Jahn, Detlef, Nils Düpont, Christina Stremming, Erik Baltz, Maximilian Andorff-Woller, Lisa Klagges, and Sophie Suda.

# PIP Codebook Ready-Made Yearly TSCS Dataset

Version: 2022-04

# Introduction

The PIP (Parties – Institutions – Preferences) dataset combines information about political parties, party ideology, governments, parliaments and presidents in a unique way which allows for the estimation of actors' policy positions. For those interested in the Agenda Setting Power Model (ASPM) proposed by Jahn (2016), we provide a framework[1] that allows you to change (m)any modelling(s). For starting right away with your analyses, we provide an aggregated yearly time-series–cross-section dataset with ready-made government and EU positions plus veto player ranges (Jahn 2010) on the Left-Right and the Green-Growth dimension (Jahn 2011; 2016) for 36 countries from 1944 to 2020,[2] namely

- 23 OECD countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the USA;
- together with thirteen Central and Eastern European and Mediterranean EU member states: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, and Romania.

For more details on the PIP dataset – from which the aggregated TSCS file originates – see the "PIP Codebook Main Dataset".[3]

# File Structure and Modellings

The ready-to-use data file provides variables for government positions, veto players and EU-positions; it is organized in variable blocks resembling certain models, namely

- Vanilla
- Prime Minister coding
- Categorical government coding
- EU positions with categorical government coding
- Minister government coding
- EU positions with minister government coding

---

[1] https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/S0UGDC
[2] For Greece, Spain, Portugal, and the thirteen Central and Eastern European and Mediterranean EU member states the actual time period is shorter; see the Codebook of the main dataset for more details.
[3] https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/KRXPH4

Note that all models differ only for parliamentary democracies. The scores for the United States and Switzerland are always the same and modeled according to Jahn (2016). For classifying countries as prime minister dominated, minister model or collegial model see Jahn (2022b). The operationalization of EU positions is based on Jahn and Düpont (2015) and differs according to the models used for the country governments (categorical or minister coding). For all actor's positions, we use the LR index developed by Jahn (2011; 2022a). For the vanilla variables and for the environmental ministries and environmental EU position we use the green-growth index in addition (Jahn 2016).

## Vanilla

These variables consider governments as a collegial system and the weighted average position is used. Such models represent the most frequent way of operationalizing government positions. Because it is the simplest operationalization, we call the variables "vanilla". Variables are given for left-right and green-growth government positions and the average coherence (Jahn and Oberst 2012) of the government parties in both policy dimensions. For each operationalization we also include the veto player range.

## Prime Minister coding

Government positions in the left-right and green-growth dimension are the position of the prime minister. Please be aware that this operationalization differs from the prime minister dominated model in that it only uses the position of the prime minister.

## Categorical government coding

For these variables, we use the adjusted and extended coding from Woldendorp, Keman, and Budge (2000). It means that all ministers are considered which fall into one of the 15 policy fields using their average. For more details about the differences of the categorical and the unique minister coding see also the "Companion PIP Minister".

## EU positions with categorical government coding

In this block, we provide data on the European Council, the Commission, the European Council of Ministers, the European Parliament and an index of the ideological center of gravity of the EU. This has been done for the vanilla variables and for the categorical coding of the portfolios of country governments. We use six policy fields in which the EU is particularly active.

## Minister government coding

Almost the same as the categorical government coding except that in this case we only use the most important minister per cabinet in ten major policy fields. For more details about the differences of the categorical and the unique minister coding see also the "Companion PIP Minister".

## EU positions with minister government coding

The same as categorical coding except that in this case we use the unique minister coding for modelling the country governments which feed into the EU positions.

# Variable Naming Convention

Each variable name consists of certain characters and acronyms from which the content, modelling and ideological dimension can be derived.

| Character(s) | Description |
|---|---|
| LR | Ideological dimension: Left–Right |
| GG | Ideological dimension: Green–Growth |
| VP | Veto player range |
| Vanilla | Default government positions |
| PM | Prime minister coding |
| c | Categorical coding of ministers |
| m | Unique minister coding |
| EU | EU position(s) |
| COU | European Council |
| COM | European Commission |
| EP | European Parliament |
| Foreign, Finance, Economic, Labour, Housing, Health, Agriculture, Industry, Environment, Social | Policy fields and minister/commission portfolios, respectively |

In short, the ready-made dataset makes it easy to start more analytical analyses in macro-comparative studies than before. All these standard models imply important decisions which we outlined in peer-reviewed articles. However, the PIP database allows for many different codings in line with alternative decisions using the ASPM framework. Of course, users can also write their own syntax using the raw data. We hope that you enjoy working with the PIP Dataverse. Do not hesitate to contact us when you have any queries or suggestions.

# References

Jahn, Detlef. 2010. "The Veto Player Approach in Macro-Comparative Politics: Concepts and Measurement." In *Reform Processes and Policy Change: Veto Players and Decision-Making in Modern Democracies*. Vol. 16 of *Studies in Public Choice*, eds. Thomas König, Marc Debus and George Tsebelis. New York: Springer, 43–68.

———. 2011. "Conceptualizing Left and Right in Comparative Politics: Towards a Deductive Approach." *Party Politics* (17): 745–65.

———. 2016. *The Politics of Environmental Performance: Institutions and Preferences in Industrialized Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2022a. "The Changing Relevance and Meaning of Left and Right in 34 Party Systems from 1945 to 2020." *Comparative European Politics*: Online First.

———. 2022b. "The Government's Ideological Center of Gravity in 34 Parliamentary Democracies." Mimeo and Presentation at the University of Greifswald, May 24, 2022.

Jahn, Detlef, and Nils Düpont. 2015. *Estimating the Position of the European Union: A Tool for Macro-Quantitative Studies*. Free University, Berlin. KFG Working Paper Series, 65.

Jahn, Detlef and Christoph Oberst. 2012. "Ideological Party Cohesion in Macro-Comparative Politics: The Nordic Social Democratic Parties from a Comparative Perspective." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 35 (3): 222–45.

Woldendorp, Jaap, Hans Keman, and Ian Budge. 2000. *Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998): Composition - Duration - Personnel*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.