Coding Rules for Political Regimes of the World Dataset

When classifying the countries into autocracies and democracies for the time period 2011-2016, we have used the following basic strategy: For each country, we have compared scores for the polyarchy-variable in the V-dem dataset as well as scores for Freedom House's political rights dimension to the values the country in question received in 2010, the last year for which data for Boix et al. is available, on these same scales. Thereafter we have checked how Boix et al. have classified the countries during the same point in time. If, for instance, Boix et al. classified a country as a democracy in 2010 and its value on V-dem's polyarchy-variable in 2013 equalled or exceeded the corresponding polyarchy-score for 2010, we have classified the country as a democracy for the year 2013. In cases where polyarchy-scores and political rights scores differ, we have also compared the values with the Polity 2 scale in the Polity IV-dataset (Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers, 2014).

In cases where countries have received values on the two scales which suggest that they have moved away from their initial position, we have made a comparison with the values the countries received on the two scales during the time period 2000 to 2009. Thereafter we have looked at how Boix et al. classified the countries in question during these years. For instance, Boix et al. classified Armenia as an autocracy in 2010, when it received the value 6, on Freedom House's political rights dimension and the value 0.33 on V-dem's polyarchy scale. In 2012, Armenia's value moved in the direction towards democracy as its political rights score changed to 5 at the same time as its value on the polyarchy scale rose to 0.4. However, the country also received the value 5 on the political rights dimension in 2004-2007 and the value 4 in the period 2000-2003. On V-dem's polyarchy scale, again, Armenia's value exceeded 0.4 in the period

2000-2002. During the whole period 2000-2010 Boix et al. classified Armenia as an autocracy. Accordingly, we classify Armenia as an autocracy also in 2012. The dataset by Boix et al. does not contain extensive information on regime characteristics for the European miniature states Liechtenstein, Monaco and San Marino. For these countries, we have made classifications for the time periods for which data is lacking.[1]

Drawing the line between the different categories of authoritarian systems can sometimes be quite problematic as many systems contain elements of different regime types. A particular challenge has been to code the regimes during the period 1800 to 1946, as the literature on political regimes for this period is rather scarce. The problem should not be exaggerated, though; the number of independent countries was much lower during this era, and the independent countries to a high extent concentrated to Europe and Latin America.

In Latin America, the main challenge has been to draw a line between military regimes and personalist regimes in the age of *caudillos*. Often, but not always, these strong leaders were military leaders but there are also instances were persons without a strong military background could rise to and stay in power, relying on informal networks rather than military forces. As an example, we classify the rule of José Maria Linares (a wealthy civilian who proclaimed himself dictator) in Bolivia 1857-1861 as a personalist regime, whereas the subsequent regime under José Mará de Achá, a military general who lead the coup d'etat that removed Linares from power is classified as a military regime. When separating personalist rule from military rule in this era, we have made use of a variety of texts of biographical nature. The Wikipedia site "List

[1] In Monaco the monarch chooses, appoints and directs the ministers while the legislature lacks the possibility to bring down the government. Needless to say, the democratic status of a country where a hereditary monarch is in possession of such powers is highly questionable (e.g. Veenendaal, 2013, pp.57-58) and Monaco is therefore transformed from the category democracy to autocracy).

of heads of state…" retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_heads_of_state_of [country] has been particularly useful.

The line between party-based regimes and personalist regimes is far from always clear. Although Linz' criteria of sultanism are very helpful for separating personalist regimes from party-based regimes we cannot escape the fact that many cases where the leader has concentrated a great deal of power into his own hands fall in a grey area between the two categories. In such cases, it is of particular importance to try to establish the level of importance of the ruling party in the state apparatus. Following Geddes et al. (2014: 329) focus is here on the extent to which party organization "penetrates" the whole country and how deeply rooted the party is in the bureaucracy. The V-Dem dataset (Coppedge et al., 2017) also provides information which is very useful for making a distinction between regime types, especially for distinguishing between party-based regimes and personalist regimes in the period 1900-2016. In this respect we have, in particular, used the following questions : HOS/HOG appointment in practice (v2expathhs, v2expathhg): *How did the head of state reach office/How did the head of government gain access to office?*; HOS/HOG removal by other in practice (v2exrmhsol, v2exrmhgnp): *Which of the following bodies would be likely to succeed in removing the head of state/head of government if it took actions (short of military force) to do so?*; and HOS/HOG control over (c) (v2exctlhs, v2exctlhg): *In practice, from which of the following bodies must/does the head of state/head of government customarily seek approval prior to making important decisions on domestic policy?* In addition, we have made use of the executive constraints-variable from the Polity IV-index (Marshall, M. G. et al. (2014).

.

For some countries, again mostly in a Latin American context, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the problem is aggravated by the fact that we also need to separate oligarchies from party-based- and personalist regimes. As a general strategy, when defining oligarchies, we have demanded that the countries included in the category of oligarchies meet the criteria of democracy when disregarding the level of participation. Here, the Polity IV-dataset has often been useful. The dataset has been criticized heavily because it does not pay regard to the level of participation (Munck and Verkuilen, 2002: 11). However, in the present context the negligence of this dimension makes it possible to account for differences in the level of democracy, disregarding the level of participation. Chile serves as an illustrative case: In 1874, its Polity2 score rose from 0 to 3, due to an increase of constraints on the executive, in this case effectively a transfer of powers from the president to the legislature. At the same time, the requirement that half of the adult male population had the right to vote was not met until 1909, and this is consequently the year when Chile qualifies as a democracy by Boix et al. However, this shift is not reflected in Polity 2-scores where Chile continues to receive the value 3 until the military coup of 1924. We therefore classify Chile as an oligarchy during the period 1874 to 1908, and a democracy with a presidential form of government from 1909 until the military coup of 1924.

Furthermore, regarding cases where a military regime transforms itself to a civilian regime we have, in addition to bibliographic sources, relied on the following questions from the V-dem dataset: *HOS removal by other in practice (C) (v2exrmhsol) and HOS control over (C) (v2exctlhs)***.** Finally, in order to separate single-party rule from multi-party authoritarian rule the most important sources have been the series on elections in different regions of the world edited by Dieter Nohlen and others. In addition we have used the question "*Elections multiparty (C) (v2elmulpar, *_osp, *_ord)*" from the V-dem dataset.

Coding procedure and data sources

In order to ensure reliability, each author coded all cases separately. Each author marked all classifications as either certain or uncertain. For each author, the share of uncertain cases was below 10 per cent. Regarding the certain cases, inter-rater reliability exceeded 95 per cent. The authors then jointly classified the uncertain cases, as well as those certain cases where the authors had provided different classifications.

Data has been compiled from a variety of sources. As a general rule, we have used the sources listed below and compared the information provided in the sources to each other. For many countries we have used complementary sources, often in languages other than English.

Bienen, H.S. and van de Walle, N.

Blaustein, A. & Flanz, G.H., eds, (various years).

Boix et al. (2012).

Cheibub et al. (2009).

Cheibub et al. (2010).

Coppedge et al. (2017).

Encyclopedia Britannica.

Freedom House.

Geddes et al. (2014).

Mainwaring, S and Scully, T.R. 1995.

Marshall, M. G. et al. (2014).

Nationalencyclopedin

Nohlen, D. and Krennerich, M. 1999

Nohlen, D., Grotz, F., and Hartmann, C. 2001.

Nohlen, D. (ed.) 2005. Nohlen, D. and Stöver, P. 2010.

Siaroff (2003).

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP).

Wahman, M., Hadenius, A. and Teorell, J. 2013.

Wikipedia: “List of heads of government …”

Wikipedia: “list of heads of state of ….”

WORLD STATESMEN

References

Bienen, H.S. and van de Walle, N. 1991. *Of Time and Power: Leadership Duration in the Modern World*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Blaustein, A. and Flanz, G.H., eds, (various years). *Constitutions of the Countries of the World*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana.

Boix, C., Miller, M. and Rosato, S. (2012). A Complete Data Set of Political Regimes. 1800-2007. *Comparative Political Studies* 46: 1523-1554.

Cheibub, J.A. Gandhi, J. and Vreeland, J.R. (2009). Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited Codebook, available at http:///sites.google.com/site/joseantoniocheibub/datasets/democracy-and-dictatorship-revisited.

Cheibub, J.A. Gandhi, J. and Vreeland, J.R. (2010). Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited. *Public Choice* 143(1): 67-101.

Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Lindberg, S.I., Skaaning, S-E., Teorell, J. et al. (2017) 'V-Dem Codebook v7'. *Varieties of Democracy (v-Dem) Project*, available at https://www.v-dem.net/en/reference/version-7-may-2017.

Correlates of War Project. Correlates of War country code. http://www.correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/cow-country-codes).

Encyclopedia Britannica. http:// britannica.com.

Freedom House. http//www.freedomhouse.org.

Geddes, B., Wright, J. and Frantz, E. (2014). Autocratic regimes and transitions. *Perspectives on Politics* 12(2): 313-331.

Mainwaring, S and Scully, T.R. (eds) 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Marshall, M. G., Gurr, T.R., and Jaggers, K. (2014). *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2013*. Center for Systemic Peace, George Mason University.

Munck, G. and Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1): 5-34.

Nationalencyclopedin. http://www.se.ne

Nohlen, D. and Krennerich, M. (eds). 1999. *Elections in Africa*. Oxford University Press.

Nohlen, D., Grotz, F., and Hartmann, C. (eds.). 2001. *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, vols. 1 & 2: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nohlen, D. (ed.) 2005. *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, vols. 1 & 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nohlen, D. and Stöver, P. (eds.). 2010. *Elections in Europe: A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP). http://ucdp.uu.se.

Veenendaal, W.P. (2013) *Politics and Democracy in Microstates. A comparative Analysis of the Effects of Size on Contestation and Inclusiveness*, Dissertation, University of Leiden.

Wikipedia: "*list of heads of state of* …." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_heads_of_state_of [country].

Wikipedia: "*List of heads of government* …" https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_heads_of_government_of_[country].

World Bank. https://wits.worldbank.org/wits/wits/witshelp/content/codes/country_codes.htm

WORLD STATESMEN. http://www.worldstatesmen.org