are computed as the number of legislators running in the district of each magnitude divided by the total number of seats. For example: A country with 300 seats divided among one national district with 200 members and 100 single-member districts has a magnitude for the average legislator of [(200*200) + (100*1)]/300, which yields a figure of 133.67.

jw_mcand2   District Magnitude of Average Legislator (upper house)
(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 654, N: 43, $\overline{N}$: 23, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 21)

This is the district magnitude of the average legislator in the upper house.

jw_mdist   Average District Magnitude (lower/only house)
(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 3100, N: 161, $\overline{N}$: 111, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 147)

This is the standard magnitude of the average district in the lower house. For example: A country with 300 seats divided among one national district with 200 members and 100 single-member districts would have an average district magnitude (jw_mdist) of 2.97 (i.e., 300/101).

jw_mdist2   Average District Magnitude (upper house)
(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 567, N: 29, $\overline{N}$: 20, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 26)

This is the average district magnitude in the upper house.

General characteristics:

jw_bicameral Bicameral System
(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 3729, N: 172, $\overline{N}$: 133, $\overline{T}$: 22)

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 163)

Dummy variable, 1 if bicameral system.

jw_election   Year of Election (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2274, N: 152, $\overline{N}$: 81, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 127)

Dummy variable, 1 if year of election to lower house.

jw_election2 Year of Election (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 421, N: 26, $\overline{N}$: 15, $\overline{T}$: 16)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 23)

Dummy variable, 1 if year of election to upper house.

jw_legsize   Number of Coded Legislators (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2709, N: 155, $\overline{N}$: 97, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 147)

jw_legsize2   Number of Coded Legislators (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 557, N: 32, $\overline{N}$: 20, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 28)

The number of legislators coded in the dataset. These may not account for the total number of legislators if there are appointed legislators that have no electoral rules to code.

jw_multiround Runoff Elections

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2089, N: 111, $\overline{N}$: 75, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 108)

The variable indicates whether there are run-off elections. These are usually for SMDs with absolute majority requirements. Where jw_multiround is equal to 1, voters have more than a single vote to cast, albeit votes occur on separate election days.

jw_multitier Multi Tier (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2420, N: 138, $\overline{N}$: 86, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 131)

jw_multitier2 Multi Tier (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 493, N: 28, $\overline{N}$: 18, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 25)

Equals 1 wherever there are multiple allocation tiers, regardless of whether they are the result of mixed member systems that incorporate different members under

different rules, or systems that have upper tiers within a single electoral system to compensate for disproportionality in lower tiers.

jw_oneparty Single Party System

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 3484, N: 170, $\overline{N}$: 124, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 135)

Dummy variable, 1 if single-party system.

jw_parallel   Tiers allocated in Parallel

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 257, N: 21, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 12)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 20)

Coded 1 if multiple tiers are elected in parallel fashion, 0 when they are elected in (at least somewhat) compensatory fashion. Is coded only when jw_multitier = 1.

jw_propn   Seats from a National District (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 3425, N: 170, $\overline{N}$: 122, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 129)

jw_propn2   Seats from a National District (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1106, N: 67, $\overline{N}$: 40, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 28)

This is the proportion of coded legislators that are elected via a national tier. This is often (but not always) similar to the proportion elected via multi-member districts (jw_propmmd): some electoral systems have proportional representation based on regional multimember districts as well as national tiers (e.g. Hungary).

jw_propsmd Seats from Single-Member Districts (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2705, N: 155, $\overline{N}$: 97, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 146)

jw_propsmd2 Seats from Single-Member Districts (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 422, N: 23, $\overline{N}$: 15, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 21)

This is the proportion of coded legislators elected in single-member districts. (Note: In the original data for Kyrgyzstan propsmd2=60 in 1997-1999 and propsmd2=45 2000-2004. We have replaced these figures with missing values.)

jw_propmmd Seats from Multi-Member Districts (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2760, N: 156, $\overline{N}$: 99, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 147)

jw_propmmd2 Seats from Multi-Member Districts (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 479, N: 26, $\overline{N}$: 17, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 24)

This is the proportion of coded legislators elected in multi-member districts.

jw_propcoded Proportion Coded Legislators (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 3545, N: 171, $\overline{N}$: 127, $\overline{T}$: 21)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 142)

jw_propcoded2 Proportion Coded Legislators (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 874, N: 52, $\overline{N}$: 31, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 27)

This is the proportion of the total number of legislators (elected and non-elected) that are coded.

jw_tiervote   Tiervote (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 2143, N: 111, $\overline{N}$: 77, $\overline{T}$: 19)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 109)

jw_tiervote2 Tiervote (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 364, N: 18, $\overline{N}$: 13, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 17)

Equals 1 when citizens are given a separate vote for deputies in each legislative tier.

jw_rank   Rank Vote (lower/only house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 1785, N: 90, $\overline{N}$: 64, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 88)

Equals 1 in two circumstances: where voters may rank order candidates according to preference, or where citizens have multiple preference votes for multiple candidates, even if they may not specifically rank the candidates. Otherwise, jw_rank is equal to zero. Refers to lower house elections.

jw_rank2   Rank Vote (upper house)

(Time-series: 1978-2005, n: 424, N: 21, $\overline{N}$: 15, $\overline{T}$: 20)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 20)

Same as jw_rank, but for upper house elections.

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

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).

Religion

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

Maddison

http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/
(Maddison 2003)

mad_pop   Population (thousand)

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 11304, N: 197, $\overline{N}$: 185, $\overline{T}$: 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.

mad_gdp   GDP levels (million)

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 7875, N: 162, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 49)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 155)

GDP levels in million 1990 International Geary-Khamis dollars. (The Geary-Khamis dollar is a hypothetical unit of currency that has the same purchasing power that the U.S. dollar had in the United States at a given point in time.)

mad_gdppc   GDP per Capita

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 7871, N: 162, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 49)
(Cross-section: 1500, 1600, 1700, 1820, 1900, 2002, N: 154)

GDP per Capita in 1990 International Geary-Khamis dollars. (The Geary-Khamis dollar is a hypothetical unit of currency that has the same purchasing power that the U.S. dollar had in the United States at a given point in time.)

Maddison provides historical GDP data back to year 1 A.D. In the cross-section version of the QoG dataset, we include data from the years 1500, 1600, 1700, 1820, 1900 and 2002 (one variable for each year).

Melander

m_femlead   Female State Leader

(Time-series: 1965-2002, n: 5740, N: 180, $\overline{N}$: 151, $\overline{T}$: 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).

m_wominpar Women in Parliament (percent)

(Time-series: 1965-2002, n: 4767, N: 175, $\overline{N}$: 125, $\overline{T}$: 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.

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.

Executives

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5785, N: 193, $\overline{N}$: 175, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

no_ce   Classification of Executives
(1)   Parliamentary Monarchy
(2)   Presidential Republic
(3)   Mixed Executive
(4)   Monarchy
(5)   Military State

Note: Some of the observations have a value of 0, which is not explained in the documentation. In communication with the author it was stated that this might indicate that the observations actually should be coded as missing. We have nevertheless chosen to leave the data as is.

no_pm   Parliamentary Monarchy

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

no_pr   Parliamentary Republic

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

no_rm   Ruling Monarchy

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

no_ms   Military State

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

Electoral Systems

The following variables have IDEA as original source of data.

no_ef   Electoral Family

(Time-series: 1972-2004, n: 5880, N: 193, $\overline{N}$: 178, $\overline{T}$: 31)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 191)

Classification of the electoral system.

(1)   Majoritarian
(2)   Combined (mixed)
(3)   Proportional
(4)   No competitive elections

no_ndel   No Directly Elected Legislature

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

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

no_pes   Proportional Electoral System

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

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

no_ces   Combined (Mixed) Electoral System

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

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

no_mes   Majoritarian Electoral System

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

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

Decentralization

no_ufs   Unitary or Federal State

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

(0)   Non-unitary
(1)   Unitary

Persson & Tabellini

(Persson and Tabellini 2003)

Persson and Tabellini only include countries of democratic rule in their sample. To be included in the cross-section, an average of the Freedom House indices for civil liberties and political rights (fh_cl and fh_pr) lower than an average of 5 for the 1990-1998 period is required. For the 1960-1998 panel data, Persson and Tabellini include

country-years that obtain a score greater than zero on the Polity democracy indicator (p_polity2) (For details, see Persson and Tabellini 2003, 74-77.)

pt_federal   Federal Political Structure

(Time-series: 1960-1998, n: 2340, N: 61, $\overline{N}$: 60, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 83)

Dummy variable, 1 if the country has a federal political structure and 0 otherwise.

pt_magn   Inverse of District Magnitude

(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 84)

Inverse of district magnitude, defined as districts (the number of electoral districts in a country, including the number of primary as well as secondary and tertiary districts if applicable) over the number of seats (pt_seats).

pt_maj   Majoritarian Electoral Systems

(Time-series: 1960-1998, n: 2179, N: 61, $\overline{N}$: 56, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 85)

Dummy variable, 1 if the lower house is selected under plurality rule, 0 otherwise. Only legislative elections (lower house) are considered.

pt_pind   Ballot Structure 1

(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 85)

Continuous measure of the ballot structure defined as the proportion of legislators elected by plurality rule via a vote on individuals (as opposed to party lists). Computed as 1 − list/pt_seats, where list is the number of lower-house legislators elected through party list systems.

pt_pindo   Ballot Structure 2

(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 85)

Continuous measure of the ballot structure defined as the proportion of legislators in the lower house elected individually or on open lists. Computed as 1 − list/pt_seats*clist, where list is the number of lower-house legislators elected through party list systems and clist is a dummy variable for closed party lists.

pt_pres   Forms of Government

(Time-series: 1960-1998, n: 2340, N: 61, $\overline{N}$: 60, $\overline{T}$: 38)
(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 85)

Dummy variable, 1 for presidential regimes and 0 otherwise. Only regimes in which the confidence of the assembly is not necessary for the executive to stay in power (even if an elected president is not the chief executive, or if there is no elected president) are included among presidential regimes. Most semi-presidential and premier-presidential systems are classified as parliamentary.

pt_sdm   Weighted Inverse District Magnitude

(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 77)

Inverse of district magnitude, where the weight on each district is the share of legislators running in districts of that size.

pt_seats   Number of Seats

(Cross-section: 1990-1998 (average values over the nine-year period), N: 85)

The number of seats in lower or single chambers for the last legislature of each country. It is also related to the number of districts in which primary elections are held.

QoG Survey

(Cross-section: 2008-2009 (varies by country), N: 52)
http://www.qog.pol.gu.se
(Dahlström, Lapuente and Teorell 2010)

The QoG Survey is a unique data set on the structure and behavior of public administration, based on a web survey of 528 country experts from 58 countries around the world (although advanced industrialized and post-communist countries carry the weight of countries covered). The dataset covers key dimensions of quality of government, such as politicization, professionalization, openness, and impartiality.

Included in the QoG dataset are three indexes, each based on a group of questions from the survey. When constructing the indexes we excluded countries with less than three responding experts (which left us with 52 countries in the sample). (Two indexes are listed below. The third index is listed in the "What It Is" section.)

The confidence interval variables give the higher and lower limits of the 95% confidence interval.

qs_proff   Professional Public Administration

qs_proff_cih Professional Public Administration – Confidence Interval (High)

qs_proff_cil   Professional Public Administration – Confidence Interval (Low)

The index measures to what extent the public administration is professional rather than politicized. Higher values indicate a more professionalized public administration. It is based on four questions from the survey:

Thinking about the country you have chosen, how often would you say the following occurs today:
- When recruiting public sector employees, the skills and merits of the applicants decide who gets the job?
- When recruiting public sector employees, the political connections of the applicants decide who gets the job?
- The top political leadership hires and fires senior public officials?
- Senior public officials are recruited from within the ranks of the public sector?

The scale for each question is 1-7 (from "hardly ever" to "almost always").

The index is constructed by first taking the mean for each responding expert of the four questions above. The value for each country is then calculated as the mean of all the experts' means. (If one or more answers are missing, these questions are ignored when calculating the mean value for each expert. The scale of the second and third questions are reversed so that higher values indicate more professionalism).

qs_closed **Closed Public Administration**

qs_closed_cih Closed Public Administration – Confidence Interval (High)

qs_closed_cil Closed Public Administration – Confidence Interval (Low)
The index measures to what extent the public administration is more closed or public-like, rather than open or private-like. Higher values indicate a more closed public administration. It is based on three questions from the survey:

Thinking about the country you have chosen, how often would you say the following occurs today:
- Public sector employees are hired via a formal examination system?
- Once one is recruited as a public sector employee, one stays a public sector employee for the rest of one's career?

To what extent would you say the following applies today to the country you have chosen to submit your answers for?
- The terms of employment for public sector employees are regulated by special laws that do not apply to private sector employees?

The scale for the first two questions is 1-7 (from "hardly ever" to "almost always").
The scale for the third question is 1-7 (from "not at all" to "to a very large extent").

The index is constructed by first taking the mean for each responding expert of the three questions above. The value for each country is then calculated as the mean of all the experts' means. (If one or more answers are missing, these questions are ignored when calculating the mean value for each expert.)

Roeder

http://weber.ucsd.edu/~proeder/elf.htm
(Roeder 2001)

r_roberts **Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization**
(Time-series: Country constant, N: 53)
(Cross-section: Year unknown, N: 49)

Measures probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same ethnolinguistic group. Reprint from the index published in Taylor and Hudson (1972: 271-274). Original source: Roberts (1962).

r_muller   **Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization**
(Time-series: Country constant, N: 108)
(Cross-section: Year unknown, N: 101)

Measures probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same ethnolinguistic group. Reprint from the index published in Taylor and Hudson (1972: 271-274). Original source: Muller (1964).

r_atlas   **Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization**
(Time-series: Country constant, N: 129)
(Cross-section: 1960, N: 121)

Measures probability that two randomly selected people from a given country will not belong to the same ethnolinguistic group. Reprint from the index published in Taylor and Hudson (1972: 271-274). Original source: Atlas Narodov Mira (1964).

r_elf61   **Ethnolinguistic fractionalization 1961**
(Time-series: Country constant, N: 150)
(Cross-section: 1961, N: 139)

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.)

Sachs – Malaria Risk
(Cross-section: 1994, N: 160)
http://www.nber.org/papers/w9490.pdf
(Sachs 2003)

sa_mr   **Malaria Risk**
The proportion of the population living with risk of malaria transmission. The variable is measured by combining the 1994 WHO world map of malaria risk with a map of the world population.

sa_fmr   **Fatal Malaria Risk**
The proportion of the population living with risk of fatal malaria transmission. The variable is based on sa_mr, multiplied by an estimate of the proportion of malaria cases that involve the fatal species (*Plasmodium falciparum*).

Treisman
http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/treisman/
(Treisman 2007)

t_demyrs   Years of Democracy

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 173)

The number of consecutive years since 1930 the system had been democratic as of 2000, as classified by Beck et al. (2001). Note this is adapted from Beck et al.'s variable "tensys", which just measured tenure of the system, whether democratic or authoritarian. Democracies are those with a 6 or higher on Beck et al.s Executive Index of Electoral Competitiveness (dpi_eipc).

t_alldem   Democratic All Year from 1930 to 1995

(Cross-section: 1995, N: 175)

Countries democratic all years from 1930 to 1995, by classification of Beck et al. 2001, coded 1 (0 otherwise). Democracies are those with a 6 or higher on Beck et al.'s Executive Index of Electoral Competitiveness (dpi_eipc).

t_paper   Newspaper per 1000 inhabitants in 1996

(Cross-section: 1996, N: 135)

Newspapers per 1000 inhabitants, as of 1996. Original source: UNESCO.

t_tvsets   Television sets per 1000 inhabitants in 1997

(Cross-section: 1997, N: 141)

Television sets per 1000 inhabitants, as of 1997. Original source: World Bank.

t_fed   Classified as a Federation

(Cross-section: 1995, N: 191)

Countries classified as federations by Elazar (1995) plus Ethiopia, Serbia-Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, which became federal after the article, coded 1 (0 otherwise).

t_subrev   Subnational share of Revenues

(Cross-section: 1995-2000, N: 60)

Subnational share of revenues, average for 1995-2000 as percent of total revenues. Original source: IMF Government Finance Statistics.

t_subexp   Subnational share of Expenditures

(Cross-section: 1995-2000, N: 61)

Subnational share of expenditures, average for 1995-2000, available years, as percent of total expenditures. Original source: IMF Government Finance Statistics.

t_fuel   Mineral Fuels in Manufacturing Exports

(Cross-section: 2000, N: 142)

Percentage of mineral fuels in manufacturing exports as of 2000. Original source: World Bank.

t_yot   Year Opened to Trade
(Cross-section: 1995, N: 134)

The year a country opened for trade according to Sachs and Warner (1995). Coded as the two last digits of the year in question (e.g. 1950 coded as 50). If the country had not opened in 1994 it is coded as 100.

A country is defined as having an open trade policy if none of these following conditions apply:

"1. Nontariff barriers (NTBs) covering 40 percent or more of trade.
2. Average tariff rates of 40 percent or more.
3. A black market exchange rate that is depreciated by 20 percent or
more relative to the official exchange rate, on average, during the 1970s
or 1980s.
4. A socialist economic system (as defined by Kornai).
5. A state monopoly on major exports."

(Sachs and Warner 1995, p. 22-23)

UNDP - Human Development Report
http://hdr.undp.org/
(UNDP 2004)

undp_gini   Gini Index (inequality measure)
(Cross-section: 1983-2002 (varies by country), N: 126)

Measures the extent to which the distribution of income (or consumption) among individuals or households within a country deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. A Lorenz curve plots the cumulative percentages of total income received against the cumulative number of recipients, starting with the poorest individual or household. The Gini Index measures the area between the Lorenz curve and a hypothetical line of absolute equality, expressed as a percentage of the maximum area under the line. A value of 0 represents perfect equality, a value of 100 perfect inequalities.

undp_gdp   GDP/Capita PPP in Constant USD
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 174)

The sum of value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated capital assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Value added is the net output of an industry after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.

* PPP (purchasing power parity) = A rate of exchange that accounts for price differences across countries, allowing international comparisons of real output and

incomes. At the PPP US$ rate, PPP US$1 has the same purchasing power in the domestic economy as $1 has in the United States.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics

http://www.uis.unesco.org
(UNESCO 2010)

Enrollment

All values given are gross enrollment rate (GER). GER is defined as the number of pupils enrolled at a given level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the population in the theoretical age group for the same level of education. For the tertiary level, the population used is the five-year age group following on from the secondary school leaving age. Gross enrollment rate can be over 100% due to the inclusion of over-aged and under-aged pupils/students because of early or late entrants, and grade repetition. In this case, a rigorous interpretation of GER needs additional information to assess the extent of repetition, late entrants, etc.

une_preet   Pre-primary education enrollment, total

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1421, N: 179, $\overline{N}$: 129, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 179)

une_preef   Pre-primary education enrollment, female

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1383, N: 176, $\overline{N}$: 126, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 176)

une_preem   Pre-primary education enrollment, male

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1379, N: 176, $\overline{N}$: 125, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 176)

une_pef   Primary education enrollment, female

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1618, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 147, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 185)

une_pem   Primary education enrollment, male

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1620, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 147, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 185)

une_sef   Secondary education enrollment, female

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1470, N: 184, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 184)

une_sem   Secondary education enrollment, male

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1471, N: 184, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 184)

une_tef   Tertiary education enrollment, female

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1103, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 100, $\overline{T}$: 7)

(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 163)

une_tem   **Tertiary education enrollment, male**

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1135, N: 166, $\overline{N}$: 103, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 166)

une_ppepre   **Percent private enrollment, pre-primary**

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1098, N: 159, $\overline{N}$: 100, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 1999-2008 (varies by country), N: 159)

Private pre-primary school enrollment, as a percentage of total enrolment.

une_ppep   **Percent private enrollment, primary**

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1185, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 108, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 1999-2008 (varies by country), N: 163)

Private primary school enrollment, as a percentage of total enrolment.

une_ppes   **Percent private enrollment, secondary**

(Time-series: 1999-2009, n: 1047, N: 163, $\overline{N}$: 95, $\overline{T}$: 6)
(Cross-section: 1999-2009 (varies by country), N: 163)

Private secondary school enrollment, as a percentage of total enrolment.

United Nations Statistics Divisions – National Accounts

http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/
(United Nations Statistics Divisions 2009)

Note: The UN Statistics Division treats Zanzibar and the Mainland of Tanzania as separate countries from the year 1990, while the QoG dataset treats them as one unit (Tanzania). The GDP variable (unna_gdp) was simply summed up for each pair of observations. The trade openness variables (unna_otco and unna_otcu) were also summed up, but weighted for the difference in population sizes.

unna_er   **Exchange rate**

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6868, N: 197, $\overline{N}$: 181, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

Amount of local currency per US dollar. The exchange rates are IMF-based, but for some countries and years price adjusted rates of exchange are used. These where calculated by the United Nations Statistics divisions when there appeared to be a serious disparity between real GDP growth and growth when GDP was converted to US dollars using the IMF-based rates. This applied mainly to countries with fixed exchange rate regimes and countries going through a period of high inflation (e.g. transition countries from 1990-1995) but their exchange rates were not adjusted adequately to reflect changes in their prices relative to the US prices.

unna_cu   Currency

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6886, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 181, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

Name of the currency used in the country.

unna_gdp   Real GDP

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6886, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 181, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

GDP at constant 1990 prices in US dollars.

unna_pop   Population

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6886, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 181, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

Number of inhabitants.

unna_otco   Openness to Trade, Constant Prices (%)

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6826, N: 195, $\overline{N}$: 180, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 191)

Exports plus imports as a percentage of GDP. Measured at constant 1990 prices.

unna_otcu   Openness to Trade, Current Prices (%)

(Time-series: 1970-2007, n: 6834, N: 196, $\overline{N}$: 180, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

Exports plus imports as a percentage of GDP. Measured at current prices.

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, $\overline{N}$: 38, $\overline{T}$: 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.

uw_quality   Quality (mean)

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

The UNU-WIDER World Income Inequality Database applies the following quality ratings of its GINI-measures, where a lower value indicates higher quality:
(1)   for observations where a) the underlying concepts are known, and b) where the quality of the income concept and the survey can be judged as sufficient;
(2)   for observations where the quality of *either* the income concept *or* the survey is problematic or unknown or the estimates have not been possible to verify;
(3)   for observations where both the income concept and the survey are problematic or unknown;
(4)   for observations classified as memorandum items.

uw_ngini   Gini (count)

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

The number of separate GINI measures supplied each year in the original data (of which uw_gini provides the average).

uw_sdgini   Gini (standard deviation)

(Time-series: 1946-2006, n: 964, N: 127, $\overline{N}$: 16, $\overline{T}$: 8)
(Cross-section: 1957-2005 (varies by country), N: 29)

The standard deviation of those possibly separate GINI measures supplied each year in the original data (only computed for years of multiple measures).

uw_yom   Year of Measurement

(Cross-section: 1957-2005 (varies by country), N: 151)

The latest year available for each country in the cross-sectional dataset of the uw_gini measurement.

UTIP – University of Texas Inequality Project

http://utip.gov.utexas.edu/data.html
(Galbraith and Kum 2003; 2004; Galbraith 2009)

utip_ehii   Estimated Household Income Inequality

(Time-series: 1963-2002, n: 3371, N: 149, $\overline{N}$: 84, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 1972-2002 (varies by country), N: 146)

In order to provide a more reliable and consistent measure of household income inequality, Galbraith and Kum (2004) estimate GINI coefficients through an equation whereby the Deininger and Squire (1996) high quality dataset (ds_gini) is regressed on: a measure of manufacturing pay inequality (utip_ipi); the ratio of manufacturing employment to population; and three dummies for data sources of the Deininger and

Squire (1996) measures (income vs. expenditure, gross vs. net of taxes, household vs. personal unit of analysis). Apart from providing substantially enhanced coverage, Galbraith and Kum (2004) argue that this estimated income inequality measure produces better comparability both across countries and over time.

utip_ehii_yom Year of Measurement - EHII

(Cross-section: 1972-2002 (varies by country), N: 146)

The latest year available for each country in the cross-sectional dataset of the utip_ehii measurement.

utip_ipi   Industrial Pay Inequality

(Time-series: 1963-2003, n: 3356, N: 154, $\overline{N}$: 82, $\overline{T}$: 22)
(Cross-section: 1972-2002 (varies by country), N: 148)

Based on data on pay across industrial categories in the manufacturing sector compiled by the United Nations International Development Organization (UNIDO), Galbraith and Kum (2003) compute this measure of pay inequality. The measure consists of the between-groups component of Theil's T statistic, where groups are defined using a two or three digit code of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC). Larger values indicate greater manufacturing pay inequality.

utip_ipi_yom Year of Measurement - IPI

(Cross-section: 1972-2002 (varies by country), N: 148)

The latest year available for each country in the cross-sectional dataset of the utip_ipi measurement.

Vanhanen – Index of Power Resources

http://www.fsd.uta.fi/english/data/catalogue/FSD1216/meF1216e.html
(Vanhanen 2003a; 2003b)

The data underlying Vanhanen's indicators of power resource distribution has been taken from the beginning of each decade. In accordance with this, we have included them in our time-series dataset as decennial constants (1946-49, 1950-59, 1960-69 and so on up until 1990-99). This means that the data included in the cross-sectional dataset is from 1990 or around 1990.

van_urban   Urban Population (%)

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 6645, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 123, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

Urban population as a percentage of total population. Note that comparisons across time and space must be interpreted with caution as the concept of urbanity has changed over time and to some extent varies from country to country.

van_nagric   Non-Agricultural Population (%)

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

Non-agricultural population as a percentage of total population (derived by subtracting the percentage of agricultural population from 100). Note that comparisons across time must be interpreted with caution as the population concept has to some extent changed over time.

van_occup   Index of Occupational Diversification

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 6645, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 123, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The arithmetic mean of Urban Population % (van_urban) and Non-Agricultural Population % (van_nagric).

van_students Students

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The number of students at universities or other higher education institutions per 100,000 inhabitants of the country. For the data covering 1946-79, Vanhanen has applied a time lag of one decade, which means that the data for the 1960s, for example, actually concerns the 1950s. For this time period, the lack of statistical data also means that the number of students has had to be estimated in numerous cases. Moreover, the concept of higher education has become wider over time, including other types of educational institutions than universities. The data covering 1980-99 is more reliable, although the definitions of 'universities and other degree-granting institutions' vary. In other words, comparisons across time and space must be interpreted with caution.

van_studentsp Students (%)

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The percentage of Students (%) has been calculated in two different ways: before the year 1980 the value 1000 of van_students is set equivalent to 100%, whereas between the years 1980-1999 the value 5000 of the same variable is set equivalent to 100%. This means that since 1980 five times more students have been needed to reach the same percentage as in the period 1946-79. In combination with the comments made above (see van_student), comparisons across time and space must obviously be interpreted with caution.

van_literates Literates (%)

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

Literates as a percentage of adult population. Note that comparisons across time and space must be interpreted with caution as the concept of literacy has changed over time and to some extent varies from country to country.

van_knowdistIndex of Knowledge Distribution

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 6645, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 123, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The arithmetic mean of Students % (van_studentsp) and Literates % (van_literates).

van_familyf   Family Farms (%)

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 6645, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 123, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The area of family farms as a percentage of total cultivated area or total area of holdings. Family farms refer to holdings that are mainly cultivated by the holder family and that are owned by the cultivator family or held in owner-like possession. The upper hectare limit and other criteria of family farms vary from country to country and over time. Moreover, the data for the 1980s is based on information from 1960-80, and for the 1990s mostly from 1980 but also from the 1970s and the 1960s. In other words, comparisons across time and space must be interpreted with great caution.

van_decent   Decentralization of Non-Agricultural Economic Resources

(Time-series: 1980-1999, n: 3186, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 159, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

This indicator, theoretically ranging from 0 (minimum) to 100 (maximum decentralization), has been measured in two ways. For the 1980s, it is based on a combination of the public sector's, foreign-owned enterprises' and big private enterprises' share of productive capacity or of employment in the nonagricultural sectors of the economy (or in its most important sector); the indicator is then computed as the inverse of this combined percentage. For the 1990s, another measure was used: first each country's economic system was categorized as being centrally planned, public sector dominated, market oriented with concentrated ownership, or market oriented with diversified ownership; then the degree of concentration of ownership within each category was determined. Both measurement approaches are in large part based on Vanhanen's own estimations. In other words, comparisons across time and space must be interpreted with great caution.

van_distec   Index of Distribution of Economic Power Resources

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

The arithmetic mean of Family Farms % (van_familyf) and Decentralization of Non-Agricultural Economic Resources (van_decent).

van_powres   Index of Power Resources (multiplicative)

(Time-series: 1946-1999, n: 6645, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 123, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: ~1990, N: 171)

Measures the level of dispersion of economic, intellectual, and organizational—or, for short, power—resources in society. Computed as the product of Index of Occupational Diversification (van_occup), Index of Knowledge Distribution (van_knowdist) and Index of Distribution of Economic Power Resources (van_distec), divided by 10.000, to range from 0 (low) to 100 (high relative distribution of power resources).

van_mean   Index of Power Resources (additive)

(Time-series: 1948-1998, n: 708, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: ~1998, N: 171)

Same as Index of Power Resources (multiplicative) (van_powres), but instead computed as the arithmetic mean of Index of Occupational Diversification (van_occup), Index of Knowledge Distribution (van_knowdist) and Index of Distribution of Economic Power Resources (van_distec), to range from 0 (low) to 100 (high relative distribution of power resources).

World Development Indicators

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

GDP and GNI

wdi_gdpcu   GDP (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 7242, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 122, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 185)

Gross domestic product in current US dollars. GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Dollar figures for GDP are converted from domestic currencies using single year official exchange rates. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

wdi_gdp   GDP, PPP (Constant International USD)

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 4704, N: 178, $\overline{N}$: 162, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_gdpc   GDP per Capita, PPP (Constant International USD)

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 4687, N: 178, $\overline{N}$: 162, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_gni   GNI, Atlas Method (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1962-2008, n: 6344, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 182)

Gross national income. GNI, calculated in national currency, is usually converted into US dollars at official exchange rates for comparisons across economies, although an alternative rate is used when the official exchange rate is judged to diverge by an exceptionally large margin from the rate actually applied in international transactions. To smooth fluctuations in prices and exchange rates, a special Atlas method of conversion is used by the World Bank. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

wdi_gnipc   GNI per Capita, Atlas Method (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1962-2008, n: 6309, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2001-2005 (varies by country), N: 182)

GNI per capita, Atlas method. (See wdi_gni above for explanation.) Sources: World Bank and OECD.

Trade

wdi_exp   Exports (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6790, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 37)
(Cross-section: 1997-2002 (varies by country), N: 179)

Exports of goods and services as a percentage of GDP. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

wdi_imp   Imports (% of GDP)

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

Imports of goods and services as a percentage of GDP. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

wdi_ttr   Total Trade (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6730, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_tot   Terms of Trade

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 3184, N: 139, $\overline{N}$: 110, $\overline{T}$: 23)

(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 139)

The terms of trade index is calculated as the percentage ratio of the export unit value indexes to the import unit value indexes, measured relative to the base year 2000. It is a measure of how much export is needed per import. Sources: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and International Monetary Fund.

Other

wdi_aid   Net Development Assistance and Aid (Constant USD)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6580, N: 164, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_aidcu   Net Development Assistance and Aid (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6613, N: 165, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 165)

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

wdi_area   Area (sq. km)

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 9120, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 190, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_dn   Daily Newspapers (per 1,000 People)

(Time-series: 1997-2005, n: 590, N: 124, $\overline{N}$: 66, $\overline{T}$: 5)
(Cross-section: 1997-2004 (varies by country), N: 124)

Daily newspapers refer to those published at least four times a week and calculated as average circulation (or copies printed) per 1,000 people. Sources: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

wdi_pl   Phone Lines (per 100 People)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6255, N: 187, $\overline{N}$: 128, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 187)

Fixed phone lines per 100 people. Sources: International Telecommunication Union, World Telecommunication Development Report and database, and World Bank estimates.

wdi_inet   Internet Users (per 100 People)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 2995, N: 177, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 187)

Internet users per 100 people. Sources: International Telecommunication Union, World Telecommunication/ICT Development Report and database, and World Bank estimates.

wdi_fe   Fuel Exports (% of Merchandise Exports)

(Time-series: 1962-2009, n: 4960, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 103, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_oame   Ores and Metals Exports (% of Merchandise Exports)

(Time-series: 1962-2008, n: 5078, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 108, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_me   Merchandise Exports (Current USD)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 7918, N: 184, $\overline{N}$: 162, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_gini   Gini Index

(Time-series: 1979-2008, n: 594, N: 147, $\overline{N}$: 20, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 142)

Gini measure of economic inequality, where greater values represent greater inequality. 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.

wdi_isl20   Income Share of Lowest 20%

(Time-series: 1979-2008, n: 595, N: 148, $\overline{N}$: 20, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 143)

Percentage share of income that accrues to the lowest quintile of the population. Percentage shares by quintile may not sum to 100 because of rounding. Source: see wdi_gini.

wdi_megdp   Military Expenditure (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1988-2008, n: 2857, N: 159, $\overline{N}$: 136, $\overline{T}$: 18)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 159)

Military expenditure as a percentage of GDP. The data is derived from the NATO definition. Data for some countries are based on partial or uncertain data or rough estimates. Source: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Yearbook: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security.

wdi_mege   Military Expenditure (% of Government Expenditure)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1275, N: 133, $\overline{N}$: 67, $\overline{T}$: 10)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 159)

Military expenditure as a percentage of government expenditure. See wdi_megdp for more information.

wdi_pop   Population

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 9150, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 187, $\overline{T}$: 48)
(Cross-section: 2002-2004 (varies by country), N: 190)

The de facto definition of population, which counts all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship, except for refugees not permanently settled in the country of asylum, who are generally considered part of the population of their country of origin. The values shown are midyear estimates.

Sources: United Nations Population Division, census reports and other statistical publications from national statistical offices, Eurostat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, US Census Bureau and household surveys conducted by national agencies, Macro International, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and refugees statistics from the UNHCR.

wdi_tds   Total Debt Service (% of GNI)

(Time-series: 1970-2008, n: 9150, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 187, $\overline{T}$: 48)
(Cross-section: 2000-2004 (varies by country), N: 119)

Total debt service is the sum of principal repayments and interest actually paid in foreign currency, goods, or services on long-term debt, interest paid on short-term debt, and repayments (repurchases and charges) to the IMF, as a percentage of exports of goods services and income. Source: World Bank, Global Development Finance.

wdi_urban   Urban Population (%)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 9280, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 189, $\overline{T}$: 49)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 190)

Percentage of total population living in urban areas as defined by national statistical offices. It is calculated using World Bank population estimates and urban ratios from the United Nations World Urbanization Prospects.

wdi_wip   **Women in Parliament (%)**

(Time-series: 1990-2009, n: 2364, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 118, $\overline{T}$: 13)
(Cross-section: 2001-2006 (varies by country), N: 188)

The percentage of parliamentary seats in a single or lower chamber held by women. Source: United Nations, Women's Indicators and Statistics database (www.ipu.org).

Wright – Authoritarian Regimes

http://jgwright.bol.ucla.edu/index_files/AuthoritarianLegislatures_WebAppendix.pdf
(Wright 2008)

The Wright data on authoritarian regimes is an update of Geddes (1999).

Note: This data is partly a "work in progress", and should therefore be used with caution.

wr_mir   **Military Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

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

wr_mor   **Monarchic Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a monarchic authoritarian regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_mpr   **Military-Personalist Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a military-personalist regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_pr   **Personalist Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a personalist regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_spr   **Single-Party Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a single-party regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_spmr   **Single-Party-Military Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a single-party-military regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_spmpr   **Single-Party-Military-Personalist Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a single-party-military-personalist regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_sppr   **Single-Party-Personalist Regime**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 4181, N: 125, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 73)

Equals 1 if the country is a single-party-personalist regime, and 0 otherwise.

wr_ppf   **Predicted Probability of Failure (Time Horizon)**

(Time-series: 1946-2003, n: 3922, N: 119, $\overline{N}$: 68, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 72)

Wright uses the predicted probability of regime failure as a proxy for autocratic time horizon. The variable is "based on the observable causes of regime failure" and "give[s] us a measure of how likely an autocrat is to be replaced in any given year. The greater the perceived probability of failure, the shorter the time horizon." (Wright 2008, p. 330)

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, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 13)
(Cross-section: 1997, N: 142)

bdm_short   Short

(Time-series: 1972-1999, n: 2982, N: 184, $\overline{N}$: 107, $\overline{T}$: 16)
(Cross-section: 1997, N: 179)

The yearly number of deaths per 1,000 inhabitants.

bdm_nasty   Nasty

(Time-series: 1972-1999, n: 4061, N: 167, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 1997, N: 158)

The Freedom House index of civil liberties.

bdm_solitary Solitary

(Time-series: 1972-1999, n: 4603, N: 191, $\overline{N}$: 164, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 1997, N: 181)

The number of Radios per capita.

bdm_poor   Poor

(Time-series: 1972-1999, n: 4007, N: 172, $\overline{N}$: 143, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 1997, N: 166)

The logarithm of per capita income.

bdm_brute   Brutish

(Time-series: 1972-1997, n: 4984, N: 197, $\overline{N}$: 192, $\overline{T}$: 25)

(Cross-section: 1997, N: 187)

The annual experience with civil war, revolution, and international war.

Environmental Performance Index

http://epi.yale.edu/
(Esty et al 2008)

PLEASTE NOTE: In many cases the EPI variables lack actual observations and rely on imputation. Please refer to the original documentation on more information about this.

epi_epi   Environmental Performance Index
(Cross-section: NA, N: 149)

The Environmental Performance Index is a composite index that measures how well countries succeed in reducing environmental stresses on human health and promoting ecosystem vitality and sound natural resource management. It is built on the 25 variables below.

The index ranges theoretically between 0 and 100, where higher values indicate a better environmental performance.

epi_aas   Access to Adequate Sanitation (%)
(Cross-section: 2004 or most recent year available, N: 189)

The percentage of population with an access to an improved source of sanitation. Original source is WHO.

epi_as   Agricultural Subsidies (%)
(Cross-section: 2005, N: 192)

The variable measures agricultural subsidies as a percentage of total agricultural production. Public subsidies for agricultural production are assumed to exacerbate environmental pressures by encouraging intense chemical use and overexploitation of resources.

epi_bla   Burned Land Area (%)
(Cross-section: 2005-2006 (varies by country), N: 156)

The variable measures the proportion of land area where a fire occurred under the given year. The data was taken from the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

epi_chp   Critical Habitat Protection (%)
(Cross-section: 2004, N: 79)

The percentage of sites, identified by the Alliance for Zero Extinction as a remaining refuge for one or more endangered species, that is provided habitat protection.

epi_co2en   Energy Sector Carbon Intensity
(Cross-section: 2005, N: 183)

Emissions of greenhouse gases per unit of electricity and heat output in the energy sector, measured in tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.

epi_co2ind   Industrial Carbon Intensity
(Cross-section: 2005, N: 169)

Emissions of greenhouse gases per gross domestic product of the industrial sector, measured in tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.

epi_co2pc   Carbon Dioxide Emissions per Capita
(Cross-section: 2000-2005 (varies by country), N: 165)

Emissions of greenhouse gases per capita, measured in tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.

epi_cri   Conservation Risk Index
(Cross-section: 2006 for protected areas, 2000 for land cover, N: 181)

The conservation risk index compares the area of each terrestrial biome in a country that has been converted to other land uses (e.g. conversion from forests to cropland) to the area of each biome that is under protection. Higher values indicate larger share of protected area.

epi_ebd   The Environmental Burden of Disease
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 190)

This variable captures the environmental impact on human health. The indicator shows the number of life years lost due to premature mortality caused by environmentally influenced disease and the years of healthy life lost due to disability caused by such disease (disability adjusted life years – DALY). Original source is WHO.

epi_effcon   Effective Protected Area Conservation (%)
(Cross-section: 2007, N: 191)

The index measures how much habitat within protected areas that is actually intact or relatively intact. Areas within a designated protected area that have a high human footprint (incompatible with biodiversity) are considered to be unprotected, despite their status on paper. Based on the target set by the Convention on Biological Diversity, and in order to ensure that the target performance for a country in one biome does not mask the below-target performance for the country in another, the maximum performance was capped at 10% protection by area for each biome.

epi_fgs   Forest Growing Stock Change 2000-2005
(Cross-section: 2000-2005, N: 191)

Growing stock is defined as the standing volume of the trees in a forest above a certain minimum size. Higher growing stock signifies more standing biomass, which often translates to better forest conditions. The variable measures the change between 2000 and 2005, in cubic meters per hectare.

epi_fti   Fish Trawling Intensity
(Cross-section: 2004, N: 145)

Bottom trawling equipment has been described as the most destructive fishing gear in use today. The trawling intensity indicator consists of the share of the shelf area in each country's exclusive economic zone that is fished using trawling. There are no direct data available for the area trawled on a country-by-country basis. However, fish landings data are acceptable as a proxy for each country's fishing fleet. Thus trawling ships can be counted and incorporated into this trawling metric.

epi_iap   Indoor Air Pollution (%)
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 175)

The percentage of a country's inhabitants using solid fuels indoors. Original source is WHO.

epi_ic   Intensive Cropland (%)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 163)

The cropland intensity indicator measures the proportion of cropland in agricultural landscapes, and sets a target of 40% uncultivated land in areas of crop production. Since uncultivated land includes land left uncultivated, grazing land, and settlements, this target is quite conservative. The indicator considers only whether each cell where cropping occurs has at least 40% land uncultivated, "making space" for other ecosystem functions. All 1×1 km grid cells without any cropland are excluded. Large blocks of uncultivated land or wilderness near agricultural areas will not impact a country's performance in this indicator.

epi_is   Irrigation Stress (%)
(Cross-section: circa 2000, N: 157)

The irrigation stress indicator is based on a measurement of water stress developed by the University of New Hampshire Water Systems Analysis Group. By overlaying data on irrigated areas with the measure of water stress, it is possible to determine spatially where measures of extreme water stress correspond with irrigated areas. Water stress is present when rates of freshwater withdrawal exceed rates of replenishment though rainfall and natural flow. Higher values indicate more irrigation stress.

epi_lo   Local Ozone
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 192)

Ground-level ozone causes significant health impacts, including respiratory distress and increased mortality. The target level for this category in the Environmental Performance Index is an ozone exposure limit of 85 parts per billion (ppb) based on the established United States Environmental Protection Agency standard. The indicator

measures time of exposure and the population exposed to ozone above the target concentration level. Higher scores indicate higher exposure of ozone.

epi_mpa   Marine Protected Areas (%)
(Cross-section: 2006, N: 192)

This indicator represents an assessment of the percent area in each country's exclusive economic zone that is legally protected from human disturbances.

epi_mti   Marine Trophic Index
(Cross-section: 1950-2005, N: 118)

The marine trophic index is used to measure the degree to which countries are "fishing down the food chain," i.e., catching smaller and smaller fish within their exclusive economic zones. It is considered to be a measure of overall ecosystem health and stability, but also serves as a proxy measure for overfishing. When the average trophic value of a marine ecosystem is low, it indicates that many of the large predators have been removed through excessive fishing pressure.

The index is calculated from datasets of commercial fish landings by averaging trophic levels for the overall catch each year 1950-2005. The score equals the slope of the trend, so that lower scores indicate a more negative trend and higher scores a more positive trend.

epi_pr   Pesticide Regulation
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 192)

The Environmental Performance Index measures pesticide regulation, a policy variable that tracks government attention to the issue. The pesticide regulation indicator is based on national participation in the Rotterdam Convention, which controls trade restriction and regulations for toxic chemicals, and the Stockholm convention, which bans the use of persistent organic pollutants (POPs). Accordingly the Pesticide Regulation indicator also considers national efforts to ban the 9 POPs which are relevant to agriculture: Aldrin, Chlordane, DDT, Dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Hexachlorobenzene, Mirex, and Toxaphene.

The index varies between 0 and 22, where higher scores indicate a stricter pesticide regulation. Countries receive the full 22 points if they have signed both conventions and submitted a national implementation plan, as well as banned the 9 POPs.

epi_ro   Regional Ozone
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 192)

The regional ozone indicator regards ground-level ozone, but contrary to the local ozone variable (epi_lo) it concerns effects on the ecosystem rather than on humans.

The indicator measures the extent to which very high ozone concentrations are present during the vegetative growing season, i.e. during summer daylight hours. The parameter chosen for assessing the critical level of ozone exposure for vegetation is the

Accumulated Ozone Threshold of 40 parts per billion (ppb). Higher scores indicate more exposure to high levels of ozone.

epi_so2   Sulfur Dioxide Emissions (tons)
(Cross-section: 2000, N: 190)

The sulfur dioxide indicator included in the Environmental Performance Index is based on estimates of emissions compiled by the Netherlands Environment Assessment Agency's Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR). The variable is measured as tons of emissions per populated land.

epi_up   Urban Particulates
(Cross-section: 2004 or most recent year available, N: 179)

Particles suspended in outdoor air contribute to acute lower respiratory infections and many other non-communicable diseases, such as cancer. The dataset used for the urban particulates indicator accounts for exposure by using population-weighted PM10 concentration estimates in each country's national capital and in cities with populations over 100,000. The updated dataset from the Global Model of Ambient Particulates was provided by Kiran Pandey at the Global Environment Facility.

The unit of measurement is micro-grams per cubic meter.

epi_watsup   Access to Improved Drinking Water (%)
(Cross-section: 2004, N: 190)

The percentage of population with an access to an improved water source. Original source is WHO.

epi_wq   Water Quality
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 191)

Five water quality parameters are included in the water quality indicator: dissolved oxygen, pH, conductivity, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus. The United Nations GEMS/Water Programme was used as the data source. For countries where no values could be computed using available data, a regional imputed value was used.

Higher values indicate a better water quality.

epi_ws   Water Stress (%)
(Cross-section: mean of period 1950-1995, N: 164)

The water stress is calculated as the percentage of a country's territory affected by oversubscription of water resources. A high degree of oversubscription is indicated when the water use is more than 40% of available supply. The data comes from the University of New Hampshire's Water Systems Analysis Group.

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Forest Cover Change
http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra/fra2010/en/
(FAO 2010)

fao_fcc05_10 Forest Cover Change 2005-2010 (Annual %)
(Cross-section: 2005-2010, N: 187)

The average annual rate of change (%) 2005-2010 of forest cover.

fao_fcc00_05 Forest Cover Change 2000-2005 (Annual %)
(Cross-section: 2000-2005, N: 188)

The average annual rate of change (%) 2000-2005 of forest cover.

fao_fcc90_00 Forest Cover Change 1990-2000 (Annual %)
(Cross-section: 1990-2000, N: 187)

The average annual rate of change (%) 1990-2000 of forest cover.

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.

fao_fpia   Fish Production, Inland Aquaculture
(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 5653, N: 158, $\overline{N}$: 97, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 155)

Inland aquaculture fish production, in tons.

fao_fpic   Fish Production, Inland Capture
(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8002, N: 160, $\overline{N}$: 138, $\overline{T}$: 51)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 157)

Inland captured fish production, in tons.

fao_fpma   Fish Production, Marine Aquaculture
(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 2511, N: 72, $\overline{N}$: 43, $\overline{T}$: 35)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 70)

Marine aquaculture fish production, in tons

fao_fpmc   Fish Production, Marine Capture

(Time-series: 1950-2007, n: 8374, N: 156, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 54)
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 153)

Marine captured fish production, in tons.

Fish Trade

http://www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/en
(FAO 2008)

The data shows the volume of fish export and import measured in tons, and excludes other aquatic animals and plants.

fao_fe   Fish Export (Tons)

(Time-series: 1976-2006, n: 4449, N: 185, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 24)
(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 181)

fao_fi   Fish Import (Tons)

(Time-series: 1976-2006, n: 4886, N: 187, $\overline{N}$: 158, $\overline{T}$: 26
(Cross-section: 2002-2006 (varies by country), N: 184)

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, $\overline{N}$: 144, $\overline{T}$: 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

Global Barometer

The Global Barometer is a comparative survey of attitudes and values toward politics, power, reform, democracy and citizens' political actions in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Arabic region. It is based on a common module of questions contained in four regional barometer surveys: the Latinobarómetro, the Asian Barometer, the Afrobarometer and the Arab Barometer.

Heston, Summers & Aten – Penn World Table

pwt_grgdpch Growth Rate of Real GDP per Capita (Constant Prices: Chain series)

(Time-series: 1951-2007, n: 8002, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 140, $\overline{T}$: 44)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 183)

Growth rate of real GDP per capita.

Holmberg – The Good Society Index

(Cross-section: 1999-2003, N: 71)

hg_gsi   Good Society Index

The Good Society Index builds on three basic premises. First, the index consists of birth and deaths of human beings as well as the quality of life of people. The second premise is that the Good Society Index should adhere to *lex parsimoniae*, that is to the principle of Ockham's razor, meaning that a model should use a minimum number of explanatory variables. Third, the index measures subjective as well as objective characteristics. Subjective and objective indicators need to be combined, neither is sufficient as of its own.

Given these three premises the Good Society Index is operationally constructed using:
- Infant mortality data from the WHO
- Life expectancy data from the WHO
- Life satisfaction data from the World Values Survey

The three indicators all carry the same weight. Furthermore, the index is based on ranks, not on rates, which means that the countries' rank orders are utilized to build the composite index. The rank orders of each country have been summed and divided by three to yield an index value that in theory can vary between 1 (top nation on the Good Society Index) and 71 (bottom country). A top index value of 1 and a bottom value of 71 thus tell us that these specific countries are closest and furthest away respectively from the good society among the investigated nations. But the figures do

not tell how close or how far away from the maximum good society the countries are. The index is not continuous, it is a rank order scale.

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, $\overline{N}$: 185, $\overline{T}$: 40)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 186)

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

ihme_pnm   Postneonatal Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Births)

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

Probability of death between age 1 month to 1 year, expressed as deaths per 1,000.

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

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

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

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

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

Number of maternal deaths per 100,000 live Births.

OECD – The Gender, Institutions and Development Database
(OECD 2009)

The OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Database contains comparative data on gender equality. It has been compiled from secondary sources as well as from in-depth reviews of country case studies. The sources are the UNDP Human Development Report, World Bank Gender Stats, ILO Key Indicators of the Labour Market and CIA World Factbook.

gid_far   Female Activity Rate (%)
(Cross-section: 2004, N: 151)

The percentage of the female population aged 15 and above who supply, or are available to supply, labor for the production of goods and services. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_farpm　　**Female Activity Rate as Percent of Male**
(Cross-section: 2004, N: 151)

Same as gid_far, but measured as percentage of male activity rate. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_fptw　　**Female Professional and Technical Workers (%)**
(Cross-section: 1992-2004 (varies by country), N: 74)

Women's share of positions defined according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) which includes physical, mathematical and engineering science professionals (and associate professionals), life science and health professionals (and associate professionals), teaching professionals (and associate professionals) and other professionals and associate professionals. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_fwe　　**Female Wage Employment (%)**
(Cross-section: 2006, N:112)

The share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector as a percentage of the total non-agricultural sector employment. (Source: UN Millennium Development Goal Indicators.)

gid_rfmi　　**Ratio of Female to Male Income**
(Cross-section: 1991-2004 (varies by country), N: 146)

The ratio of the estimated female to male earned income. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_fgm　　**Female Government Ministers (%)**
(Cross-section: 1992-2004 (varies by country), N: 151)

The percentage of women in government at ministerial level. Includes vice prime ministers and ministers. Prime ministers are only included if they held ministerial portfolios. Vice-presidents and heads of ministerial-level departments or agencies were also included when exercising a ministerial function within the government structure. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_whp　　**Women in High Positions (%)**
(Cross-section: 1992-2004 (varies by country), N: 73)

The share of women's positions defined according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88), which includes legislators, senior government officials, traditional chiefs and heads of villages, senior officials of special-interest organizations, corporate managers, directors and chief executives, production and

operations department managers and other department and general managers. (Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2006.)

gid_wip   Women in Parliament (%)
(Cross-section: 2006, N:154)

The percentage of women in parliament. The data refers to single house, or the weighted average of both upper and lower house, where relevant. (Source: UNDP Human Develement Report.)

gid_ywv   Year Women Received Right to Vote
(Cross-section, N: 153)

The year women received the right to vote. (Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union.)

gid_ywse   Year Women Received Right to Stand for Election
(Cross-section, N: 153)

The year women received the right to stand for election. (Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union.)

gid_yfwp   Year of First Woman in Parliament
(Cross-section, N: 153)

The year the first woman was appointed or elected to parliament. (Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union.)

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

(Time-series: 1946-2004, n: 7889, N: 183, $\overline{N}$: 134, $\overline{T}$: 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_type1   Extrasystemic armed conflict
These conflicts occur between a state and a non-state group outside its own territory.
(0)   No extra-state conflict

(1)   Extra-state minor armed conflict
(2)   Extra-state intermediate armed conflict
(3)   Extra-state war

ucdp_type2   Interstate armed conflict

These conflicts occur between two or more states.
(0)   No interstate conflict
(1)   Interstate minor armed conflict
(2)   Interstate intermediate armed conflict
(3)   Interstate war

ucdp_type3   Internal armed conflict

These conflicts occur between the government of a state and internal opposition groups without intervention from other states.
(0)   No internal conflict
(1)   Internal minor armed conflict
(2)   Internal intermediate armed conflict
(3)   Internal war

ucdp_type4   Internationalized internal armed conflict

These conflicts occur between the government of a state and internal opposition groups with intervention from other states.
(0)   No internationalized internal conflict
(1)   Internationalized internal minor armed conflict
(2)   Internationalized internal intermediate armed conflict
(3)   Internationalized internal war.

ucdp_count   Number of Conflicts

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

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

UNDP - Human Development Report

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

undp_hdi   Human Development Index

(Time-series: 1975-2003, n: 1079, N: 177, $\overline{N}$: 135, $\overline{T}$: 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.

undp_gdi Gender-Related Development Index

The GDI is based on HDI (undp_hdi), but adjusts the average achievements in the three dimensions to reflect the inequalities between men and women. The value of each dimension is first calculated separately for the male and the female population. The value of each of the three components is then calculated as: {[female population share * (female index^{-1})] + [male population share * (male index^{-1})]}$^{-1}$. The total index is then the equally weighted sum of each component.

undp_gem Gender Empowerment Measure

(Cross-section: 2002, N: 78)

A composite index measuring gender inequality in three basic dimensions of empowerment: economic participation and decision-making, political participation and decision-making and power over economic resources. The variable ranges from 0 to 1, where a higher value indicates a higher level of gender empowerment.

United Nations Statistics Divisions – National Accounts

http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/
(United Nations Statistics Divisions 2009)

unna_grgdp Growth Rate of Real GDP (%)

(Time-series: 1971-2007, n: 6688, N: 198, $\overline{N}$: 181, $\overline{T}$: 34)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 192)

The growth rate of GDP at constant prices, in percent.

Veenhoven – World Database of Happiness

http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl/
(Veenhoven 2007)

Years Lived Happy:

Life expectancy at birth multiplied by average survey self-assessments of subjective happiness, where the latter is scaled to range from 0-1.

wdh_ylh80_83 Years Lived Happy (1980-1983)

(Cross-section: 1980-1983, N: 20)

wdh_ylh90_91 Years Lived Happy (1990-1991)

(Cross-section: 1990-1991, N: 48)

wdh_ylh90_95 Years Lived Happy (1990-1995)

(Cross-section: 1990-1995, N: 45)

wdh_ylh90_98   **Years Lived Happy (1990-1998)**

(Cross-section: 1990-1998, N: 61)

Years Lived Satisfied:

Life expectancy at birth multiplied by average survey self-assessments of subjective life satisfaction, where the latter is scaled to range from 0-1.

wdh_yls80_83   **Years Lived Satisfied (1980-1983)**

(Cross-section: 1980-1983, N: 21)

wdh_yls90_91   **Years Lived Satisfied (1990-1991)**

(Cross-section: 1990-1991, N: 42)

wdh_yls90_95   **Years Lived Satisfied (1990-1995)**

(Cross-section: 1990-1995, N: 40)

wdh_yls90_98   **Years Lived Satisfied (1990-1998)**

(Cross-section: 1990-1998, N: 55)

Years in Good Mood:

Life-expectancy at birth multiplied by average survey assessments of affect balance, where the latter is scaled to range from 0-1.

wdh_ygm80_83   **Years in Good Mood (1980-1983)**

(Cross-section: 1980-1983, N: 20)

wdh_ygm90_91   **Years in Good Mood (1990-1991)**

(Cross-section: 1990-1991, N: 39)

Mixed Measure:

Life-expectancy at birth multiplied by average survey self-assessments of subjective life satisfaction (combined measure of a 10-step life satisfaction and an 11-step best-worst life), where the latter is scaled to range from 0-1.

wdh_lsbw95_05   **Life Satisfaction combined with Best-Worst Life**

(Cross-section: 1995-2005, N: 94)

World Development Indicators

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

GDP Growth

wdi_gdpgr   GDP Growth (%)

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 6947, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_gdpcgr   GDP per Capita Growth (%)

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 6947, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 145, $\overline{T}$: 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.

Poverty

wdi_pb2   Population Below $2 a Day (%)

(Time-series: 1978-2008, n: 584, N: 120, $\overline{N}$: 19, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_pb125   Population Below $1.25 a day (%)

(Time-series: 1978-2008, n: 584, N: 120, $\overline{N}$: 19, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_pbpl   Population Below National Poverty Line (%)

(Time-series: 1985-2008, n: 216, N: 100, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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.

Health and Life Expectancy

wdi_lifexp   Life Expectancy at Birth (Years)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 8347, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 170, $\overline{T}$: 44)
(Cross-section: 2000-2006 (varies by country), N: 188)

Life expectancy at birth indicates the number of years a newborn infant would live if prevailing patterns of mortality at the time of its birth were to stay the same throughout

its life. Sources: United Nations Population Division, national statistical offices, Eurostat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and U.S. Census Bureau.

wdi_mort   Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 3185, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 65, $\overline{T}$: 17)
(Cross-section: 2000-2002 (varies by country), N: 190)

Infant mortality rate is the number of infants dying before reaching one year of age, per 1,000 live births in a given year. Source: Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UNICEF, WHO, World Bank, UNPD, universities and research institutions).

wdi_fmort   Mortality Rate, Under-5 (per 1,000)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 2815, N: 190, $\overline{N}$: 57, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2000-2002 (varies by country), N: 190)

The probability per 1,000 that a newborn baby will die before reaching age five, if subject to current age-specific mortality rates. Source: Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation.

wdi_hiv   Prevalence of HIV (% of Population Aged 15-49)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 2111, N: 141, $\overline{N}$: 111, $\overline{T}$: 15)
(Cross-section: 2002-2007 (varies by country), N: 141)

Prevalence of HIV refers to the percentage of people ages 15-49 who are infected with HIV. Sources: UNAIDS and the WHO's Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic.

Health Expenditure

wdi_hec   Health Expenditure per Capita, PPP (Constant USD)

(Time-series: 2003-2007, n: 926, N: 187, $\overline{N}$: 185, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_the   Total Health Expenditure (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 2003-2007, n: 935, N: 187, $\overline{N}$: 187, $\overline{T}$: 5)
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 187)

The sum of public and private health expenditure as a percentage of GDP. Source: WHO, supplemented by country data.

wdi_puhegdp Public Health Expenditure (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 2003-2007, n: 940, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 5)
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 188)

Public health expenditure as a percentage of GDP. Source: WHO, supplemented by country data.

wdi_prhe   Private Health Expenditure (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 2003-2007, n: 940, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 5)
(Cross-section: 2003, N: 188)

Private health expenditure includes direct household (out-of-pocket) spending, private insurance, charitable donations, and direct service payments by private corporations. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Source: WHO, supplemented by country data.

Government Revenue and Expenditure

wdi_gbds   Government budget deficit/surplus (% of GDP)

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

Government revenue (including grants) minus expenses, minus net acquisitions of nonfinancial assets. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Source: International Monetary Fund. (World Bank and OECD for GDP estimates.)

wdi_cgd   Central Government Debt (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 905, N: 103, $\overline{N}$: 48, $\overline{T}$: 9)
(Cross-section: 1995-2007 (varies by country), N: 99)

The gross amount of government liabilities reduced by the amount of equity and financial derivatives held by the government. Because debt is a stock rather than a flow, it is measured as of a given date, usually the last day of the fiscal year. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Source: International Monetary Fund. (World Bank and OECD for GDP estimates.)

wdi_gr   Government Revenue (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1492, N: 146, $\overline{N}$: 79, $\overline{T}$: 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.)

wdi_tr   Tax Revenue (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1497, N: 146, $\overline{N}$: 79, $\overline{T}$: 10)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 141)

Tax revenue refers to compulsory transfers to the central government for public purposes. Certain compulsory transfers such as fines, penalties, and most social security contributions are excluded. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Source: International Monetary Fund. (World Bank and OECD for GDP estimates.)

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

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1352, N: 141, $\overline{N}$: 71, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_ge Government Expense (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 1377, N: 144, $\overline{N}$: 72, $\overline{T}$: 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

wdi_gce Government Consumption Expenditure (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 6528, N: 177, $\overline{N}$: 133, $\overline{T}$: 37)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 173)

General government final consumption expenditure includes all current government expenditures for purchases of goods and services (including compensation of employees). It also includes most expenditure on national defence and security, but excludes government military expenditures that are part of government capital formation. Measured as a percentage of GDP. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

Energy and Environment

wdi_co2 Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Tons per Capita)

(Time-series: 1960-2006, n: 7504, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 160, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_epc Electric Power Consumption (kWh per Capita)

(Time-series: 1960-2007, n: 4714, N: 132, $\overline{N}$: 98, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_eu   Energy Use (kg of Coal Equivalent per Capita)

(Time-series: 1960-2007, n: 4730, N: 133, $\overline{N}$: 99, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 1999-2002 (varies by country), N: 129)

Energy use in kg of coal equivalent per capita. Source: International Energy Agency.

wdi_fw   Freshwater Withdrawals (% of Internal Resources)

(Time-series: 1982-2007, n: 208, N: 155, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 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.

Other

wdi_aas   Access to Adequate Sanitation (% of Population)

(Time-series: 1990-2006, n: 629, N: 168, $\overline{N}$: 37, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_iws   Improved Water Source (% of Population)

(Time-series: 1990-2006, n: 666, N: 177, $\overline{N}$: 39, $\overline{T}$: 4)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 177)

The percentage of the population with reasonable access to an adequate amount of water from an improved source, such as a household connection, public standpipe, borehole, protected well or spring, and rainwater collection. Sources: World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund.

wdi_ase   Agriculture's share of economy (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 5959, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 122, $\overline{T}$: 33)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 179)

The share of the economy that stems from agricultural production as a percentage of GDP. Agriculture includes forestry, hunting, fishing, cultivation of crops and livestock production. 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.

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

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 5927, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 121, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_sse   Services' share of economy (% of GDP)

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 5930, N: 181, $\overline{N}$: 121, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_brd   Battle-Related Deaths

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 9210, N: 189, $\overline{N}$: 188, $\overline{T}$: 49)
(Cross-section: 2002, N: 189)

Deaths in battle-related conflicts between warring parties, usually involving armed forces. This includes traditional battlefield fighting, guerrilla activities, and all kinds of bombardments of military units, cities, and villages, etc. All deaths – military as well as civilian – incurred in such situations, are counted as battle-related deaths.

wdi_idp   Internally Displaced Persons

(Time-series: 2000-2008, n: 262, N: 45, $\overline{N}$: 29, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_eodb   Ease of Doing Business

(Time-series: 2008-2009, n: 356, N: 178, $\overline{N}$: 178, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_trsb   **Time Required to Start Business (Days)**

(Time-series: 2003-2009, n: 1171, N: 178, $\overline{N}$: 167, $\overline{T}$: 7)
(Cross-section: 2003-2008 (varies by country), N: 178)

Time required to start a business is the number of calendar days needed to complete the procedures to legally operate a business. If a procedure can be speeded up at additional cost, the fastest procedure, independent of cost, is chosen. Source: World Bank, Doing Business project.

wdi_fdi   **Foreign Direct Investments, Net Inflows (% of GDP)**

(Time-series: 1970-2008, n: 5340, N: 177, $\overline{N}$: 137, $\overline{T}$: 30)
(Cross-section: 1996-2006 (varies by country), N: 175)

Foreign direct investment are the net inflows of investment to acquire a lasting management interest (10 percent or more of the voting stock) in an enterprise operating in an economy other than that of the investor. This series shows the net inflows in the reporting economy. Data are in percent of GDP. Sources: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics and Balance of Payments databases, and World Bank, Global Development Finance.

wdi_fr   **Fertility Rate (Births per Woman)**

(Time-series: 1960-2008, n: 8560, N: 189, $\overline{N}$: 175, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_gris   **Gender Ratio in School (%)**

(Time-series: 1991-2009, n: 1555, N: 182, $\overline{N}$: 82, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wdi_infl   **Inflation (%)**

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 6722, N: 188, $\overline{N}$: 140, $\overline{T}$: 36)
(Cross-section: 2002-2003 (varies by country), N: 187)

Inflation measured by the annual growth rate of the GDP implicit deflator, showing the rate of price change in the economy as a whole. The GDP implicit deflator is the ratio

of GDP in current local currency to GDP in constant local currency. Sources: World Bank and OECD.

wdi_rir   **Real Interest Rate (%)**

(Time-series: 1961-2008, n: 3919, N: 174, $\overline{N}$: 82, $\overline{T}$: 23)
(Cross-section: 1996-2006 (varies by country), N: 165)

Real interest rate is the lending interest rate adjusted for inflation as measured by the GDP deflator.

wdi_ue   **Unemployment (%)**

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 2124, N: 168, $\overline{N}$: 73, $\overline{T}$: 13)
(Cross-section: 1996-2007 (varies by country), N: 157)

The share of the labor force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. Source: ILO.

wdi_lue   **Long-Term Unemployment (% of Unemployed)**

(Time-series: 1980-2008, n: 887, N: 55, $\overline{N}$: 31, $\overline{T}$: 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.

World Economic Forum

(Cross-section: 2005, N: 128)
http://www.weforum.org/gendergap

wef_gend   **Gender Gap Index**

All scores are reported on a scale of 0 to 1, with 1 representing maximum gender equality. The study measures the extent to which women have achieved full equality with men in five critical areas:

- Economic participation
- Economic opportunity
- Political empowerment
- Educational Attainment
- Health and well-being

World Resources Institute

(Cross-section: 2004, N: 181)
http://earthtrends.wri.org/searchable_db/index.php?theme=7

wri_pa16   Protected Areas: Percentage of Total Land Area

Protected areas: IUCN Categories I-IV and other, percentage of total land area. The proportion of a country or region's total land area that is assigned terrestrial protected area status by the World Conservation Union (IUCN). Both IUCN categories I-VI and terrestrial protected areas that are not assigned to a category by IUCN are included here. A protected area is defined by IUCN as "an area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means." See http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/ for more information on the IUCN categories. Original source: UNEP-WCMC (2004)

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_module   WVS module

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

The variable denotes from which of the five WVS waves the observation comes. The waves were conducted the following years:

(1)   1981-1984
(2)   1989-1993
(3)   1994-1999
(4)   1999-2004
(5)   2004-2008

In the cross-sectional dataset different variables may come from different waves for the same country. In these cases we have let wvs_module take the value of the wave from which the most variables were picked for that country.

wvs_a008   Feeling of happiness

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 241, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_a009   State of health

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 207, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_a062   How often discusses political matters

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 190, N: 84, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 81)

When you get together with your friends, would you say you discuss political matters frequently, occasionally or never?

(1)   Frequently
(2)   Occasionally
(3)   Never

wvs_a165   Most people can be trusted

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 243, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_a168   Do you think most people try to take advantage of you

(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 40)

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?

(1)   Would take advantage
(2)   Try to be fair

wvs_a170   How satisfied are you with your life

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

All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?

(1)   Dissatisfied
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   Satisfied

wvs_a173   How much freedom you feel

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 236, N: 95, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 93)

Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, while other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please use this scale where 1 means none at all and 10 means a great deal to indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out.

(1)   Not at all
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   A great deal

wvs_c006   Satisfaction with the financial situation of household

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 209, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 84)

How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household?

(1)   Dissatisfied
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   Satisfied

wvs_e023   Interested in politics

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 215, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 93)

How interested would you say you are in politics?

(1)   Very interested
(2)   Somewhat interested
(3)   Not very interested
(4)   Not at all interested

wvs_e150   How often follows politics in the news

(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 61)

How often do you follow politics in the news on television or on the radio or in the daily papers?

(1)   Every day
(2)   Several times a week
(3)   Once or twice a week
(4)   Less often
(5)   Never

Statements about the environment

I am now going to read out some statements about the environment. For each one read out, can you tell me whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree or strongly disagree?

wvs_b001   Would give part of my income for environment

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 143, N: 84, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1999-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

I would give part of my income if I were certain that the money would be used to prevent environmental pollution.

(1)   Strongly agree
(2)   Agree
(3)   Disagree
(4)   Strongly disagree

wvs_b002   Increase in taxes if extra money used to prevent environmental pollution

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 196, N: 90, $\overline{N}$: 10, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 88)

I would agree to an increase in taxes if the extra money were used to prevent environmental pollution.

(1)   Strongly agree

(2)   Agree
(3)   Disagree
(4)   Strongly disagree

wvs_b003   **Government should reduce environmental pollution**

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 143, N: 84, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1999-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

(1)   Strongly agree
(2)   Agree
(3)   Disagree
(4)   Strongly disagree

wvs_b008   **Environmental vs. economic growth**

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 143, N: 84, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 83)

Here are two statements people sometimes make when discussing the environment and economic growth. Which of them comes closer to your own point of view?

(1)   Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some losses of jobs.
(2)   Economic growth and creating jobs should be the top priority, even if the environment suffers to some extent.

(3 – "other answer" is recoded as missing)

wvs_b009   **Human & nature**

(Time-series: 1994-2005, n: 78, N: 58, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 1)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 57)

For the following pair of statements, please tell me which one comes closest to your own views:

(1)   Human beings should master nature
(2)   Humans should coexist with nature

(3 – "both", 4 – "neither" and 5 – "other answer" are recoded as missing)

Ideology

wvs_e033   **Self positioning in political scale**

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 226, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 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

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_e035   Incomes more equal

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 209, N: 95, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

Incomes should be   We need larger income differences
made more equal   as incentives for individual effort

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

wvs_e036   Private ownership of business

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 202, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 88)

Private ownership of   Government ownership of
business and industry   business and industry
should be increased   should be increased

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

wvs_e037   Government more responsibility

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

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

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

wvs_e039   Competition is good

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 206, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)

(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

| Competition is good. It stimulates people to work hard and develop new ideas | | | | | | | | Competition is harmful. It brings out the worst in people | | |

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

wvs_e196   How widespread is corruption
(Cross-section: 1995-2004 (varies by country), N: 49)

How widespread do you think bribe taking and corruption is in this country?

(1)   Almost no public officials engaged in it
(2)   A few are
(3)   Most are
(4)   Almost all public officials are engaged in it

Confidence
I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all?

(1)   A great deal
(2)   Quite a lot
(3)   Not very much
(4)   None at all

wvs_e069_01 Confidence: churches

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 236, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 92)

wvs_e069_02 Confidence: armed forces

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 231, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 89)

wvs_e069_04 Confidence: the press

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 236, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)
wvs_e069_05 Confidence: labor unions

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 234, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

wvs_e069_06 Confidence: the police

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 233, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

wvs_e069_07 Confidence: parliament

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 229, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 89)

wvs_e069_08 Confidence: the civil services

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 232, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)

wvs_e069_09 Confidence: social security system

(Time-series: 1990-2001, n: 71, N: 47, $\overline{N}$: 6, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1999-2001 (varies by country), N: 31)

wvs_e069_10 Confidence: television

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 150, N: 83, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 83)

wvs_e069_11 Confidence: the government

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 147, N: 81, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

wvs_e069_12 Confidence: the political parties

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 150, N: 81, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

wvs_e069_13 Confidence: major companies

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 221, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 87)

wvs_e069_14 Confidence: the environmental protection movement

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 140, N: 81, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

wvs_e069_15 Confidence: the women's movement

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 140, N: 81, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 81)

wvs_e069_17 Confidence: the justice system

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 200, N: 85, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2008 (varies by country), N: 83)

wvs_e069_18 Confidence: the European Union

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 130, N: 63, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1997-2008 (varies by country), N: 58)

wvs_e069_19 Confidence: NATO

(Time-series: 1990-2005, n: 78, N: 58, $\overline{N}$: 5, $\overline{T}$: 1)
(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 47)

wvs_e069_20 Confidence: the United Nations

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 172, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 92)

Political system

I'm going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country?

(1)   Very good
(2)   Fairly good
(3)   Bad
(4)   Very bad

wvs_e114   Having a strong leader

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 171, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)

wvs_e115   Having experts make decisions

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 170, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)

wvs_e116   Having the army rule

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 170, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)

wvs_e117   Having a democratic political system

(Time-series: 1994-2008, n: 170, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)

Democracy

I'm going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly after I read each one of them?

(1)   Agree strongly
(2)   Agree
(3)   Disagree
(4)   Strongly disagree

wvs_e120   In democracy, the economic system runs badly

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 117, N: 78, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 77)

wvs_e121   Democracies are indecisive

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 117, N: 78, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 77)

wvs_e122   Democracies aren't good at maintaining order

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 118, N: 79, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 1)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 78)

wvs_e123   Democracy may have problems but is better

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 118, N: 78, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 77)

wvs_e124   Respect for individual human rights

(Time-series: 1996-2008, n: 126, N: 89, $\overline{N}$: 10, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_e110   Democracy is developing in our country

(Cross-section: 1996-2005 (varies by country), N: 68)

On the whole are you very satisfied, rather satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy is developing in our country?

(1)   Very satisfied
(2)   Rather satisfied
(3)   Not very satisfied
(4)   Not at all satisfied

Regime

wvs_e125   Satisfaction with the people in national office

(Time-series: 1994-2005, n: 87, N: 65, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_e128   Country is run by big interest vs. all people

(Time-series: 1990-2007, n: 100, N: 68, $\overline{N}$: 6, $\overline{T}$: 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

Justifiable

Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between.

(1)   Never justifiable
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   Always justifiable

wvs_f114   Justifiable: claiming government benefits

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 234, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 92)

wvs_f115   Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 219, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 87)

wvs_f116   Justifiable: cheating on taxes

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 234, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 91)

wvs_f117   Justifiable: someone accepting a bribe

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 239, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

WVS - indices

wvs_sup   Support for democracy

(Time-series: 1994-2006, n: 115, N: 76, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2005 (varies by country), N: 75)

Democracy-scale according to Klingemann (1999): In the first step, we added up respondent's support of the statements "Having a democratic political system" and "Democracy may have problems but it's better than any other form of government". Support for these statements could be expressed in four categories: "very good" (code 3), "fairly good" (code 2), "fairly bad" (code 1) and "very bad" (code 0) in the first statement and "agree strongly" (code 3), "agree" (code 2), "disagree" (code 1) and "disagree strongly" (code 0) in the latter. People's support for these statements has been added up to a 0-to-6 scale, with 6 representing the highest support for democracy. In the second step, we added up people's support of the statements "Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections" and "Having the army rule". Analogous to the first step, this creates a 0-to-6 scale of support for autocracy. In the third step, we subtracted the "support for autocracy" scale from the "support for democracy" scale to create an overall index of "autocratic versus democratic support", ranging from –6 (maximum autocratic support) to +6 (maximum democratic support). In the fourth step, we calculated for each country the percentage of people scoring on at least +4 on this index (since from +4 onward you are closer to the maximum democratic support (+6) than to the neutral point (0)). Hence, we obtain the percentage of "solid democrats" for each country.

wvs_org   Belong to organizations
wvs_vol   Voluntary work for organizations

(Cross-section: 1999-2005 (varies by country), N: 59 (org), 55 (vol)).

Average number of organizations (0-14).

Which of the following organizations do you belong to or do voluntary work for?
- social welfare service for elderly
- church organization
- cultural activities
- labor unions
- political parties
- local political
- third world development or human rights
- conservation, the environment, ecology, animal rights
- professional associations
- youth work
- sports or recreation
- women's group
- peace movement
- organizations concerned with health

wvs_theo   Support for theocracy

(Time-series: 1999-2008, n: 110, N: 84, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 1)

(Cross-section: 1999-2008 (varies by country), N: 84)

Support for theocracy is a 0-1 scale composed of four items.

"How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following":

- "Politicians who do not believe in God are unfit for public office" (agree coded high).
- "Religious leaders should not influence how people vote in elections" (agree coded low).
- "It would be better for [this country] if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office" (agree coded high).
- "Religious leaders should not influence government decisions" (agree coded low).

wvs_act   Political Action

(Time-series: 1981-2006, n: 175, N: 78, $\overline{N}$: 7, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1995-2006 (varies by country), N: 75)

Average number of the following political actions that the respondents actually have carried out (0-5):
- Signing a petition
- Joining in boycotts
- Attending lawful demonstrations
- Joining unofficial strikes
- Occupying buildings or factories

wvs_pm4   Post-Materialism 4-item index

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 239, N: 95, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 3)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 93)

The Post-Materialism indices measure the extent to which the respondent gives top priority to economic and physical security, on the one hand; or to autonomy and self-expression on the other. The Post-Materialism 4-item index is based on the respondent's first and second choices in the following questions:

"People sometimes talk about what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years. On this card are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority. Would you please say which one of these you, yourself, consider the most important? And which would be the second most important?"

	1st choice	2nd choice
I. Maintaining the order of the nation	1	1
II. Giving people more say in important government decisions	2	2
III. Fighting rising prices	3	3
IV. Protecting freedom of speech	4	4

The first and third options tap materialist priorities, while the second and fourth options tap postmaterialist priorities. If both materialist items are given high priority, the score is "1"; if both postmaterialist items are given high priority, the score is "3"; if one materialist item and one postmaterialism item are given high priority the score is "2".

(1) Materialist
(2) Mixed
(3) Postmaterialist

wvs_pm12   Post-Materialism 12-item index

(Time-series: 1989-2008, n: 184, N: 91, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 82)

The Post-Materialism 12-item index is based on the respondents' views on what the aims of their country should be for the next ten years. The following items are postmaterialist priorities drawn from three questions. The score is the average number of these postmaterialist items that are given priority.

- Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities.
- Giving people more say in important government decisions.
- Protecting freedom of speech.
- Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society.
- Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money.

(0)   Materialist
(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)   Postmaterialist

wvs_gen   Gender Equality Scale

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 242, N: 95, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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).

wvs_rs   Religiosity Scale

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 242, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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?"

Factor indices

wvs_selfexp1 Self-expression values I

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 199, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 10, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 89)
(Inglehart and Welzel 2003)

Principal components factor index based on wvs_tol, wvs_pet, wvs_lib, wvs_trust and wvs_lifsat.

WARNING: Some inconsistencies found in the original data regarding wvs_tol (see below).

wvs_selfexp2 Self-expression values II

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 194, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 10, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 89)
(Welzel et al 2003)

Principal components factor index based on wvs_tol, wvs_pet, wvs_lib, wvs_trust, wvs_lifsat and wvs_rel.

WARNING: Some inconsistencies found in the original data regarding wvs_tol (see below).

wvs_selfexp3 Self-expression values III

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 221, N: 92, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 90)
(Inglehart and Baker 2000)

Principal components factor index based on wvs_pet, wvs_lib, wvs_trust, wvs_happy and wvs_homo.

wvs_secrat   Secular-rational values

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 220, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)
(Inglehart and Baker 2000)

Principal components factor index based on wvs_rel, wvs_auton, wvs_abort, wvs_proud and wvs_auth.

Factor indices items

Please tell me for each of the following statements (abortion/homosexuality) whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between.

(1)   Never justifiable
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   Always justifiable

wvs_abort   Abortion is justifiable

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 237, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

wvs_homo   Homosexuality is justifiable

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 233, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 92)

wvs_homo is dichotomized as follows:
(0)   Not justifiable (1 above)
(1)   Justifiable (2-10 above)

wvs_auth   Respect for authority

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 237, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

I'm going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don't you mind?. Greater respect for authority.

(1)   Good
(2)   Don't mind
(3)   Bad

wvs_auton   Autonomy index

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 237, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Which, if any, do you consider to be especially important?
A.   Independence.
B.   Determination
C.   Religious faith

D.   Obedience

(0)   Not mentioned
(1)   Important

Autonomy index is computed as (A+B)-(C+D), generating the following five-point scale:

(-2)   Obedience/Religious Faith
(-1)
(0)
(1)
(2)   Determination, perseverance/Independence

wvs_happy   Happiness

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

See variable wvs_a008 above.
(0)   Not very happy/ Not at all happy
(1)   Very happy/ Quite happy

wvs_lib   Liberty and participation

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

If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? (Rank first and second choice).

- Maintaining order in the nation
- Give people more say in important government decisions
- Fighting rising prices
- Protecting freedom of speech

Respondents first and second priorities for "giving people more say in important government decisions" and "protecting freedom of speech" added to a four-point index, assigning 3 points for both items on first and second rank, 2 points for one of these items on first rank, 1 point for one of these items on second rank and 0 for none of these items on first or second rank.

wvs_lifsat   Life satisfaction

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

10-point rating scale for life satisfaction (=wvs_a170).

wvs_pet   Public self-expression

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 233, N: 94, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 92)

I'm going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I'd like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never under any circumstances, do it:
Signing a petition.
- Have done
- Might do
- Would never do

"Have done" coded (1) and dichotomized against (0).

wvs_proud   National pride

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 240, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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

wvs_rel   Religiousness

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 234, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 8, $\overline{T}$: 2)
(Cross-section: 1996-2008 (varies by country), N: 94)

How important is God in your life? Please use this scale to indicate - 1 means very important and 10 means not at all important.

(1)   Very
(2)
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)   Not at all

(In the original question (1) is not at all important and (10) very important).

wvs_tol   Tolerance of diversity

(Time-series: 1990-2008, n: 206, N: 93, $\overline{N}$: 11, $\overline{T}$: 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.

wvs_trust   Interpersonal trust

(Time-series: 1981-2008, n: 243, N: 96, $\overline{N}$: 9, $\overline{T}$: 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).

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.

Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer, A., Easterly, W., Kurlat, S., and Wacziarg, R. 2003. "Fractionalization." *Journal of Economic Growth,* 8: 155-194.

Amorim Neto, O. and Cox, G. 1997. "Electoral Institutions: Cleavage Structures and the number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(1): 149-174.

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_se ts/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.

Austin, R. and Tjernström, M. (eds.) 2003. *Funding of Political Parties and Election Campaigns*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA).

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.

Beck, T., Clarke, G., Groff, A., Keefer, P. and Walsh, P. 2000. "New Tools and New Tests in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2283.

Beck, T., Clarke, G., Groff, A., Keefer, P. and Walsh, P. 2001. "New Tools in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions", *World Bank Economic Review*, 15(1): 165-176.

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. *CIA World Factbook*, published online.

Cheibub, J. A., Gandhi, J. and Vreeland, J. R. 2009. "Democracy and dictatorship revisited." *Public Choice*, 143(1-2): 67-101.

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).

Cukierman, A., Webb, S. B. and Neypati, B. 1992. "Measuring Independence of Central Banks and Its Effect on Policy Outcomes." *The World Bank Economic Review*, 6(3): 353-398.

Crowe, C. and Meade, E. E. 2007. "The Evolution of Central Bank Governance around the World." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 21(4): 69-90.

Crowe, C. and Meade, E. E. 2008. "Central bank independence and transparency: Evolution and effectiveness. *European Journal of Political Economy*. 24: 763-777.

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

Dahlström, C., Lapuente, V. and Teorell, J. 2010. "Dimensions of Bureaucracy. A Cross-National Dataset on the Structure and Behavior of Public Administration." QoG Working Paper Series 2010:13, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg. http://www.qog.pol.gu.se

Deininger, K. and Squire, L. 1996. "A New Data Set Measuring Income Inequality." *The World Bank Economic Review,* 3: 565-591.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., López-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. 2002. "The Regulation of Entry. "*Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 117: 1-37.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., López-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. 2003. "Courts: The Lex Mundi Project." *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 118: 453-517.

Djankov, S. McLeish, C., Nenova, T. and Shleifer, A. 2003. "Who Owns the Media?" *The Journal of Law and Economics,* 46: 341-382.

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 Consecquences*. New York: Springer.

Easterly, W. and Levine R. 1997. "Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 4: 1203-1250.

Eckstein, H. and Gurr, T. R.. 1975. *Patterns of Authority: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Elazar, Daniel J. 1995. "From Statism to Federalism: A Paradigm Shift," Publius, 25, 2, spring, pp.5-18.

Esty, D. C. et al. 2008. *2008 Environmental Performance Index.* Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, Center for International Earth Science Information Network (Columbia University), World Economic Forum, Joint Research Centre of the European Commission. http://epi.yale.edu/Home

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). 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010.*

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

Fearon, J.D. 2003. "Ethnic and Cultural Diversity by Country." *Journal of Economic Growth,* 8: 195-222.

Feld, L.P. and Voigt, S. 2003. "Economic growth and judicial independence: cross-country evidence using a new set of indicators" *European Journal of Political Economy*, 19: 497–527.

Fish, M.S. and Kroenig, M. 2009. *The Handbook of National Legislatures: A Global Survey*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freitag, M. 1999. Politik und Währung. Ein internationaler Vergleich". PhD dissertation, University of Bern.

Gakidou, E., Cowling, K., Lozano, R. and Murray, C.J.L. 2010. "Increased educational attainment and its effect on child mortality in 175 countries between 1970 and 2009: a systematic analysis". *Lancet*, 376: 959-974.

Galbraith, James. 2009. "Inequality, unemployment and growth: New measures for old controversies". *Journal of Economic Inequailty*, 7: 189-206.

Galbraith, James and Hyunsub Kum. 2003. Inequality and Economic Growth: A Global View Based on Measures of Pay, *CESifo Economic Studies* 49(4): 527–556.

Galbraith, James and Hyunsub Kum. 2004. Estimating the Inequality of Household Incomes: A Statistical Approach to the Creation of a Dense and Consistent Global Data Set. *UTIP Working Paper No. 22* (<http://utip.gov.utexas.edu/papers/utip_22rv5.pdf>)

Geddes, B. 1999. "What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years?"*Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 115–44.

Gerring, J., Thacker, S. C. and Moreno, C. 2005. "Centripetal Democratic Governance: A Theory and Global Inquiry." *American Political Science Review*, 99(4): 567-581.

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.politicalterrorscale.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.

Grimes. M. 2008. "Contestation or Complicity: Civil Society as Antidote or Accessory to Political Corruption." *QoG Working Paper Series,* 2008:8. The Quality of Government Institute, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg.

http://www.qog.pol.gu.se/working_papers/2008_8_Grimes.pdf

Gunnemark, E. V. 1991. *Countries, Peoples and Their Languages: the Linguistic Handbook*. Göteborg, Sweden: Länstryckeriet.

Gurr, T. R. 1974. "Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971." *American Political Science Review*, 68: 1482-1504.

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.

Holmberg, S. 2007. *The Good Society Index*. QoG Working Paper Series 2007:6. http://www.qog.pol.gu.se/working_papers/2007_6_Holmberg.pdf University of Gothenburg: The quality of Government Institute.

IMF, 1986. *A Manual on Government Finance Statistics. (GFSM 1986)*. http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/gfs/manual/gfs.htm Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.

IMF, 2001. *A Manual on Government Finance Statistics 2001. (GFSM 2001).* http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/gfs/manual/gfs.htm Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.

Inglehart, R., and Baker, W. E. 2000. "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review*, 65(1): 19-51.

Inglehart, R., and Norris, P. 2003. *Rising Tide, Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R., and Welzel, C. 2003. "Political Culture and Democracy: Analyzing Cross-Level Linkages." *Comparative Politics*, 36(1): 61-79.

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.

Kekic, L. 2006. "The Economist Intelligence Unit's index of democracy." *The Economist. The World in 2007.* London.

Klingemann, H.-D. 1999 "Mapping Political Support in the 1990s: A Global Analysis," in Norris, P. ed., *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 31-56.

Knack, S., and Kugler, M. 2002. "Constructing an Index of Objective Indicators of Good Governance". PREM Public Sector Group, World Bank.

Laakso, M., and Taagepera, R. 1979. "Effective Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to Western Europe". *Comparative Political Studies* 12:3-27.

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., Lopez-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

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.

Midlarsky, M. 1997. *Inequality, Democracy, and Economic Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Mocan, N. 2007. "What Determines Corruption? International Evidence from Micro Data." Revised version of NBER Working Paper 10460, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Muller, S. H. 1964. *The World's Living Languages: Basic Facts of Their Structure, Kinship, Location, and Number of Speakers*. New York, NY: Ungar.

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.

Persson, T., and Tabellini, G. 2003. The Economic Effects of Constitutions. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

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.

Rauch, J.E., and Evans, P.B. 2000. Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic Performance in Less Developed Countries. *Journal of Public Economic*, 75: 49-71.

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

Richards, D. L., Gelleny, R. and Sacko, D. 2001. Money With A Mean Streak? Foreign Economic Penetration and Government Respect for Human Rights in Developing Countries. *International Studies Quarterly*. 45(2): 219-239.

Roberts, J. 1962. "Sociocultural change and communication problems," in *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, Frank A. Rice, ed. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association of America. 105-123.

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

Sachs, J. D. 2003. *Institutions Don't Rule: Direct Effects of Geography on Per Capita Income*. Working Paper 9490. http://www.nber.org/papers/w9490.pdf Cambridge, Massachusettes: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Sachs, J. D. and Warner, A. M. 1995. "Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration." *Brooking Paperson Economic Activity*, 1: 1-118.

Salamon, Lester M., Sokolowski, S. W. and List, R. 2003. Global Civil Society: An Overview. The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.

Schemmel, Benjamin. 2004. Rulers. http://www.rulers.org 2004, 18 December.

Statistical Abstract of the World .1995. New York, NY: Gale Research, Inc.

Taagepera, R. 1997. "Effective Number of Parties for Incomplete Data." *Electoral Studies* 16:145-151.

Taylor, C. L., and Hudson, M. C. 1972. *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators,* 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Teorell, J. 2009. "The Impact of Quality of Government as Impartiality: Theory and Evidence." Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada, September 2-6, 2009.

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

Treisman, Daniel. 2007. "What Have We Learned About the Causes of Corruption from Ten Years of Cross-National Empirical Research?" *Annual Review of Political Science,* 10: 211-244.

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].

Veenhoven, R. 2007. *World Database of Happiness*. Erasmus University, Rotterdam. Available at http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl. Accessed at 2007-10-08.

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

Welzel, C., Inglehart, R. and Klingemann, H.-D. 2003. "The Theory of Human Development: A Cross-cultural Analysis." *European Journal of Political Research*, 42(3): 341-373.

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.

Wright, J. 2008. "Do Authoritarian Institutions Constrain? How Legislatures Affect Economic Growth and Investment." *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(2): 322-343.